

soon, it follows that the continued evolution of society will be in the direction of freedom, equality, and community.

The process of anarchist transformation in Africa might prove comparatively easy, given that Africa lacks a strong capitalist foundation, well-developed class formations and relations of production, and a stable, entrenched state system. What is required for now is a long-term program of class consciousness building, relevant education, and increased individual participation in social struggles. Meanwhile, the crises and mutations in capitalism, Marxist socialism, and the state system, individually and collectively, cannot but accelerate. For Africa in particular, long-term development is possible only if there is a radical break with both capitalism and the state system—the principal instruments of our arrested development and stagnation. Anarchism is Africa's way out.

53. Mok Chiu Yu: An Anarchist in Hong Kong (2001)

Although anarchism as a significant movement virtually disappeared from China by the 1930s, anarchist ideas and anti-authoritarian movements have continued to manifest themselves in China during various social upheavals. During the so-called "Cultural Revolution" in the 1960s, some Red Guards took Mao Zedong's revolutionary pronouncements to heart, advocating the transformation of China into a "People's Commune" based on the revolutionary models of the 1871 Paris Commune and the 1917 Petrograd Soviets (see the "Whither China" manifesto of the Sheng-Wu-Lien group in China: The Revolution is Dead—Long Live the Revolution (Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1977)). After the Communist authorities, with Mao's approval, suppressed these "ultra-leftist" deviations, some former Red Guards became interested in anarchist ideas. In 1976, the Hong Kong based libertarian communist group, the '70s, published their collection of ultra-left writings, China: The Revolution is Dead—Long Live the Revolution, in which Lee Yu See and Wu Che wrote that:

1. From the beginning, the Chinese Communist Party was a bourgeois organism. The party was structured along hierarchical lines. It was a miniature state. It assimilated all the forms, techniques and mentality of bureaucracy. Its membership was schooled in obedience and was taught to revere the leadership. The party's leadership, in turn, was schooled in habits born of command, authority, manipulation and egomania. At the same time, the party was the spineless follower of the Comintern directed by Moscow.
2. The rigid dogma adopted by the Chinese Communist Party was that of Leninism-Stalinism, an ideology which had led to the consolidation of a system of state capitalism in Russia. Not by deviating from but by following

Lenin's ideas, a new dominating and exploiting class came into power over the working masses.

3. China was an economically backward country in which the old ruling classes were incapable of carrying out industrialization. The young native bourgeoisie had neither the strength nor the courage to revolutionize the old social structure in the way that a genuine modernization would require. The "bourgeois tasks" were to be solved by a bureaucracy

4. In pursuing the strategy of encircling the cities from the countryside in its attempt to seize state power, the Chinese Communist Party built up a peasant army. But such an army, organized by a bourgeois party, became a tool of the party and therefore a capitalist machine.

5. The so-called 1949 revolution [had] nothing in common with a genuine socialist revolution. It was simply a violent takeover of the state by a bureaucracy better placed to manage the national capital than the old ruling clique.

6. Having won control of the state machine, the only way to move forward for the Maoist bureaucracy was to impose a regime of ruthless exploitation and austerity on the working masses.

The bureaucracy began to carry out the task of primitive accumulation. Because of the lack of capital-intensive industry, economic development depended on the most primitive methods of extraction of surplus value: in the countryside, mobilizing millions of peasants and semi-proletarians around the construction of public works and irrigation projects, built almost bare-handed by the rural masses; in the cities, forcing the workers to work long hours for extremely low wages, banning strikes, putting restrictions on the choice of employment and so on.

7. The new bureaucratic capitalist class in China did not emerge because of the development of new modes of production. It was on the contrary, the bureaucracy which brought the new mode of production into existence. The Chinese bureaucracy did not originate from the industrialization of the country. Industrialization was the result of the bureaucracy's accession to power.

8. Soon after the accession to power of the Maoist bureaucracy, intra-party feuds occurred. Such feuds originated out of two different conceptions of how China was to modernize in agriculture, industry, science and technology.

