

GRACIA ARCHIST

The enemies of the people are those who know what people need


MOLESWORTH INVADED: UNITED WE WIN: ANTI-CAR:
ALT. ECONOMY: ANARCHY IS HERE AND NOW



MOLES- WORTH. WHAT NOW?

UNITED WE WIN

Divided, we remain dreamers.



I consider myself to be an ANARCHIST. That is to say a person who wants to see a society based on the principles of freedom, peace and self-determination without governments. Furthermore I want to see anarchism in my lifetime so I can personally reap the benefits that will be on offer in an anarchist society. I refuse to subscribe to any line of thought that says 'anarchism tomorrow' or 'but the people ar'nt ready yet', as I believe the time is drawing near when people will be ready for anarchism. And failure for us to grab the opportunity will result in future generations being subservient to the state machine


I genuinely believe that anarchism can be achieved SOON, but first we have to prove to non-anarchists that we are a real movement, a unified force to be trusted, and a collective mass that can help bring about revolutionary change. To do this we must stop the petty infighting between different anarchist factions who argue about who is more anarchist than whom. For too long this argument has been thrown back and forth and has now spilled (with boring regularity) onto the pages of two excellent anarchist papers, FREEDOM and BLACK FLAG. Such infighting serves nobody within the anarchist movement, and if we're not careful we could end up as divided and sectarian as the left. Then what chance will we have for grabbing the real opportunities for anarchism that are to come our way? For fuck sake the state must be revelling in our infighting and the lack of solidarity between us that keeps us off its spineless back! What chance have we of tackling the state if we can't accept the differences between us?

Personally, as an anarchist, I accept other anarchists' choice of roads for achieving anarchism. I find no personal contradiction in aligning myself with such diverse anarchists as anarcho-pacifists and Class War, or anarcho-syndicalists and anarcho-drop outs. My acceptance of different anarchist arguments for the best way of achieving revolution stems from the fact that I recognise us all as individuals and having personal preferences. Further, that the state must be agitated from as many different angles as possible if we are to bring it to its knees. It is a simple matter of 'ends and means'; we all have the same idea of what anarchism will be, just different ways for achieving the same outcome.

If we should stop arguing over our differences we would find ourselves part of a broad-based movement that will be able to offer something to everyone outside of it. Proof for this theory can be seen by the way different anarchist factions have influenced different sectors of radical activity. For instance anarcho-pacifists have reached into and drawn from the anti-war movement. Similarly Class War and anarcho-syndicalists have built bridges with striking miners and other working class unions/groupings. The same also applies to the Animal Liberation Front, anarcho-feminists and green anarchists all influencing the causes they subscribe to. It is clear to me that our anarchist ideas are touching sensitive areas of anti-state activity and if we could unite behind one another our influence would spread, and the response from non-anarchists would be staggering.

The reason for this call for unity stems not only from a


personal desire to see a united anarchist movement, but as I briefly mentioned above, we now have a chance of actually achieving our aims. For us, NOW, we have an opportunity that has been denied the anarchist movement for over a hundred years since the industrial revolution.



Once again the state is on the verge of another change, though this one is to give capitalism a scientific face. But for this transformation to take place the state will have to deal with certain situations that will cause instability. Some of these situations the state will have to bring upon itself for wanting technological change, while others will naturally occur due to such changes. It is these unstable situations that will be a united anarchist movement's best allies.

I don't want to sound like a Marxist of the 1930s who genuinely believed capitalism was on its last legs. I'm not that naive. In fact I reckon if too much pressure isn't put upon the state, it will be able to tackle each situation as it arises, deal with it, and actually achieve the transformation - even though few people will gain from it. However, no anarchist wants to see the state become a technological centralised power, so we have no choice but to agitate and exploit every unstable situation and use each to our advantage. That means ALL OF US and in EVERY POSSIBLE WAY!

We are all aware of the de-stabilising pressures upon the state. We can see them in our daily lives, and as each day goes by we can see them getting worse. Obvious examples are: the military build-up with new scientific weaponry, a stronger centralised police force to protect the state from threats within, continually rising unemployment, the lack of spending power for an ever-growing number of people, cut-backs in government spending on hospitals, housing, roads, schools and education, the uncertainty of sterling in the international market, industrial pollution on the one hand and industrial decay on the other, the bulldozer approach by the present government on every issue, lack of parliamentary opposition and so on These and other situations will continue to bear down on ANY government trying to take capitalism into the new technology no matter what reformist tactics they attempt to employ.



