When the KSL issued our first publication, George Cores’ “Personal Recollections of the Anarchist Past” in 1992 there really was a shortage of good, accurate and informative books, articles or pamphlets about the history of anarchism. The works of Paul Avrich were the gold standard – exhaustively researched and reliable – and other occasional gems shone out of the pile. Some of the available material, though, was disturbingly erroneous and we have to put that down partly to a lack of primary material that led authors to make strange assumptions about people and their ideas. Within twenty odd years, matters had changed beyond recognition. In 1992 I had read more or less every book and pamphlet on the history of anarchism. Now there has been a relative explosion in the material available. Books, pamphlets, articles and blog posts are appearing constantly and, in a rather comforting way, it is impossible to read them all – especially the latter, and this is not even taking into account the once rare and inaccessible newspapers and pamphlets that are now available to read on line as well as the digitization of letters and pamphlets that, once, one would have had to travel the world to see.

Why is that? Why the recent flood? Well I do remember Albert Meltzer speaking of academic research muttering grimly “When the buggers have finished with Marxism they’l start on us” but I’d like to think that there is in all of that a growing genuine interest in what anarchism is, how it developed and what influences it had on the world about us. Anarchists themselves are keen to preserve and display their own history and they are keen for others to have access to it. I find it especially interesting because a while ago I entered history myself. For a while a spate of students, mainly, were looking to interview me about the anarchist actions and movements I had been involved in. I have to say it was a little flattering, at first. I’d never seen myself particularly important (I’d always put the stamps on the envelopes and book the meeting rooms etc) but perhaps I really was a player – even if many of the questions were if I knew so and so and what were they like. It got all a little disturbing though. They knew more about me than I did. They’d quote a flier I’d written here, a meeting I had spoken at there – none of which I could remember with any clarity at all. I began to worry that I wasn’t giving them the answers they wanted. They were often like kindly teachers trying to lead the awkward pupil to the correct response. One young man in particular was very concerned about my casual statement that much of what I had written was not exactlying thought out but intuitive and often a space filler so we could have the paper ready for printing the next day, and I couldn’t even remember the pseudonym I’d used to write it. Reluctantly I ended these relationships. We weren’t going anywhere. I knew it would end in tears so I had to walk away.

A free man, left to my books and memories, the world took on a very late summer glow. I basked in the sun of age, gave a few talks thinking I had advice to offer the young ones (in retrospect I had fuck all worth saying) and then packed up the bags and retreated into history. When I surfaced I began to read, for pleasure, some new publications – blog posts, books/ theses whatever, about events I had been part of, and papers I had helped produce. The problem was that I really couldn’t really recognize what was being written about. It wasn’t as I remembered and it didn’t feel at all like they said it did. There were probably good reasons for that – not least some of us not being interviewed, and our grouping/ publication/ support group probably not being considered as particularly important by the writer. After all you can’t cover everything, can you? Any historian has to have some priorities. I shrugged the shoulders and went back to obscure anarchists of the nineteenth and early twentieth century. To be honest that was giving me enough problems. Something, though, wouldn’t settle and I couldn’t let it lie. If I couldn’t recognize in these “histories” the movements and activities I had been part of what could that suggest about all the histories of other places, people and periods that were being produced?

What I think we have been doing in the field of anarchist history during the last twenty or so years is the job John Locke described philosophers as doing. We have been under-labourers in the garden of knowledge. We have been clearing the rubble from the garden of history to find the patterns beneath it and letting others plant it. The rubble has been the rubble of time and the rubble of previous writers, many of whom lacked the access to this flood of primary material mentioned earlier, or were simply distorted
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by their own prejudices as to what anarchists were and anarchism was. And clearing away the rubble is no easy task. It’s often lonely work, sometimes maddeningly pedantic and demanding a patience and relentlessness that can be quite exhausting. Of course when we clear the rubble we put piles of it behind the garden shed or next to the garden wall and these piles can create problems of their own, but there can be no doubt that some fine and exciting work, in the tradition of Paul Avrich, has taken place within this context. We have had to re-think what we thought we knew about our ideal; we have had our eyes opened to the substantial presence of anarchists and anarchism in countries where we had originally thought they had the most minimal of traces. Our understanding of what we might call “prominent figures” has grown, revealing them as far more complex people than we previously thought. In some cases we have been able to see more clearly the anarchist milieu they were part of and consequently have been able to chart some of the social, personal and political dynamics of that milieu and how it may have shaped their writing.

