"There has been an unprecedented revival of the various anti-Marxist trends of the Trotskyists and anarchists who, by infiltrating into various mass movements, especially into those of youth and intellectuals, are seeking to fish in troubled waters, with a view to diverting the masses from the correct road and throwing them into dangerous adventures that lead to grave defeats and disillusionment. Although they frequently come out with ultra-revolutionary and antirevisionist slogans, in fact they play the revisionists’ game and together undermine the cause of revolution".

ENVER HOXHA

ANARCHISM AS COUNTERREVOLUTIONARY THEORY AND PRACTICE

by BUJAR HOXHA

ANARCHISM IS A PRODUCT OF THE BOURGEOIS IDEOLOGY AND ITS COUNTERREVOLUTIONARY PRACTICE. THE ORIGIN, NATURE AND FEATURES OF ANARCHISM ARE CONNECTED WITH THE CLASS INTERESTS OF THE BOURGEOISIE. HISTORICALLY, ANARCHISM AS AN IDEOLOGICAL AND POLITICAL TREND HAS, FROM ITS BEGINNING, EXPRESSED AND REFLECTED THE AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THAT SECTION OF THE BOURGEOISIE, IN PARTICULAR OF THE petty-bourgeoisie, which has most strongly felt the weight of the consequences of capitalist development.

The social basis of anarchism is mainly the petty-bourgeoisie. When speaking of the social basis of anarchism, V.I. Lenin points out that the small proprietor, the small boss «easily passes over to extreme revolutionism and is unable to show himself consistent, organized, disciplined and determined. The petty bourgeois, who «frets and fumes» over the horrors of capitalism, like anarchism, is a social phenomenon typical of all the capitalist countries». (V.I. Lenin, works, v. 31, p. 18, Albanian edition). During its approximately one and a half centuries of existence, anarchism has gone from one fail-
the revival of the anarchist views, Lenin stresses that anarchism has been as a punitive force against the opportunistic offenses of the labour movement. Both these ugly things, Lenin continues, reciprocally complement one another. (See V.I. Lenin, Works, v. 25, p. 180, 3rd Russian ed.). In order to convince ourselves of the correctness of this Leninist truth suffice it to address ourselves to practice, to the course of historical events. The vigorous revival of revisionism which began after the XX Congress of the CPSU swept over working class parties in countries where the socialist revolution had triumphed, as well as in capitalist countries. From revolutionary parties, they turned into counterrevolutionary parties. In the countries where the working class had political power in its hands, these parties prepared and realized that counterrevolutionary reversal which led to the restoration of capitalism. In the bourgeois countries these parties became "stabilizers" of the capitalist order and a support of the reactionary bourgeoisie. In such a situation trends of anarchism emerged. The new anarchists reared their heads. Alongside the criticism against the capitalist order and the calls for the destruction of this order and of all state authority, in order to raise their prestige in the eyes of the working class, they began to use «leftist», «revolutionary» phraseology and criticize the «communist» (revisionist) parties as well as the «socialist» (revisionist) countries. But their propaganda and their writings, proceeding from erroneous bases of principle and methodology, sow ideological confusion among the masses, and divert them from the road of revolution and socialism. Thus, by their activity the present-day anarchists objectively provide grist to the mill of the bourgeoisie and, willingly or unwittingly, together with the revisionists, help the bourgeoisie to consolidate its rule. However, one cannot draw from this the conclusion that all the elements who intend and desire to fight against the bourgeois order, proceeding from anarchist positions, are consciously servants of the bourgeois government, and of the capitalists. What should be stressed is this: even when such elements sincerely fight against the capitalist order and are prepared to make the greatest sacrifices for this struggle they nevertheless objectively do the opposite of what they aim to reach. Historical experience confirms a great truth of Marx’s doctrine.

Capitalism can be destroyed and communism can be built only when the revolutionary movement is guided by a truly revolutionary theory, when it is armed with the theory of Marxism. No other theory gives the working class that spiritual weapon which creates the possibility for it to perform its historic mission: to destroy capitalism and build the communist society. For this reason the ideologists of the proletariat, from Marx to our time, have fought and continue to fight for this theory to be assimilated by the masses, and they have criticized and exposed all the different anti proletarian, anticommunist, counterrevolutionary trends. These trends include anarchism with all its manifestations.