9. The Maoist-radical faction (led... by Jiang Qing, Wang Hongwen, Zhang Chunqiao and Yao Wen Yuan [the so-called "Gang of Four"]) advocated self-reliance, the active mobilization of the "popular masses" behind the state and the economy to promote production by ideological rather than material incentives, "redness" over "expertness," the "infallibility" of the thoughts of Mao Zedong, hostility towards the Soviet Union, "revolutionizing" arts and

literature to serve the single purpose of propagating the official ideology, the need for endless mass movements and struggle because “in the long historical period of socialism, the principal internal contradiction is the contradiction between the working class and the bourgeoisie.”

The so-called capitalist roaders (Liu Shaoqi, Deng Xiaoping, et al) favoured the retention of wage differentials and the extension of material incentives for increased productivity. They also stood for a more efficient technological apparatus, rapprochement with the Soviet “revisionists,” liberalization of policies in relation to the arts, rejection of the personal cult of Mao, the priority of national Construction over endless “class struggles.”

Both lines represented different strategies designed by the different factions of the bureaucratic capitalist class for attacking the working masses, for intensifying their exploitation.

The Maoist-radical road was leading to a “feudalistic social-fascist dictatorship.” The road of the “capitalist roaders” would bring a “destalinized Russian type of society” like today’s Russia.

Today it is clear that the “capitalist roaders” were ultimately victorious in the struggle for control of the Chinese Communist Party, economy and state after the death of Mao and the fall of the “Gang of Four” in 1976. By 1997, when China regained control of Hong Kong, state capitalism was firmly established in China. In the following passages, Mok Chiu Yu, a Hong Kong anarchist, describes the changes that have taken place since 1997, and the limited prospects for anarchism in Hong Kong and China today. Originally published in interview form in the Italian anarchist review, Libertaria, No. 3 (2001); translated by Paul Sharkey.

Since the reunification, the Chinese Communists—like the British before them—have favoured alliance with Hong Kong’s businessmen. Recently a sizable delegation of entrepreneurs visited Sinkiang and other northwestern regions of China: they were invited to take a hand in fast-tracking development in the area. Favourable conditions were promised.

Hong Kong businessmen are like businessmen the world over: what concerns them is profit. Ever since China opened up economically in the ’80s, lots of industries and entrepreneurs have relocated their investments to the Chinese interior. Workers in processing industries in Hong Kong have felt the negative impact of this exodus of capital investment to the SEZs (Special Economic Zones). Hong Kong’s economy has worsened since reunification even though the heaviest blows came from the Asian financial crisis. Besides, with the information technology revolution many trades (say, translation or the like) have been relocating to mainland China.

In addition, many smaller firms have relocated to Shenzhen (a city just over the border from the ex-colony) and its environs and, broadly speaking, the revenue of the middle class has diminished. The real estate market is in crisis but today those in a position to invest do not feel that the situation is worrisome. Businessmen play a prominent role in the running of the economy and, thanks to support from the PRC (People's Republic of China) the problems generated by the Asian financial crisis have been overcome and have left less lasting damage than elsewhere in eastern Asia. Those strata of society which have been hit hardest (workers and employees in the relocated factories or offices) have found their earning ability diminished and survive thanks to support from the Chinese "extended" family. In recent decades, however the extended family as a feature of society has been eroded; broadly speaking, there are usually only two children and the core nucleus is more and more frequently mono-nuclear (partly because homes are tiny and expensive)...

In our view the Special Economic Zone (SEZ) of Shenzhen represents the worst of both worlds: people are wide open to the exploitation of the capitalist mode of production (extreme working conditions, longer hours, inhuman living conditions and so on) as well as to the totalitarian controls of a corrupt "Communist" regime! But now that the whole of China is open to capitalist practices, the arrangements adopted in Shenzhen are spreading everywhere. The workers in these Special Economic Zones earn an average of 100 dollars a month and are a very amenable workforce. The cost of living in Shenzhen is lower than in Hong Kong and citizens of the ex-colony have developed the habit of venturing beyond its borders on shopping trips.