There is now, also, a far more common presumption that anarchism was more than these prominent voices. Thanks to recent work we can see more of “the unknowns”, those whose efforts kept anarchism alive in desperate times, those who struck back at capitalism in all its forms, those who argued in the workplace, the rent resistance group, the literary society, the pubs etc for what they believed in. Those who put out the chairs and sold the papers. These are tantalizing glimpses of people who, ten years ago, we knew nothing about and this has opened exciting new routes of research and reflection. Finally, of course this recent research has demanded of us that we interrogate the historical narrative of anarchism that has been generally accepted both by academia and, in many cases, anarchists themselves. How anarchism developed, when and where, and what it actually was, continue to be up for discussion, and consideration. At the very least we can now sense that “anarchism” did not float untouched by humanity in the blue sky of philosophy and was simply the product of fine, or quirky, minds but, rather, something that was constantly being interrogated, assessed and refined by the practice of many people. Sometimes very good anarchist history can isolate for us just where in that spectrum of interrogation anarchism was during a certain period. It doesn’t hurt us, also, to realize that “history” is the actions, or non-actions of men and women rather than something imperial and mysterious with its laws of stately movement.

As more and more information comes to light we see works, then, that are regularly looking at history to provide some type of answer to the question of what anarchism is, or at the least some understanding of what it was. Some anarchists have positioned themselves as inheritors of a certain type of anarchism (the real one, of course) and look to justify their present positions in the light of a rather careful selection from anarchist history. It’s an attractive strategy. It can mean the end of those tedious discussions about “What is Anarchism?” – discussions that appear to have taken much of our lives and led us both to spend far more time talking and arguing with each other, rather than anyone else, and have become a constant series of relentless mutterings that tend to obscure rather than clarify. We have the answer and if we sometimes smooth out the rough edges of the past we can justify it as helping push forward towards anarchy now. Looking back over my life I think I have done that rather too much. That said, I don’t think historians, however anarchist they are, should ever do this. The rough edges of anarchism, as well as the apparently smooth and straightforward areas, should be their territory; the contradictions that initially puzzle and the anomalies that are too worrying to ignore. Historians should be the irritatingly sober person at the party warning you not to get too pissed on the historical correctness of your ideas. The awkward truth is that mining seams of anarchist history purely in the light of our own present pre-occupations is at best ahistorical and at worst potentially dangerous for the movement. Such methodologies can easily dismiss the complexities of anarchism in favour of comforting and rather one-dimensional interpretations. They can just as easily lead us to draw wrong conclusions about what we are doing now and how we go forward because we may have drawn erroneous or simplistic conclusions about both what people believed and how their actions reflected that belief. Perhaps there is considerably more rubble to be cleared before we become too presumptuous about planting the garden.

The opposite of this approach is the rather common tendency of each generation of new anarchists to believe that their experience is unprecedented and all that has gone before is largely irrelevant. Somehow, nothing really existed before us and all that matters is now. Of course there were a few comrades who were very prescient but really instead of thinking about history we should be doing stuff today. Circumstances have changed so much and the past is irrelevant. Both positions have an uncomfortable arrogance about them (even if it is not deliberate). In essence; the lived experiences of anarchists from the past are either irrelevant full stop, or only important if they were lived as we want them to have been lived. Not caring about the past at all or thinking about history we should be doing what anarchists believed and who they were. It also can lead to either the repetitious and relentless repeating of myth after myth that results in the usual
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sulky, or aggressive, response when they are challenged or re-inventing the wheel of errors time and time again, presumably in the hope that this time we’ll get it right. I hope that the work now being produced has a salutary effect on both positions.