And what of pressures that are to come? We can already see the energy crisis getting decidedly worse, oil price uncertainties (which won't lessen as stocks diminish), the failure of nuclear power to provide, and 300 years of coal could fail to alleviate the problem thanks to capitalism's incompetent management. Other foreseeable problems relate to areas as diverse as specialised technocrats having more muscle than the NUM could ever hope for, to transport systems unable to meet the mobility we now take for granted because no one's planning for our future needs (it'll probably be easier for the State to send ships to the moon than for you or I to get from Wales to Norfolk). Then of course there are problems that neither

us nor them can foresee.

The real effects of the build-up of all situations will not only be upon government, but more importantly upon ordinary people. They will experience changes in their world and daily lives which will not just disturb them, but will radically change their attitude and acceptance towards authority that forced these changes upon them. Of course, those with power, wealth or vested interests in the transformation will find their standard of living increase while the rest, the majority, will find themselves not only getting poorer, but discarded and not wanted or needed by the new technological state. It will offer them nothing as it believes they have nothing to offer it.

It's with this last group in mind, those who will suffer from this transformation, that I see a golden opportunity to push anarchism forward. The unwanted will, as time goes by, need to organise themselves without the state, for the state will offer them nothing but crumbs from its scientific cake. They will have to learn the arts of solidarity, self-survival, free exchange of information and resources, self-sufficiency as communities, and other acts of mutual aid that people have to employ if they are to survive. These people, which includes you and me, will be leapt upon by every reformist group, organisation and do-gooder. All will proclaim to be on 'our side', but realistically (and I emphasise this is not a hopeful wish) it will only be a broad-based anarchist movement that will be able to offer any real help to all people so they can organise free of and outside the state.



One may wonder why anarchists should be any more successful than others? Well the answer is as simple as anarchism itself. We are not a religious sect or order which promises pie in the sky, we don't say to people suffer happily and god will reward you when you die. Nor are we a political party that asks for their vote so we may be able to offer a better society sometime in the future. Neither are we a lefty group with an hierarchical or centralised structure that is bogged down with bureaucracy. We fit into no such categories and what we have to offer will be a lot more. Because of our philosophy we have no choice but to encourage people to organise themselves so they can weather the state's hostility towards them. We know the benefits of mutual aid and how it helps people survive. Only we can impress upon people to get their act together for themselves and to take control of their own destiny without leaders.

It is as we agitate and organise that we will begin to see the dawning of anarchism. At first it will be a juxtaposition with the state forging ahead with its technological nightmare while at the same time those who suffer most from this transformation will begin to act for themselves, organising themselves in the homes, streets, places of work, in the dole queue, college etc. Eventually we would see the state confronted by a people who have had enough, and begin to demand total control over their own lives. What will the state do then? It will have several options open to it, but once the tide begins to turn it will be as useless as King Canute. But before we can begin to appeal to non-anarchists, we must have a united front that is looking outward, agitating and organising in every sphere, wherever and whenever and however possible. A broad-based movement that will have something to offer everyone.

The opportunities are coming our way, and it is thanks to

capitalism's desire to adopt scientific technology. But if our lust for infighting causes us to blow this opportunity (that hasn't happened since the industrial revolution) then we will leave future generations prisoners to an all-powerful technological state.

UNITE FOR ANARCHISM NOW!

Though I believe for anarchism to come about it must be on a world wide scale. I have not dealt with the matter beyond these shores as the article would become too generalised. Also it goes without saying that the problems that face British capitalism are not unique and that all forms of capitalism (including state-run) are up against the problems that arise with their desire to adopt new technologies. Further, I do not believe in abolishing ALL new technology (even if it was possible) just certain aspects of it and the way in which the remainder is managed.



Anarchist Festival?

Finally, to further encourage bridge-building within our movement, BLACK SHEEP will be pushing the idea for a united movement both in words and action. One way we see of achieving this is for us to help organise an ANARCHIST FESTIVAL this summer, where ALL anarchists can meet, get to know one another, entertain, lay plans, love, relax and begin to unite. As a movement we have the resources needed, except for one important ingredient - the land. If anyone out there has the space and would like to see an anarchist festival take place, contact BLACK SHEEP via GREEN ANARCHIST.

Jon Preston.

Green Anarchist seconds the motion. It sounds a great idea. And so does the Anarchist picnic, below.

Anarchist Picnic!
Hampstead
Heath Bandstand
1pm Sunday May 5th
BR hampstead heath

booze
not
cruise

SPREAD THE WORD...

