

# INSURRECTION

ANARCHIST PAPER

ISSUE THREE

50 PENC

BUT HOW CAN  
I GET CLOSE  
ENOUGH TO  
BUMP HER  
OFF ?



# violence and non-violence

THE STRUGGLE CONTINUES...that of the miners, the unemployed, the low paid workers, immigrant workers, proletarian women, young people...the groups and sub-groups are endless in the great mass of the exploited of advanced capital.

The urban ghettos kindle, there is ferment in the schools. Anger is mounting among the services workers pushed out of their jobs or devalued by privatisation. Shipyard workers, workers in the car industry, skilled and unskilled workers in all the heavy and light industries are finding themselves thrown like rejects on to the scrap heaps of poverty and depression. Meanwhile the rich get richer. And to keep this wealth they are building more and more bunkers, bullet proof cars, training armies, special corps for crowd control, building new prisons, formulating new laws, tightening border controls, perfecting social control.

The obvious place to turn in this situation is the official workers' movement. This however has miserably failed in its historic task. There can no longer be any doubt. The unions need the space to survive and grow that only capital will provide for them. Even the seemingly combative ones have no intention or desire to destroy a system which is happy to delegate to them the role of bargaining over the cost of the restructuring process in course. Their role is indispensable, and is worth the price of policing picket line battles when workers are no longer prepared to accept the results of the conference table.

The only losers are those who fought and gave all—and lost all. What good is the credit balance of 'self-respect' if all it serves to do is to palliate another twenty years down the mines or a life on the dole.

The struggle continues, in spite of the unions. In spite of the parties and hangers on. In spite of the anarchists so long as we remain tied to illusions that our movement has fostered for so long now.

What to do? Wait for the next confrontation to appear? Improvise next time, become insurrectionalists, trade unionists, abstentionists for the day, anti-militarists or whatever else the occasion demands of us?

Or is it time to work out—and make known in clear terms—what anarchists really are. What we really want: to subvert the present order and be protagonists in the struggle for the new. This is not an abstract concept, a maximalisation to delay the moment of action. If our final subversive, destructive, aim is forgotten for a moment, allowing ourselves to be fascinated by the pull of activism without clear thought and profound analysis, we can often end up flanking the very counter-revolution we believe we are fighting.

We need organisational proposals that become a clear point of reference beyond the institutionalised haggling of capitalist forces. These proposals must be concrete and we must be present to participate in bringing them about. It is time to come out from our ideological bunkers and confront each other not so much on the immediate and pressing tactical choices for the next demo, but to analyse the reality in which we are trying to work. It is time to come out.

The problem of the difference between 'violence' and 'nonviolence' is usually posed wrongly because of the class interests and emotive reactions it triggers off.

State violence and the terrorism of the bosses knows no limits or moral obstacle. Revolutionaries, and anarchists in particular, are quite justified in responding to this violence with revolutionary violence.

Complications arise when we examine the positions of those who support non-violence. In appearance only do they choose peaceful methods, methods which when seen in isolation are not violent, ie do not physically attack the adversary. Yet when seen within the general framework of the struggle, their interventions (apart from those of organisations who use non violence as an alibi to leave things as they are) turn out to be just as violent as those carried out by the supporters of 'violence'.

A march of 'pacifist' demonstrators is itself a violent event which upsets the order of exploitation. It is a demonstration of strength, a show of force. It does not differ from the 'violent' demonstration, at least in its choice of objective. From the strategic and revolutionary point of view, the idea of a violent demonstration capable of winning and holding a military victory is unthinkable today. In so saying, we do not mean that we should refuse revolutionary violence. We only mean we must be clear so as to

avoid sanctifying the machine gun on the one hand or becoming the policeman of the situation on the other.

A purely verbal distinction between violence and non-violence is a false one. A well-fed bourgeois can easily 'theorise' the most unchained violence, against the boss class, but only with difficulty will he put it into effect in conditions requiring total dedication to the revolutionary task. Most often his violence is purely verbal. In practice he prefers things to remain as they are, because among other things, that allows him to continue to exercise his fiery rhetoric.

Another equally well-fed bourgeois might feel himself transported to an exaltation of non-violence, but still as something theoretical, something condemning the negative 'instincts' of struggle and violence and sanctifying the positive 'instincts' of peace and brotherhood. Only with difficulty however will this bourgeois put his non-violent 'principles' into practice in a total daily involvement in the social struggle. He will prefer the comfort of the situation as it is, where he can carry on with his reflections on peace and brotherhood.

Before speaking of violence and non-violence a distinction should be made as to whether the question is being applied to a real situation, or whether it is simply an abstract theory and there is no intention of actually applying it. Only in the case of the former is it possible to dis-

cuss the strategic and military conditions that render non-violent methods less effective and more easily overcome by power. But this discussion is one which comes afterwards, is a question of method and never an abstract one.

We are not interested in philosophical discussions on violence that lead to theories of the hereditary biological violence of the species, etc, which stink of theology. What is important is to approach the struggle in its reality. The rest is a question of choice of means and the best way to put them into effect.

If we are personally convinced that non-violent methods are unsuitable in the social struggle today, not for this are we against the comrades who see their own dimension of struggle in non-violent methods. What is important is that the struggle be engaged upon seriously, that it not be limited to speaking of 'non-violent struggle' as an alibi so that the police will leave us alone.

Abstract discussions on violence (nearly always fiery and bloody) and just as abstract discussions on nonviolence (nearly always idiotic and paradisaical) are equally disgusting. We can only respond effectively to the historic crime of exploitation, terrorism and institutionalised violence with struggle, using any means we choose. The violence (or non-violence) of words and speeches will change nothing.

## VICTORY? WHOSE

The recent media operation disclosing the shock horror story of the Princess Michael's nazi/SS antecedents (and who of her age, nationality and class does not have nazi/SS antecedents?) has given the aforementioned a wonderful opportunity to drag the well-worn films of the concentration camps out of the archives again, just a few days before "VE" day.

We are reminded of what was (some of it), and of what might have been (had 'we' not saved 'democracy'). That "the Allies" fought and vanquished the Demons of the earth, replaced Evil with Good.

The not-for-this less horrendous systematic torture and slow annihilation of millions of Jews, Poles, Russians, gypsies, etc, which lent itself so well to the celluloid documentary and never fails to stagger one with its tremendous teutonic methodical rationality, serves to cover up the equally horrendous, but less visible, annihilation of the populations of Dresden, Hiroshima, Nagasaki, Vietnam. The more recent slaughter over the Falklands. The present-day massacre in the Lebanon and South American countries to

name but a few.

The same media that rekindles an abhorance of the concentration camps, covers up the legacy of dismemberment, blindness, malformation, the slow and painful deaths of the 'good' wars.

In the spirit of the pioneers and frontiersmen, these wars were and are waged with a quick clean efficiency. No messing about, just bomb them off the face of the earth. Too bad that chemical reactions and radiation can achieve the whole thing in just the one radical obliteration but continue through succeeding generations (see agent orange). But with progress in science and chemical warfare, one day this might be possible.

In the same way, the old teutonic version of the fascism of the jackboot and the swastika has given way to the new, clean, sanitised fascism of social democracy. The fascism of participation and controlled dissent, on condition that real power is centralised in the hands of a restricted minority which coordinates political and economic power, making it balance. This minority is supra-national in character and structure (IMF, international

power summits, ecumenical church, multinational corporations) and uses 'international' wars as a stimulous to profit and social control. (And the monarchies are at the same time anachronistic figure-heads and active participants in the ongoing slaughter this fascism represents both in 'wars', at the workplace and in the famine-ridden deserts.)

