INTRODUCING

ANARCHY

by i@n hornsby

Table of Contents

Section three; 20ᵗʰ Century Anarchists page 80-131

Section Four: Post Anarchy anarchy page 132-182

The author & illustrator wish to extend special thanks to

Tim Hornsby

Dr. Benjamin Noys

Page one:

Introduction

Is anarchy the zenith of libertarian ideas or is it the end of civilisation? Is it the ultimate consequence of socialism or merely a naive belief in altruism and innate human goodness? There are many questions surrounding anarchy today which need to be addressed and in the following pages you will find an accessible and informative introduction to this wide ranging and extraordinary subject. You will be introduced to many of the usual suspects in this unfolding drama, the men and women who have written and fought for anarchist ideas and beliefs. Yet, it is also the purpose of this book to see how relevant these ideas are today and to question their validity in the light of current thought.

We live in a postmodern age where representation and interpretation are in crisis because both certainty and truth have been exposed as illusions. They're each lost in an existence that is constructed from a language that slips and slides and deconstructs its own position. Democracy today merely gives the illusion of choice, where the individual gets to put an **X** in a box every five years to symbolise his or her own freedom to choose. Government was once said to be for the people, by the people and of the people, but who really knows any more which group of people this statement is referring to. State bureaucracy has become so dominant that rather than politicians controlling it, it controls them and us and our everyday lives. So, can anarchist ideas make a difference or merely add to all the confusion?

If you have dismissed anarchist ideas in the past for whatever reason; if you have lost faith in government, church and the state; or if you have distrusted politicians and political ideas, then this book is for you, read on and discover for yourself what anarchy means to you.

Page two:

What is Anarchy?

Anarchy is often confused with notions of disorder, chaos, violence, masked bombers and assassins. It is often seen as a return to barbarism and. . .well '*anarchy*'.

But in truth anarchy encompasses a wide variety of different opinions and describes a whole collection of attitudes and ideas united in their conviction that each individual must be allowed to make his or her own choices and that government is both harmful and superfluous to this intention.

The term '**ANARCHY**' avoids a single, unyielding definition in as much as it emphasises an extreme freedom of choice and the pre-eminence of individual judgement. Therefore, anarchy is as various and mutable in its rejection of government, and all forms of authority, as the thoughts and expectations of each and every one of us.

Page three:

The Word

'Anarchy' refers to 'a society without government' and has its origins in three Greek terms: ***Anarchos*** meaning, without a ruler, ***an*** added to ***archê***, meaning contrary to authority, and ***anarchia***, which refers to the absence of government.

The Circled 'A' symbol was first used in 1964 by the French anarchist youth group 'Jeunesse Libertaire'. (Words written under the ancient Greek who is spraying graffiti on the wall)

When the word 'anarchy' first appeared it was used as a term of derision by opponents of the rebels in the English Civil War (1642) and the French Revolution (1789).

(Proudhon): "I am an Anarchist"

The French journalist, publisher and social activist, Pierre-Joseph Proudhon was the first to call himself, and his libertarian ideas, 'anarchist'. He used the term as a challenge to his critics who could hardly use it against him after he'd appropriated it for himself.

Today, anarchy is still a term deeply misunderstood by the vast majority of people and deliberately misrepresented by those in power.

A current definition of anarchy; is the opposition to all forms of coercion. It is a term which advocates the abolition of economic monopolies and all political and social institutions which act against the freedom of the individual.

An Anarchist is therefore; one who seeks freedom and the discontinuance of all forms of coercion and authority.

Page four:

SECTION
ONE
ANARCHIST
TRAILBLAZERS

Page five:

Anarchy, as we might recognise it today, does not appear until the end of the eighteenth century, with the rise of the modern centralised nation-state and the development of the alienated individual who is lost within the mechanisation of early-industrialised capitalism.

However, before this time, there were certain groups and individuals whose belief in freedom and liberation were clearly the precursors to our present view of anarchy.

The ancient Chinese philosopher and inspiration for Taoism (pronounced *dow-ism*), **Lao Tsu** (6th century B.C.), incorporated within his most famous text, ***Tao Te Ching*** (circa 604 B.C.), an anarchist approach to life. This is especially evident in chapter nineteen when he says: "Give up ingenuity, renounce profit, And bandits and thieves will disappear" a line which predates Pierre-Joseph Proudhon's famous words: "All property is theft" by some two thousand five hundred years.

Page six:

"The two Eastern philosophies of **Taoism** and **Zen Buddhism** seek ways towards universal unity by liberating the individual not only from the state but also from itself."

These radical and poetic ways of living have many elements in common with current libertarian philosophies which attempt to move beyond the grand-narratives of Capitalism and Socialism, towards an existence of multiplicity and the acceptance of 'difference' rather than utility, identity and equality.

Taoism and Zen Buddhism emerged out of societies quite different from the modern western state, from which anarchy arose in the Nineteenth century. Yet, it is interesting now, as we take our first tentative steps into the Twenty-First century, to see how anarchist ideas are moving towards an acceptance of these Eastern philosophies.

Today there appears to be a shift beyond an existence obsessed with substance, political economy and production, towards an appreciation of being and reality as a continuous state of flux, process and creativity.

(Cartoon image of a builder sculpting the 'Venus of Milo') "De Milo my arse, get back on that shovel"

Page seven:

FREE SPIRITS

Throughout northern Europe, from the 11th to the 14th century, there flourished a movement of Free Spirits who broke with traditional aspects of Christianity by refusing the authority of the established Church. They sought to create an earthly Utopia believing heaven to exist beneath the constraints of organised Christianity and the oppression of the state. This movement of Free Spirits, although a diverse and varied group, can be gathered together through their endorsement of absolute freedom and their complete rejection of authority. From what evidence survives from this period these free spirits advocated individualism and sexual equality.

(Free Spirit woman saying to God who is standing by his suitcases): "Your welcome to come in but all your baggage stays right here."

Page eight:

THE PEASANT REBELLION

This Free Spirit anti-authoritarianism extended its reach to the peasant population of England, Germany, and Czechoslovakia by the late fourteenth-century and culminated in what has become known as the **'Peasant Revolts'**.

In England this took place in London during the month of June 1381 under the influence of **Wat Tyler**, an artisan from Essex, and the 'hedgerow preacher' **John Ball**, an excommunicated clergyman who wandered the towns and villages of rural England preaching the virtues of the Free Spirit movement. These rebels marched into the capital overthrowing the hated government and offering the people of London their freedom. They also set about releasing prisoners from the gaols; most of whom were incarcerated for debt. This rebellion lasted for only a few days when the peasants naively handed back power to the government in return for pardons, freedom from serfdom and the abolition of the crippling poll tax.

With its power re-established the government abandoned its promises and set about capturing and assassinating the rebels including John Ball and Wat Tyler who were dragged wounded from their sickbeds and beheaded in public.

Similar uprisings took place in Germany and Czechoslovakia, with similar results.

Gerrard and the Diggers

"DIG IT"

Although the Free Spirit revolts can be seen in retrospect as failing to achieve their overall objective, they did assist in creating the first recognisably anarchist movement, '**The Diggers**'.

"Freedom is the man who will turn the world upside down; so it is no wonder that he hath enemies."

The English Civil War of the mid seventeenth century was fought between King Charles I of England and his Royalist supporters (known as the Cavaliers) on one side, and the Parliamentarians (known as roundheads) on the other, who were led to victory by the puritan statesman and republican, **Oliver Cromwell**. The causes of the civil war were religious, economic, and constitutional but centered upon the question of who had right to rule England; was it the discredited King Charles I who claimed a 'divine' right to rule, or was it parliament who although made up entirely from the aristocracy were said to represent the people of England.

During this period of civil war a development in consciousness among the population of England saw a shift towards the importance and possibility of individual liberty. This transformation in perception produced two groups of dissenters known as the **Levellers** and the **Diggers**. The Levellers were formed from the disgruntled lower ranking soldiers of **Oliver Cromwell's** all conquering cavalry regiment, **The New Model Army** and were led by their lieutenant-colonel **John Lilburne** a puritan pamphleteer who began advocating of a levelling of the land and a levelling of society.

Lilburne's Levellers stopped short of demanding individual liberty, preferring instead equality through the newly established political system under Cromwell. Although Lilburne found Cromwell's republic too autocratic and aristocratic he and his supporters wanted a share in the government they had fought so hard to establish during the years of civil war.

(Winstanley): "We Diggers, on the other hand were mostly poor men, ordinary soldiers who fought for Cromwell, only to discover that revolution had simply replaced the dictatorship of the king, for the Puritan dictatorship of Oliver Cromwell."

A leading member of the Diggers, or True levellers, as they are sometimes named, was **Gerrard Winstanley**, a former textiles dealer from Lancashire who after moving to London was bankrupted by the recession brought about through the King's unsuccessful European wars of the 1630s.

Winstanley began writing pamphlets in 1648 which called for a rejection of authority and property as well as urging the poor to take up and work the common land (which made up two-thirds of Britain at that time). He renounced the state, put forward the notion of decentralised politics and promoted the abolition of private property, believing economic inequality to be the cause of all crime.

Page eleven:

The English (Un) Civil War

1642   The English civil war begins and a close indecisive battle is fought at Edgehill.

1644   The Parliamentary army defeats the Royalist army at the battle of Marston Moor.

1645   Cromwell's 'New Model Army' defeats the Royalist army at Naseby.

1646   King Charles I Surrenders to the Scots, who then sell him to Parliament.

1647   The Levellers gain control of vast sections of the Parliamentary army.

1648   Winstanley and his companions call themselves the 'True Levellers', disappointed at the lack of change under Cromwell's leadership and feeling let down by the 'Levellers' acceptance of political authority.

1649   In January King Charles I is executed.
        In April Winstanley and the 'True Levellers' create a settlement by digging up the common land on St. George's Hill Surrey. They plant crops and build huts to live in.
        In May a mutinous regiment of Levellers are defeated at Burford by the Parliamentary army.
        On the 19th of May Cromwell's Republic is proclaimed.

1650   After a year of constant hostility and aggravation the 'Diggers' are forced to leave their settlement on St. George's Hill.

1658   Cromwell Dies.

1660   King Charles II restored to the English throne.

1662   New laws are enforced by the English Parliament to prevent travelling people from forming settlements on the common land.

Page twelve:

On the first of April 1649 thirty men and women led by Gerrard Winstanley, walked to St. George's Hill near Walton-on-Thames in Surrey and began to dig up the common land. They set about sowing wheat, rye, parsnips, carrots and beans and built themselves huts to live in. The Diggers believed that soon their number would swell to 5,000 or more, but in truth their number never grew beyond fifty.

The local gentry paid hooligans to tear down the Diggers makeshift huts, destroy their seedlings, drive off their cattle and attack them physically. Magistrates were also continuously fining them; for which Winstanley was gaoled twice. Soldiers were sent by **General Fairfax** under the authority of Parliament to intimidate and investigate these *troublesome Diggers*, but they were quickly returned to barracks when many of them began to show an interest in the 'Digger way of life'.