Virtually every consumer good can be found there at lower cost: there are also lots of counterfeit or contracted goods, especially Italian brands. People also venture out in search of entertainment. All of which has eroded the Hong Kong domestic market and caused an ongoing shrinkage in business sectors, with the resultant impact one might expect on employment. On the other hand, we have the phenomenon of house buying in Guangdong by Hong Kong citizens. Economic reforms in China have furnished the already highly corrupt party leaders and officials with superb opportunities for capturing key positions and, in some instances, amassing extraordinary wealth. That wealth is indicated by the spectacular consumption of luxury products and motor vehicles. In a number of instances workers have been asked to become shareholders in the company for which they work, but management remains under the control of persons backed by the party or drawn from the party itself.

It is not unusual for payment of wages to be delayed or indeed to go unpaid, while the trade union officers are utterly useless. There have been attempts to set up unofficial unions but these have been snuffed out immediately. The urge, how-

ever, is a strong one because living and working conditions are very oppressive. The system was corrupt and economic reforms have only inflated this. Chinese pragmatism is evident in business strategies and contract models. After the comparative isolation of China in the wake of the Tiananmen incidents [in 1989], Chinese leaders agreed to sign contracts to launch companies with 51% of the capital coming from abroad: now that they are in a stronger position, they are renegotiating the contracts for the purpose of winning back a majority shareholding.

The head of the Hong Kong executive who was appointed by an indirect, 800-strong electoral college was a businessman operating “in tune” with Beijing’s chosen policy line.

With a chief executive who was “on side,” political control became simpler. [When] Jiang Zemin, the PRC president, visited Hong Kong... the local government deployed upwards of three thousand police to counter the few demonstrators and some of the latter were very brutally handled. In fact, there are political changes under way but they are taking place very slowly. Shortly before leaving the colony, the British gave approval to a range of democratic measures (for which they had shown no appetite during their 150 year long stay, however) that were not to the liking of the Chinese rulers. In practical terms only half of the deputies are returned by direct democratic election whereas other representatives are indirectly chosen by a variety of corporations and associations. Thus the majority of the deputies support the government and are openly pro-China. According to traditional Chinese custom, the ruling class displays clear signs of self-censorship and caution and strives not to come into conflict with the Beijing authorities and indeed tries to anticipate their wishes. Potential dissenting voices are progressively “corralled” (like the leader of the democracy party) or are shunned or victimized.

The daily newspaper *Apple Daily* was very critical of Beijing and so its owner came under severe pressure in the form of impediments placed in the way of his economic activities until he was forced into selling some of these off in order to liquidate some of his assets. In social and political terms there is more control over demonstrations of any sort and in some instances there can be heavy repression. The Falun Gong sect, banned and harshly repressed in China, is legal in Hong Kong but its most recent public demonstration was limited to just 25 participants. The crackdown on the Falun Gong within China is probably the result of a mistaken assessment of the threat that it poses, but the repression is the result of the fact that even some party cadres (lots of them, it would appear) are followers of the sect. In Hong Kong today, there are tighter controls on immigration and emigration and these areas (reuniting families, residence permits, etc.) have thrown up the starkest clashes “of principle”...

Powers are being centralized in government hands, with decentralized municipal councils being abolished and in fact this program of “integration” is worrying as far as the prospects for Hong Kong’s independence are concerned...

Before reunification, there were a lot of worries about freedom and artists were keen to demonstrate their concerns. In fact we now find ourselves in the paradoxical situation where we can speak freely about what we want because artists are not regarded as posing any danger, in social terms. Hong Kong has no organized anarchist movement, but whenever I think about Artivist, say, I contend that it can be counted as an anarchist organization, albeit on a rather small scale. Since 1990, Artivist has been organizing a yearly concert to commemorate 4 June [1989], which is to say, the date of the crushing of the democracy movement in Tiananmen Square in Beijing. We are quite embedded and influential within artistic circles, as individual anarchists, and not just anarchists. Personally, I contend that I engage in political work by involving myself in cultural improvement efforts. I do this, for instance, through my theatre work, while other comrades are involved in young children’s theatre... The older generation of artists operates on an individual basis, but they have a common objective, promoting libertarian positions. Often the model imitated is that of the Living Theatre and the teachings of Julian Beck and Judith Malina [Volume Two, Selections 24 & 25]; and artists from the Philippines and Japan occupy the same terrain. We operate through theatre work and self-improvement workshops: it is out of these that the conquest of autonomy and real democracy spring.