All that said there is a welcoming lessening of hagiography with regard to anarchists and anarchism in most of the new material that is appearing. I rather think that the hagiographic assessments that were produced in the past may well have been an understandable reaction to the vilification anarchists have received from all sides and the creation or re-discovery of heroes and heroines was a necessary stage in how we responded to our own history. We have gone beyond that now and presented fuller and more complex picture of ideas, movements and people. We have also been able to look at earlier anarchists with far more realism. It doesn’t hurt us to know that Adolph Fischer and George Engels had not spoken to Albert Parsons and August Spies for a year before their arrests and were angry at what they saw as the latter’s move to reformism within the struggles of the Chicago Labour Movement. To see them all as the “Haymarket Martyrs” may be a wonderfully shorthand and iconic symbolism. To realize the political differences and tensions between them pays respect to who they were (not who we made them to be).

Perhaps the most fascinating result of this recent research is the discovery of how complex anarchism was when interpreted and experienced by many earlier comrades. One example may help here. Billy MacQueen was an extraordinarily brave and committed class struggle anarchist. Sympathetic to the ideas of Johann Most, with whom he was in regular correspondence, MacQueen would go on pay a grim price for his anarchist beliefs, which we might roughly summarize as the primacy of working class struggle, the importance of industrial action in bringing about anarchy and a fierce anti-religiousness. The paper he helped edit called The Free Commune, though, had space for the Christian anarchism of John C. Kenworthy and cheerfully advertised the individualist paper “The Eagle and the Serpent.” (sent to it by Max Nettlau) in its third edition in 1899 – all this while mocking the sentimental and hypocritical responses of “reformers” to the assassination of the Empress Elisabeth of Austria by Italian anarchist Luigi Luccheni in September 1898. These sorts of apparent contradictions are not isolated examples. We can see them in Chris Ealham’s portrayal of young CNT-FAI members reading Kropotkin and Stirner while being profoundly influenced by both, or the refusal of unquestionably brave militants of the IWW to refuse to allow Emma Goldman to speak on birth control in their hall. Quite what this all means will provide fertile ground for further work. We might hazard a guess that a present tendency we can see for absolute ideological purity in anarchism was not, in the past, as common as we may have thought and when it was present it was not a particularly pretty sight. Remember that anarchists have killed each other because of it.

Of course all this complexity being discovered does change the historical narrative of anarchism with regard to individuals, organizations and tendencies. It challenges the adjudication of importance based on our own pre-occupations and allows for all kinds of re-assessment. We might cite the works of Chris Ealham and Agustin Guillamon, for instance, that has allowed us to see the central importance of the CNT-FAI Defense Committees on July 19 1936 and, between them, have almost obliterated the rather romantic idea of how wonderfully spontaneous Spanish anarchist practice was. These Committees were both actively involved in the communities where they lived and also busy planning for the revolution they were looking to bring about. When it came they could both challenge the army and put into place structures that kept working class communities supplied with food and materials. Both writers have also reflected on, and explored the nature of, the tensions within the CNT. Using the hastily scrawled minutes of locals and other sources they portray the fierce and confused opposition to some of the positions of the CNT Higher Committees while still being shackled by a loyalty to an organization that meant so much to them both in the past and in their present. Such emotional commitment meant that many cenetistas could have their feet in more than one of the many, many tendencies that swirled around in the organization – some of which we are still grappling to understand.

Whatever we extrapolate from all of this though, we are learning, I hope, to respect the ideas of our historical comrades and are making sure we do not see them as simple, one dimensional or lacking our intelligence and political sophistication. Even if they were not what once we thought they were, or really wanted them to be, we can try and see their world through their eyes and not through our own.

Barry Pateman

The Life of Hirshauge / Library News

Tenth Anniversary of the death of Eliezer Hirshauge (1911-1954) [A work in progress]

A

Eliezer Hirshauge’ brought out two editions of an anarcho-syndicalist publication called Opinions [Dey’es] in Tel-Aviv in the year 1952. In 1951, under the pseudonym of A. Goral, he had written a pamphlet, ‘Pyr Kropotkin’ (Toldotav Rayonotav Vsefarav). This was published under his own name. He arranged for the pamphlet as well as the two issues of Opinions to be translated from Yiddish into Hebrew – he typeset and printed both himself, at his own cost. E. H. was a master composer by trade and a great idealist. It was through his initiative that Dr Yisroel Rabin’s work ‘From Here to There’ appeared in the year 1954.