Page thirteen:

Throughout all of these difficulties the Diggers refused to be provoked into violent action; but after almost a year of constant persecution the Diggers were forced, through starvation and fatigue, to abandon their settlement on St. George's Hill.

This first modern attempt at creating an anarchist way of life had failed but on that waste land in Surrey the seed had been sown which would give sustenance enough for libertarians in the coming years.

Winstanley continued to write pamphlets up until his death, even addressing Oliver Cromwell, the self proclaimed 'Lord Protector of England', directly in his last and longest pamphlet *The Law of Freedom* (1652). This work was an attempt to show the Puritan dictator the merits of the Digger doctrine; but his words, as he was no doubt aware, were to fall on ears that refused to listen.

In the radical pamphlet ***The New Laws of Righteousness*** (1649), Winstanley wrote that: "Everyone that gets an authority into his hands tyrannises over others".

This statement sounds much like that of the Russian anarchist Mikhail Bakunin who, two hundred years later, wrote:

(Bakunin): "POWER CORRUPTS EVEN THE BEST"

Other than the purely libertarian reason for wanting to eradicate government, the Diggers had a practical need to be rid of Cromwell's dictatorial government which had created a new elite and robbed them not only of their freedom, which they had fought for, but also of a sufficient standard of living.

Page fourteen:

The ideas of the Diggers were lost to the world for over two centuries until they were uncovered by 19th century Marxists who began to claim these dissenters as early Communists. Yet, this is a misreading of Winstanley's writings and the Digger doctrine, which did not advocate equality through political economy or a 'dictatorship of the proletariat' in the tradition of Marxism. The Digger doctrine was one of individual liberty first and foremost, which places them clearly in the anarchist tradition as the first in a long line of anarchist dissidents.

As Winstanley wrote in, *The True Levellers Standard Advance*:
"Take notice that England is not a Free People, till the Poor that have no Land, have a Free allowance to dig and labour the Commons, and so live as comfortably as the Landlords in their enclosures. For the people have not laid out their Monies and shed their blood, that their landlords should still have the right to rule in tyranny; but that the oppressed be set free, Prison doors opened, and the poor peoples hearts confronted by a universal consent of making the earth a Common treasury."

Page fifteen:

William Godwin (b. 1756)

The son of a Calvinist Minister, who was inspired to write his libertarian classic "Enquiry Concerning Political Justice, and its influence on General Virtue and Happiness" (1793), after the events of the French revolution of 1789.

Godwin puts forward the notion, in *'Political Justice'*, that by removing government, a decentralisation would begin to recreate society along egalitarian lines through local communities and voluntary exchange. He believed that individual justice would be obtained through education and rhetoric rather

than through political and revolutionary tactics which constantly failed to address the immoral foundations which underlie a society attempting to emerge out from underneath authoritarian rule.

Page sixteen:

Godwin didn't refer to himself as an anarchist, and only used the word when referring to the disorder resulting from the breakdown of government without political justice. Yet, he considered, even this chaotic disorder to be preferable to subordination.

Essentially a Utilitarian (One who seeks on the basis of usefulness alone and without regard for pleasantness or beauty, the greatest happiness for the greatest number), Godwin, believed that the correctness of any activity could only be calculated by the total amount of pleasure minus the total amount of pain that it generated.

"If we only accept truth on the basis of authority it becomes lifeless; truth must be open to attack and change, and only then can a society trust truth to deliver it from error."

"Spontaneous conduct needs to be tempered through education, because without such tutoring our ungoverned passions will not stop at equality but urge us on towards a desire for power."

Godwin remains in many respects a man of **The Enlightenment***, seeing the practice of justice and virtue as the only true road to individual happiness.

*The Enlightenment theory of the 18th century stated that human reason moves steadily from error to truth, so that later generations understand the world better than earlier ones. These ideas also form the basis for the 'cult of progress' which have dominated human thought and actions for well over two hundred years. With the growth in post-humanist thought in recent times these ideas have come under increasing attack.

Page seventeen:

"Punishment is always ineffectual and immoral under the man-made laws of government. Laws were never designed to protect the freedom of the individual; they were designed to protect the property of the rich."

"A murderer in a society ruled over by government, is no more responsible for the death of a victim than the knife used in the act of homicide. Neither is given any freedom so neither can be asked to take responsibility for their own actions. Punishment and coercion are not only ineffectual but alienate the mind. Only education and kindness lead to the path of reason, truth and recovery."

(A knife in the dock): "BUT HE MADE ME DO IT, YOUR HONOUR!"

Although Godwin believed strongly in society, he was adamant that it must exist for the benefit of the individual, and not the other way around.

"All individuals are supremely equal and although we have no inalienable rights, in the final analysis society is subordinate to the individual."

Page eighteen:
"Property is the cause of all crime and to be born into poverty is to be born a slave. The only wealth in the world is human labour and this belongs to each individual and should be used creatively or for the greater good."

(Midwife while delivering a ball and chain): "KEEP PUSHING!"

Godwin's utopia is a world republic populated by free men and women living in local communities but also free to travel anywhere in the world. This vision of the future is achieved according to Godwin through the simplification and decentralisation of all forms of administration.

This dream of the world to come is imbued throughout with religious morality, even if its Calvinism has been carefully erased from every page.

Godwin does not advocate the immediate abolition of government, waiting instead for democracy to make people sufficiently virtuous and wise. He saw the 'perfectibility of man' as a gradual process.

Page nineteen:

A Post-humanist in the 18th Century?

Another figure inspired by the French revolution towards ideas which can be described as anarchist, is the visionary poet **William Blake** (1757-1827). Today many versions of William Blake are in existence, as a multitude of different groups have adopted him as the prophet for their cause.

Blake dedicated much of his life and work to the pursuit of liberty in both the negative sense, of desiring freedom from subordination, and the positive sense, of being free to realise ones own desires.

(Bird flying pulling a banner with the words): "No bird soars too high, if he soars with his own wings"

Blake remains both within a tradition of libertarianism and at the same time moves these ideas on to a whole new and exciting plateau.

"My ideas are similar to those of the **Free Spirit mystics** of the Middle-Ages, and the **Diggers** of the English civil war, in that we each want to find Heaven on earth. I want to replace the Babylon of existing Church and State with the Jerusalem of a free society."

Page twenty:

Like **Lao Tsu**, Blake, in his poetic rebuke to materialist philosophy, saw REALITY as existing in a constant state of flux.

(Intoxicated man): "Everything in the universe is organised spirit, hic!"

Blake saw the Universe as God, suggesting as Taoists and Buddhists do, that we are in error if we separate the observer from the observed and cut ourselves off from the rest of the universe by dividing the mind from the body and the body from the universe.

Blake's version of **Pantheistic Idealism*** implies that: "As a man is, so he sees" suggesting that our scientific view of the human body as vertical and binary determines our vision of the world.

Blake saw the life of the individual as a constant struggle between authority and liberty, **God** and **Jesus, Spectre** and **Emanation**.

We must move beyond these conflicts, these binary oppositions and contradictions by rebuilding a free society, a new 'Jerusalem'.

*Pantheistic Idealism is the doctrine that identifies everything as divine by seeing God and the universe as identical.

Page twenty-one:

Blake describes how we might go about building the 'new Jerusalem' in one of his best know poetic works: The Marriage of Heaven and Hell written in 1793.

"From the moment that we are born we are placed in a constant struggle with life and experience which removes us from our unity with the rest of the universe. This struggle between authority and imagination, when properly resolved, must lead to a free society of Divine humanity that will exist on an earthly plain without abandoning the spiritual unity of the universe."

One of Blake's key concerns was to free us from what he called the '**Mind Forged Manacles**' which he suggests are as real as iron chains. Blake recognised the power of the ruling ideology to shape our consciousness and saw the hegemony***** of the dominant culture as the most powerful form of imprisonment.

*Blake is suggesting, like the twentieth century Italian philosopher and political theorist Antonio Gramsci, that the ruling class keeps control over the masses not only through physical and economic power but also by encouraging the masses to share its social, cultural and moral values. This form of hegemony for Blake manacled the mind and transformed the masses into a reactionary force rather than a revolutionary one.

Page twenty-two:

Blake foresaw that the enforced repression of the individual's freedom and desire was a highly volatile game for authority to be playing. He suggested that by repressing the desire to be free authority ignorantly dismissed, at their own inevitable peril, the subversive nature of this energy and its explosive need to be released from bondage.

Many of Blake's poetic ideas are so far ahead of their time that he can be seen as the first real post-humanist***** anarchist almost one hundred years ahead of the inheritors of his rebellious position.

A **POST-HUMANIST** is one who rejects the Humanist notion of the centrality of the human species in the order of nature. The post-humanist sees an arrogance in mans' belief that his or her own description of reality is the ultimate truth of the world. Truth is a 'human invention' nothing more, nothing less and it doesn't exist prior to or beyond the realms of human communication.

Page twenty-three:

"Man is to Man the Supreme Being"

Max Stirner, whose real name was Johann Casper Schmidt, was born to poor parents in the Bavarian town of Bayreuth in 1806. He studied philosophy in Berlin in the late 1820's and attended lectures by the German Idealist philosopher **Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel**. Yet despite this advantage Stirner still had an undistinguished academic career.

In the early 1840's much of Stirner's time was spent at Hippel's café with a group of Young Hegelian thinkers who went by the collective name (Die Freien) the **Free Ones**. They sat for hours drinking and discussing the teachings of their former lecturer. Other members of the group included **Karl Marx**, **Friedrich Engles**, **Bruno Bauer** and Stirner's future wife **Marie Daenhardt**.

In 1845 Stirner set about investigating Bruno Bauer's claim that 'Man had just been discovered'. Bauer was implying that humanity now freed from its subordination to God was a newly discovered supreme being. Out of this research and questioning Stirner gained the material to write his most important work:

"**THE EGO AND HIS OWN**"

Page twenty-four:

Stirner: "The individual ego, the flesh and blood self and not some abstract spiritual notion, is a unique reality which seeks, from the time it is consciously aware, to preserve and assert itself in the world. This unique individual ego must preserve itself against the actual and potential threat of other beings that endanger its existence as an ego."

Stirner believed that both the despotic and democratic state were a negation of our individual free will.

'The ego is to be concerned only with itself.'

In place of the **Idealist*** notion of Spirit, the **materialist**[†] conception of Humanity and the general claims towards a universal essence of man, Stirner put forward the idea of the unique and free individual.

*Idealist theories suggest that the progress of 'spirit', or human consciousness, moves historically through a series of stages, each representing a contradiction and resolution which lead to an advance. Therefore, change takes place through the use of our reason.

[†]**Materialist** theories have found the source for transformation in the changing physical circumstances of our lived experience, especially in relation to production and consumption. It is the material circumstances of our existence; things such as factories and new technologies, which materialists believe influence our beliefs and desires.

Page twenty-five:
(Stirner): "I foresee a world which includes neither master nor slave but only egoists, a world where the uniqueness of each individual prevents rather than cultivates conflicts."

"Egoism encourages the union between individuals because they are free to work together if they so choose, or not if they don't."