54. Mihara Yoko: Anarchism in Japan (1993)

The Japanese anarchist movement was crushed by the late 1930s, when Japan embarked on its quest for imperial domination of Asia. After the Second World War, Japanese anarchists attempted to regroup, with some becoming involved in “ban the bomb” movements, a particularly important issue in Japan, where Hiroshima and Nagasaki remain the only cities to have been subjected to atomic bombing. In the following excerpts, Mihara Yoko surveys Japanese anarchism since the war and suggests that anarchists should become more involved in popular social movements that evince an anarchist sensibility. Translated by John Crump.

“Ecology” has been an important preoccupation of the members of the [post-war Japanese] Anarchist Federation. What stands out is their attitude towards the current situation in Japan, where a superficial type of ecology is fashionable. This so-called “ecology” tolerates satiated people buying commodities which, in the words of the advertising jingles, are “kind to nature.” The members of the An-

trines of the Nazis, which, on the one hand, portrayed the “Aryan” and “Nordic” German people as a superior race, but then, in order to justify rule by an elite, had to argue that the “ruling strata” were of purer blood (Berneri, 1935). As Rocker observed, “every class that has thus far attained to power has felt the need of stamping their rulership with the mark of the unalterable and predestined.” The idea that the ruling class is a “special breed,” Rocker pointed out, originated among the Spanish nobility, whose “blue blood” was supposed to distinguish them from those they ruled (Volume One, Selection 121). It was in Spain that the conflict between the “blue bloods,” capitalists and fascists, on the one hand, and the anarchists, socialists and republicans, on the other, was to reach a bloody crescendo when revolution and civil war broke out there in July 1936.

CHINESE ANARCHISM: AGAINST MARXISM

In Asia during the 1920s and 30s, the anarchists faced obstacles similar to those of their European comrades. The success of the Bolsheviks in Russia led to the creation of Marxist-Leninist Communist parties in various parts of Asia. The anarchists had until then been the most influential revolutionary movement in China. By the late 1920s, the anarchists had been eclipsed by the Chinese Communist Party and the Guomindang, who fought each other, and the Japanese, for control of China over the next twenty years.

Chinese anarchists rejected the Marxist notion of the dictatorship of the proletariat, concentrating all power “in the hands of the State,” because this would result in the “suppression of individual freedom” (Volume One, Selection 100). The Chinese anarchists did not regard Marxist State socialism as sufficiently communist, for during the alleged “transition” from socialism to communism, a wage system and some forms of private property would be retained.

Huang Lingshuang (1898-1982), one of the more noteworthy Chinese anarchist critics of Marxism, rejected the Marxist view that society must progress through successive stages of economic and technological development before communism can be achieved. Drawing on the work of European anthropologists, Huang Lingshuang was able to more clearly distinguish between cultural change and biological evolution than Kropotkin, who had largely conflated the two. Huang Lingshuang argued that, contrary to the Marxist theory of historical materialism, the “same economic and technological conditions do not necessarily result in the same culture,” cultural and economic changes do “not occur at the same rate,” and not every society goes through the same economic stages of development in the same order (Volume One, Selection 100). Rudolf Rocker made similar arguments in *Nationalism and Culture* (Volume One, Selection 121).

CLASS STRUGGLE AND 'PURE' ANARCHISM IN JAPAN

In contrast to the decline of the Chinese anarchist movement in the 1920s, according to John Crump, "the anarchists in Japan were organisationally stronger than ever before, and there was a corresponding flowering of ideas and theories, particularly among the anarchist communists" (Crump, 1996). The anarchist communists identified themselves as "pure anarchists." They criticized the anarcho-syndicalist concept of workers' control of the existing means of production. As Hatta Shûzô (1886-1934) put it, "in a society which is based on the division of labour, those engaged in vital production... would have more power over the machinery of coordination than those engaged in other lines of production." The Japanese "pure anarchists" therefore proposed a decentralized system of communal production "performed autonomously on a human scale," where "production springs from consumption," being designed to meet local and individual wants and needs, in contrast to existing systems of production, where consumption is driven by the demands of production. Under such a system of decentralized human scale production, people "can coordinate the work process themselves," such that there is no need for a "superior body and there is no place for power" (Volume One, Selection 106).