The fight of the Marxist-Leninists against the anarchists is intensifying in all directions. Although the divergences with the anarchists essentially remain those that existed before, the anarchists, under the pretext that the specific historical conditions have changed, raise some old questions in a new form and level criticism against everybody, confounding the most fundamental and the simplest problems. Suffice it to mention here that they confound and put on a par, for example, the revisionist, Trotskyist and Marxist-Leninist parties and the revisionist countries and the socialist ones. If we were to speak of the fundamental problems about which a fierce ideological struggle is being waged between us and the anarchists, we would mention the question of the revolution and of its tasks, the question of the party and its role, the question of the stand towards the state and its future, the question of the freedom and development of the individual and of the masses, the question of the other organisations of the working class, the question of the stand towards the revisionist parties, towards the Trotskyist groups, the question of the stand towards Stalin, etc. On all these questions our position is diametrically opposed to that of the anarchists.

The anarchists speak of the destruction of capitalism. Many of them see in revolution the means of this destruction. But the anarchist understanding of revolution has nothing in common with the Marxist-Leninist understanding of it. If attentively seen, it clearly follows that the anarchists, with their viewpoints about revolution hinder its carrying out and, consequently, hinder the liberation of the working class from the yoke of capital. Where is this evident? First of all, the
anarchists distort the question of the motive forces of revolution. Although there exist divergences among the anarchists about this question, a common feature unites them: they all deny the role of the proletariat, and consequently, of the proletarian party in the revolution. Various social strata and groups are considered as motive forces of the revolution, but they do not consider the real and main force – the proletariat. Thus, for instance, there are some who consider the lumpen-proletariat as the principal motive force of the revolution and criticize Marx and Engels, who in their opinion, have not understood, that this lumpen-proletariat has the spirit and force of the coming social revolution, something which the bourgeoisified section of the working class does not have (See Roger Boussines, Little Encyclopaedia of anarchism, p. 105, Italian edition, 1970).

This social basis of revolution is extended by other anarchists. They include among the motive forces of the revolution groups of students and various elements. They especially praise to the skies the student and youth movement as a revolutionary movement which they allege must be the spark of the labour movement, the decisive factor of each and every revolutionary movement. This opinion is expressed by anarchist Cohn-Bendit as follows: «A spectre is haunting the world, the spectre of students. All the world powers have entered into a holy alliance in order to be able to seize and curb it, the pope and the central committee, Kissinger and de Gaulle, the French communists and the German police.» (Cohn-Bendit, Obsolete Communism. The Left-Wing Alternative). The reactionary forces today have not united to penetrate and take control of the student or youth movement. From U.S. imperialism to Soviet social-imperialism, they are joined in united front to fight their common enemy – communism. If the students and the youth take part in the struggle for the triumph of communism, this is to be welcomed. But neither the students nor any other group can play the role of the revolutionary vanguard which is played by the working class in this struggle. Denying the role of the working class in the revolution means fighting against the revolution, means hindering its realisation and triumph, it means strengthening the positions of the bourgeoisie and capitalism. The working class has been and remains the most revolutionary class of society. The conditions which make it the decisive force of present-day social development, and the leading force in the struggle for the revolutionary transformation of the capitalist world, have not changed at all. In spite of the changes the present-day capitalist world has undergone, the working class is deprived of any kind of ownership of the means of production. In contrast with the preachings of the bourgeois and revisionist ideologists, capitalist society is not being proletarianized, but is being continuously proletarianized; the weight and role of the working class in production are becoming increasingly decisive; it remains the main productive force of society.

