

# ANARCHISM, VIOLENCE AND CIVIL DISORDER

Paul W. Blackstock

*The Liberal's Dilemma and the Anarchism of Youth.* The sensitive individual in the Western world has nearly always been impelled to protest the injustices of the political and social order in which he finds himself. For example, very early in life Stephen Spender observed that "to be born is to be a Robinson Crusoe, cast up by elemental powers upon an island," that "all men are not free to share what nature offers here . . . are not permitted to explore the world into which they are born." Throughout their lives they are "sealed into leaden slums as into living tombs." To this general awareness of the plight of the poor, the New Left in this country has added a sense of burning moral indignation that the colored minority has also been sealed into ghettos and deprived of civil rights and human dignity. (Asked why he had joined the Poor People's March on Washington, a white-bearded black man recently told a reporter: "I suppose I'm here because I'm 59 years old and some people still call me 'boy'.")

The options available to the prewar generation were strictly limited: rebellion or becoming an accomplice of a despised social order. Ignazio Silone writes of a village doctor in the poverty-stricken South of Italy who used to say: "There's no halfway house here; you've got either to rebel or become an accomplice." He declared himself an anarchist. He made Tolstoyan speeches to the poor. He was the scandal of the entire neighborhood, loathed by the rich, despised by the poor, and secretly pitied by a few. His post as panel-doctor was taken away from him and he literally died of hunger."

In America today the social and political orders are far more flexible than in the Italy of Silone's youth, and new forms of social protest, especially the techniques of non-violent action, offer a wide range of options. Nevertheless, the politically sophisticated but alienated liberal is soon caught in a similar dilemma. On the question, "Where Shall Liberals Go?"

---

Paul Blackstock is an intelligence and research specialist. As an intelligence specialist he served in Army G-2, and as a psychological warfare specialist in the office of the Chief of Psychological Warfare. Mr. Blackstock is a member of the Department of International Studies, University of South Carolina and author, most recently, of *Masters of Deceit*.

Arnold S. Kaufman writes that there are many on the New Left who "condemn as 'finks' liberals who refuse to participate in their projects when those projects seem ineffective or counter-productive. But — and this is my central point — between 'finkdom' and violent revolution there may be only the career of noisy impotence, despair, and eventual absorption by the hated establishment."

This dilemma is rapidly transcending national boundaries as the New Left movement has spread to other affluent societies, notably France, Germany, Italy and even the Soviet Union. In the case of the Soviet poet Yevtushenko, disappointed critics in the West condemn him for having "sold out to the interests" instead of joining some of his fellow liberals such as Abram Tertz (Sinyavsky) who have wound up in prison camps. Such critics miss the point with respect to both their own and Soviet society. Of course liberals everywhere sympathize with Sinyavsky and Daniel and are revolted by the outrageous circumstances of their show trial and imprisonment. Nevertheless, it must be recognized that as prisoners these brave dissenters have absolutely no access to the institutional resources which are indispensable if liberal ideals are to be effectively pursued in Soviet society, or for that matter in our own. In an authoritarian state such as the USSR, the real burden of social protest is carried by liberals such as A. T. Tvardovsky, the courageous editor of *Novy Mir*, and others who remain within the Establishment and quietly resume their forward push after each setback, of which there have been many in the past and more are foreseeable.

Anarchism, like puppy love and other romantic aberrations, is an instinctive response in the very young. As Santayana observes, a free spirit "will not only defy all tyrants, divine and human, but will declare all the ways and works of man in the past to have been false to humanity." Within the youth movement today there are unlettered school boys who have never heard of Kropotkin who declare themselves anarchists. They are intoxicated with the liberty provided by an affluent and tolerant society. Although few of them have ever read Rabelais, their rule of life, *do your own thing*, is a translation into Hippie jargon of "do as you wish," the motto which the great French humanist placed over the entrance to the monastery of Thélème. Blissfully unaware that life itself is a continuous exer-

cise in self-government, the new anarchists noisily seek an end to all government. Like Samson they are eager to pull the old order down in a shambles of uncollected garbage and burning ghettos with no real thought as to what may replace it. Why not? Their academic mentors have declared an end to ideology, and in an understandable stroke of oneupmanship, a significant number of students have declared a moratorium on thought itself, so far as political and social problems are concerned. The Hippie elements among today's youth prefer to blow their minds and drop out of society altogether. The militant extremists, for whom history begins with the Bay of Pigs, prefer thinking with their blood, unaware that this puts them on a par with the totalitarians of the Hitler youth and other political primitives for whom violence became a way of life.