We cannot detach what the State calls war from the global project of capitalist exploitation. Our task as anarchists is to demystify war, and underline what we all know very well: that we are living in a perpetual state of war, a war which has not frontier but class boundaries. Terrorism and genocide is not the prerogative of the military structure of one country, but is the underlying basis of everyday life.

Nothing to celebrate then, but time to organise and work out a real offensive in a libertarian class dimension whose objectives are always the same: an organised attack against the organisations and individuals who put into act and make possible exploitation in all its bellicose forms.

# ON AMNESTY

## More on Amnesty

There has been reference in some anarchist papers recently to the 'struggle for amnesty' taking place by prisoners in Italy. Even without knowing much of what has been happening there in recent years, it doesn't take much reflection to see there is a contradiction in terms here. A 'struggle' for amnesty is at best a contradiction, in its true light it is one of the latest swindles by the repressive apparatus of the Italian State, requiring the complicity of a large part of what was once its contestant (at least in its present form) both inside and outside the prison walls.

Hence the rivers of words, theories, justifications and platitudes, amounting to no more than a fairly generalised 'throwing in the towel'. 'The War is over', and the same laws that churned out life sentences and allowed for the release of vile traitors and grasses, are now sanctioning amnesty. The order is: continue the struggle with other means. The ones used till now have made too much noise. Abandon everything. Put aside the class struggle. Abandon the revolution.

First the appearance of the *pentiti* who abandoned the struggle on a military and political level, passing over to the side of the State and personally taking on the task of strangling all further forms of resistance resulting in the assassination of four Red Brigades comrades in Genova in 1980 and the arrest of hundreds of comrades since. Now the appearance of those affirming 'desertion'. In May 1980 a collective document drawn up by the supporters of the *desertion* thesis, nearly all ex-*Prima Linea*, among whom Donat Cattin and Gai, was published by *Lotta Continua*. This first group of deserters was short-lived. Many of them ended up with a very fine line between themselves and the *pentiti*, and almost all of them ended up collaborating with the judiciary.

In September 1982, a document appeared known as that of the 51 (the number of signatories) drawing up a way of taking a distance from the struggle; disassociation, proposals for pacification, amnesty, etc.

Those who signed this document, mainly from the autonomy area, maintain that combattant positions be condemned, opening the way to a dialectic with the State. Negri, Ferrari, Bravo, Vesce and others say it is necessary to criticise the past radical antagonism and immerse themselves in a dialectic relationship with the 'healthy' social and political forces. In this way (they maintain) the State will also find itself forced into self-criticism. New conditions of the political clash will lead not to radical dissent or total opposition, but to dialectic and increased discussion, with the aim of stimulating the State to increasingly democratise itself. In this way the area of *disassociation* has developed and contains various positions.

One of these positions is that of Scalzone and other refugees in France. They maintain there should be a great mobilisation to impose a battle for amnesty for all political prisoners. An armistice has to be drawn up with the State, and the two sides are to bargain over the price of the movement's defeat.

Another area born within the prisons is that of the so-called *decarcerisation* (release of prisoners). Its supporters refuse to subscribe to *disassociation*, but see the need to find other roads to social transformation, passing through pacifist and ecological struggles to a better 'quality of life'. In their situation as prisoners they want to begin a politico-cultural struggle aimed at reducing the negative effects of segregation. This area are calling for conferences, demonstrations, concerts, exhibitions, production and cultural coops, with the aim of creating social structures

that are 'alternatives to prison', in a perspective allowing a passage from the dreamed of political revolution to social transformation. This area is rapidly approaching that of the true *disassociated* and constitutes the so-called *homogeneous area*. They organised a conference in Rebibbia prison in Rome last May in which 30 prisoners participated.

Many ex-militants of *Prima Linea* have taken a road leading to positions of disassociation. Instead of *pacification* they speak of *reconciliation*, concluding that conditions in Italy today do not consent the use of armed struggle.

The 'continuist' nucleus of the Red Brigades (eg Curcio) are enclosed in an unreal irreducibility, insisting on the need for the constitution of the Combattant Communist Party. They have highlighted the limitations and defects of armed struggle and the organisation that have practised it over the past years. They say it is possible to use revolutionary violence but that it has not managed to unite all the expressions of the proletariat over the past years. A critique has been made of those who lived and still live the myth of the Red Brigades as monolithic armed vanguard. So the concept of the party in the third-internationalist sense has fallen, giving way to the conception of a guerilla attacking proletarian contradictions from within. In December 1983 they began a hunger strike in the prison of Nuoro against prison conditions. They have since instored a relationship with the catholic church recognising it in the role of prisoners' defence.

There also exists, however, a considerable number of comrades who criticise political solutions. They support the need for taking up the struggle again, both inside and outside the prisons and seeing the problem of prison within the whole perspective of liberation from the capitalist system.

While the massacre continues in South Africa, the hangman Botha is trying to create a veneer of 'softening' the white bourgeois regime through the repeal of the laws on intermarriage between blacks and whites. A turning on to the road of superstructural reforms, leaving intact the basic structure of exploitation.

Another highlight of this 'democratisation' of the Botha regime has been the ultimatum proffered to Nelson Mandela, incarcerated in the dungeons of apartheid now for 22 years after being sentenced to life imprisonment for sabotage, to renounce the struggle along with other ANC (African National Congress) prisoners. So in terms of the South African government, Mandela 'has only himself to blame' for his continuing incarceration in the strongholds of capitalist domination and greed. He was offered his release 'on the condition that he renounce armed struggle'.

From his cell in Pollsmoor prison near Capetown he replied, broadcast and reported by the liberal media: "I am not a violent man...it was only when all other forms of resistance were no longer open to us that we turned to armed struggle. Let Botha renounce violence...let him say he will dismantle apartheid...let him unban the ANC...let him free all who have been imprisoned, banished or exiled for opposition to apartheid...I am not less life-loving than you are. But I cannot sell my birthright, nor am I prepared to sell the birthright of the people to be free..."

What freedom am I being offered when I must ask for permission to live in an urban area? What freedom am I being offered when my very South African citizenship is not respected.

Only free men can negotiate... prisoners cannot enter into contract. I cannot and will not give any undertaking at a time when I and you, the people, are not free." Nelson Mandella

## Neighbourhood WATCH

In Orlando, Florida, a pilot scheme using drivers from local businesses has been launched, developed by the Greater Orlando Crime Prevention Association. The so-called 'Mobile Watch' consists of volunteers trained as 'extra eyes and ears' of the police. Local company fleet drivers are trained by police to spot and report 'emergencies or suspicious criminal activity'. All reports are immediately relayed to police headquarters either directly or through company dispatchers.

This brings to mind a recent report from the communications research group in applied psychology at Aston University which dispelled the myth—held by both public and police—of the police as great solvers of 'crime'. In actual fact the police represent the *symbols* of effectiveness rather than provide the reality of it.

More than 85 per cent of the 'crimes' known to the police are solved by the public (still according to our worthy researchers), who provide most of the crucial information. Hence the great police drive in neighbourhoods, schools, etc, appealing to the policeman that beats in


everyman's heart, using the media inflation of acts of basic survival into an alarming crimewave to arouse public vigilance.

These schemes have been welcomed with enthusiasm in the middle class areas, the occupants of which spend their lives being cops in one way or another: filling in registers, report cards, log books and all the other records of exploitation. Not so in the proletarian ghettos, where the struggle for survival creates its own laws and its own code of practise.