Life shows that when the working class moves, when it suspends work even for one day, the hole of the bourgeoisie is shaken and all its institutions are placed in a state of alarm. Certainly the working class does not make revolution by itself. The working class secures its allies – the labouring masses of the city and the countryside, the intelligentsia and the students, the youth and the women. Comrade Enver Hoxha, pointing out the leading role of the working class in the revolution and its importance for the fate of the revolution, says: «The question of hegemony in the revolution is of great principled importance because its direction, its consistent development and its very fate depend on who is at its head. The stand towards the working class and its leading role is a touchstone for all revolutionaries» (Report to the 6th Congress of the PLA, Albanian ed. p. 210).

Concerning the forms of struggle to be used for the destruction of capitalism, there are divergences among the anarchists. But these divergences by no means change the anarchist essence of their viewpoints. Some anarchists think that the bourgeoisie can be overthrown through isolated «revolutionary» actions. In their opinion, these actions can be carried out by small groups of determined individuals, as for instance the groups called «the extra-parliamentary opposition», or isolated and conspiratorial urban guerrillas. Others advocate individual terror, thinking that individual and collective assassinations, kidnapping of persons, sabotage, etc., are the most effective means to attain the goal. Relying on such principles, the anarchist groups in various countries decide upon their practical activity. Experience shows that however sensational and bold these actions may be, they do not bring about the change of the situation. On the contrary, they hinder the revolution because very dangerous illusions may be created in politically immature elements concerning the effectiveness of individual and collective terror, of spontaneous and unorganized movements. There are anarchists who still consider as true the old anarchist thesis that the general strike is the supreme weapon for the destruction of capitalism, a thesis which was long ago exposed by Marx and Engels. It has been proved in theory and in practice that capitalism cannot be wiped off the face of the earth by any kind of strike. It can be eliminated only by means of the proletarian revolution.

There is no definite opinion among the ranks of the anarchists today concerning the tasks to be solved by revolution. Some think that the fundamental task of revolution is the elimination of the cultural inequality existing in the present-day society, the elimination of the division of men into intellectuals, mental workers, on the one hand, and workers and peasants, manual workers, on the other hand. Thus the elimination of such a division is, allegedly the main task of each and every revolutionary movement. With such a viewpoint the anarchists conceal the fundamental task of the socialist revolution, which is the seizure of political power by the working class, and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, without which there can be no question of eliminating capitalism as a social order with all its evils, including the contrast between the manual and mental work. The contrast between manual and mental work, which
was born with private ownership over the means of production and with antagonistic classes, characterizes all exploiting societies. It disappears when the cause that has given rise to it disappears, that is when private ownership over the means of production disappears. This is achieved with the establishment of socialism. This is confirmed by the experience of Albania where private ownership over the means of production has been liquidated. As a result, this contrast has disappeared and today in Albania, although differences between manual and mental work continue to exist, these differences keep narrowing with the advance on the road of socialism. Therefore, we say that the elimination of the contrast between mental and manual work cannot be the cause of the construction of the socialist society, but is the effect of this construction.

Not being consistent in their opinions, the anarchists are easily influenced by various events and, without understanding their essence, and in general without understanding the causes which determine these events, they draw erroneous conclusions about revolution and socialism. In the first place, the anarchists stress the idea of the self-organization of the masses in the revolution. In their opinion, the masses by themselves, without the need of leadership, through various violent actions, will win victory over the bourgeois bureaucracy.

From this anarchist understanding of revolution we draw two important conclusions: First, the anarchists deny the need of a leading staff of the revolution, that is they deny the need of the party, as they replace it with the self-organization of the masses; and second, the anarchists, speaking only of victory over the bourgeois bureaucracy, leave aside the necessity of replacing the bourgeois state with a new type of state.

Let us analyze more deeply these viewpoints about the role of the party and the necessity for the dictatorship of the proletariat. According to the anarchists, to secure the triumph of revolution it is not necessary for the objective and subjective conditions to be ripe. Suffice it for these or those groups to decide to act and the revolution will come about and will triumph. This expresses their subjectivism in understanding the revolution. Historical experience shows that revolutions are not created, and do not develop according to the desire of these or those groups of men, or of certain individuals, however outstanding they may be. If within a country the conditions for revolution are not ripe, each and every effort to stage it is doomed to fail. Very significant and instructive in this direction, are the failures of those who have attempted to carry out revolution when the objective and subjective conditions for it were lacking, because such a way of understanding revolution inevitably leads to adventurism which is a premise for defeat. By renouncing the need for the ripening of the objective and subjective conditions of revolution, the anarchists deny in the first place the role of the party in the revolutionary movement. Moreover, they see the role of the party as an obstacle, as curbing the revolutionary movement, and they attribute a counterrevolutionary role to the communist party. Let us briefly summarize the viewpoints of the present-day anarchists on three questions in this field:

First, the anarchists seek to prove that the working class does not need a leading party, as the revolutionary movement develops spontaneously.