As an instinctive response of youth, anarchism may be likened to Santayana's description of love as an ultra-violent angel (doing its own thing) at one end of the spectrum and a red devil at the other. Part of the New Left movement has thus adopted a romantic, mindless, free-floating anarchism which invites comparison with traditional anarchism and its rationale for the use of violence and terror as instruments of revolutionary struggle.

*Traditional Anarchism, Violence and Terror.* There is a major distinction between the violence practiced by militant extremists today and the direct action of the anarchists of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The earlier anarchists knew what they were doing and thought about it. At first, assassination was regarded as the only feasible weapon against specific tyrants such as heads of state and other high government officials. For example, in Tsarist Russia the conspiratorial terrorist organization, *Narodnaya Volya* (The People's Will) after two years of intensive activity, finally succeeded in assassinating Tsar Alexander II in March, 1881, an act which was followed by the brutally organized counter-terror of the Security Police, which quickly reduced revolution "to a cottage industry." Later the wider use of violence and terror, including bombing and sabotage, was justified on ideological grounds as an integral part of the universal revolutionary struggle between the bourgeois and capitalist classes.

Sorel, the French apostle of "creative violence," laid the philosophic groundwork for the sporadic political terror and assassination, the so-called "propaganda of the dead," which characterized the European revolutionary movements in the latter part of the nineteenth century. Political murder found its most devoted adherents prior to World War I in the Balkans,

where the secret Macedonian terrorist society, IMRO, covered itself with infamy for years. Finally, a Serbian society achieved dubious immortality with the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand at Sarajevo on June 28, 1914, an incident which escalated into W. W. I.

Ideological or race hatreds can become so bitter that individual acts of violence are rationalized on class or racist grounds. For example, in 1893 or 1894, Leauthier, an obscure French anarchist, attempted to kill a Balkan diplomat who accidentally crossed his path on the streets of Paris. He later declared in court: "I kill no innocent if I kill the first bourgeois I meet." This is the epitome of random terror directed against any member of particular class. It was recently matched on racist grounds following the assassination of Martin Luther King, when in a paroxysm of rage, a negro in Minneapolis murdered his white neighbor after openly declaring: "They killed my King, I'm going out and get me a honky."

The philosophy of indiscriminate terror was first formulated by the Russian anarchist, Judah Grossman, better known by his alias Roshchin, who called it "unmotivated terror." His group called itself The Black Flag after the title of a periodical *Chornoye Znamia* which Roshchin published in a single issue in 1905. He argued that the bourgeoisie should be harassed by acts of terror committed, not for any special motive or against specific targets (such as a cruel tyrant or police chief), but against the bourgeoisie *as such*, for the sole crime of constituting a class hostile to the workers. Hence his term, "unmotivated terror." Bombs thrown into expensive restaurants and cafes, not to speak of the random stabbing or shooting of any prosperous looking person, would be the practical day-to-day application of this theory.

There is an interesting parallel between Roshchin's "unmotivated terror" and the indiscriminate violence practiced by militant extremists on both the Right and Left in the struggle for and against civil rights in the United States. The former has an ideological, the latter a racist base. Roshchin's anarchists threw bombs into "bourgeois" theaters and restaurants in the early 1900's. In September, 1963, militant white extremists dynamited the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church in Birmingham, Alabama, killing four negro children. Each case represents an indiscriminate strike against a convenient target of opportunity.