Stirner saw co-operation between individuals as an advantage in a situation where we are each free to join a union of egoists. An association whereby each egoist enters from his or her own advantage and leaves the moment that they cease to find it useful.

(Stirner): "I proceed out of and return into the 'creative nothing', and while I exist my concern is with myself alone. My endeavour is to express my unique individuality without allowing myself to be enslaved or hampered by any alleged higher power, such as God or the State, or by any abstraction such as Humanity or the Universal Moral Law. Subservience to such fictitious entities weakens my sense of my own uniqueness. . .Nothing is more to me than myself!"

Page twenty-six:

Egoist ideas have been attacked, most notably by Karl Marx's who saw Stirner's work as both ill conceived and self-centred. Many other critics have been hostile to Stirner's theories, their main concern being the safety and position of the sick, the elderly and the very young in an egoist world.

However, Stirner's extreme version of individualism has been very influential among the thoughts of anarchist thinkers, especially after his work became popular in the 1890's when Friedrich Nietzsche recognised Stirner as one of the key thinkers of the nineteenth century.

It is also evident that Stirner's ideas contributed greatly to the growth in Existentialist***** thinking in the early twentieth century.

Stirner's ideas are problematic in the way that they place enormous emphasis upon the notion of the concrete individual subject; a concept brought radically into question in the work of several late twentieth century thinkers (to be discussed from page 133 onward).

Max Stirner died in absolute poverty in 1856.

* Existentialism refers to a number of related theories each denying objective universal values, believing that existence precedes essence and holding the opinion that a person must create values for themselves through their actions and by living each moment to the full.

Page twenty-seven:

Section

Two

Classical

Anarchists

Page twenty-eight:

(Quotations on the next two pages written over an altered image of the Usual Subjects)

"All religions, with their gods, their demigods, and their prophets, their messiahs and their saints, were created by the credulous fancy of men who had not attained the full development and possession of their faculties. Consequently, the religious heaven is nothing but a mirage in which man, exalted by ignorance and faith, discovers his own image, but enlarged and reversed—that is, divinised." (Mikhail Bakunin 1814-1876)

"The anarchists conceive of a society in which all the mutual relations of its members are regulated, not by laws, not by authorities whether self imposed or elected, but by mutual agreements between the members of that society." (Peter Kropotkin 1842-1921)

Page twenty-nine:

"I build no grand system and I ask only an end to privilege, the abolition of slavery, equality of rights, and the reign of Justice, nothing else. That is the alpha and omega of my argument." (Pierre-Joseph Proudhon 1809-1865)

"Anarchism urges man to think, to investigate, to analyse every proposition. . . Anarchism is the only philosophy which brings to man the consciousness of himself; which maintains that God, the State, and society are nonexistent, that their promises are null and void since they can be fulfilled only through man's subordination." (Emma Goldman 1869-1940)

"I consider anarchy the most rational and practical conception of social life in freedom and harmony. I am convinced that its realisation is a certainty in the course of human development." (Alexander Berkman 1870-1936)

Page Thirty:

(The next two pages are written as a newspaper)

The Representative of the People

Circulation 60,000   **The first regular anarchist newspaper**

Vol. 1 No. 1 Feb 7th 1848   by Pierre-Joseph Proudhon (1809-1865)

'What is the producer? Nothing! What should he be? Everything!'

'What is the Capitalist? Everything! What should he be? Nothing!'

Pierre-Joseph Proudhon was born in the French suburb of Besançon, in the Free County of Burgundy on the 15th of January 1809.

Both of Proudhon's parents were from free peasant origins, each free from feudal servitude, a fact of which Proudhon was extremely proud. His father Claude-Francois was a cooper, a brewer and an unsuccessful tavern-keeper.

The young Proudhon not only knew the peasant life but he also lived it; up until the age of twelve he was constantly engaged in farm-work, especially in herding cattle.

MILITARY COVER UP

In 1833, Proudhon learned of his brother's unexplained death during military training after he'd threatened to expose his captain's misuse of army funds. After this devastating news Proudhon became a relentless enemy of abusive authority and the state.

Page thirty-one:

After a promising but truncated education Proudhon entered the trade of printing. Once his apprenticeship and period as a journeyman printer was over he began his own printing business in Besançon which slowly went into decline leaving Proudhon in debt for the remainder of his life.

REVIEW

Proudhon's writing contains a multitude of contradictions as part of his overall argument. He professes a hatred for nationalism while maintaining a passion for French culture and landscape. He considered himself a social individualist (surely a contradiction in terms), seeing individualism as the goal of all our endeavours while embracing association and society as the only foundations upon which this goal could be achieved. Proudhon referred to 'The People' as 'infallible' and 'the divine being', while at other times calling them 'an ignorant rabble'; he also refers to property in his writing as theft while maintaining that every man has the right to control his dwelling and the land and tools he needs to work and live. This last apparent contradiction unlocks Proudhon's contradictory method of argumentation.

Page thirty-two:

In *What is Property? An Inquiry into the Principles of Right and of Government* published in 1840, Proudhon begins with these celebrated opening lines: 'If I were asked to answer the following question: '*What is slavery?*' and I should answer in one word, 'It is murder!' my meaning would be understood at once. No extended argument would be required to show that the power to take from a man his thought, his will, his personality, is a power of life and death; and that to enslave a man is to kill him. Why, then, to this other question: 'What is property?' may I not likewise answer, 'It is theft!' without the certainty of being misunderstood; the second proposition being no other than a transformation of the first.'

All to often this statement is simplified or misrepresented as:

(Proudhon saying): "All property is theft"

Proudhon's intention was to suggest that: "**THE PROPERTY OF A MAN WHO USES IT TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE LABOUR OF OTHERS WITHOUT ANY EFFORT OF HIS OWN IS AN ACT OF INJUSTICE.**" And immanent justice was central to Proudhon's idea of anarchy.

In *What is Property?* Proudhon makes a distinction between 'property' and 'possessions' suggesting that the worker has an absolute right over what he or she produces, but not over the means by which those possessions were produced; things such as factories, fields, tools, equipment and raw materials.

Possessions, according to Proudhon, are objects for our own personal use, whereas property is the material from which profits are made.

Page thirty-three:

"To be ruled is to be kept an eye on, inspected, spied on, regulated, indoctrinated, sermonised, listed & checked off, estimated, appraised, censured, ordered about by creatures without knowledge & without virtue. To be ruled is at every operation, transaction, movement, to be noted, registered, counted, priced, admonished, prevented, reformed, redressed, corrected, it is under the pre-text of public utility and in the name of the common good to be put under contribution, exploited, monopolised, concussed, pressured, mystified, robbed; then at least resistance and at the first hint of complaint, repressed, fined, vilified, vexed, hunted, exasperated, knocked down, disarmed, garrotted, imprisoned, shot, grape shot, judged, condemned, deported, sacrificed, sold, tricked and to finish off with, hoaxed, calumniated, dishonoured, such is government and to think that there are democrats among us who claim that there is some good in government". (Proudhon's anti-government diatribe of 1948, the same year as the publication of Karl Marx's *The Communist Manifesto*).

Proudhon advocated throughout his life and work a rejection of government by promoting economic equality and free contractual relationships between independent workers. He encouraged all workers to emancipate themselves through a form of **FEDERALISM**.

(Question): "But surely the United States of America and Switzerland are both Federations?"

(Reply): "Proudhon's federalism is quite different from either of these examples which are Federal Republic States; his idea of federalism shows how real power resides at the local level and rises up from below, rather than being handed down from the top. Proudhon believed that the state would eventually be replaced by the workers if they could organise themselves into small associations based upon mutual needs and aims. He believed that these groups must then form themselves into social organisations where workers collectives would take direct control in a decentralised and federated society. It is in this positive way that Proudhon believed that anarchy would be achieved."

Page thirty-four:

Proudhon was more than a theoretician; he actually took part in the insurrections of 1848 when he joined the workers at the barricades on the streets of Paris, demanding universal suffrage and an end to monarchy. He was gaoled on several occasions because of the subversive views expressed in his work, and was eventually charged with 'crimes against public morality, religion and state'.

His dynamic writing style was also admired by the French 'Decadent poet' Charles Baudelaire and the Russian novelist Leo Tolstoy, who took the name of his most famous novel, '**War and Peace**', from a work by Proudhon.

One criticism that has been levelled at Proudhon is that he has an essentially peasant's view of property relations, knowing little of the growing industrialisation of the 19th century.

There are also problematic references to the existence of Human nature in Proudhon's work which have a dubious place within current thinking, however, this is also true of most other mid-nineteenth century thinkers.

Proudhon's ideas also remain bound to notions of production which have the same basic problems as capitalism in that it turns the individual into a slave to the product.

Mikhail Bakunin

Bakunin both looked and lived the part of an anarchist revolutionary. He was born in 1814 to an aristocratic Russian family in the village of Premukhino in the province of Tver. He was educated for military service at St. Petersburg but left Artillery school at age 21.

(Bakunin): I'm not a solider; I'm a serf, bribed by pay and decorations to keep down my fellow serfs.

Bakunin travelled to Berlin where he studied philosophy and was drawn into the complexities of Hegelian philosophy.

Whereas the idealist Hegel and the materialist left-Hegelians had seen the dialectic as a positive aspect within history, Bakunin saw it as the negative driving force of history.

Q. Hegel's dialectic?

It's the march of reason through history, with contradiction as its driving force, moving constantly on towards Absolute reason or spirit.

(Bakunin ripping through page depicting Hegel's dialectic saying):
"The urge for destruction is a creative urge."

Bakunin saw this 'positive' 'Hegelian' form of the dialectic as a way of either confirming the existing order or of replacing one authority with another. He, on the other hand, wanted to create a new world only after the total destruction of the old.

(Bakunin in a bulldozer smashing down history saying):

If history was and is determined by the onwards march of the dialectic, then what better motivation could the workers need in order to revolt and break from the past, and a future determined for them, than to break the chain of historical cause-and-effect and liberate themselves from all forms of authority.

In 1843 Bakunin visited Paris and became acquainted with Pierre-Joseph Proudhon; the pair spent many long nights talking through and unravelling the intricacies of Hegelian philosophy. At this time Bakunin became hugely influenced by the ideas of the French Anarchist.

(Bakunin): "Proudhon, You're the master of us all"

Page thirty-eight:

Bakunin participated in the insurrection in Prague in 1848, stirring up the Congress of Slavs. When popular rebellion broke out in Dresden in 1849 Bakunin emerged as a "heroic" leader, but the rebellion was crushed and Bakunin was arrested and held in the Königstein fortress for one year condemned to death.

(Bakunin): It's all right for you; they only hung me up the right way yesterday.

Eventually Bakunin was handed over to the Austrians who chained him to a damp dungeon wall for eleven months until they handed him over to the Russians who gaoled him in Peter-and-Paul fortress until 1857 when he was offered exile to Siberia. This period of incarceration destroyed Bakunin physically but not mentally and after a dramatic escape to freedom in 1861 via Japan and New York, eventually arriving in London, Bakunin was ready for more revolutionary action. Twelve years of detachment had not broken his spirit or destroyed his will for action.

Page thirty-nine:

Strike!