In fact from these areas, especially among young black people, there is no mystification as to the role of the police and their schemes. Not only have they refused en masse to police their own people either formally or informally, they have also refused point blank to participate in ID parades. Hence the frequent presence of uniformed and plain clothes police at the top of the Brixton tube station escalator: anyone travelling up it at one of these moments risks being 'recognised' by a witness and feeling the icy grip of the handcuffs in the new public ID parade.



# PANNEKOEK ON TRADE UNIONISM



How must the working class fight capitalism in order to win? This is the all important question facing the workers every day. What efficient means of action, what tactics can they use to conquer power and defeat the enemy? No science, no theory, could tell them exactly what to do. But spontaneously and instinctively, by feeling out, by sensing the possibilities, they found their ways of action. And as capitalism grew and conquered the earth and increased its power, the power of the workers also increased. New modes of action, wider and more efficient, came up beside the old ones. It is evident that with changing conditions, the forms of action, the tactics of the class struggle have to change also. Trade unionism is the primary form of labour movement in fixed capitalism. The isolated worker is powerless against the capitalistic employer. To overcome this handicap, the workers organise into unions. The union binds workers together into common action, with the strike as their weapon. Then the balance of power is relatively equal, or is sometimes even heaviest on the side of the workers, so that the isolated small employer is weak against the mighty union. Hence in developed capitalism trade unions and employers unions (Associations, Trusts, Corporations, etc), stand as fighting powers against each other.

Trade unionism first arose in England, where industrial capitalism first developed. Afterward it spread to other countries, as a natural companion of capitalist industry. In the United States there were very special



conditions. In the beginning, the abundance of free unoccupied land, open to settlers, made for a shortage of workers in the towns and relatively high wages and good conditions. The American Federation of Labour became a power in the country, and generally was able to uphold a relatively high standard of living for the workers who were organised in its unions.

It is clear that under such conditions the idea of overthrowing capitalism could not for a moment arise in the minds of the workers. Capitalism offered them a sufficient and fairly secure living. They did not feel themselves a separate class whose interests were hostile to the existing order; they were part of it; they were conscious of partaking in all the possibilities of an ascending capitalism in a new continent. There was room for millions of people, coming mostly from Europe. For these increasing millions of farmers, a rapidly increasing industry was necessary, where, with energy and good luck, workmen could rise to become free artisans, small business men, even rich capitalists. It is natural that here a true capitalist spirit prevailed in the working class.

The same was the case in England. Here it was due to England's monopoly of world commerce and big industry, to the lack of competitors on foreign markets, and to the possession of rich colonies, which brought enormous wealth to England. The capitalist class had no need to fight for its profits and could allow the workers a reasonable living. Of course, at first, fighting was necessary to urge this truth upon them; but then they could allow unions and grant wages in exchange for industrial peace. So here also the working class was imbued with the capitalist spirit.

Now this is entirely in harmony with the innermost character of trade unionism. Trade unionism is an action of the workers, which does not go beyond the limit of capitalism. Its aim is not to replace capitalism by another form of production, but to secure good living conditions within capitalism. Its character is not revolutionary, but conservative.




Certainly, trade union action is class struggle. There is a class antagonism in capitalism—capitalists and workers have opposing interests. Not only on the question of conservation of capitalism, but also within capitalism itself, with regard to the division of the total product. The capitalists attempt to increase their profits, the surplus value, as much as possible, by cutting down wages and increasing the hours or the intensity of labour. On the other hand, the workers attempt to increase their wages and to shorten their hours of work.

The price of labour power is not a fixed quantity, though it must exceed a certain hunger minimum; and it is not paid by the capitalists of their own free will. Thus this antagonism becomes the object of a contest, the real class struggle. It is the task, the function of the trade unions to carry on this fight.

Trade unionism was the first training school in proletarian virtue, in solidarity as the spirit of organised fighting. It embodied the first form of proletarian organised fighting. In the early English and American trade unions this virtue often petrified and degenerated into a narrow craft-corporation, a true capitalistic state of mind. It was different, however, where the workers had to fight for their very existence, where the utmost efforts of their unions could hardly uphold their standard of living, where the full force of an energetic, fighting, and expanding capitalism attacked them. There they had to learn the wisdom that only the revolution could definitely save them.

So there comes a disparity between the working class and trade unionism. The working class has to look beyond capitalism. Trade unionism lives entirely within capitalism and cannot look beyond it. Trade unionism can only represent a part, a necessary but narrow part, in the class struggle. And it develops aspects which bring it into conflict with the greater aims of the working class.

With the growth of capitalism and big industry the unions too must grow. They become big corporations with thousands of members, extending over the whole country, with sections in every town and every factory. Officials must be appointed: presidents, secretaries, treasurers, to conduct the affairs, to manage the finances, locally and centrally. They are the leaders, who negotiate with the capitalists and who by this practice have acquired a special skill. The president of a union is a big shot, as big as the capitalist employer himself, and he discusses with him, on equal terms, the interests of his members.



The officials are specialists in trade union work, which the members, entirely occupied by their factory work cannot judge or direct themselves.

So large a corporation as a union is not simply an assembly of single workers; it becomes an organised body, like a living organism, with its own policy, its own character, its own mentality, its own traditions, its own functions. It is a body with its own interests, which are separate from the interests of the working class. It has a will to live and to fight for its existence. If it should come to pass that unions were no longer necessary for the workers, then they would not simply disappear. Their funds, their members, and their officials: all of these are realities that will not disappear at once, but continue their existence as elements of the organisation.

The union officials, the labour leaders, are the bearers of the special union interests. Originally workmen from the shop, they acquire, by long practice at the head of the organisation, a new social character. In each social group, once it is big enough to form a special group, the nature of its work moulds and determines its social character, its mode of thinking and acting. The officials' function is entirely different from that of the workers. They do not work in factories, they are not exploited by capitalists, their existence is not threatened continually by unemployment. They sit in offices, in fairly secure positions. They have to manage corporation affairs and to speak at workers' meetings and discuss with employers. Of course they have to stand for the workers, and to defend their interests and wishes against the capitalists. This is, however, not very different from the position of the lawyer who, appointed secretary of an organisation, will stand for its members and defend their interests to the full of his capacity.

However, there is a difference. Because many of the labour leaders came from the ranks of workers, they have experienced for themselves what wage slavery and exploitation means. They feel as members of the working class and the proletarian spirit often acts as a strong tradition in them. But the new reality of their life continually tends to weaken this tradition. Economically they are not proletarians any more. They sit in conferences with the capitalists, bargaining over wages and hours, pitting interests against interests, just as the opposing



interests of the capitalist corporations are weighed one against another. They learn to understand the capitalist's position just as well as the worker's position; they have an eye for 'the needs of industry'; they try to mediate. Personal exceptions occur, of course, but as a rule they cannot have that elementary class feeling of the workers, who do not understand and weigh capitalist interests against their own, but will fight for their proper interests. Thus they get into conflict with the workers.;

The labour leaders in advanced capitalism are numerous enough to form a special group or class with a special class character and interests. As representatives and leaders of the unions they embody the character and the interests of the unions. The unions are necessary elements of capitalism, so the leaders feel necessary too, as useful citizens in capitalist society. The capitalist function of unions is to regulate class conflicts and to secure industrial peace. So labour leaders see it as their duty as citizens to work for industrial peace and mediate in conflicts. The test of the union lies entirely within capitalism; so labour leaders do not look beyond it. The instinct of self-preservation, the will of the unions to live and fight for existence, is embodied in the will of the labour leaders to fight for the existence of the unions. Their own existence is indissolubly connected with the existence of the unions. This is not meant in a petty sense, that they only think of their personal jobs when fighting for the unions. It means that primary necessities of life and social functions determine opinions. Their whole life is concentrated in the unions, only here have they a task. So the most necessary organ of society, the only source of security and power is to them the unions; hence they must be preserved and defended by all possible means, even when the realities of capitalist society undermine this position. This happens when capitalism's expansion class conflicts become sharper.


