With rare exceptions one is struck by the mediocre and superficial character of the ideas advanced by modern writers on anarchism.

ANARCHISM AND MODERN SOCIETY

SAM DOLGOFF

BOURGEOIS NEO-ANARCHISM

Meaningful discussion about the relevance of anarchist ideas to modern industrialized societies must first, for the sake of clarity, outline the difference between today's "neo-anarchism" and the classical anarchism of Proudhon, Bakunin, Kropotkin, Malatesta and their successors. With rare exceptions one is struck by the mediocre and superficial character of the ideas advanced by modern writers on anarchism. Instead of presenting fresh insights, there is the repetition of utopistic ideas which the anarchist movement had long since outgrown and rejected as totally irrelevant to the problems of our increasingly complex society.

Many of the ideas which the noted anarchist writer Luigi Fabbri a half century ago labelled "Bourgeois Influences in Anarchism" are again in circulation.[1] For example, there is Kingsley Widmer's article. "Anarchism Revived Right-Left and All Around." Like similar bourgeois movements in the past, Widmer correctly points out that:

> *Anarchism's contemporary revival . . . mostly comes from the dissident middle-class intellectuals, students and other marginal groups who (base themselves) on individualist, utopian and other non-working class aspects of anarchism . . .*[2]
> (All words throughout the article between paretheses and emphasized are ours.)

Like the old bourgeois anarchist, Widmer too, practically denies the link between anarchism and free socialism and chides Noam Chomsky for seeing "anarchism as purely integral to socialism."

Other typical bourgeois anarchist characteristics are:

---

1. *Influences Bourgueses en el Anarquismo;* Solidaridad Obera, Paris 1959
2. *The Nation;* Nov. 16, 1970