Bakunin thought that as the struggle between labour and capital increased, so would the intensity and number of strikes.

(Bakunin thinking): The ultimate strike is the GENERAL STRIKE in which class-conscious workers are infused with anarchist ideas. This will lead to the final explosion that will bring about an anarchist society.

Bakunin saw the state as an anti-social machine controlling society for the benefit of an elite, oppressive class.

(Bakunin): "The state is essentially an institution based upon violence, coercion and domination and is concerned only with its own maintenance of inequality through political repression."

Bakunin believed that the aim, *Liberty*, and the method, *Revolt*, went hand in hand.

Page forty:
Bakunin used Proudhon's idea of federalism as the basis for his own Collectivism. However, unlike his French anarchist friend, Bakunin turned association into a central principle of economic organisation. Rather than Proudhon's individual and independent workers, Bakunin suggested worker's collectives as the basic unit of social organisation.

Here Bakunin's Collectivism separates from Proudhon's mutualism by moving further away from individualist anarchy towards a form of Anarcho-communism.

Like Proudhon, Bakunin didn't want to take control of the state apparatuses, as his long time adversary Karl Marx advocated, but wanted instead to replace the state completely with a society of free federations, free associations and free workers.

Bakunin wrote constantly but never wrote a complete book, only ever producing essays and pamphlets. He may not have had the prose technique of Proudhon but he was able to communicate complex and important anarchist theories to the masses in a clear and persuasive manner.

Bakunin, the man of action, the libertarian federalist, who didn't want to conquer the state but destroy it, died in 1876 with the revolutionary strength still burning within him.

THE GREAT ESCAPE

On a cold morning in March 1876 a prisoner, walking quietly alongside the perimeter fence, heard the trigger sound of a violin being played. On hearing this musical sign, the prisoner threw off his heavy overcoat and made a dash for the prison gate which lay open to allow supplies into the compound. Each of the prison guards had been distracted by other inmates and as the prisoner passed through the heavy gates he was running as fast as he could with his heart pounding in his ears. One hundred yards ahead of him he saw the get-away carriage, it appeared much further off to the prisoner now who could hear the sound of several guards pursuing him from behind. The guards gave chase but by shear determination the prisoner made it to the carriage just in time to be rushed away to freedom.

(Based on the Prologue to Matt Ridley's 'The Origins of Virtue' 1997.)

The prisoner was **Prince Peter Alexeivich Kropotkin**, a convert to anarchist ideas in his late twenties, who remained for the rest of his life acutely aware of the fact that his dramatic breakout from prison was made possible only through the selfless acts of others, many of whom sacrificed their own freedom for what they saw as a greater goal. This experience became the inspiration for Kropotkin's major work 'Mutual Aid', a book that illustrates how cooperation rather than competition lay at the core of evolution.

Prince Peter Kropotkin was born in Moscow to an aristocratic family on December 9th 1842. He was considered a brilliant student who had an illustrious military career ahead of him; however, at age twenty, he joined the 'Mounted Cossacks of Amur,' a newly formed and lowly Siberian regiment. In 1863 he took charge of a geographical survey expedition across Siberia and over the following years produced valuable results and gained international recognition for his contribution to scientific discovery.

During this period Kropotkin was introduced to the work of Pierre-Joseph Proudhon and his thinking became more and more revolutionary. Firstly, he quit his position in the military and then, after a spell in academia, he renounced all professional scientific study.

(Kropotkin): "The misdirected energies of state Bureaucracy would be far better directed towards socially useful tasks."

In 1874 Kropotkin was arrested for subversive activities and imprisoned in the now infamous tsarist prison 'Peter-and-Paul Fortress' until his dramatic escape in 1876.

Over the next thirty years, spent mainly in England apart from a three-year imprisonment in France, Kropotkin formed his ideas of Anarchist Communism based upon two principles, free distribution of wealth, produce and property and the abolition of wages. Kropotkin believed that the community (a voluntary association united in social interests) lay at the heart of an anarchist way of life.

(Kropotkin): "I foresee a network of cooperating communes replacing the state; where free goods and services will be available to all who need them."

Page forty-three:

Unlike Proudhon and Bakunin, who put forward methods of distribution based upon the labour of each individual worker; Kropotkin was against any form of remuneration, seeing wages as another form of compulsion.

(Kropotkin): "Need, not work, determines distribution and need can only be determined freely."

Kropotkin believed in revolution and his ideas are close to those of Bakunin, yet Kropotkin was always careful to take into account the practicality of any action, always looking at the forms of organisation that would be needed to replace the old order.

(Bakunin): "Revolution is a destructive act, sweeping away all that has come before."

(Kropotkin): "Revolution is the creative process of transforming the state into a just society; established not after the revolution but in the very process of revolution itself."

Page forty-four:

Kropotkin believed that the health and wealth of a society was created collectively.

"It is impossible to measure the contribution of any individual to society. Therefore if the man and the woman bare their fair share of the work, they have a right to their **fair share** of all that is produced by all."

(Kropotkin): "Man cannot live by bread alone, it is not enough that we simply survive; leisure is as necessary as bread for the human spirit."

Q. "But what is a fair share, and who gets to determine this?"

Kropotkin hoped that in an Anarcho-communist society, work would no longer be seen as frustrating, alienating, and something to escape from but would be 'attractive work' spent in pleasant surroundings, varied and useful, where the individual would be free to work creatively.

Q. "But what of the asocial individual who chooses to resist the attractions of work; does society have the right to exert a moral pressure upon this individual as Kropotkin suggests?"

Here enters the (written in a serpent) self-righteous puritan serpent of public moral pressure, a problem within much nineteenth century anarchist ideas.

Page forty-five:

In *Mutual Aid*, published in 1902, Kropotkin collected together evidence to support his claim that co-operation and social solidarity rather than struggle and competition were the main factors within evolution. Kropotkin hypothesized from all this scientific evidence that animals do struggle, but against natural circumstances and not against individuals from within the same species.

Kropotkin found that a form of mutual aid was evident in virtually all successful species.

(Kropotkin): "Those animals that know best how to combine, have the greatest chance of survival."

Kropotkin believed that Man was and always had been a social species whose best chances of survival were based upon mutual aid. It was through mutual aid that the intellectual faculty of language, knowledge and culture emerged; and it was through this faculty that Kropotkin prophesied the evolution of an Anarcho-communist society.

Page forty-six:

One of the major problems with Kropotkin's argument is that it is based upon the premise that the instinct of mutual aid exists as an unchanging characteristic of human nature and of Nature itself. Ideas such as an innate and benign human nature are philosophically suspect and highlight a weakness not only in the work of Kropotkin, but also in the arguments of Bakunin and Proudhon.

The idea of human nature is exactly that, an idea, it is a human invention and is not innate, fixed or determined. The institutions of religion, science and the law have constructed it for us. These institutions determine through their position of authority what is accepted as the truth and reality. Notions of human nature have changed so radically over time it is difficult, if not ludicrous, to see them as stable, innate or fixed. (More on this challenge to 19th century anarchist ideas can be found on page 129 onward.)

Kropotkin returned to Russia after the Revolution and died on February 8th 1921.

(Coffin with the words on a flag above reading): "Where there is authority there is no freedom"

Page forty-seven:

Errico Malatesta was born in Capua near Naples in 1853 and came into contact with Bakunin through his enthusiasm for the Paris Commune of 1871 (see page 57). The pair struck up a friendship which saw them both spreading anarchist propaganda throughout Italy. For this crime Malatesta was imprisoned for a total of 18 months between 1873 and 1875.

In April 1877 Malatesta and a small, but armed, group of revolutionaries held aloft a large red and black flag and marched into the Matise Mountains towards the province of Benevento. To their surprise they captured the village of Letino without a struggle and were greeted by the locals with enthusiasm. Weapons, land and goods were distributed amongst the people and official documents were destroyed.

The following day the revolutionaries set out for the village of Gallo which they also took without serious resistance. Unfortunately, as they were leaving Gallo, Malatesta and his band of insurrectionists were surrounded by government troops and all were arrested. They were held in prison for over a year before

being brought to trial accused of carrying out an armed revolution. They were eventually acquitted due to the fact that no shots had been fired in anger and no actual revolution had taken place.

Page forty-eight:

After this incident Malatesta was under constant surveillance by the authorities, which ultimately forced him to leave Italy. He travelled widely eventually arriving in London where he worked as an ice-cream seller and later as a mechanic.

In July 1881 Malatesta participated in the London congress of the International that gave rise to the **Anarchist International*.**

In 1883 he returned in secret to Italy where he established the first serious weekly anarchist newspaper to be published in Italy, *La Questione Sociale*.

Malatesta was constantly hounded and imprisoned by the authorities in every country where he set foot; but he remained for more than sixty years the most accomplished anarchist propagandists to have put pen to paper.

Malatesta died in July 1932 after falling ill from a respiratory complaint, he was age 79.

* The Anarchist International arose from the ruin of the International Workingmen's Association which had been high jacked by the authoritarian socialist, Karl Marx. The Anarchist International was an organisation set up by libertarians opposed to Capitalism and authoritarian socialism. Their main concern was the reconciliation of human solidarity with personal freedom and the creation of an anarchist world without nations, barriers or frontiers. However, as a practical movement the Anarchist International didn't achieved its goals and despite several attempts to resurrect it in the first half of the twentieth century it has all but vanished from existence. Among its best know supporters were Proudhon, Bakunin, Kropotkin, Louise Michel, Malatesta and Emma Goldman.

Page forty-nine:
"Red Emma"

Emma Goldman played many roles in her life, not only was she a feminist, a writer and an inspirational public speaker, but first and foremost, she was an anarchist.

(Emma): "Anarchy is not, as some may suppose, a theory of the future to be realized through divine inspiration. It is a living force in the affairs of our life, constantly creating new conditions. The methods of Anarchy therefore do not comprise an ironclad program to be carried out under all circumstances. Methods must grow out of the economic needs of each place and clime, and of the intellectual and temperamental requirements of the individual."

Born to a Jewish family on June 27, 1869, in Kovno, Lithuania, Goldman was brought up in East Prussia, but emigrated to the United States of America in 1887.

Like many others, Emma was drawn to the anarchist cause in 1887 after the trial and execution of the Haymarket Anarchists.

Page fifty:

HAYMARKET TRAGEDY

The chain of events leading to the Haymarket tragedy began with the enormous industrial expansion which took place in the United States after its civil war. To increase profit without reducing production, capitalists lowered wages and demanded longer working hours. In the early 1880's this sparked rebellion among the working population of America who began to strike in favour of an eight-hour working day.

The situation in the city of Chicago was among the most tense and added to this was the arrival of the German advocate of 'Direct Action' **Johan Most**.

Most was influenced by the work of Bakunin and had begun a speaking tour of the United States in 1883 urging workers to rebel against the state.

(Most): "A pound of dynamite beats a bushel of ballots"

He produced an instruction manual for the use and preparation of bombs, poisons, dynamite and Nitro-Glycerine.