Roshchin also introduced the concept of seizing and holding an industrial city for at least a few days during which the rebels would expropriate from the rich for the benefit of the poor. With typical anarchist romanticism, he believed that such an act would stimulate uprisings in other localities until the whole country or the whole world would be aflame, and

bourgeois governments would be abolished once and for all. As opposed to the indiscriminate violence of the freelance extremist (whether anarchist or racist), the political use of terror before and after the Russian Revolution was directed at carefully selected targets. Revolutionary propaganda was used to inspire terror, and physical terror in turn was exploited for its propaganda effect by the Socialist Revolutionary Party in Tsarist Russia. The terror Section or "combat arm" of the party was organized by Boris Savinkov, an implacable terrorist, much admired by Winston Churchill and described by Somerset Maugham as the most remarkable man he had ever met. Savinkov was a sinister, controversial character with a magnetic personality to which it was impossible to be indifferent. His outward physical appearance was unattractive; he was slightly built, slightly balding, a heavy smoker, and morphine addict. Nevertheless he was able to inspire blind faith and devotion among his Socialist Revolutionary comrades and assassins who willingly carried out his orders at the risk of almost certain death. In Tsarist days he had personally planned and carried through nineteen successful political assassinations, including the murder of the hated Minister of Interior Plehve and the Grand Duke Sergei, the uncle of the Tsar. Under the pen name of Ropshin he wrote a highly successful novel, *The Pale Horse*, dealing with the assassination of a provincial Governor-General during this period. Following his bitter disappointment with Lenin and the Revolution, he offered his services to the anti-Bolshevik cause, but failed over a period of several years to carry through a number of assassination attempts against Soviet officials traveling in Europe. When his subsidies from Western Intelligence agencies and from private funds ran out, he made a deal with Soviet Intelligence (the OGPU) and defected back to Russia. There he committed suicide in May, 1925, by jumping from a fourth story window of the Lubyanka prison where he had been imprisoned during and after a famous show trial.

•

Following the Russian Revolution, terrorism was frowned upon and fell into disrepute among orthodox Leninist revolutionaries, since in *What Is To Be Done* the master had condemned it as part of the superannuated tactical baggage of the Economists, a Right deviationist faction. In January, 1963, Soviet Premier Khrushchev strongly reaffirmed Lenin's condemnation of assassination as an instrument of policy. He recalled that in the struggle for liberation against the Czarist regime there were people who "believed that one must take the ax in one's hands, commit terrorist

acts against representatives of the regime, so as to secure the success of the revolution." Noting that Lenin's brother, Alexander Ulyanov, had been executed for an attempt on the life of the Tsar, Khrushchev quoted Lenin as saying on the day of his brother's execution, "We shall go another road. Only the road of the struggle of the masses under the leadership of the party of the working class can secure victory. Lonely heroes can die beautifully, but they are not in a position to change the social-political order, nor to achieve victory in revolution."

*Terror and Violence in the 1920's.* Except for the legendary activities of Savinkov, anti-Bolshevik terrorist operations against the early Soviet regime were closely guarded Intelligence secrets. The main thrust came from the Combat Organization of the Russian emigré General Kutypov based in Paris. His "Special Forces" teams launched a vest pocket offensive of several raids in 1927-28 which caused considerable alarm among the Soviet leaders and were a contributing factor in the 1927 War Scare. These terror raids were also highly selective. They were meant to duplicate the feats of the early Socialist Revolutionaries and were directed mainly against Party or OGPU headquarters. Incredible as it may seem, in spite of the omnipresent Secret Police, bombs were actually exploded in both the Leningrad Central Party Club in June, 1927, and a year later in the Lubyanka quarters of the OGPU itself. Targets were selected for their symbolic importance by volunteer militants who operated in two or three man teams. These volunteers knew the insuperable odds they faced, but were willing to die for the cause of "liberating Russia from the Bolshevik yoke." Such operations against a totalitarian police-state were hopeless by definition and there was only one known survivor who is alive today.

Except in connection with the anti-Soviet covert operations of Western Intelligence agencies, the occasional politically inspired violence of the 1920's was as indiscriminate as it is today. Nevertheless anti-Communist fears and passions ran high at the beginning of the decade, which was ushered in by the Bolshevik seizure of power in Russia followed by abortive Communist-led revolutions in Germany, Bavaria and Hungary. In the United States a largely imaginary Red Scare reached its climax in 1919-1920, but the anti-Bolshevik legacy was kept alive when the U.S. State Department, in December of 1923, published a forged Zinoviev "Letter of Instructions to the Communist Party" which expressed the absurd hope that "the proletarians of America" would soon "raise the Red flag over the White House!" These were the days of dreamers, dynamiters and dema-