Second, the anarchists seek to prove that the working class, if it has such a party, cannot direct its struggle itself, either in capitalism or in socialism.

Third, the anarchists criticize as reformist the revisionist parties (such as those of the USSR, France, Italy, etc) not because the anarchists aim to create revolutionary parties, but because they aim to prevent the creation of revolutionary Marxist-Leninist parties or to destroy the existing ones. In a word, the anarchists are opposed to the political organization of the working class.

Lenin, speaking of the liberation of the working class from the yoke of capital, forcefully stressed that to fight and overthrow the bourgeoisie, the working class has no other weapon in its hands except organization. If we take full account of this teaching of Lenin, we shall clearly understand how dangerous is the anarchist viewpoint that denies the necessity of the creation, existence and role of the party for the revolutionary labour movement.

As a theoretical basis for the denial of the necessity of the creation of the party and of its role, the anarchists have the theory of «spontaneity» of the labour movement. On this basis they fight the idea of introducing scientific socialism into the labour movement in order to make it conscious, a duty which can be and is accomplished by the working class party. This is why they also demand an anonymous «labour movement», detached from the influence of the party, in short a spontaneous movement. Anarchist Cohen-Bendit says that «the anonymous character is the term which most perfectly characterizes a spontaneous movement. We call spontaneous a movement which develops without passing through official organizations; thus, an anonymous movement which cannot be given a name that may have previously existed, thus, a movement which gives itself a name» (Op. cit.).

Historical experience shows that the spontaneous movement cannot lift the working class out of the framework of capitalism. This means that it remains oppressed and exploited if it does not create its own party which organizes, directs and leads its struggle against the bourgeois order for the triumph of socialism and communism. Socialism has not come about, and will not be established in any country as a result of spontaneous development, without an organized struggle headed by the working class under the leadership of its own party. Exposing the theories which advocate spontaneity in the labour movement and negate the role of the party, comrade Enver Hoxha says: «All the revolutionary forces fighting for the overthrow of the bourgeois order can win victory only if they merge with struggle of the working class, if they recognize and accept its leading role and that of the Marxist-Leninist proletarian party... Any other alternative leads to adventurism and defeat» (Report to the 6th Congress of the PLA, Albanian edition, p. 212).
The anarchists oppose the party to the class. In their opinion, the party hinders and restrains the struggle of the working class. They go to the extent of asserting that if the working class wins and has its own party, its situation does not change. It remains as it was in capitalism—a «directed», a «guided» class. In this way, without purpose, the anarchists identify the leadership and guidance of the party of the proletariat with capitalist oppression and exploitation. To reinforce this idea, these counterrevolutionary theorists proclaim the working class party to be a counterrevolutionary, reactionary party. And to prove this, they give us as an example the communist party of the Soviet Union and its role in the counterrevolutionary reversal of the Soviet Union. But here they confound the most elementary things.

It is a fact that the Russian revolution has degenerated. But this degeneration was not organized and led by a revolutionary party of the working class, but by a counterrevolutionary party. It is known that the economic base defines the superstructure. This is a general line of social development. But in the conditions of socialism the superstructure plays a decisive role in the creation of the new socialist relations of production, as well as in their development and further improvement. If that degenerates, and in the first place if the party, which is the guiding and leading force in the conditions of socialism degenerates, as a consequence the degeneration of the social-economic order also begins. This occurred in those countries where the revisionists usurped the party leadership and are in power, something which led to the already known consequences.