The concentration of capital in powerful concerns and their connection with big finance renders the position of the capitalist employers much stronger than the workers'. Powerful industrial magnates reign as monarchs over large masses of workers; they keep them in absolute subjection and do not allow 'their' men to go into unions. Now and then the heavily exploited wage slaves break out in revolt, in a big strike. They hope to enforce better terms, shorter hours, more humane conditions, the right to organise. Union organisers come to aid them. But then the capitalist masters use their social and political power. The strikers are driven from their homes; they are shot by militia or hired thugs; their spokesmen are railroaded into jail; their relief actions are prohibited by court injunctions. The



capitalist press denounces their cause as disorder, murder and revolution; public opinion is aroused against them. Then, after months of standing firm and of heroic suffering, exhausted by misery and disappointment, unable to make a dent on the ironclad capitalist structure, they have to submit and to postpone their claims to more opportune times.

In the trades where unions exist as mighty organisations, their position is weakened by this same concentration of capital. The large funds they had collected for strike support are insignificant in comparison to the money power of their adversaries. A couple of lock-outs may completely drain them. No matter how hard the capitalist employer presses upon the worker by cutting wages and intensifying their hours of labour, the union cannot wage a fight. When contracts have to be renewed, the union feels itself the weaker party. It has to accept the bad terms the capitalists offer; no skill in bargaining avails. But now the trouble with the rank and file members begins. The men want to fight; they will not submit before they have fought; and they have not much to lose by fighting. The leaders, however, have much to lose—the financial power of the union, perhaps its existence. They try to avoid the fight, which they consider hopeless. They have to convince the men that it is better to come to terms. So, in the final analysis, they must act as spokesmen of the employers to force the capitalists' terms upon the workers. It is even worse when the workers insist on fighting in opposition to the decision of the unions. Then the union's power must be used as a weapon to subdue the workers.

So the labour leader has become the slave of his capitalistic task of securing industrial peace—now at the cost of the workers, though he meant to serve them as best he could. He cannot look beyond capitalism, and within the horizon of capitalism with a capitalist outlook, he is right when he thinks that fighting is of no use. To



criticise him can only mean that trade unionism stands here at the limit of its power.

Is there another way out then? Could the workers win anything by fighting? Probably they will lose the immediate issue of the fight; but they will gain something else. By not submitting without having fought, they rouse the spirit of revolt against capitalism. They proclaim a new issue. But here the whole working class must join in. To the whole class, all their fellow workers, they must show that in capitalism there is no future for them, and that only by fighting, not as a trade union, but as a united class, they can win. This means the beginning of a revolutionary struggle. And when their fellow workers understand this lesson, when simultaneous strikes break out in other trades, when a wave of rebellion goes over the country, then in the arrogant hearts of the capitalists there may appear some doubt as to their omnipotence and some willingness to make concessions.

The trade union leader does not understand this point of view, because trade unionism cannot reach beyond capitalism. He opposes this kind of fight. Fighting capitalism in this way means at the same time rebellion against the trade unions. The labour leader stands beside the capitalist in their common fear of the workers' rebellion.

When the trade unions fought against the capitalist class for better working conditions, the capitalist class hated them, but it had not the power to destroy them completely. If the trade unions would try to raise all the forces of the working class in their fight, the capitalist class would persecute them with all its means. They may see their actions repressed as rebellion, their offices destroyed by militia, their leaders thrown in jail and fined, their funds confiscated. On the other hand, if they keep their members from fighting, the capitalist class may consider them as valuable institutions, to be preserved and protected, and their leaders as deserving citizens. So the trade unions find themselves between the devil and the deep blue sea; on the one side persecution, which is a tough thing to bear for people who meant to be peaceful citizens; on the other side, the rebellion of the members, which may undermine the unions. The capitalist class, if it is wise, will



recognise that a bit of sham fighting must be allowed to uphold the influence of the labour leaders over the members.

The conflicts arising here are not anyone's fault; they are an inevitable consequence of capitalist development. Capitalism exists, but it is at the same time on the way to ruin. It must be fought as a living thing, and at the same time, as a transitory thing. The workers must wage a steady fight for wages and working conditions, while at the same time communistic ideas, more or less clear and conscious, awaken in their minds. They cling to the unions, feeling that these are still necessary, trying now and then to transform them into better fighting institutions. But the spirit of trade unionism, which is in its pure form a capitalist spirit, is not in the workers. The divergence between these two tendencies in capitalism and in the class struggle appears now as a rift between the trade union spirit, mainly embodied in their leaders, and the growing revolutionary feeling of the members. This rift becomes apparent in the opposite positions they take on various important social and political questions.

Trade unionism is bound to capitalism; it has its best chances to obtain good wages when capitalism flourishes. So in times of depression it must hope that prosperity will be restored, and it must try to further it. To the workers as a class, the prosperity of capitalism is not at all important. When it is weakened by crisis or depression, they have the best chance to attack it, to strengthen the forces of the revolution, and to take the first steps toward freedom.

Capitalism extends its dominion over foreign continents, seizing their natural treasures in order to make big profits. It conquers colonies, subju-



gates the primitive population and exploits them, often with horrible cruelties. The working class denounces colonial exploitation and opposes it, but trade unionism often supports colonial politics as a way to capitalist prosperity.

With the enormous increases of capital in modern times, colonies and foreign countries are being used as places in which to invest large sums of capital. They become valuable possessions as markets for big industry and as producers of raw materials. A race for getting colonies, a fierce conflict of interests over the dividing up of the world arises between the great capitalist States. In these politics of imperialism the middle classes are whirled along in a common exaltation of national greatness. Then the trade unions side with the master class, because they consider the prosperity of their own national capitalism to be dependent on its success in the imperialist struggle. For the working class, imperialism means increasing power and brutality of their exploiters. These conflicts of interests between the national capitalisms explode into wars. World war is the crowning of the policy of imperialism. For the workers, war is not only the destruction of all their feelings of international brotherhood, it also means the most violent exploitation of their class for capitalist profit. The working class, as the most numerous and the most oppressed class of society, has to bear all the horrors of war. The workers have to give not only their labour power, but also their health and their lives.

Trade unions, however, in war must stand upon the side of the capitalist. Its interests are bound up with national capitalism, the victory of which it must wish with all its heart. Hence it assists in arousing strong national feelings and national hatred. It helps the capitalist class to drive the workers into war and to beat down all opposition.

Trade unionism abhors communism. Communism takes away the very basis of its existence. In communism, in the absence of capitalist employers, there is no room for the trade union and labour leaders. It is true that in countries with a strong socialist movement, where the bulk of the workers are socialists, the labour leaders must be socialists too, by origin as well as by environment. But then they are right-wing socialists; and their socialism is restricted to the idea of a commonwealth where instead of greedy capitalists honest labour leaders will manage industrial production.

Trade unionism hates revolution. Revolution upsets all the ordinary relations between capitalists and workers. In its violent clashings, all those careful tariff regulations are swept away; in the strife of its gigantic forces



the modest skill of the bargaining labour leaders loses its value. With all its power, trade unionism opposes the ideas of revolution and communism.