While still in Warsaw before the outbreak of the Second World War, he was active in not-for-profit publishing. He typeset and published a number of works by Jewish and non-Jewish writers, among them the monthly journal ‘Society’s Conscience’, edited by Tadeusz Marian Lubetski (in Polish).

B

The story of Eliezer’s Hirshauge’s life is short, tragic and heroic.

He was born to religious parents in Warsaw. The fourth child. Before him come two sisters and a brother. To cheder at the age of five. Studies at yeshiva till the age of 16. Thereafter apprentices himself to a composer in the face of protests from his parents, who regarded association with a trade as a stain on the well-to-do chasidic family’s honour.

E. H. applies himself seriously to self-education. After a period spent looking into, and picking over, political parties and their ideologies, he comes upon the idea of anarcho-syndicalism.

In 1936, he meets girlfriend Dinah Huzarski. She becomes his life companion.

With troubles in Spain starting to intensify, he writes a pamphlet: “Spain at the Crossroads”. He typesets and prints it himself, and he and Dinah make for the news-stands and give out a large number of copies. The rest are confiscated by the reactionary Polish government.

In his free time, he translated into Yiddish several chapters from Maimonides’ philosophical treatise, Guide for the Perplexed. His work was published in Warsaw, by the Erlikhman Press in 1937. 1939: Warsaw is attacked by German warplanes. Eliezer and Dinah leave the city. They arrive in Kovel as refugees. They move on and reach Vsielub near Novogrudek. E. H. takes up tutoring. He goes from home to home teaching little children and, for his pains, receives some provisions here, a meal to eat there. Dinah works as a nurse in a hospital.

1940: Eliezer and Dinah refuse to take Soviet citizenship and are deported to the Urals. Eliezer works as a ‘zaboyshchik’ in the coalmines of Yegorishina in the oblast of Sverdlovsk. His pay – half a kilo of bread a day. He is run over at work, breaks a leg and, as a convalescent, is given lighter work: he becomes a stable hand. His job is to watch over blind, starving horses from the pit.

He can’t bear to look on at their hunger-pangs and feeds the horses hay he takes from his pillows.

1941: they are transferred to work felling trees in Vsefarv.

1 The spelling Hirshauge follows the standard Yiddish transliteration convention. Troym in farvirklekhung gives his name as Eliesor Hirshauge. In Polish it’s given as Eliezer Hirshauge (or Herzauge).

2 The transliteration of the sequence of Yiddish characters used is G-U-R-L. The name is, however, rendered as Goral at Results for ‘au:Goral, A.’ [WorldCat.org]. This latter rendering is perhaps more consistent with ‘standard’ Yiddish. In the Polish Yiddish accent, the sound ‘o’ shifts to ‘u’, and DH may here simply be writing as she speaks.

Furthermore, goral is, it appears, a Polish word meaning ‘highlander’. Could this be the source of the pseudonym? On the other hand, the character sequence also forms a Yiddish word, pronounced govrn and meaning destiny: it is plausible too that this could be the inspiration of the pseudonym.

3 The name, as DH writes it, would be transliterated as ‘Krupotkin’. The observation on Polish Yiddish pronunciation in preceding footnote would seem to be relevant here and, on that basis, the more conventional spelling Kropotkin has been employed.

4 DH cites the Hebrew title of pamphlet in brackets here. This translates as: His times, His Thoughts, His Writings. Cf: Results for 'Hirschaue kropotkin' [WorldCat.org]


6 The word used here – khavera – is a Hebraism with no apparent currency in Yiddish. In modern Hebrew, its range of meanings extends across (female) ‘friend’, ‘associate’ (‘colleague’?) and ‘companion’ to ‘girlfriend’. In English, we are forced to make a choice between these possibilities, and the last looks the most likely, particularly because what DH says in the very next sentence. This juxtaposition of the two sentences suggests she specifically wants to point up a contrast between a possibly temporary, initial attachment and the life-long relationship which evolved from it. It is strange that the word khavera is not preceded by the possessive adjective, zayn (his). But she clearly resorts to quasi note-form elsewhere in her introduction: it would seems she does so here too.