Japanese anarcho-syndicalist advocates of class struggle agreed that the existing authoritarian system of production should be replaced by "communal property... where there is neither exploiter nor exploited, neither master nor slave," with society being "revived with spontaneity and mutual free agreement as an integral whole" (Volume One, Selection 107). However, in order to create such a society a profound revolutionary transformation was required. The anarcho-syndicalists argued that it was only by participating in the workers' daily struggles against the capitalist system that anarchists would be able to inspire a revolutionary movement capable of creating the anarchist community to which the "pure anarchists" aspired.

Contrary to the claims of the "class struggle" anarcho-syndicalists though, the "pure anarchists" did not hold themselves aloof from the workers' struggles but convinced the anarchist Zenkoku Jiren labour federation to adopt a "pure anarchist" position which emphasized that their goal was not to take over the existing means of production, replacing the capitalists and the government with a trade union administration, but to create a decentralized system of communal production based on human-scale technology, a position similar to that developed by Murray Bookchin in the 1960s (Volume Two, Selections 48, 62 & 74). The Zenkoku Jiren reached out to Japanese tenant farmers, seeing them "as the crucial social force which could bring about the commune-based, alternative society to capitalism" advocated by the "pure anarchists" (Crump, 1996). The ap-

peal of this vision to radical Japanese workers and farmers is illustrated by the fact that by 1931, the Zenkoku Jiren had about 16,000 members, whereas the more conventional anarcho-syndicalist federation, the Jikyô, had only 3,000.

In the early 1930s, as the Japanese State began a concerted push for imperialist expansion by invading Manchuria, the State authorities renewed their campaign against the Japanese anarchist movement, which was staunchly anti-imperialist. In the face of the Japanese occupation of Manchuria, the Japanese Libertarian Federation had called on all people to “cease military production, refuse military service and disobey the officers” (Volume One, Selection 110). Anarchist organizations were banned and hundreds of anarchists arrested. By 1936, the organized anarchist movement in Japan had been crushed.

ANARCHISM IN THE KOREAN LIBERATION MOVEMENT

Japan had annexed Korea much earlier, in 1910, around which time Japanese authorities had made their first attempt to destroy the nascent anarchist movement by executing several leading anarchists, including Kôtoku Shûsui (Volume One, Selection 102). The Japanese occupation of Korea gave rise to a national liberation movement to free the Korean people from Japanese exploitation and domination. Some of the more radical elements in the liberation movement gravitated toward anarchism.

In 1923, a prominent member of the movement, Shin Chaeho (1880-1936), published his “Declaration of the Korean Revolution” in which he argued that when driving out their Japanese exploiters, the Korean people must be careful not to “replace one privileged group with another.” The goal of the Korean revolution should be the creation of a world in which “one human being will not be able to oppress other human beings and one society will not be able to exploit other societies.” The revolution must therefore be a “revolution of the masses.” To succeed in constructing a free society, the revolution must destroy foreign rule, the “privileged class” that benefits from it, the “system of economic exploitation,” “social inequality” and “servile cultural thoughts” created by conformist forms of “religion, ethics, literature, fine arts, customs and public morals” (Volume One, Selection 105).

In emphasizing the constructive role of destruction, Shin Chaeho was expressing a viewpoint shared by many anarchists that can be traced back to Proudhon and Bakunin (Volume One, Selection 10). He also recognized that to win the masses over to the cause of the revolution, they must be convinced that the revolution will result in material improvements and greater freedom for themselves, not simply the expulsion of their foreign rulers. As Kropotkin put it, for “the revolution to be anything more than a word... the conquest of the day it-

self must be worth the trouble of defending; the poor of yesterday must not find themselves even poorer today” (Volume One, Selection 45).

This was one of the reasons why Kropotkin had entitled his most sustained argument in favour of anarchist communism *The Conquest of Bread* (Volume One, Selection 33). When Korean anarchists began publishing their own paper in 1928, they called it *Talhwan*, or *Conquest*, and championed anarchist communism, calling for the abolition of capitalism and government (Volume One, Selection 108). They also rejected the Marxist “State capitalism” that was being created in the Soviet Union through the “despotic and dictatorial” policies of the Soviet Communist Party (the Bolsheviks).