This opposition is not without significance. Trade unionism is a power in itself. It has considerable funds at its disposal, as material element of power. It has its spiritual influence, upheld and propagated by its periodical papers as mental element of power. It is a power in the hands of leaders, who make use of it wherever the special interests of trade unions come into conflict with the revolutionary interests of the working class. Trade unionism, though built up by the workers and consisting of workers, has turned into a power over and above the workers, just as government is a power over and above the people.

The forms of trade unionism are different for different countries, owing to the different forms of development in capitalism. Nor do they always remain the same in every country. When they seem to be slowly dying away, the fighting spirit of the workers is sometimes able to transform them, or to build up new types of unionism. Thus in England, in the years 1880-90, the 'new unionism' sprang up from the masses of poor dockers and the other badly paid, unskilled workers, bringing a new spirit into the old craft unions. It is a consequence of capitalist development, that in founding new industries and in replacing skilled labour by machine power, it accumulates large bodies of unskilled workers, living in the worst of conditions. Forced at last into a wave of rebellion, into big strikes, they find the way to unity and class consciousness. They mould unionism into a new form, adapted to a more highly developed capitalism. Of course, when afterwards capitalism grows to still mightier forms, the new unionism cannot escape the fate of all unionism, and then it produces the same inner contradictions.

The most notable form sprang up in America, in the 'Industrial Workers of the World'. The IWW originated from two forms of capitalist expansion. In the enormous forests and plains of the West, capitalism reaped the natural riches by Wild West methods of fierce and brutal exploitation; and the worker/adventurers responded with as wild and jealous a defence. And in the eastern states new industries were founded upon the exploitation of millions of poor immigrants, coming from countries with a low standard of living and now subjected to sweatshop labour or other most miserable working conditions.

Against the narrow craft spirit of the old unionism, of the AF of L, which divided the workers of one industrial plant into a number of separate unions, the IWW put the principle: all workers of one factory, as comrades against one master, must form one union, to act as a strong unity against the employer. Against the multitude of often jealous and bickering trade unions, the IWW raised the slogan: one big union for all the workers. The fight of one group is the cause of all. Solidarity extends over the entire class. Contrary to the haughty disdain of the well-paid old American skilled labour towards the unorganised immigrants, it



was these worst-paid proletarians that the IWW led into the fight. They were too poor to pay high fees and build up ordinary trade unions. But when they broke out and revolted in big strikes, it was the IWW who taught them how to fight, who raised relief funds all over the country, and who defended their cause in its papers and before the courts. By a glorious series of big battles it infused the spirit of organisation and self-reliance into the hearts of these masses. Contrary to the trust in the big funds of the old unions, the Industrial Workers put their confidence in the living solidarity and the force of endurance, upheld by a burning enthusiasm. Instead of the heavy stone-masoned buildings of the old unions, they represented the principle of flexible construction, with a fluctuating membership, contracting in time of peace, swelling and growing in the fight itself. Contrary to the conservative capitalist spirit of trade unionism, the Industrial Workers were anti-capitalist and stood for Revolution. Therefore they were persecuted with intense hatred by the whole capitalist world. They were thrown into jail and tortured on false accusations; a new crime was even invented on their behalf: that of 'criminal syndicalism'.

Industrial unionism alone as a method of fighting the capitalist class is not sufficient to overthrow capitalist society and to conquer the world for the working class. It fights the capitalists as employers on the economic field of production, but it has not the means to overthrow their political stronghold, the State power. Nevertheless, the IWW so far has been the most revolutionary organisation in America. More than any other it contributed to rouse class consciousness and insight, solidarity and unity in the working class, to turn its eyes towards communism, and to prepare its fighting power.

The lesson of all these fights is that against big capitalism, trade unionism cannot win. And if at times it wins, such victories give only temporary relief. And yet, these fights are necessary and must be fought. To the bitter end?—no, to the better end.

The reason is obvious. An isolated group of workers might be equal to a fight against an isolated capitalist employer. But an isolated group of workers against an employer backed by the whole capitalist class is powerless. And such is the case here: the State power, the money power of capitalism, public opinion of the middle class, excited by the capitalist press, all attack the group of fighting workers.

But does the working class back the strikers? The millions of other workers do not consider this fight as their own cause. Certainly they sympathise, and may often collect money for the strikers, and this may give some relief, provided its distribution is not forbidden by a judge's injunction. But this easy-going sympathy leaves the real fight to the striking group alone. The millions stand aloof, passive. So the fight cannot be won (except in some special cases, when the capitalists, for business reasons, prefer to grant concessions), because the working class does not fight as one undivided unit.

The matter will be different, of course, when the mass of workers really consider such a contest as directly concerning them; when they find that their own future is at stake. If



they go into the fight themselves and extend the strike to other factories, to ever more branches of industry, then the State power, the capitalist power, has to be divided and cannot be used entirely against the separate group of workers. It has to face the collective power of the working class.

Extension of the strike, ever more widely, into, finally, a general strike, has often been advised as a means to avert defeat. But to be sure, this is not to be taken as a truly expedient pattern, accidentally hit upon, and ensuring victory. If such were the case, trade unions certainly would have made use of it repeatedly as regular tactics. It cannot be proclaimed at will by union leaders, as a simple tactical measure. It must come forth from the deepest feelings of the masses, as the expression of their spontaneous initiative, and this is aroused only when the issue of the fight is or grows larger than a simple wage contest of one group. Only then will the workers put all their force, their enthusiasm, their solidarity, their power of endurance into it.

And all these forces they will need. For capitalism also will bring into the field stronger forces than before. It may have been defeated and taken by surprise by the unexpected exhibition of proletarian force and thus have made concessions. But then, afterwards, it will gather new forces out of the deepest roots of its power and proceed to win back its position. So the victory of the workers is neither lasting nor certain. There is no clear open road to victory; the road itself must be hewn and built through the capitalist jungle at the cost of immense efforts.

But even so, it will mean great progress. A wave of solidarity has gone through the masses, they have felt the immense power of class unity, their self-confidence is raised, they have shaken off the narrow group egotism. Through their own deeds they have acquired new wisdom: what capitalism means and how they stand as a class against the capitalist class. They have seen a glimpse of their way to freedom.

Thus the narrow field of trade union struggle widens into the broad field of class struggle. But now the workers themselves must change. They have to take a wider view of the world. From their trade, from their work within the factory walls, their mind must widen to encompass society as a whole. Their spirit must rise above the petty things around them. They have to face the State; they enter the realm of politics. The problems of revolution must be dealt with.

# T H E MINERS STRIKE AT E CARMAUX

I had carefully followed the events at Carmaux. The first news of the strike had filled me with joy; the miners seemed to want to have nothing more to do with those useless, peaceful strikes where the worker patiently waits for the time when his few francs triumph over the companies' millions.

They seemed to have entered upon the path of violence as was finally shown on 15th August 1892.

The offices and buildings of the mine were invaded by a crowd who were tired of suffering without taking revenge; justice was coming to the engineer, so despised by his workers, when the faint-hearted intervened.

Who were these people?

The very same ones who wreck all revolutionary movements, because they fear that once underway they will no longer be obeyed, these people who force thousands of men to endure hardship for months on end, so that they can then make a big noise about their sufferings and create for themselves a popularity allowing them to claim a mandate—these men indeed assumed the leadership of the strike movement.