Page fifty-one:

In 1886, Chicago workers began to organise themselves; and on May 1st over 80,000 people marched through the city streets on the first ever May Day parade in support of an eight-hour working day. In Chicago 70,000 workers joined in the protest through strike action and over the next few days 350,000 workers, striking in 1,200 factories, joined them nationwide.

On May 3rd the police opened fire on 6,000 striking workers killing four people and wounding many more.

On May 4th at a rally of 2,500 people held in protest at the police massacre, a bomb was thrown from a side street, killing a policeman. The police retaliated, killing four protesters and seven of their own in the crossfire; almost two hundred workers were wounded. The identity of the bomb thrower remains a *mystery.*

Page fifty-two:

On June 21st, 1886, eight labour leaders went on trial charged with responsibility for the bombing. The trial was filled with anecdotal evidence, lies and contradictions. The state prosecutor appealed to the jury: "convict these men, make an example of them, hang them, and you save our institutions."

Seven of the eight were sentenced to die, one to fifteen years imprisonment. On November 11th 1886, four anarchist leaders were hanged.

Two hundred thousand people took part in the funeral procession.

All eight were eventually to be pardoned posthumously, but far too late to save them or the fate of anarchist ideas in the United States. The events at Haymarket Square created a damaging stereotype in the public imagination of the radical activists as a violent troublemaker who endangered the well being of society.

Page fifty-three:

Emma Goldman remained passionately sympathetic to the Haymarket anarchists and their cause throughout her life, and was buried alongside them in 1940.

Emma moved to New York City in 1889, after an unsuccessful marriage. In New York she joined the Yiddish Anarchist commune and met her life-long companion, **Alexander Berkman** (1870-1936), also a Russian émigré, who arrived in the United States in 1887 when he was seventeen.

The friendship between Goldman and Berkman led in 1892, to Berkman's infamous and failed attempt to assassinate Henry Clay Frick, the wealthy industrialist who owned the Homestead Steal Mills in Pennsylvania. Berkman carried out this act of violence in retaliation for Frick's role in the shooting of several striking steal workers at the mill by Pinkerton men who Frick had hired to break the strike.

Berkman eventually served 14 years in the Western Penitentiary for his crime. Goldman bore much guilt during the remainder of her life over Berkman taking sole responsibility for a crime they both participated in.

Page fifty-four:

In 1895 Goldman travelled to Vienna to study medicine, attending lectures by Freud; and in London, she met one of her ideological mentors, Peter Kropotkin.

On returning to America the following year she set off on one of her many cross-country speaking tours.

In 1917 she and Berkman were both jailed and fined for their active role in the 'No-Conscription League', an organisation set up to discourage American workers from signing up for active service in the 1914-18 war. A war that both Berkman and Goldman opposed on the grounds of their pacifism and on the way that the workers of the world were being sacrificed in their millions on the battlefields of Europe over bourgeois disputes and gains.

After serving out their two-year sentence, Goldman and Berkman were deported in 1919 to Soviet Russia, but it was not the country of freedom they had both hoped for, and within a year they had left for Europe.

Alexander Berkman committed suicide in 1936 after prolonged agony caused by an aggravated case of prostate cancer. During his lifetime Berkman produced three classic anarchist texts: *Prison Memoirs of an*

Anarchist, What is Communist Anarchism? and the *ABC of Anarchy* along with the publication of his anarchist paper 'Blast' between 1915-16.

Page fifty-five:

Much of Emma Goldman's work is an attempt to blend aspects of Individualist anarchy back into Kropotkin's 'Mutualism', Bakunin's 'direct action' and Proudhon's 'Federalism' as well as responding to the latter's anti-feminism. She was a strong advocate of society but never at the expense of individual liberty.

Anarchy stands for the liberation of the human mind from the dominion of religion; the liberation of the human body from the dominion of property; and the liberation from the shackles and restraint of government. Anarchy stands for a social order based on the free grouping of individuals for the purpose of producing real social wealth and order that will guarantee to every human being free access to the earth and full enjoyment of the necessities of life, according to individual desires, tastes, and inclinations.

Emma's version of anarchy has sexuality and feminism placed prominently within it. She, unlike the other major anarchists of her time, investigates the issue which subordinates one half of the population to the other for no better reason than ignorance, cowardice and fear.

"Until this most obvious of coercive and abusive activities is confronted how are we to move beyond the master/slave mentality."

Page fifty-six:

Goldman worked as a midwife on New York's lower east side and was exposed at first hand to the degradation, oppression and objectification of women in the poorer areas of America.

She was, throughout her life, a strong Feminist, perhaps even stronger than many of the middle-class women of the suffragette movement who wanted the vote without thinking about the abysmal conditions that lower-class women had to endure. For Goldman, voting was merely symbolic; she was more interested in putting bread in the mouths of poor women, and to hell with symbolism.

(Emma): "Universal suffrage itself owes its existence to direct action."

For Goldman, feminism and anarchy were one and the same and for her no one could properly call himself or herself an anarchist who did not want and fight for the freedom of each and every individual irrespective of class, race, gender or sexuality.

Page fifty-seven:

The tradition of feminism in anarchy is very strong and is best exemplified by the words and actions of **Louise Michel** during the **PARIS COMMUNE** of 1871, a revolution and occupation of the French capital city which lasted for two months.

The Paris commune can be seen as the precursor to all modern urban revolution. It began after the French population, disillusioned with their governments failed and crippling war against the Prussians in 1870, rose up against their leaders.

Revolts began all over France and in Paris the people took up arms against the government who fled the capital calling upon the National Guard to take back control. The soldiers refused to shoot upon the people and instead turned the guns on their commanding officers and eventually handed over control of the city to the people.

For seventy-three days the people ran the city and a festival ambience is said to have filled the capital. The absent government managed to prevent food and supplies from entering Paris; thus placing the commune under considerable strain and hardship.

(Half mast flag with the words): On May 1st the government troops entered the staving city and for seven days a bitter battle was fought over the barricades. With a lack of ammunition the communards were eventually defeated and a terrible slaughter followed in which 30,000 Communards were murdered.

Page fifty-eight:

Louise Michel became one of the major figures of the commune through her tireless actions. She was born on 29th May 1830 and became a schoolteacher at the age of 22.

Before the rebellion she had been a novelist, poet, composer, scientist and mathematician.

During the commune she opened schools and nurseries for all women and children many of whom had never had any education before.

Not only was she one of the most active women in the commune she was also one of its bravest defenders, fighting on the barricades and willing to sacrifice her life for the "conquest of freedom".

On 16th December 1871, Louise Michel gave herself up to the authorities to secure the release of her mother, who had been taken hostage. She was brought to trial by the Versailles Government and accused of trying to overthrow the government by encouraging citizens to arm themselves; she was also accused of murder.

Page fifty-nine:

At her defence, Michel replied:

"I do not wish to defend myself, I do not wish to be defended. I belong completely to the social revolution and I declare that I accept complete responsibility for all my actions, without reservations…

I wished to oppose the invader from Versailles with a barrier of flames. I had no accomplices in this action. I acted on my own initiative.

I am told that I am an accomplice of the Commune. Certainly, yes, since the Commune wanted more than anything else the social revolution, and since the social revolution is the dearest of my desires.

The Commune had nothing to do with murders and arson. Do you want to know who are really guilty? It is the politicians.

So do with me as you please. Take my life if you wish. . . since it seems that any heart which beats for freedom has the right only to a lump of lead, I too claim my share. If you let me live, I shall never stop crying for revenge and l shall avenge my brothers.

I have finished. If you are not cowards, kill me!"

Instead of being sentenced to death Michel was exiled to New Caledonia in the South Pacific, but she remained active all her life returning to France in the final years of her life to embark upon a huge lecture tour. She died in 1905.

Page sixty:

(Images place over 'Mother Earth' journal)

I.   Goldman's monthly magazine, **Mother Earth,** which she published with Berkman in New York from March 1906 to August 1917, is an important source for those interested in her ideas and the anarchist movement of the period.

II.   Emma Goldman shared a close relationship with Louise Michel and admired her revolutionary spirit.

III.   Emma Goldman saw Louise Michel as a complete woman, free of all prejudices and traditions which for centuries held women in chains and turned them into household slaves and objects of sexual lust.

IV.   Goldman expressed little interest in the suffrage cause but she set about a critique of the social and economic subordination of women and was an early advocate of birth control.

Goldman saw Anarchy "as the great leaven of thought, permeating every phase of human endeavour. Science, art, literature, drama, and the effort for economic betterment, in fact every individual and social opposition to the existing disorder of things, is illuminated by the spiritual light of Anarchy. It is the philosophy of the sovereignty of the individual. It is the theory of social harmony. It is the great, surging, living truth that is reconstructing the world, and that will usher in the new Dawn."

The ideas of Goldman and Michel have been reinvigorated by the post-feminists of the late 20th century.

Page sixty-one:

The Anarchist Assassins

The image of the anarchist that has remained popular in the public imagination is that of the bomb-throwing assassin.

This shadowy individual, whose intentions and deeds take Stirnerite and Bakuninist ideas to their distorted extreme, has held a romantically mystical and mythic place in the hearts and minds of many artists and revolutionaries.

However, the fact remains that very few anarchists have actually participated in such extreme acts of terrorism or violence, believing instead that to take a life is ultimately the act of the power hungry tyrant and as such, wholly opposed to anarchist principles.

Paris, after the violent suppression of the Commune in 1871, was a city straining under the pressure of class-hatred. After two decades of bourgeois authoritarianism, which had seen working class political activity outlawed and trade union membership band, something had to give way and in the early years of the 1890s it did. These years saw a spate of violent terrorist activities which became known as '**Propaganda by Deed**' (rather than by word). Perhaps the most notorious of all these direct activists was Francois-Claudius Koeningstein who became known to posterity as **Ravachol**.

Page sixty-two:
Ravachol had been angered by the French governments massacre of 14 protesters at a 'May Day' rally in 1891 in support of workers rights and at the death sentences handed out to workers defending themselves with pistols against armed officers at a labour rally in Clichy.

Ravachol took his vengeance by bombing the Lobau barracks in Paris and the homes of the judge and prosecutor of the Clichy trial. These three activities cause property damage but no deaths.

The police arrested Ravachol after a waiter had pointed him out to them. The night before the trial the restaurant was bombed, killing its proprietor and a customer, the waiter escaped.

At the trial Ravachol was sentenced to hard labour for life, but two months later he was returned to court and sentenced to death for his part in the murder of an old miser known as the 'Hermit of Chambles'. He responded to the sentence of death with the words *'vive l'Anarchie!'* (Long live Anarchy) and walked to the guillotine singing an anti-religious song *Père Duchesne*. His last words were:

(Severed head in a basket): "The French government can kill thirty thousand men, women and children and we are forced into collective amnesia, I am accused of killing one old miser and I am demonised forever. I will be avenged, long live anarchy."

This calmness and courage in the face of death turned Ravachol, in the eyes of many, from a miscreant into a cult 'anarchist' hero.

Page sixty-three:

In Paris, in 1892, Emile Henry, the highly intelligent son of a murdered Parisian Commune revolutionary, bombed a police station and a café, killing several people. He also went to the scaffolds shouting out the now familiar cry: *'vive l'Anarchie!'*

Auguste Vaillant, a normally good-natured but poverty-stricken man, threw bombs into the Chamber of Deputies in Paris; his actions killed no one but he was nevertheless executed for the crime.