gogues, when the last of the free-lance anarchists occasionally exploded a home-made bomb and sent shudders of revulsion through the bourgeois capitals of the Western world. But the violence of the day was so unstructured, so disorganized and so much an end in itself that it was soon dissipated. A few anarchists and terrorists such as Roshchin and Savinkov made their peace with the Bolsheviks and returned to the USSR. Others tired of the lonely struggle and let themselves be absorbed by the bourgeois political and social order which they professed to hate. The last sensational political murder of the decade took place on June 7, 1927, in Warsaw. The Soviet Ambassador, Voikov (himself one of the murderers of Tsar Nicholas II and his family) was assassinated in broad daylight by a sixteen-year old boy, Boris Koverda. The incident touched off an international diplomatic crisis and contributed to the 1928 Soviet war scare. Koverda belonged to a Russian emigré organization, and the Soviet press blamed the British Secret Intelligence Service, which then had the reputation which the American C.I.A. enjoys today. However, there is no evidence that the murder, which many (including the King of England) regarded as poetic justice, was a covert operation.

*The Manipulated Violence of the 1930's.* In contrast to the anarchistic and mainly sporadic violence in the 1920's, the following decade was characterized by the planned, deliberate use of violence on a massive scale. It was a golden age of organized kidnapping, murder, subversion, and political violence.

The kidnapping of the Russian emigré leader, General Kutypov in Paris on January 26, 1930, marked a subtle change in atmosphere and the transition to the new decade. Seven years later, on September 22, 1937, Kutypov's successor, General Miller, disappeared under remarkably similar circumstances. Although documentary proof is lacking, there is no question that both kidnappings were covert operations of agents of OGPU (which changed its initials in 1934 to NKVD). By the middle of the decade, inside the Soviet Union, the NKVD, a rapidly growing bureaucratic weed, had become a pliable instrument at the disposition of Stalin in his rise to a position of absolute power. Abroad, the foreign section of the NKVD had built up extensive networks of legal and "illegal" agents. Under the talented direction of men such as Walter Krivitsky, a highly professional corps of covert operators murdered and kidnapped on orders from above as described by Hugo Dewar in *Assassins At Large*.

The complacent return of the normalcy of the twenties was shattered by the Great Depression. Economic

and social dislocation in turn gave rise to the intense ideological and political tension which characterized the 1930's. Following the ominous and meteoric rise of Adolph Hitler, the European world was politically and spiritually bipolarized after 1935 into a Communist-led anti-fascist Left and a pro-fascist Right ready to appease Hitler at almost any price in the hope that he might be turned East against Bolshevik Russia. It was an age of both individual and mass subversion. National loyalties were undermined and transferred to the political "cause" of the Right or Left and sometimes back again. Under these circumstances treason was redefined as no more than a willingness to help the other side, and French superpatriots raised the slogan "Better Hitler than Leon Blum!"

By the mid-thirties what Hitler called the "battle of the streets" had spread from Germany to France. Violent clashes between gangs of Right-wing thugs such as the Cagoulauds, and Communist goon-squads became the order of the day. The ideological "Rape of the Masses" (the title of a book by Serge Chakoutine) became a universal phenomenon.

The battle of the Intelligence Services was also intensified. A variety of competing and overlapping Nazi Intelligence agencies (usually lumped together and mistakenly labeled the Gestapo) flooded Western Europe with agents and created the image (largely false) of an all-powerful "Fifth Column" abroad. Until decimated by the purges at home, the Soviet NKVD naturally responded with a similarly intensified effort abroad. The manipulated political violence of Right- and Left-wing mobs in Europe was matched in the United States by the cold blooded violence of organized crime under gangster overlords. It was the heyday of the Chicago mobsters and the John Dillinger type loners. Civil crimes of violence in turn had their counterpart in political kidnapping and murder executed by the new "organization men" of the Nazi S.D. (*Sicherheitsdienst*) or the NKVD. In this muddled atmosphere hostile propaganda could plausibly blame either the Nazi Security Police (the S.D.) or its Soviet counterpart (NKVD) for almost any major crime. By the eve of World War II which marked the tragic end of the decade, the new professionally manipulated violence reached its logical endpoint in the Nazi extermination camps on the one hand and in the bloody purges and slave-labor camps of the USSR on the other.