Suddenly a crowd of grandiloquent gentlemen appeared in the region who put themselves at the disposal of the strike, organised subscriptions, set up meetings, and appealed for funds from all sides. The miners placed all initiative in their hands. What happened then is now history.

The strike dragged on. Their hunger, from which they were never free, became even greater; they used the union's small reserve funds to buy food, as well as the money given by supporting organisations, then, after two months they returned to

**This is part of Emile Henri's speech to the jury during his trial in April 1894 where he was accused, among other things, of leaving a bomb inside the door of 11 avenue de l'Opera, at the offices of the Carmaux mine company. The bomb was discovered and taken to the police headquarters nearby where it exploded killing four policemen and a Carmaux messenger.**

the pits crestfallen and more wretched than before.

It would have been so easy from the beginning to attack the company's sole weak point—money; burn the stocks of coal, break up the mining equipment, and demolish the drainage pumps.

There is no doubt the company would have very soon given way. But the great pontiffs of socialism are not ones for such methods because they are anarchist methods. If you play this game you run the risk of prison and, who knows, perhaps one of those bullets which worked such wonders at Fourmies. And there will be no seats on municipal councils or legislatures.

In short, after a momentary disturbance, order reigned once more at Carmaux.

The company, more powerful than ever, continued its exploitation and the shareholders congratulated themselves on the happy outcome of the strike. After all, there were still dividends to reap.

It was because of this that I decided to add my own voice to that happy chorus, one that the bourgeoisie had already heard but they thought had died with Ravachol: the voice of dynamite.

I wanted to show the bourgeoisie that from that time on there would be an end to their joy, their insolent triumphs would be disturbed, and their golden calf would tremble violently on its pedestal until the final push casts it down into the blood and the filth.

At the same time I wanted to show the miners that there is only one group of men, the anarchists, who genuinely feel and understand their suffering and are ready to avenge them.



## VEGETARIAN OR VEGETATE?

**A**mong the many schemas to which the movement of opposition has become a slave, one of the most diffused is that of vegetarianism.

To eat meat has become one of the ideologically unsound crimes against ...what? Against whom? On cashing their dole cheques young comrades resist the temptation to buy a pork pie or a sausage roll to return to the fold and devoutly ingest lentils, brown rice and organically grown vegetables (in order to avoid the toxins of DDT or to prevent a further massacre of slugs, greenfly or others of the more humble species of the animal kingdom?). So who defines what is an animal and what is not? Does it have a brain? Does it feel? Must it have big brown eyes, or can it have the creepy feelers of the spider or the slimyness of the worm? Where do we start? And hasn't it been proved beyond doubt that plants, ie carrots, cabbages, potatoes (or are they simply the 'lower echelons' of the plant kingdom, leaving the way to the super-race of trees and ornamental plants?), also scream at the assassin's knife. Aren't they too at the mercy of we Humans, masters (for the meantime) of the universe?

Do we discard our much-loved leather jackets and studded boots in favour of synthetic plastics fabricated at the cost of thousands of human lives on the oil rigs, petrol refineries, the polluted ghetto-ghettos in the shanty towns of industrial waste? And doesn't the soap so diligently applied to hold up our crests come from whale's blubber?

As we can see, to continue in this vein leads us to the logic of the medieval theologians arguing about how many angels can be balanced on the end of a

needle. And how many of the classless angels of the ecology movement know that Hitler too was a devout vegetarian? Not only Hitler, but the whole of the pre-Nazi commune movement of the time?

Today the new 'clean' nazis, the so-called strasserites, are among the protagonists of the great ecological swindle. The ecology movement has become a murky reservoir for a cohabitation of monarchists, monarchs (isn't Prince Charles himself officially a vegetarian?), fascists, secret services, pacifists and punks.


And before it be said that the present writer is trying to impose world-wide carnivorousness, let us hasten to say that in our opinion there is no one facet of social activity that can be separated from the rest and followed to an ultimate ideal to the exclusion of everything else. This is a certain road to interclassism, whether it be that of vegetarianism, feminism, pacifism, alleviating starvation or any other causes so fashionable today.

The horrors of forced farming and the slaughter of baby seals are but one tiny part of the result of capital's total negation of individual responsibility and feeling in every sphere of life on and beyond this planet. Equally, the reality of each horror cannot be put aside to wait for better times. We must act now in the single aspects of the general plan of exploitation, but using means that unite us in the totality of revolutionary struggle: those of attacking the common enemy. This will immediately distinguish us from the forces of moral indignation and reform—power structures such as the church the neo-church, and the State in all its forms—whose only aim is to change everything in order for everything to stay the same.



# ANARCHISM AND THE NATIONAL LIBERATION STRUGGLE

translated from IRL journal d'expressions libertaires - 51



One thing that strikes us from the beginning is the almost total absence of movements or individuals who refer to anarchism in 'third world' countries. This (sad) fact leads to a number of consequences. Judging things from the outside, libertarians have difficulty in appreciating the conflicts that are tearing the world apart.

Lack of information, difficulty in putting aside western ideas to make room for others, activities carried out in their own countries, etc...does not motivate them to concern themselves with struggles far removed from their habitual point of view. All the more so as the content of these struggles does not favour unreserved adhesion.

Quite on the contrary: the affirmation of a national identity evaluates one people or ethnic group and develops xenophobic feelings towards 'foreigners'.

Carriers of a Statist project, national liberation movements try to replace one nationalism with another, one power with another.

In the great nationalist family all the political tendencies cohabit, and the composition of the 'Fronts' seems quite ambiguous.

Anarchists therefore have a tendency to put coloniser and colonised alongside each other. Fearing they might compromise themselves in a combat whose objectives turn out to be contrary to their ideas, they prefer to keep prudently out of the way. But this attitude traps them.

First of all it leaves the field open to marxism. The social and insurrectional movements which have been exploding for dozens of years in the world have passed by libertarians (apart from a few exceptions such as the support given by some to the Algerian struggle during the war of independence). In this way their project for society seems to address itself to the west alone, and the socialist model becomes the only possible alternative in the eyes of the oppressed, where-

as it has largely proved its failure.

Next, by refusing to take a position among the various protagonists, anarchists comfort the position of the imperialist aggressor. In assuring no international support to its victims, they contribute to continuing the established system of exploitation. Any reference to nationalism provokes among a number of them a kind of 'mental block', making them lose sight of the reality of colonialism.

In the name of this reality and in view of historical experience, it is time to ask oneself whether the anarchist idea would not benefit by being otherwise defended. Its credibility depends on it. Because to abandon the field of struggle—on the pretext of conserving ideological purity—by considering the national liberation movement should be condemned as a whole in no way constructive.

A nationalist current is a sum of complex and ambiguous interests. It serves as a trampoline for the representatives of the future dominant class who, by overcoming colonial power wish to satisfy their own ambitions. But it also represents a way for the colonised people to escape from their miserable situation and freeing themselves.

Nationalism rests on the sentiment of belonging, on a whole cultural and linguistic set of values shared by a community. Oppressed countries oppose these values to those of the oppressor, affirming their differences, claiming the right to master their own destiny. Libertarians, for their part, refuse a levelling of cultures. They attach value to the differences between peoples—because that is their wealth—and defend the federalist idea. They cannot therefore ignore the aspirations of a colonised people to have its cultural identity recognised.

Moreover, certain ideas released during the struggle are open to meeting their adhesion. Thus the self-managing experiences developed just after the independence of Algeria by numerous agricultural

workers took on a logic closer to the anarchist one than that of the national liberation front.