A young Parisian shoemaker, who went by the name of Léauthier, and claiming to be an anarchist, attacked a Serbian minister with a cobbler's knife, severely wounding him.

And in 1901 in the state of Buffalo, USA, President McKinley was assassinated by the Polish youth Leon Czolgosz who claimed to be an anarchist, although evidence for this is extremely vague.

Theodore Roosevelt, the incoming American President, after McKinley's death, was quick to present Czolgosz as a typical anarchist in order to cast a shadow over libertarian ideals in the minds of the public; a shadow that extends right up to the present day.

The severity of the violent acts carried out by Ravachol, Henry, Vaillant, Léauthier and Czolgosz sent shockwaves across the world and throughout the Anarchist International (see page 48), which began to question the action of these individuals who claimed an allegiance to anarchist ideals.

Page sixty-four:

THE FRENCH ILLEGALISTS

In the years leading up to the First World War a group of young anarchists came together in Paris and formed themselves into 'a union of egoists' determined to confront French bourgeois society.

They were not a criminal gang in the usual sense of the term and they had neither leader nor name but after their notorious exploits the French press named them 'The Bonnot Gang' after their oldest member Jules Bonnot.

This group of young Parisian anarchists, calling their ideas Illegalist, were partly reacting against the intellectual moral theories of theft put forward by anarcho-Syndicalists such as Jean Grave and Élisée Reclus.

(Élisée Reclus): It is possible to justify the act of robbery and illegality by seeing it as part of some greater revolutionary morality and class war ideal.

The young Illegalists simply acted to fulfil their own desires, taking their main source of inspiration from the anarchist-individualism of Max Stirner. Whereas many anarcho-communists spoke endlessly of subordinating desires to social justice and morality; Stirner, on the contrary, saw morality as the main ideological method for repressing individuals and individuality.

Page sixty-five:

The Illegalists agreed with Stirner that the fulfilment of individual desires could form the basis for eliminating the State.

In habitually surrendering desires to the State the individual hands power over and allows him or herself to be alienated and formed into an easily manipulated mass. By taking that power back and reasserting individual desires the States power can be eradicated.

The Illegalists appropriated the Egoist battle cry "Take hold and take what you require! I alone decide what I will have."

The gang consisted of six key figures:

Jules Bonnot, a man hardened by military service, poverty, prison and petty crime. Bonnot was an inspiration to the other Illegalists and became its figurehead.

Raymond Callemin consistently claimed that scientific reason would replace faith and gained the nickname '**Raymond La-Science**'; he was a deep thinking anarchist.

Rene Valet a shy and serious minded anarchist came from a middle class family but grew to hate the lack of freedom allowed both within and by his class.

Octave Garnier, along with Bonnot, became one of the main instigators of the Illegalists. He spent his whole life fighting oppression and authority and as a result spent much of his life in prison or on the run from authority. From the age of seventeen he became a committed anarchist and by 1910 was wanted by the French authorities for draft dodging.

Andre Soudy was infamously nicknamed by the press 'the man with the rifle'. He suffered seriously with tuberculoses that had been worsened by his years spent in child labour. These years of child slavery lead him to the anarchist cause.

Elie Monier nick-named '**Simentoff**" was the only member of the Illegalists from the south of France. He, like Garnier was a draft-dodger and had survived destitution through petty crime until joining the Illegalists. He had been placed under surveillance by the French police from the age of sixteen because of his anarchist activities.

Page sixty-six:

The Illegalists set out in search of an act that would fulfil their desire for a Stirneresque mocking of the sacred and the Nietzschean feel for the aesthetic. They settled upon the theft of a 1910 Delaunay-Belleville limousine, the finest car of the day, with an eye to becoming the initiators of the motorised get-away. Once the car had been captured from the fashionable suburb of Boulogne-sur-Seine the Illegalists set about holding up several banks and messengers in Paris.

In 1912 the six Illegalists hid out in the forest of Sénart laying in wait for the Marquise de Dion's brand new luxury limousine. They blocked the road and as they held-up the car the driver pulled out his gun but Bonnot and Garnier were too quick for him and shot both driver and co-driver where they sat. The gang then sped the seventy kilometres towards the town of Chantilly where they intended to attack bourgeois society by raiding its richest bank the Société Gérérale while using the Marquis car.

The raid didn't go as planned and the Illegalists got drawn into a shoot out, in which a bank clerk was shot dead. A hazardous car chase ensued before the gang could make their escape. Incredibly, after dumping the car, the Illegalists managed to stroll through a huge cordon of police in Paris and escaped on foot with fifty thousand francs.

Page sixty-seven:

After this incident every act of violence in Paris was attributed to the 'Bonnot Gang'. In 1913 during a desperate attempt to avoid being arrested Bonnot, killed two detectives and quickly became France's '**Public Enemy Number One'**.

Later that year the Republican Guard finally tracked Bonnot to a garage in *Choisy-Le-Roi* where he was hiding out; a huge shoot out followed in which thousands of bullets were fired into the frail building in which Bonnot was hiding.
The Republican Guard dynamited the front of the building and as Bonnot attempted to escape through the dust he was shot down.

Garnier and Valet died in a gun battle with the Republican Guard in May 1913. The siege lasted six hours until the Guard used Melanite (a nitric acid based high explosive) to blow Valet's home sky high. Under the cover of machine gun fire the police fired two bullets at point blank range into the heads of the unconscious Garnier and Valet.

The other Illegalist gang members, Soudy, Monier and Callemin were eventually captured and sent to the guillotine. The authorities and bourgeois press were quick to use the violent actions of the Illegalists as a stick with which to beat anarchy as a whole.

Page sixty-eight:

Anarchists and Syndicalists

Rudolf Rocker (1873-1958): "Anarcho-Syndicalism is based on the principles of Federalism, putting the right of self-determination of every member above everything else and recognising only the organic agreement of all on the basis of like interests and common convictions."

Syndicalism refers to a militant form of trade unionism that came to prominence in the early decades of the twentieth century. It arose from the frustration felt in many countries by sections of the working classes at the inequality of their economic conditions. Although Syndicalist ideas were not strictly part of the anarchist tradition, anarchists themselves were eager to see their ideas flourish among these militant groups of working class revolutionaries.

Class conflict was the driving force behind early Syndicalist ideas. The proletariat, both the urban and rural working class, began to form into syndicates after years of oppression, exploitation and impoverishment enforced upon them by the exploits of the parasitic bourgeois capitalist class and its pawns, the police, the armed forces, the politicians and judges.

Page sixty-nine:
The Syndicalist's believed that an equitable compromise between these two classes could never be reached.

The capitalist, ruling class had no reason to relinquish any of its wealth and power to the workers, and besides:

(Capitalist): "The workers should be grateful that it is our wealth that gives them work and money."

(Worker): "But it's our bloody labour which gives 'em their wealth."

The Syndicalists knew that in any confrontation between the two classes the capitalists had the financial resources and military might behind it, whereas, the workers had superior numbers and the ability to disrupt the production process.

Yet, by itself, the Syndicalist knew that greater numbers and disruption were not enough. They must organise themselves into syndicates based upon trade associations, controlled by its members without leadership.

The syndicates were to form into local federations and then into lager confederations, yet each individual syndicate was to retain its own autonomy.

Page seventy:
The Syndicalists method of struggle was Direct Action.

(Puppet master): "If it's change we're after then we must take action for ourselves and not leave it up to politicians who are merely puppets on the pay-role of the ruling class."

Syndicalist **Direct action** took four main routes:

Strike action: downing tools and withdrawing labour to stop production and force employers to yield to workers demands.
The down side to this action was that it allowed employers to exploit deprivation among the working classes by enticing the poverty stricken unemployed into blackleg labour, an action which inevitably broke the strike and working class unity.

Sabotage: a way around the blackleg strike breakers was the disruption of production by damaging machinery. This action removed the strikes disadvantage of pay-loss during a strike but had the obviously danger of illegality which meant that those who were caught in the act of sabotage were heavily sentenced by the courts and unlikely to ever find work again.

Consumer Boycott: the refusal to buy products placed on the market by unscrupulous employers.

Consumer Labelling: the opposite of the consumer boycott in that syndicates allowed industries sympathetic to their cause to have its goods stamped with the Syndicalists labels.

Page Seventy-one:
The revolutionary **GENERAL STRIKE** was the ultimate goal of the Syndicalist movement. This was seen as the moment when the workers, properly organised, would rise up against the capitalist class and take control of production. There were several attempts at a general strike but their success was extremely limited.

In France during the early years of the twentieth century, strikes became commonplace but all too often they ended in violence without any ground being won. In 1906 the revolutionary workers syndicate, the C.G.T. (*Confédération Générale du Travail*) began a widespread campaign of strike action in support of an eight-hour working day, but its leaders were arrested and the strikers were bullied back to work.

Between 1911 and 1914 the revolutionary group of American workers known as the IWW (*The Industrial Workers of the World*) had many successes across America in their attempt to usher in an anarchist society through workers solidarity. They won hard fought victories over textile, mining, lumber and farming employers all over the United States, right up until the beginning of the First World War. In 1914 the US government used the IWW's opposition to war as a way of raiding its premises and seizing its funds as well as jailing and shooting its organisers; by 1918 the IWW was spent as a force for revolutionary change.

The general strike never did materialise as the Syndicalists intended.

Page seventy-two:

Anarchy in Russia: Nestor Makhno

In the years following the Russian Revolution of 1917 a Ukrainian named Nestor Ivanovich Makhno lead an army of libertarian workers and peasants to victory against:

The ruling Russian mercantile classes, ***The Bourgeoisie;***

The Russian socialist majority after the 1917 Russian revolution, ***The Bolsheviks;***

The authoritarian partisans ***The Ukrainian Nationalists,*** who opposed the Bolsheviks but feared Makhno's anarchist ideas;

And the counter-revolutionary ***White Army*** led by General Denikin who fought the Bolshevik **Red Army** in an attempt to return Russian to its pre-revolutionary Tsarist condition.

And for a short period of time Makhno put anarchist ideas into practice.

Nestor Makhno was born October 27th 1889; his father died the following year leaving the family in poverty. Makhno worked as a herd-boy from the age of seven to help feed the family. He received only a very limited education and was exploited by both farm and foundry employers up until the age of sixteen, by which time he had formed an intolerance towards the ruling class.

Makhno took part in the revolutionary efforts of 1905 and was brought to trial for the murder of a police chief. He was condemned to hang at age 17 but was given a long sentence because of his age.

Page seventy-three:

During his term in Butyrki prison, Makhno encountered anarchist ideas for the first time and began to make plans to put these ideas into practice on his release from prison. Makhno was eventually released following the March revolution of 1917 that had been brought about through a general strike and a mass demonstration by Russian housewives who were outraged at the loss of Russian lives in trenches of western Europe during world war one. After his release Makhno stayed true to his beliefs and returned to Gulai-Polye in Ukraine and threw himself into organising syndicates and Anarcho-communes.