*The New Radicalism and Manipulated Violence of the 1960's.* In the late afternoon of February 1, 1960, four negro college students sat down at the lunch counter of the F. W. Woolworth store in Greensboro, North Carolina, and remained without being served

until the store closed at 5:00 p.m. This first sit-in marked the beginning of a long struggle for civil rights by means of nonviolent action which still continues. Before long a New Left student movement which has since leaped across national boundaries was born. It rapidly enlisted the support of white intellectuals, many of them highly articulate, and soon reached the proportions of a crusade, reminiscent of the "going to the people" movement in Tsarist Russia when, in 1872-74, swarms of intellectuals, professional men, and even "repentant nobles" left the cities for the villages in an attempt to help awaken the depressed masses of the peasants. The earlier Russian *Narodnik* movement ended in disaster, and its militant leaders, unable to achieve reforms through constitutional channels, turned to an equally fruitless use of terror and assassination. An analogous development has taken place within the Civil Rights movement in the United States, as formerly moderate leaders, impatient with the pace of reform and revolted by the continuing social injustices of the Great Society, have become increasingly militant. Today Black Power militants such as H. Rap Brown and Stokely Carmichael, openly advocate violence while ghettos have burned in a number of American cities — Los Angeles, Detroit, New York, and also Washington, D. C. Most recently student-led violence on a massive scale paralyzed Paris, and sympathetic student demonstrations of solidarity followed in a number of European cities — Rome, Turin, Madrid, and even Belgrade. The specter of civil disorder thus hangs over all the metropolitan centers of Western, affluent societies, striking at random like summer lightning.

The New Radicalism which has catalyzed this civil disorder is loosely anarchistic, but unlike the traditional anarchist and Marxist-Leninist revolutionary movements of the past, it has no underlying ideology or philosophy. Quite the contrary, it rejects as sterile and even paranoid the preoccupation with ideology which marked the so-called "confrontation between communism and the Free World" of the cold war decade.

The New Radicalism also differs from previous revolutionary movements in two other respects. First, its student leaders bear little or no resemblance to the brooding, half-starved Raskolnikovs of the past who lived in social orders which could offer no hope of a decent life to millions of depressed proletarians and peasants. On the contrary, the new radicals have been aptly described by Jack Newfield as "the children of economic surplus and spiritual starvation." This is reflected in the opening lines of the Port Huron State-

ment (published as a manifesto at the founding of the Students for a Democratic Society, in June 1962): "We are people of this generation, bred in at least modest comfort, housed now in universities, looking uncomfortably to a world we inherit."

Marx's law of increasing misery has been turned upside down, and revolutionary social protest has been born, not primarily out of poverty, but out of increasing affluence. It is this paradox of protest in the midst of plenty which makes the New Radicalism so incomprehensible to the older generation. Now that bread is plentiful, a paternalistic Power Elite which is proud of its material achievements is painfully rediscovering the ancient truth that man does not live by bread alone.

Second, thanks to the Marxist-Leninist heritage, previous radical movements have advocated overthrowing the existing order by revolutionary violence as the only effective means of achieving social and political reform. The Maoist factions of the Communist Party still do, although *Pravda* recently branded student rebels as "werewolves." By contrast, some on the New Left have adopted techniques of nonviolence, and have already achieved notable results in the struggle for civil rights without the direct use of force. On the whole the leaders of the movement have been pacifists, dedicated to the principles and techniques of nonviolent action, although the increasing militancy of a significant Black Power minority has already been noted. As pacifists, many leaders of the New Left have actively protested the use of organized violence in war — specifically the war in Vietnam. A growing consensus along these lines is symbolized by the title of a book by James Finn, *Protest: Pacifism and Politics, Some Passionate Views on War and Nonviolence* (Random House, New York, 1968).

Yet in spite of much agonized soul-searching, just as it lacks a philosophy or ideology, the New Radicalism lacks a comprehensive theory of violence and nonviolence as instruments of revolutionary struggle or social reform. Perhaps the movement will spawn a modern Sorel or Kropotkin (or a combination of both) who will formulate a new theory of "creative violence" unencumbered by the anarchist and Marxist-Leninist impedimenta of the past. Meanwhile, certain tentative conclusions may be deduced from the practical experience of the civil rights movement, and from the fragmentary thoughts which its leaders have expressed on the subject.