Korean anarchists, including Shin Chaeho, were instrumental in forming the Eastern Anarchist Federation in 1927, which had members from Korea, China, Vietnam, Taiwan and Japan. Most of their work and publications had to be carried out from exile, and even then at great risk to themselves. Shin Chaeho was arrested by Japanese authorities in Taiwan in 1928 and died in prison in 1936. However, after the defeat of Japan in the Second World War, it was only in Korea that a significant anarchist movement reemerged in southeast Asia. In China, the Marxist Communists under the leadership of Mao Zedong had seized control by 1949. They no more tolerated an independent anarchist movement than had the Communists in the Soviet Union. In Japan, the U.S. occupiers engineered the purging of radicals, whether Marxist or anarchist, from positions of influence within the trade union movement, and the reform of rural landholdings, creating “a new class of landowning small farmers” who “then became a bastion of political conservatism” hostile rather than sympathetic toward anarchism (Crump, 1996).

During the war, some Korean anarchists participated in the Korean Provisional Government in exile. Their desire for Korean independence superseded their commitment to anarchist ideals. Before the war, the Korean Anarchist Federation had rejected the establishment of a “national united front” (Volume One, Selection 108). After the war, Yu Lim, who had served as a cabinet minister in the Provisional Government, urged the anarchists to support an independent Korean government to prevent Korea from falling “into the hands of either the Stalinists to the north or the imperialistic compradore-capitalists to the south” (Volume Two, Selection 9). Other Korean anarchists, while seeking “to cooperate with all genuinely revolutionary nationalist groups of the left,” continued to call for “total liberation” through the “free federation of autonomous units covering the whole country” (Volume Two, Selection 9). At the conclusion of the war in 1945, grass roots committees for the reconstruction of Korea sprang up across the country, and peasants and workers began forming independent unions. However, this process of social reconstruction “from the bottom upward” came to a halt after

the Soviet Union and the United States imposed their own “national” governments in the north and south in 1948, leading to the divisive and inconclusive Korean War (1950-1953).

SPANISH ANARCHISM

The Spanish anarchist movement which Bakunin had helped inspire experienced its greatest triumphs and most tragic defeats during the Spanish Revolution and Civil War (1936-1939). The two most prominent anarchist groups in Spain were the Iberian Anarchist Federation (the FAI) and the anarcho-syndicalist trade union confederation, the Confederación Nacional del Trabajo (the CNT). The FAI was a federation of anarchist revolutionaries which sought to foment social revolution and to keep the CNT on an anarchist path. This “dual organization” model had been followed in Spain since the days of the First International, when Bakunin recruited Spanish radicals into his Alliance of Social Revolutionaries. Members of the Alliance were to ensure that the Spanish sections of the International adopted Bakunin’s collectivist anarchist program.

By the 1930s, the Spanish anarchist movement had moved toward an anarchist communist position, although the doctrine of “anarchism without adjectives,” which originated in the debates between the anarchist collectivists and anarchist communists in the 1890s, continued to be influential. Diego Abad de Santillán (1897-1983), who played a prominent role in the Argentine and Spanish anarchist movements, saw anarchism as representing a broad “humanistic craving” which “seeks to defend man’s dignity and freedom, regardless of circumstances and under every political system, past, present and future.” Anarchism must therefore be without adjectives because it is not tied to any particular economic or political system, nor is anarchy only possible at a certain stage of history or development. Abad de Santillán argued that anarchism “can survive and assert its right to exist alongside plough and team of oxen as readily as alongside the modern combine-harvester; its mission in the days of steam was the same as it is in the age of the electric motor or jet engine or the modern age of the computer and atomic power” (Volume Two, Selection 53).

Despite his endorsement of “anarchism without adjectives,” Abad de Santillán did not shy away from controversy. Although he participated in the anarcho-syndicalist movements in Argentina and Spain, he urged anarchists “not to forget that the Syndicate is, as an economic by-product of capitalist organization, a social phenomenon spawned by the needs of its day. Clinging to its structures after the revolution would be tantamount to clinging to the cause that spawned it: capitalism” (Volume One, Selection 94).

On the eve of the Spanish Revolution, when the CNT reaffirmed its commit-