7 From the Russian "zaboyschchik" (забойщик), meaning (coal-) miner or face-worker.
the virgin Seravski forests, where no human being has ever set foot. Ending up completely exhausted and drained of strength, they are transferred to Uzbekistan. They work on a kholkhoz, in cotton plantations. From there, they are relocated to Kazakhstan. Eliezer works as a cleaner in a hospital. But soon he is conscripted. From Stalingrad to Warsaw, his footsteps follow the road of war. From Warsaw, where Eliezer and Dinah find no trace of their families, they set off on the road and arrive at a Joint-UNRA [sic] camp at Hasenhecke near Kassel, in western Germany.

Eliezer throws himself into work with all his drive and enthusiasm. He organises schools for learning skills; he edits, and almost single-handedly produces, a camp newspaper. He also puts together and personally typesets a study book for the children in the camp to help them learn Hebrew. The book is called ‘Eden’.

End of 1947: Eliezer and Dinah arrive in Israel. E. H. finds work in his field. He renovates a little home for the household of four. But he is immediately called up. After returning from the war of liberation he resumes work as a compositor.

He dies suddenly from a heart attack on 8th May 1954.

D. H. [Dinah Hirshauge]


8 Presumably a reference to the Sarovskie forests, near the town of Sarov, 371 km ESE of Moscow. The forests were regarded as sacred in the Orthodox religion because of their association with St. Seraphim of Sarov, and were untouched until Soviet times.

9 “Joint” (in English) was the common name for one of the Jewish relief agencies: JDC (Joint Distribution Committee) active at the time. The other agency is UNRRA United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. See also http://www.dpcamps.org/hasenhecke.html

10 i.e., the 1948/49 war for control over the territory of the former British mandate in Palestine. It is interesting to reflect on the political journey from her roots in the inter-war anarchist movement the writer must have made, and the life experiences she must have gone through, that led her to choose to express herself in this way.

New publication: What Does Syndicalism Want? Living, Not Dead Unions By Max Baginski

What does syndicalism want? was first published in 1909, when the syndicalist revolt was growing worldwide. Baginski is clear in his call for working class rebellion: the task is not to fight simply for better conditions but ‘to break the chains of wage labor and at the same time the shackles of servitude to the state.’ At the same time, Baginski is no joyless martyr to ‘the cause’: personal freedom joins collective struggle at the core of his anarchism.

Max Baginski (1864-1943) was a German-born American anarchist activist and writer. Rudolf Rocker called him “one of the most outstanding human beings I have met in my life”. Nathan Jun’s introduction puts Baginski in his political and intellectual context as writer and anarchist.

What Does Syndicalism Want? Living, Not Dead Unions By Max Baginski

Edited and introduced by Nathan Jun, translated by Friederike Wiedemann; with an obituary by Rudolf Rocker, edited by Nathan Jun, translated by Yvonne Franke
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Anarchism by George Woodcock [Review]

Being in possession of the first United States edition of this book, from 1962, we can easily see just how faithful the author has been to his original text, notes, bibliography and index, adding only a post script of 11 pages in 1973. We shall go on to comment on this great innovation shortly. But first let us have a look at the oh-so-formidable text that has required no amendment since 1962.

One possible explanation for the author’s intellectual stagnation may be found in Woodcock’s political transformation from the anarchist of the 40s to today’s mandarin in Canada. Now, change is one thing, treachery another.

Aspirations

“In reality, the ideal of anarchism, far from democracy carried to its logical end, is much nearer to aristocracy universalised and purified” (Prologue, p.30). “I have brought the history of anarchism to an end in the year 1939. The date is chosen deliberately; it marks the real death in Spain of the anarchist
movement which Bakunin founded two generations before.” And: “How right they were (the reformists) – and how wrong the anarchists – in purely material terms, has been shown by the radical change in character of modern capitalism, which has led to a remarkable broadening in the standard of living and the scope of leisure in the Western world, and also the appearance of the welfare state with its insidious dulling of the edge of resentment.” (Epilogue pp.443, 447).