First, however much they may be deplored on moral grounds, viewed objectively, violence and terror are important catalytic agents of social and politi-

cal reform. Indiscriminate acts of terror and violence such as the bombing of negro churches, the murder of civil rights workers, the clubbing of peaceful demonstrators at lunch counters and in the streets, produced a sense of moral indignation that led to the passage of the Civil Rights bill. This fact has been recognized by Julian Bond, a firm believer in the immorality of violence, who opposed the war in Vietnam on this basis, was elected to the Georgia State Legislature, and who was finally seated in that body as a result of a Supreme Court decision. The dramatic assassination of Martin Luther King, followed by the burning of ghettos in a number of American cities, also undoubtedly speeded up Congressional passage of the Open Housing law. In this respect it is possible to speak of "creative violence" or at least of its positive spill-over effects. On the other side of the picture, balanced against these positive gains, the social cost has been high. Violence begets counterviolence, with such unpleasant side effects as mayhem, homicide, increased racial tension and extensive property damage. Nevertheless, it is a significant sign of the times that, according to James Finn, Julian Bond no longer describes himself as a pacifist, and now believes that "violence might be necessary if the negro is to be treated justly in this country."

It should be emphasized that so far as the perpetrators are concerned, the murders and bombings of the civil rights struggle were counterproductive. They had the opposite effect of what was presumably intended. These acts of violence failed to terrorize the negro minority and rallied substantial numbers of the white majority (at least in the North) to their support. Both insurgents and counterinsurgents in several theatres of "revolutionary warfare" operations have had similar experience with the use of terror, confirming the principle that even when "successful," terror quickly reaches a point of diminishing return, and frequently proves counterproductive. In this regard the murder of individual leaders of "the opposition," especially when they have an important following, is the most senseless form of terror. The assassination of the late President Kennedy served only to create a folk hero. The recent shooting of his brother, Robert Kennedy, in the midst of the presidential primary race was equally counterproductive and produced a second wave of revulsion against the use of terrorist methods.

The theory behind the individual acts of terror practiced by Boris Savinkov and other Socialist Revolutionary Terrorists was that such acts would dramatize resistance to the *ancien régime* and produce an avalanche effect which would sweep it away. But in order to trigger an avalanche, with a small explosive

charge, for example, the temperature and texture of the snow must be right. Similarly, for indiscriminate acts of terror to produce massive revolutionary effects, the political and social conditions must be such that the acts could be dispensed with anyway. Small-scale acts of violence make sense only when they are timed to trigger a revolutionary movement which has been carefully prepared within, and which can quickly command mass support. The burning of the Reichstag in the Nazi seizure of power is a familiar example. To quote an early Soviet editorial source: "Unless these conditions have been met, it is hopeless to dream that a terrorist act may touch off events which will give history a shove and serve as the opening moments of a revolution." (*Izvestia*, July 8, 1927.)

The same kind of reasoning may be tentatively applied to the violence and civil disorder which has been generated by both the civil rights and the student protest movements. The outstanding characteristic of such civil disorder is that it has been unplanned, uncoordinated, and *not* aimed at triggering revolution in the classic Marxist-Leninist sense. This is true in spite of the fact that the Progressive Labor Party in the United States, and Maoist or other extremist factions elsewhere, have deliberately incited violence in order to turn peaceful demonstrations into widespread civil disorder. Individual anarchists or extremists of the Black Power or other persuasions, who regard violence as an end in itself, have also added fuel to the fire in a number of urban riots.

Even without the stimulus of extremists, one of the most baffling aspects of civil rights and student protest demonstrations is the unpredictable way they tend to escalate, accompanied by rioting and arson, into full scale civil disorder. No one could have foreseen that the student demonstrations in Paris would escalate as they did, enlisting the support of the basically conservative French trade unions and virtually paralyzing France for several days before a semblance of order could be restored. Much in these puzzling phenomena can be explained by the traditional crowd psychology of Le Bon. However, the new technology of communications has added factors which, if not new, are certainly of an order of magnitude beyond anything known in the past. Roshchin, a sort of anarchist Minniver Cheevy of an earlier generation, before the intensive use of the mass media of communication dreamed of escalating violence and a world in flames. Today militant extremists, touched with similar delusions, set fire to urban ghettos with the assurance of widespread coverage by television and other fast media. In turn, such coverage acts as a stimulus to further

violence, and the civil disorder escalates as militants everywhere compete "to make the scene." There have even been cases of peaceful demonstrators who as soon as the television cameras moved up, began to act out the violence they had seen in previous riots. The mere presence of audio-visual equipment caused them to play the role expected of them by their peers. In such instances, to use the imagery of Marshal McLuhan, the machine becomes an integral part of the "happening," and the medium virtually creates its own message.