IF YOU GO DOWN TO THE... OF...

educated. The rest of your life is then supposed to be evenly and neatly divided between work and leisure. The acceptance of the false split between 'education' and 'life' is a necessary precursor to the acceptance of work and leisure as separate entities. Any challenge to the position of children in our society must attack that separation and must encourage the child to live and thus learn.

In order to suppress children it is vital that we suppress the child within ourselves. As I walk down a street I have to suppress the desire to run, to skip, to jump, for no reason. This would be too much like evidence of life. It would have to be suppressed, put down - by stares, comments, insults, physical action. The general level of survival must be maintained. By thinking of children as

a separate species we are able to allow their playfulness and life-fulness within certain bounds without it threatening our character status as adults. They are just children after all. And when they are a little older they will learn what it is to be an adult in this society.

The two greatest insults you can give to a man in this society are to compare him to a woman or a child. We insult and denigrate what we most fear. Men fear femininity and they fear the child within them. The transformation of society demands the liberation of women and the woman within the man; and it demands the same of children. Nothing less will do.

Simon Smith.

HOW WE GET FROM HERE TO THERE

ANARCHY IS HERE AND NOW

Don't wait for the revolution. We can be anarchists today

"THE ANARCHISTS are right in everything, in negation of existing order and in the assertion that, without Authority, there could not be worse violence than that of Authority under existing conditions. They are mistaken only in thinking that Anarchy can be instituted by a (violent) revolution. But it will be instituted only by there being more and more people who do not ask governmental power for protection, and by there being more and more people who will be ashamed of applying this power' To use violence is impossible - one would only become its instrument. One course therefore remains - to fight the government by means of thought, speech, actions, life, neither yielding to government nor joining its ranks and thereby increasing its power".

This passage by Tolstoy, written 85 years ago, is a valuable contribution to the debate that has arisen in (and thanks to) "Green Anarchist" on the question of Utopia and how to reach it. Just as the labels are confusing (gradualist/quietist/evolutionary/non-violent revolutionary), so too is the Utopia being discussed. The confusion arises not in the features this Utopia has - absence of Authority, violence and Capital - but in people's understanding of its nature: people persist in thinking of anarchy as a cloud-cuckoo land that will arrive, no-one quite knows how, at some time in the distant future. But anarchy is here and now. Anarchy has existed alongside the State since the beginning of history. Just as in every individual there are authoritarian and libertarian character traits, so in society there are - and always have been - authoritarian and libertarian situations:

"Throughout the history of our civilization, two traditions, two opposing tendencies, have been in conflict: the Roman tradition and the popular tradition, the Imperial tradition and the federalist tradition, the authoritarian tradition and the libertarian tradition" (Kropotkin)

Anarchy exists whenever people regulate their lives and solve their disputes without reference to authority; the Utopia anarchists imagine is simply when the libertarian tendency is more widespread than the authoritarian tradition. This interpretation of anarchy places emphasis on people putting their anarchist ideals into practice in their daily lives and trying to overcome their authoritarian character traits:

"The state is not something which can be destroyed by a revolution, but is a condition, a certain relationship between human beings, a mode of human behaviour; we destroy it by contracting other relationships, by behaving differently." (Gustav Landauer).

Anarchy can only stem from people's consciousness - it cannot be imposed by legislation or violence. If the people will not make their revolution, it cannot be made for them by Anarchist MPs (a contradiction in terms and a monstrosity which should be banished from the pages of GA and every other anarchist paper) or by anarchist insurrectionaries. Consciousness is the key:

Non-violent revolution supposes a plan for action on three levels:

1) Personal revolution - people ridding themselves of the authoritarian behaviour patterns and excluding the State from their lives (non-cooperation, non-payment of taxes, consumer boycotts, using alternative structures) - living anarchy through your lifestyle;

2) Creation of alternative structures - whether this be wholefood co-ops, free schools, antiauthoritarian alternatives to the State organs for welfare, childcare, counselling, housing, etc;

3) Non-violent resistance to the State - publicising and seeking to obstruct the State's plans both as individuals and in groups, using symbolic and direct action.

By becoming anarchists in our emotions as well as in our intellect, we will not alienate people from anarchism, as those who advocate revolutionary violence do. By offering an alternative to the authoritarian way of doing things, we can show people that anarchism really can work, that it is not utopian.

WAKE UP, MATE, STOP LOOKING FOR UTOPIA, ANARCHY IS HERE AND NOW.

David Stephens.