But on the other hand: “And, for the very fact that it is based on qualities and aspirations towards freedom and peace that are fundamental in human nature, the Utopia of anarchism is literally, realisable.” (p.24). “In reality, the existence of a little liberty in this country (England) means nothing … The individual has no rights; ‘Habeas Corpus’ is dead mutton. At present it is convenient and practicable for our bureaucratic rulers to allow us to retain certain of the liberties of capitalist democracy. When events render this position inconvenient for them to maintain, they will not hesitate to make the English state in all its aspects as ruthless as the German.” (Epilogue, p.119). “I do not state that such a social revolution is imminent. But I do contend that there is a general trend in social affairs towards a revolutionary situation, in the maturing of which this war is but an incident. The oppositions of the class struggle are becoming daily more clear, and there is a growing realisation among men of all kinds that the social choice before them is not one between two forms of authoritarian society, such as democracy and fascism, but between authority in any form and the completely free society of anarchy.” (Epilogue, p.121).

**Omission of Sources**

It is time now, for us to point out that the quotations in favour of anarchism, come from *Anarchy or Chaos* (Freedom Press, 1944, 124 pp) by … George Woodcock, at that time an anarchist. Woodcock’s evolving along the lines of a growing adaptation to a society which he once believed was corrupt certainly goes a long way to explain his aggressive attitude to anarchism.

Declaring in favour of unconditional pacifism, Woodcock dubs the anarchist terrorists “criminals,” which shows up the absence of a serious approach in his investigation generally; though what he owes to Max Nettlau (the anarchist historian) may be greater than his words indicate on account of the systematic omission of sources.

This blinkered pacifism leads Woodcock to ignore the Italian theoretician Galleani, the Argentine movement as a whole, the social struggles in the United States (the struggles at the turn of the century are utterly ignored) and the roles of Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman appear inconsequential. Nor do the many battles in favour of Sacco and Vanzetti and their significance in the context of the United States’ democratic fascism, deserve a mention.

The postscript from July 1973 is like the book, and although, after the book was first published, anarchism was, as far as Woodcock was concerned, nearly dead, it “has emerged again, rejuvenated.” He says he foresaw this possibility in his 1962 book, but in fact, he is surely confusing that with his anarchist book of 1944. For Woodcock, the present situation is due to “a scholarly interest” (p.456) and to a “growing political faith among young people and especially among intellectuals and students.” (p.457). So, “the new libertarianism is essentially a revolt – not of the under-privileged – but of the privileged who have seen the futility of affluence as a goal.” (p.462) and Woodcock tells us that where anarchism is firmly rooted in the people is in India with the movements of Vinoba Bhave and Jayaprakash Narayan. An odd way of looking at things!

**Autonomous Struggles**

First, scholarly interest, not only in anarchism but also in socialism and in the marxist movement, dates back to the end of the nineteenth century, and the reason is readily understandable: it is the duty of the university to supply the State with the cultural and philosophical justification for smashing or corrupting anti-exploitation theories. In Italy, Lombroso discovered that all anarchists have a congenital, wicked tendency towards crime; in France, Victor Basch saw them as religious persons without a god. Lenin takes more or less the same line when he – and with him, all authoritarian marxists – makes a distinction between the lumpen, scum anarchists and the wise, intelligent anarchists, who are unconscious marxists.

Second, to reduce the new libertarianism to the student or intellectual world is stupid. Hungary in 1956, Czechoslovakia in 1968, France that same year, and China in April 1976 (see the paper *Minus 7*) are clear indications that all workers – whether their work be physical, manual or intellectual – feel fed up with hierarchy, and the permanence of the same rulers. If anarchism were only a fad, a moral posture for intellectuals, why are millions of people pursuing its goals? To take a clear-cut example – I am not familiar with the situation in India, but I cannot see anarchism where Woodcock locates it – the autonomous struggles in Italy, the rebirth of the CNT in Spain, the numerous groups in many countries, and, above all, the great wave of anti-dogmatism, opposition to caste and decision-making from above, that is rising in Eastern Europe and China, and on a lesser scale in Western Europe, are proving that the Woodcock of 1944 was right.
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