During the debilitating years of civil war that followed the Russian revolution of November 1917, when the Bolsheviks took power, Makhno proved himself to be a talented military commander. His peoples militia the **Makhnovists**, even coming to the rescue of the Bolshevik Red Army; and saving them from a devastating military defeat at the hands of General Denikin's 'Cossack' White Army in 1919.

However, **Leon Trotsky**, the commander-in-chief of the Bolshevik Red Army, saw Makhno as an "anarcho-bandit".

Page seventy-four:

Once General Denikin's White threat had been removed the Bolshevik State turned against the Makhnovists, eventually overpowering them during August 1921 and overturning their anarchist achievements.

Makhno was a courageous guerrilla fighter and a committed anarchist who believed that a libertarian society had to be taken by force and although he admired anarchist intellectuals he was at heart a man of action seeing no way to achieve anarchist ideals through ideas alone.

Anarchism does not depend on theory or programs that try to grasp man's life in its entirety. It is a teaching, which must be based in real life…

How successful an anarchist reconstruction of society under Makhno would have been is open to much debate.

Page seventy-five:

Buenaventura Durutti became an important anarchist figure during the 1936 Spanish revolution and civil war.

(Durutti): "We are not in the least afraid of ruins. We are going to inherit the earth."

Born on July 14th 1896 in the mountainous region of Leon, central northern Spain, Durutti was to follow his father into the local railway yard working as a skilled mechanic.

In 1917 he took an active role in the general strike that was violently crushed by the government in three days; leaving seventy workers dead, five hundred strikers wounded and over two thousand gaoled. Durutti managed to escape to France but the brutality shown by the Spanish state was to have a lasting effect upon the rest of his life.

Durutti returned to Spain in 1919 joining the Spanish workers union the anarcho-Syndicalist C.N.T. (*Confederación Nacional de Trabajo*) in Barcelona; at this time the States terror campaign against anarchists and Syndicalists was in full flow.

Page Seventy-six:
Durutti battled for the anarchist cause in the years leading up to the **Spanish Civil War**, under constant harassment from the authorities.

In February 1936 a 'popular front' government came to power in Spain made up of republicans and socialists. By July, General Franco, with the help of the Army, the Aristocrats, the bourgeoisie and the Catholic Church, had mobilised forces to take power from the elected government and establish an authoritarian State in Spain.

Fascism* had been declared in Spain and a war was to be waged against the peasants and workers. Durutti raised himself from his hospital bed to join the mostly unarmed workers on the barricades to fight off Franco's pro-fascist alliance.

The workers, with Durutti's assistance, formed an anti-fascist militia, which was to become known as the legendary '**DURRUTI COLUMN**'. In late July, 8,000 volunteers, mostly anarchists, set out to liberate Saragossa from fascist control.

"Only one hundred of us may survive, but that hundred shall defeat the fascists and enter Saragossa and proclaim a free commune. We shall subordinate ourselves neither to Madrid nor Barcelona and we shall show the Bolsheviks how to make a revolution."

*Fascism: the totalitarian nationalist movement of the early twentieth century that denies all rights to individuals in their relations with the state, which is personified through the myth of the 'infallible' leader, dictators like Franco in Spain, Benito Mussolini in Italy or Adolf Hitler in Nazi Germany. Fascism has its ideological roots in ultra right wing conservatism, it sets out to protect social hierarchies by forcibly suppressing the working classes by providing scapegoats for popular anger such as Foreigners, Jews, Blacks or Gypsies.

Page Seventy-seven:

The 'Column' captured Saragossa in August 1936 and as they advanced across the Aragon front they began to put anarchist ideas into practice, forming over 450 collectives (as described in George Orwell's *Homage to Catalonia*).

In November, aided by German bombers, Franco attempted to crush resistance in Madrid.

(Below the picture of Guernica) 'This reproduction of Pablo Picasso's 'Guernica', originally painted in 1937, illustrates the horror that Franco's bombing inflicted upon his own citizen's.'

After these events Durutti moved 4,000 members of the column to alleviate the suffering of the citizens of Madrid, but on November 22nd Durutti was shot dead in the city from an unknown source.

Page Seventy-eight:

Emiliano Zapata was the only leader of the Mexican revolution who stayed true to his beliefs of re-creating an egalitarian peasant order in Mexico where the people would reclaim the land and govern themselves. He was in many respects a Mexican 'Digger' with a 'Bakuninist' belief in direct action.

Zapata was born into a poor Mexican working class family on the 8th August 1879, in Anenecuilco, Morelos; and right up until his untimely death in 1919 he was never once corrupted by power or money.

The young Zapata spent his time relieving the rich of their valuables as a way of avoiding working for the Hacendados (the rich landowners) who exploited the Mexican Indians by making them work the land which had once been their own.

Zapata and his brother were eventually caught by the police and conscripted into the army where he gained the tactical knowledge he was to use as a revolutionary guerrilla fighter against the Mexican authorities.

Zapata campaigned all his life for the restoration of peasant lands which had been stolen by the rich Hacendados; and although he was an almost illiterate and uneducated peasant, Zapata understood the advantages of anarcho-Syndicalist ideas for the Mexican working class.

Page seventy-nine:
During the revolution of 1910 Zapata and his agrarian army sided with the liberal Francisco Madero, against the hard-nosed US supported dictator, Don Porfirio Diaz.

(Zapata): "It is better to die on your feet than to live on your knees."

Between 1910 and 1919, Zapata continued his fight for land and liberty and as his peasant revolutionary army, now calling themselves the **ZAPATISTAS**, moved forward, they ploughed and reaped the land they had won and only took up arms to defend what had once been theirs.

On the 10th of April 1919, Zapata was tricked into a meeting with one of his enemies who wanted to change sides; the meeting was a trap, and Zapata was killed as he arrived.

In the late 1960s a new 'Zapatista' peasant army arose in Mexico attempting to win freedom and land for the Mexican working class.

On the 1st January 1994 these 'post modern' revolutionaries, the Zapatistas, seized several towns in Chiapas, Mexico. What it is that makes these revolutionaries 'post-modern' is their lack of interest in power. Their intention was and is to eradicate capitalism, the government and the armed forces and then disappear themselves, leaving the people to choose their own direction. The Zapatistas' intention is to create a space in which the people will be free to define their own sense of power. This postmodern model of revolution, which takes power away from those in positions of authority without the goal of mirroring this power themselves, has been adopted more recently in Europe and the USA by several groups who oppose global Capitalism.

Page eighty:

Section
Three
20th
Century
Anarchists

Page eighty-one:

Art & Anarchy

Can 'Art', (either literature, fine art, music, film, dance and acts of creativity of all kinds) transform or replace the existing ideology*?

*The accumulation of ideas that are embodied in the institutions of society and which saturate our daily lives, our culture and our way of thinking.

The question of transforming the existing ideology through art has fascinated and concerned men and women for centuries and especially anarchist thinkers, for subversive reasons. However, Karl Marx's believed that:

The **SUPERSTRUCTURE**, the cultural world of ideas, art, the law, religion and the like, was determined by the nature of the economic **BASE** of society, its factories or material means of production, its distribution and exchange.

For Marx, art was not the medium to bring about a revolutionary change in the economic base; this would only be achieved when the workers took control of the economic base for themselves and enforced a dictatorship of the proletariat.

"What a pessimist this Marx is, his inflexible, one-way economic model reeks of over determinism and is so rigidly systematic and simplistic that it ignores the complexity within the interacting correspondence between base and superstructure."

Page eighty-two:
A more optimistic and anarchist view suggests a position of relative autonomy for 'Art' which is seen to contain a level of independence from both the existing ideology and the economic base.

Many anarchists suggest that art can transform the reader, viewer or listener, from a passive consumer of art into an active participant who creatively and continuously constructs art for themselves. However, this view has also been attacked for being naive, elitist and bourgeois.

The traditional passive consumer of art, who is habitually taught to stand back from the art object and admire its 'alienated genius', must be drawn into the work and transformed by new and challenging uses of form and structure. The passive consumer of the art object is now free to take up the opportunity of becoming an active and creative participant in the artwork; one who is able to reconstruct and recreate the art and its meanings from a relatively liberated position of individuality.

It is not simply the content of a work of art that makes it 'anarchist'; it is also its challenge to traditional form and structure, as well as our reaction and active participation in the works plurality of meaning.

By challenging the reader, the listener or the viewer to accept new forms and structures within art, rather than be lulled into believing that only one correct and true form exists; the artist is able to suggest by implication that different forms of reality and ways of life are not only possible but also preferable.

Page eighty-three:

In the nineteenth century the 'Stirneresque' poet Charles Baudelaire, wrote free form poetry that was fiercely resistant to the unyielding conventional structures of 'realist' poetic language.

In *The Flowers of Evil* published in 1857, Baudelaire's use of image and language was termed 'Symbolist' in its aim to suggest subjective experience rather than directly state objective opinion.

I climb to the assault, attack the source
A choir of wormlets pressing towards a corpse,
And cherish your unbending cruelty,
This iciness so beautiful to me.

This anarchic approach to poetry was subversive in terms of both form and content and challenged the passive reader into actively rewriting the poem for themselves. Baudelaire's approach continued William Blake's Romantic disruption to the traditional ways of seeing and thinking the world.

Improvisational Jazz also contains free forms that are more abstract, anarchic and earth bound, and a structure which is more fluid and horizontal than traditional modes of western music.

Listening to improvisational jazz can also be a challenging but rewarding experience.

Page eighty-four:
Dada

In Zurich, Switzerland, in 1916, the peaceful centre within a horrifying war, a movement known as **Dada** forged its identity in the Café (**Cabaret**) **Voltaire**. Simultaneously in the Modern cosmopolitan city of

New York, on the other side of the Atlantic, an equivalent phenomenon known as New York Dada came to prominence led by the French born, American artist Marcel Duchamp (1887-1968).

Dada is often referred to as an anti-art movement, not because it sets itself up in opposition to 'High Art' but because it rejects art altogether seeing its values as identical to those of the authoritarian bourgeois establishment.

The 1914-18 War claimed the lives of over ten million men and women who were butchered to death in a pointless war of attrition.

Dada reflected a nihilistic protest against all aspects of Western Culture and reflected the widespread protest against Western Capitalism and Militarism.

Dadaists saw the annihilation of the art establishment and its rigid bourgeois values as a step towards destroying the authoritarian establishment which they held responsible for the devastating and incomprehensible military carnage.

The movement is perhaps best know for Duchamp's 'ready-mades', most notably *Fountain* (1917), a urinal bought from a pluming supplier, signed with the name R. Mutt and then placed directly in an art exhibition.

Page eighty-five:

Many Dadaists invited the world to misunderstand them, especially through their use of humour and contradiction, their disregard for traditional forms and structures and their rejection of narrative chronology and linearity: the traditional beginning, middle and end structure of storytelling.

"We sought an end to the dominating Western thought patterns of rationality and logic, through a transformation of perspective and form." (Tzara)

"Linearity and 'realism' are simply one more way of turning the working class into wage slaves and cannon fodder." (Ball)

Many Dadaists saw linearity as inherent in the failed tradition of the 18th century Enlightenment. Ideas such as science, logic and reason were seen as being too tightly bound up with Western Capitalism.