It is obviously not a question of anarchists defending any nationalist struggle under the pretext that it is a response to external aggression. It is more a question of examining the content of the nationalist claims of the proposed programme to replace the existing one, to decipher the (eventual) revolutionary aspects. This with the aim of giving critical—and not unconditional—support to the exploited, according to their defined objectives.

Actions of anarchists in favour of the colonised country can take place at various levels: —By placing the class struggle within the combat against imperialism. In other words, by insisting in the aggressing countries on the idea that proletarians of the aggressing countries are not imperialists even if, objectively speaking, they are playing the game of the imperialist State and the capitalists (when they make arms to be used against the oppressed peoples, for example). —By making an effort to establish relations between the oppressed classes of the imperialist and colonised countries. To do that anarchists must struggle against the 'nationalism' of the working class in the western States, ie, against their adhesion to a nationalistic ideology ('build British' and other such slogans of the unions and so-called communist parties), and try to develop internationalist sentiments among them. In fact, the exploiting classes of the colonising and colonised country are apparently far more internationalist than the exploited classes. (That is in both their interests, but the former perceive it far better than then the latter: the multinationals, the world arms market show that clearly). Relations between bourgeoisies of the oppressed and oppressing States in fact become conflictual when their interests begin to contradict each other at a certain point in economic

development. The former realise that only taking power will satisfy their ambitions.

On the contrary, relations between the oppressed in the exploiting country and that of the exploited are not conflictual but, blinded by State propaganda, they are hardly aware of it. —By attacking the aggressing States to demolish their ideology. In the case of Israel, for example, anarchists must criticise the State as a State, but also denounce the Zionist ideology which supports it; the imperialism of a fascist power such as South Africa. One must show them that all States can contain aspects of fascism.

Fascism is an aberration of the State and can appear as soon as the directors feel the need for it. Moreover, to go to the aid of the Palestinian people does not mean to support the OLP, partisan of the creation of a Palestinian State.

In fact it often seems difficult to do anything to advance a national liberation struggle from the outside without leading or giving lessons. But to interrogate oneself on the possibility of assuring solidarity can provoke reflection. Carrier of many different contents according to the individuals and groupings who make reference to nationalism, the struggle for national liberation has itself a purely negative value: that of bringing exploitation to an end. On the contrary, when based on the evaluation of an ethnic group, on a people as opposed to the 'foreigner', it can, once in power, develop a mystique that tends to obliterate class differences and serves to transform the exploited into exploiters. It is time anarchists made themselves heard. Critical support is one way to stop the creation of a State, of countering the totalitarian ideologies vehicled by the dominant nationalism. It can carry an anti-authoritarian message to colonised countries and show that the anarchist project also concerns them.





# IN TIMES OF DANGER HALF WAY MEASURES LEAD TO CERTAIN DEATH

## Revolutionary Cells

The peace movement, both in its composition and structure, has always wavered between radicalisation and accommodation. It has now reached a decisive point.

In recent years there have been minority groups within the peace movement who have tried to prevent forms of action degenerating into a statist adaptation, obstinately defending autonomous areas of intervention. The counter-demonstrators of Krefeld; the women of Hunsrück who entered and occupied military territory; the various peace initiatives aimed towards carrying out blockades that are not simply symbolic and amusing, but which seriously aim at preventing preparations for war; all seemed to point to a radicalisation of the movement, with the relative possibility of attacking the system without being blinded by the fear of war, and seeing instead the nuclear threat as the ultimate consequence of imperialism's strategies of exploitation and oppression. The struggle against 'rearmament' really seemed keen to activate and become a way of contesting the very roots and legitimacy of the system, as well as a point of reference and common cause for the various disconnected movements: social, ecological, feminist, etc, contributing to unifying and strengthening them.

But this was a vain hope. Instead of clarifying and demonstrating the interdependence of 'rearmament' crises; poverty in the 'third world' and reduction in public spending; sexism and racism, etc, and building new fronts on all those demarcation lines, exactly the opposite took place. Individuals came forward from every social sphere and united and organised against the 'primary danger'.

That does not detract from the fact that many have had individual experiences in the contesting of nuclear installations, which nothing and no one can take away from them. These experiences were fundamental, not only to their relationship with power, its arrogance and violence, but also for themselves, their own social role and relations between themselves. A potential for resistance the significance of which will only be put to the test in the future, was developed on the fringe of the movement. For the time being the Home Minister is publicly trying to ensure that the militant nuclei within the peace movement do not evolve to the point of becoming the 'new terrorist generation'. This would be a result of an imperfect statalisation of the movement, and its not yet complete recuperation.

### The overwhelming need for harmony

We must admit, however, that the part of the peace movement that theorised and attacked the relationship between 'rearmament' and 'imperialism' remained a minority. Most of the movement has never wanted to hear of this. On the contrary, class struggle analyses are deformed by a hypocritical moral dualism that denies the difference between above and below, and only recognises a difference between 'good' and 'bad'. Once again the ideal is pacifist man. A dangerous ideal, which sees class contradictions as the product of behavioural anomalies, and tries to resolve everything through 'moral regeneration', giving up in the face of material conditions. In this way peace can be nothing more than a consequence of a massified 'personal' disarmament and of moral 'rearmament', never the possible product of a development of a struggle to annihilate the conditions of oppression and exploitation. And so we come to the

well-worn argument of the need to find harmony in oneself before giving any credibility to the cause of peace. The significance of all that is clear: to join hands to prevent them clenching their fists.

This religious and moral concept of the world implies that engagement for peace excludes struggle, because it is the struggle itself that we are uniting against. The peace movement does not want to expose contradictions and face them, but tends to completely compartmentalise them. It is looking for oases of tranquility in a world of strident contradictions. The peace community is not only a support structure concerning the nuclear threat, it is also trying to give a positive vision of the world which is anything but wholesome, and which in fact is decaying. Perhaps it is this overwhelming need for harmony that explains the almost inconceivable combination of manifest fear and contemplative serenity that we find in peace demonstrations. Perhaps this is the origin of the obvious discrepancy between their dramatic scenes representing the consequences of a nuclear war and their innocuous forms of action. The gestures of submission, spirit of sacrifice, sophisticated religiosity, visionary commitment, the vacuous expression and the superficiality that permeates the peace demonstrations, all go to show that the peaceful struggle against missiles is used above all for internal pacification, serving to defuse that 'time bomb' that every heart could be.

### Conspiracy of fear

The mad, boundless increase in fear is the application of a method, the result of a cold calculation by power. It is a weapon. Given that imperialism is not able to prevent an anti-war movement, it uses every means to channel this in its favour and convert the legitimate fear of war into a mass psychosis capable of being mobilised in its own interests, ie those of perpetuating power.

Having said that, we do not want to say that fear of nuclear rearmament is unfounded, only that the related paranoia is a project of power—a project that should be denounced as a manipulatory act.

It is therefore necessary to denounce any attempt whatsoever to create and maintain an atmosphere of catastrophe. Under the veil of the threat of destruction the foundations are laid for the project of 'change'—of the management of power. The 'welfare State' is undone and a new politic of pauperisation, persecution and elimination is developed. The strategists of the crisis pass off its consequences as the lesser of two evils, a necessary sacrifice to prevent a fear of greater catastrophe. The utopia of a free society comes to be given to a political moral whose only declared value is the survival of humanity.

The attempt to foment an apocalyptic atmosphere through propaganda in order to inculcate a sense of total impotence into the individual should be denounced. In the struggle against the bosses other 'solutions' no longer seem possible. One convinces oneself it is necessary to 'unite' with them, the crushing threat becoming the basis of legitimacy for the actions of the imperialist State.