It is a very interesting fact that in their struggle against the idea of the formation of the revolutionary party and against the existing parties of the working class, the anarchists furiously attack J. V. Stalin. They proclaim that «the theoretical and practical denunciation of Stalinism in all its forms should be the necessary starting point of all future revolutionary organizations» (See the newspaper «De la misère en milieu étudiants», 1967). It is not accidental that the anarchists find themselves in the same camp with all the reactionaries and counterrevolutionaries, beginning with the social democrats and Trotskyists and ending with the revisionists. It is not accidental that all the enemies of the working class and of socialism, be they bourgeois, right-wing socialists, revisionists, etc., have united under the same banner—the banner of anti-Stalinism, because Stalin consistently defended the leading role of the proletarian party and the necessity for the dictatorship of the proletariat in socialist construction, he consistently fought together with Lenin and after Lenin, against the social-democratic, anarchist, Trotskyist, revisionist and cosmopolitan trends and their spontaneous and liberal, counterrevolutionary and liquidationist concepts.

On another very important question, that of the state, the anarchists held views diametrically opposed to Marxism-Leninism. The anarchists are against any state. They proclaim it as a great evil. «The state organization today is the greatest obstacle in the development of mankind towards a better society and, therefore, anything serving or guaranteeing the state power (police, army, diplomacy, bureaucratic apparatus) is bad and harmful and should be overthrown.» (See: Roger Boussinops, op. cit.). As they did yesterday, today too they make no distinction at all between various states. They put all the states on a par with each other. That is why they argue for the elimination of the state in general and do not consider at all what class it serves. The anarchists' stand towards the state in general reflects their ideological confusion. It is known that history knows no such «state in general». The state has in every epoch served definite social classes. It is known that the state is an historical category and was born when society was divided into antagonistic classes. In all antagonistic formations the state has been a tool of the exploiting classes and has served that minority of the population which had the monopoly of the means of production and political power. Things changed when the state passed into the hands of the working class. Now, for the first time in history, it begins to serve the overwhelming majority of the population. The anarchists do not understand this essential change. And in this way they oppose any kind of political organization of society and thus also the dictatorship of the proletariat as an indispensable weapon of the working class on the road of transition to communism. The anarchists deny the necessity for any kind of political organization of society after the overthrow of the bourgeoisie.

In their opinion, the organization of society will be based on the idea of the self-organization of the masses, of self-government, self-administration, the idea of the elimination of the concept of «director» and the «directed», «leader» and the «led» within any organization of society. According to them, self-administration aims a replacing the state principle of governing from above in all forms and fields. Thus, the anarchists draw the conclusion that self-administration does not come within a state system and eliminates all and every reason for the continuing existence of the state.

Lenin, dealing with the Marxists and anarchist understanding of the question of the state, points out three fundamental differences between them. First, while the Marxists assert that the state will wither away after the liquidation of classes by the socialist revolution, the anarchists stand for the complete and immediate liquidation of the state. Second, while the Marxists stand for the destruction of the old state machine and for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the anarchists deny the necessity for the proletariat to use state power, and deny the dictatorship of the proletariat. Third, while the Marxists want the proletariat to prepare for revolution by exploiting the present-day state, the anarchists deny this (See Lenin, Works, vol. 25, p. 575, Albanian edit.).

The anarchists hold positions of accentuated individualism and egoism. Their views do not admit that the interests of
the individual can be harmonized with those of the collective, of the society. Thus, they oppose the individual to the collective. This reactionary view becomes particularly evident when the anarchists strive to prove that the freedom and happiness of the individual are in contradiction with the socialist order, with the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, with the complete liberation of the working class and of the labouring masses which is realized in the socialist society. According to the anarchists, man in these conditions has turned into a tool serving the state. This anti-socialist thesis is repudiated by the experience of our development, which proves in practice that personal freedom and happiness, can be ensured within the collective, that the flourishing and free development of the collective is an indispensable condition for the all-round development of the individual and his freedom.