Finally, it should be noted that the so-called "non-violent" techniques of civil disobedience first introduced by Thoreau, and later refined by Mohandas Gandhi in the struggle against British rule in India, were in fact non-lethal forms of combat. These techniques depended for their success in part on a charismatic leader, a unifying religious faith which sustained confidence in the face of numerous setbacks, and a high level of courage and discipline among Gandhi's totally committed disciples. Such prerequisites to success in non-lethal combat are not easily found. Even though similar factors were operative in the original sit-ins, bus boycotts, and other successful actions of the civil rights movement in the United States, the Indian experience may remain unique.

However, there is an essential difference between the struggle for independence in India and the contest over civil rights in the United States. The civil rights struggle here has actually been an exercise in manipulative persuasion, in which the threat of force or violence has always been clearly visible in the background. In spite of the unquestioned idealism, moral fervor and self-sacrifice of many civil rights workers, the threat of force has been implicit in the movement and has hovered in the background.

The civil rights movement has had behind it not only the moral force of the outraged conscience of the white majority, but also the impressive legal sanction of the Supreme Court. Martin Luther King himself reportedly once questioned whether the Montgomery bus boycott could have succeeded without the support of the Supreme Court decision. Consciously or unconsciously, the civil rights leaders have invoked a wide spectrum of sanctions as tools of manipulative persuasion, with moral force at one end of the spectrum. Near the other end stands the physical force of federal troops, a force which has frequently been invoked by the Government itself to restore order. Jerome D. Frank has observed that civil rights leaders have apparently aimed at deliberately inciting the local white population to violence in order to mobilize public opinion against them and force federal intervention. This is a calculated manipulative

use of violence which has proved successful in the past and may be expected in the future. Other forms of violence, such as arson, have not only been threatened but also deliberately invoked in the burning of ghettos. The ultimate threat of protracted urban guerilla warfare has been made implicitly, but has not yet materialized on a significant scale.

From the outset there has been a calculated element of brinkmanship, which should be frankly recognized as such, in even the late Martin Luther King's moderately nonviolent conduct of the civil rights struggle.

•

Since they are only a small minority within a minority, the Black Power extremists should recognize that the area of maneuverability in which they can manipulate violence is severely limited if they hope to use it to achieve their alleged goals, such as negro rights, social justice and political power proportionate to the numbers of the minority they claim to represent. Manipulated violence is an instrument which cuts both ways and can do irreparable damage to both the user and to the social order to which it is applied. Whether they realize it or not, the Black Power extremists are in a position closely analogous to that of a group of terrorists who can apply only a limited amount of violence before reaching a point of diminishing return. At this point the inhibitions of the surrounding white majority against counterviolence will be released. David McReynolds, an associate editor of *Liberation*, and a nonviolent leader of the civil rights movement, has issued a specific warning in this regard: "I think in this country whites would, without hesitation if they had to, resort to genocide against the negroes if the confrontation were violent. I really have no illusions about what the police would do, what middle-class society would permit them to do — to Harlem and to Watts — if you began to get more Molotov cocktails tossed at businessmen's cars or snipers firing at random in the Wall Street area."

In such a context the deliberate manipulation of violence becomes a dangerous competition in risk-taking, in terms of scenarios made familiar by Herman Kahn. Intoxicated with success, extremists tend to overlook the fact that in taking risks one may be unlucky and lose the gamble. As civil disorder escalates there comes a point when both sides must ultimately lose. Only the indiscriminate anarchist seeking to wreak havoc for its own sake can derive any satisfaction from such a scenario of continually escalating civil disorder. A better understanding by all concerned of the role and limits of violence may help to moderate and control the baffling "revolution born of affluence" which threatens contemporary society with anarchy.