Finally, all attempts to use that mixture of sentiment and doom, abstractly devoid of any social point of reference which is typical of the peace movement, are made to create a situation of sub-

mission, a training for non-violence and consensus. In this sense some groups who set themselves up as promoters are not as innocuous as they might seem.

### 'No more civil war'

The organised areas of the peace movement have shown how easy it is to transform this wide feeling of threat, mobilising it against the 'disrupters' (who are explicitly pointed out as such) in their reaction against those practising direct action in small groups. The impetus and rage with which the pacifists have thrown themselves, alongside the State, against the 'hoodlums', shows what the other side of the 'good man' is really like. There might perhaps be individual reasons for doubting the attempt to reach one's aims with violent means. But when non-violence comes to be raised to the level of a non-violable principle, and where reality is divided into 'good' and 'bad', then arguments cease to have any value, and everything is seen in terms of submission and obedience. The officials of the peace movement, by distancing themselves and denouncing others have clarified one point in particular: that they see their principles—to which they feel duty-bound—as a claim to power over the movement as a whole.

This is obviously not moral behaviour, but political calculation aiming at an internal 'historic compromise'. A compromise to be understood 'in the primary interest of the survival of the species'. (Rudolf Bahro). And the apex of the peace movement heralds and guarantees this operation, reaching pacts at the top, smothering rebelliousness at the bottom. They imagine the rejection of missiles can be bartered for the promise of social peace.

Robert Jungk has said that whoever says 'no more war' must add, 'no more civil war'. He thus upturns the historic alternatives of socialism and barbarism, civil war and genocide. So imperialist wars are not prevented. One participates in building one of their central premisses: internal social peace.

Instead of confronting reactionary transformation with a radical counter-culture, the peace movement is navigating in the wake of this transformation. Once the 'green philosophers' abandon the proletariat to fish in the turbid waters of the reservoirs of conservatism', they must also renounce their past in the left and abandon any claims to emancipation. Women for peace are denying the fundamental concepts of the feminist movement, putting the struggle against oppression, sexism and structural violence into second place behind the great common goal. Some parts of the feminist movement are going back to typically feminine behavioural norms, claiming that it is in the 'nature' of women to devote oneself to sacrifice, submission, the negation of the clash and struggle: all maxims of the peace movement. In this way 'femininity', something long conceived of and fought for what it is: a product of domination, is reaffirmed.

### Open questions and non-remedies

Only an autonomous counter-movement freed from the restrictions and levels of the peace movement, and re-asserting the interdependence of crises and war, can possibly polarise the pact and create a counterweight to the peace movement's transformation into a kind of new 'nationalism of liberation'.

Decisive methods against rearmament are still those of creating internal disorder and breaking up the foundations of power at points where it is still possible to resist even with limited strength. Until a mass movement develops linking the question of power to a strategy of resistance against imperialist ones of annihilation, we have no choice. Our political involvement must continue to follow the course of strengthening and radicalising the left. We must not limit ourselves to a so-called 'principal danger' or to single aspects of social reality, but must attack the system in its totality. We must trace the lines reconnecting crisis and war; social impoverishment in the inner cities and poverty and annihila-



tion in the 'third world'; sexism and racism; technological attack from above and ecological devastation. below.

Our own ideas are not clear as to the force of the conclusions to be drawn from this brief analysis. We do not want to give the impression of knowing the answers to problems about which we ourselves are not too clear.

The new social movements—and this is amply demonstrated by the peace movement—are always compound and act in interclassist terms. They place themselves above social content, and in part veer towards the right. They become dubious as a point of reference for revolutionary praxis.

The new subjects of revolutionary change are certainly the sub-classes. But this has only been affirmed at the level of analysis, and very little at the level of social praxis. These sub-classes are struggling and developing forms of resistance, sudden tumults and riots of brief duration which, even though very violent, differ in practice from the new social movements. Insurrections such as those of Brixton and Toxteth have nothing at all to do with traditional political campaigns. A left which makes reference to the sub-classes must review the question of organisation and the areas covered by its own forms of resistance if it wants to find ways of communicating with the 'base'.



The problem of the conditions required to build new forms of awareness and organisation presents itself in the face of the abolition of 'free' salaried work, and forms of labour that have moved away from class centralisation and become disintegrated and atomised. The problem of the conditions required to build new forms of awareness and organisation presents itself. To say that it will be women, immigrants, precarious

workers and those threatened with insecurity who will be the protagonists of future struggles, says absolutely nothing about how subjectivity will be created when the upturning of life in the inner cities is hastened, nor about the role of the radical praxis of the left in the process of forming a class consciousness.

The third world as a whole, resistance here (in West Germany), can no longer be considered as points of departure for revolutionary change, even in the centres of capitalism. Oppressed peoples and countries can do nothing other than go through processes of partial liberation from colonial dependence. The consolidation of this process is strictly linked to the conditions of struggle 'at the heart of the beast' and the destruction of the strongholds of capital.

The significance of the new 'strategic sectors', both sources of accumulation of wealth and instruments of dominion, must be shown practically. The problem arises as to whether these sectors will become the central targets of a revolutionary strategy of attack in the cities, and whether sabotage will be the main form of struggle organised and carried out by the radical left.

The transformation of 'democracies' through economic/political upheaval will eventually reduce the left's area of legal action. This will mean a thrust towards a more radicalised form of resistance. The new social movements do not represent any protection for comrades, and do not in fact create any guaranteed space for action, as the peace movement has clearly demonstrated. A radical left which sees its heritage as that of being able to create resistance at any time, must build structures of its own that are subversive and illegal, if they want to remain undefeated and unpredictable.




# elephant editions

ANARCHIST POCKET BOOKS

**Sabate — Guerilla Extraordinary**  
Antonio Tellez, £2.95


Telling of the life, the action and the death of anarchist guerilla Francisco Sabate in the struggle against Franco's dictatorship until he was killed in 1960. It shows the many ways it is possible to strike the enemy no matter what colour of fascism it might be, rendering it of great validity still today.



**Strange Victories — the anti-nuclear movement in the US and Europe**  
Midnight Notes, £1.95

An interesting analysis of the anti-nuclear movement, it looks at its composition, class analysis (lack of it), the problem of violence and non-violence, opening a much-needed debate on struggle and organisation against the nuclear project seen within that of capital as a whole.

S · T · R · A · N · G · E  
V · I · C · T · O · R · I · E · S  
THE ANTI NUCLEAR MOVEMENT  
IN THE U.S. AND EUROPE



**The Angry Brigade — Documents and Chronology**  
Introduction by Jean Weir, £1.20

This is a reprint of the Bratach Dubh pamphlet which is no longer available. Beginning in 1967, it shows some extent of the armed struggle carried out in Britain in the late sixties and early seventies, and repropose the validity of the method of armed struggle against capital in all its forms.

**ANGRY  
BRIGADE  
1967-1984  
DOCUMENTS  
AND CHRONOLOGY**

# INSURRECTION

year 2 — Issue Three — 1985

Graphic Editor: Clifford Harper  
Design and Layout: Verushka  
Editor: Jean Weir

Orders and correspondence to:

Elephant Editions,  
B.M. Elephant,  
London, WC1N 3XX

(5 copies and over, less 40%)  
Cheques payable to Elephant Editions

Trade dist. by: A Distribution,  
84b, Whitechapel High S  
Street,  
London E 1.  
(tel 01 247 8307)

Printed by Algate Press, 84b, White-  
chapel High Street, London E1  
(tel 247 9249) May 1985