Despite this abyss separating anarchism from Marxism-Leninism, many bourgeois, social-reformist and anarchist authors have striven to wipe out the contrast existing between them. There are among them those who present Marx and Lenin as if they held positions of anarchism rather than those of Marxism. Some of them have sought to present the well-known anarchist Bakunin not only as a revolutionary and socialist, but also as a precursor of Lenin. Anarchism as a doctrine is considered by them as an ideological source of Leninism. Concerning this, H. Kohn writes that "the extremist theories of M. Bakunin's anarchism and of the nihilist agitators, like S. Nekhachev and P. Tkachov who stood for violence and ignored social morality, were revived later in Leninism" (H. Kohn, Basic History of Modern Russia, Princeton 1957, p. 41). Other authors are trying to further deepen this thought. They are seeking to prove that the creation of the theory of revolutionary action is allegedly a merit of Bakunin. Hence they draw the conclusion that Leninism is nothing but a continuation of this theory. Social-reformist authors have also not lagged behind on the road of such slanders. Thus, for instance, the social-reformist Henrik Kunov considers Leninism as a "reversion of Bakunism". E. Piciril, in his work "The doctrine of anarchism," says that the "Bolsheviks do not understand how much they owe to Bakunin." Also anarchist Cohn-Bendit, one of the active participants in the events of France in May-June 1968, in his book "Obsolete Communism - the Leftwing Alternative" seeks to prove that Lenin has allegedly passed over, at given moments, to the positions of anarchism.

It is through such a prism that this author sees the struggle waged by Lenin to analyse the value and importance of the Soviets, when he says: "Lenin became 'almost an anarchist' and attempted to make the party take that ideological turn for which it was very little prepared." In the same book, Cohn-Bendit considers Lenin's work "State and Revolution" rather as an anarchist work (?!), although it is known that in this work Lenin, parallel with attacking revisionism, demolishes the anarchist views about the state and revolution.

But this is not all. There are other authors who seek to prove that no essential differences exist between anarchism and Marxism, that they are both allegedly socialist trends and differ only in the fact that they aim, through different tactics, to achieve the same objective. This, in their opinion, means that between anarchism and Marxism there exist only tactical differences. The climax is reached when they proclaim anarchism as "the most radical trend of socialism".

It is a fact that among the anarchists there are many elements who are bent on waging struggle against the bourgeois order, injustices and privileges and imperialist violence. We find among them elements that are determined to fight and make any sacrifice. This situation of revolt against, of challenge to the oppressive and exploiting order which is manifested through concrete actions by many elements described as "ultra-leftists", reflects the fact that the masses are dissatisfied with the existing situation in the capitalist countries. But, unfortunately the road chosen by them does not lead to the wanted objective, that is to the elimination of injustice, oppression and exploitation. Capitalism cannot be destroyed under the guidance of just any kind of ideology, doctrine, by just any kind of ways or means. This great aim can be attained only when the masses are guided by the ideology of Marxism-Leninism, which is the only doctrine that scientifically points the way to the destruction of capitalism and the building of communism.

The Marxist-Leninists greet and support any sincere inclination and aspiration towards socialism, but at the same time they point out that socialism in every country has won or can win only on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and under the leadership of the working class and of its party armed with the proletarian world outlook. Therefore, at this time, when there is a deepening of the ideological confusion caused by the modern revisionists who are striving to intensify it, one clearly understands the great importance of the struggle against all influences of the bourgeois and revisionist ideology, anarchism included, among the ranks of the working class, as well as the importance of arming the working class with the only scientific ideology - Marxism-Leninism. And the successes in this direction are great. In the struggle for the great cause of the liberation of the working class the ranks of the Marxist-Leninist forces are swelling and strengthening. Today, almost everywhere new Marxist-Leninist movements and parties have been formed which have taken the banner of the revolution and socialism in hand and are raising it higher and higher. In conditions of a fierce class struggle they are courageously exposing both the bourgeois reaction and the revisionist treachery as well as petty-bourgeois and anarchist adventurism. While we are waging a fierce and irreconcilable struggle against anarchism as an ideology and practice of action, at the same time we should do a big job with those elements who are whole-heartedly for the cause of the working class, in order to detach them from anarchist views and practices, so that their energies should not harm, but rather help, the revolution.