'Realist' Art adopted, in the view of Dada artists such as Tristan Tzara and Hugo Ball, a passive relationship to the existing world order of Imperialism and Capitalism, by simply imitating its faults and presenting them as natural.

Dadaists saw Art as both a reflection of bourgeois culture and as a way of establishing its values throughout society. They wanted individuals to find a more authentic relationship to the world through new forms of creativity.

Page eighty-six:

The Dadaists desired a freedom to explore their creative energies which would release the individual from passively accepting mass destruction and authoritarian order as if it were in some bizarre way 'natural'.

(One legged solider): "That's just the way things are!"

In adopting the irrational techniques of serendipity, chance and risk into their work, the Dadaists tapped into the Zeitgeist of relativism and foresaw an anarchic world of spontaneous individual creativity.

Once old established art forms had been demolished the Dadaists envisaged a libertarian era of creativity that would not simply stand in opposition to an authoritarian bourgeois order but replace order altogether as well as the passive, stagnating forms of traditional art.

Tristan Tzara: "The modern artist does not paint but creates directly . . .Life and art become One."

Hugo Ball: "The ultimate aim of art is revolution and the ultimate aim of revolution is art."

Emmy Hennings: "Our ambition is for a world where art becomes life and life becomes art."

Page eighty-seven:

Many films have represented anarchist themes and heroes such as Elia Kazan's **V*iva Zapata!*** (1952), Ken Loach's 1995 film of the Spanish civil war **Land and Freedom** or documentaries like the anonymously directed **Homage to Durutti** made in 1936.

There have also been films which contain an anarchist aesthetic as well as anarchist content. The Spanish surrealist filmmaker **Luis Bunuel**'s classic ***L'Âge d'or*** (The Golden Age) made in 1930 in collaboration with the Surrealist artist **Salvador Dali** is one such film.

The Dada influenced, *L'Âge d'or,* is a unique exaltation of unmitigated love, in which two 'Stirneresque' lovers are stopped at every turn from sharing their feelings towards each other by symbols of conventional morality and social values in the shape of government officials, clerics and fathers.

Bunuel combines social satire with immature surrealist humour in depicting state power alongside sounds of flushing toilets and images of offal and lava which looks like excrement.

L'Âge d'or, like the Scorpion's tale in the films opening sequence, has six sections, the last of which contains the real venom of the piece in its reference to the Marquis de Sade's infamous novel ***120 days of Sodom.***

Page eighty-eight:
In the final sequence of the film, Bunuel appears to share Sade's view that our malicious thoughts should not be suppressed.

Throughout his life and work the **Marquis de Sade** (1740-1814), a philosopher, novelist, playwright, libertarian and the man behind the term 'Sadist', prompts some very awkward questions especially for the libertarian thinker.

In works such as *120 days of Sodom*, *Philosophy in the Bedroom*, *Justine* and *Juliette*, Sade explores themes of sexual excess, torture, depravity and murder, which take notions of individuality and libertarianism to the edge of the abyss.

In these works the freedom of the individual is taken to an extreme where the grey areas of 'might is right' are exposed and explored in ways which have been called 'perverse' and misogynous.

Yet perhaps what it is that makes Sade important as a libertarian is not that he simply opposes accepted notions of morality and values but that he makes us question our deepest darkest desires and forces us to rethink those supposedly easy answers which get accepted as unquestionable Truths. For Sade there are no easy answers and no unquestionable Truths; it is in this respect that Sade remains relevant to us and is at his most disturbing.

Page eighty-nine:

Another filmmaker, whose work brings together an anarchist aesthetic with revolutionary content and form, is **Jean Vigo**. His 1933 film ***Zéro de Conduite*** (Zero for Conduct) plunges the viewer into the world of childhood impulses rather than adult rationality through its eclectic and eccentric pace of rhythm and editing.

The film affectionately details the individual creative desires of a mischievous group of children as they attempt to break free from the shackles of moral uniformity and enforced herd mentality.

The film is celebrated for its much-copied slow-motion dormitory scene in which feathers fill the air during a pillow fight. Time is slowed down in these moments of chaos and childhood spontaneity, as Vigo holds back the hands of time to make us all creative, spontaneous and childlike once more.

Page ninety:

In 1957 a group of radical artists and writers formed a neo Dadaist assemblage of politically motivated anarchist artists named:

THE SITUATIONIST INTERNATIONAL

*"*We want nothing less than the complete overthrow of all bureaucratic regimes and the total destruction of modern culture."
*The Danish artist **Asger Jorn** (1914-1973)*

The Situationist International or S.I., set out to combine revolutionary theory with subversive art practices to promote spontaneous acts of creativity.

*"*This approach will eradicate our transactional society, made submissive via the Spectacle of mass consumerism."
The French philosopher, cultural theorist and leading member of the Situationist International **Guy Debord** (1931-1994)

The Situationists believed that creativity and spontaneity were consistently stifled under capitalism, which positioned the individual as actor or spectator, producer or consumer.

*"*It is useless to expect even a caricature of creativity from the conveyor belt.*"*
The Belgian philosopher and member of the Situationist International between 1961-1970 *Raoul Vaneigem* (1934-)

Page ninety-one:
Between 1956 and 1969 the S.I. produced twelve glossy avant-garde magazines entitled Internationale Situationniste (I.S.), which presented radical 'Situationist' ideas to the world and played a large part in generating the impetus for the occupation movement of France in May 1968.

They called themselves Situationists because they believed that all individuals had to construct the situations of their own lives by replacing the pseudo needs of capitalism with the real desires of everyday life.

There was no place within Situationist ideas for compromise.

"The revolution will be an eternal festival or nothing at all."
French novelist, writer, Situationist member and wife of Guy Debord, **Michèle Bernstein**

Page ninety-two:
The Situationists attacked the passivity within daily life, seeing modern culture as a rotting corpse, politics as a meaningless distraction, 'the media' as a restriction upon genuine communication, and

contemporary theory as an activity totally devoid of ideas and simply used as a vehicle for academic celebrity.

(Raoul Vaneigem): **"**All Situationist acts of spontaneous creativity will function as openings onto the revolution of everyday life and the transformation of the urban landscape."

The Situationists sought a revolution of the imagination, an invisible insurrection, as opposed to a physical revolution which history had shown consistently failed to revolutionise anything.

In their call for the 'complete overthrow of the State and all coercive institutions' the Situationists clearly show their anarchist credentials. However, the S.I. also rejected many traditional aspects of nineteenth century anarchism, believing things to have changed drastically in the post-industrial age of the mid to late-twentieth century. They rejected the 19th century anarchists' narrow insistence upon the industrial proletariat as the solitary revolutionary class as well as the traditional anarchists, almost bourgeois allegiance, to Rationality, Science and humanism.

Page ninety-three:

The roots of the S.I. stretched down into the vaults of Dada anti-art and the Lettriste International of the early 1950s. The Lettriste's were an avant-garde, anti-art movement founded by Isidore Isou whose poetry set out to release the letter from its entrapment within the word. Isou's intention was to free meaning from the structures of organised language.

From Dada, the Situationists acquired its central conviction that art and culture in its traditional form was completely exhausted. The S.I. wanted to integrate not only art and life but also all human activities.

"For an American take on Situationist ideas and slogans check out my lyrics from the song 'Love Minus Zero' on the Album 'Bringing it all Back Home'.
American singer & songwriter, Bob Dylan (1941-)

From the Lettriste, the Situationists took the slogan: Never Work! as well as absorbing the Lettriste keen interest in humour, architecture and its effect on urban life and individual psychology.

Page ninety-four:

"Humankind has overshot its goal in the rebellion against the harshness of nature…life is about more than continued existence…everyone has become hypnotised by work and by comfort…the S.I. is only concerned with the moments when life shatters the glaciation of survival."

Russian born writer and founding member of the Situationist international, Gilles Ivain, *aka* Ivan Chtcheglov.

Page ninety-five:

(Ivan Chtcheglov): "However, if mechanization can eradicate the need for work then everyday life should be made up of leisure and creativity and the fulfilment of our desires.

Ivain Chtcheglov suffered from mental illness and was arrested for threatening to blow up the Eiffel tower because its light kept him awake.

(Guy Debord): In his essay '*Formula for a New Urbanism*', Gilles Ivain, *aka*. Ivan Chtcheglov wrote: "Everyone will live in their own personal "cathedral," so to speak. There will be rooms more conducive to dreams than any drug, and houses where one cannot help but love. Others will be irresistibly alluring to travellers. . . ."

Page ninety-six:

A GLOSSARY OF SITUATIONIST TERMINOLOGY

SITUATIONIST: Relates to the theory or practical activity of constructing situations. A Situationist is one who constructs the situations of their own lives. A member of the Situationist International.

SITUATIONISM: A pointless term without meaning. There can be no such thing as Situationism, which would fix what is in effect the dynamic activity of constructing situations into a static dogma.

CONSTRUCTION OF SITUATIONS: A bringing together of old and new art, scientific knowledge, technical skill, life and all human activities into a creative fusion of forms and a single unified environment. The construction of situations begins on the ruins of modern culture.

DÉTOURNEMENT: Short for: "détournement of pre-existing aesthetic elements." Détournement consisted of reusing or plagiarising works from the past and integrating them into a new context, which the Situationists saw as a '*superior*' artistic construction. In this sense there can be no Situationist literature, painting or music, but only a Situationist use of these art forms. The Situationist who adopts the technique of détournement becomes a bricoleur, a craftsperson who uses materials that are ready to hand by placing these materials, often unaltered, into a new construction, creating new meanings and altering the meaning given to the old material.

Page ninety-seven:

An example of détournement can be seen in Guy Debord's first book <u>Memoires</u>, created, in 1957, entirely from prefabricated elements which are pasted into the book without logical connection. It is a book which sends the reader on a dérive and is bound in heavy sandpaper so that it can't be place next to other books. Debord's film 'The Society of the Spectacle' made in 1973 also uses the technique of détournement by reusing ready-made film footage to create a new and challenging take upon modern capitalism society. The Situationists also détourned many American comic books by changing the dialogue in the speech bubbles to fit with Situationist ideas. (See page 110-112 for an example of this technique.)

DÉRIVE: A mode of drifting or wandering through an urban environment which flows from the desires of the individual and the attractions of the architecture. The behaviour of the individual on the dérive is closely linked to the conditions of urban society.

UNITARY URBANISM: A theory that combines art and technology, architecture and ecology as a means of contributing to the creation of a unified environment in which dynamic experiments in behaviour and the construction of situations can occur.

PSYCHOGEOGRAPHY: The study of the specific effects of the geographical environment (whether consciously organized or not) on the emotions and behaviour of individuals. Psychogeography was the term given to the phenomena being investigated during the dérive.

Page ninety-eight:

GUY DEBORD (1931-1994) became an important member of both the Lettriste and Situationist Internationals. Although to a great extent Debord has remained a little known figure, he is well respected in several quarters as an avant-garde filmmaker and as one of the most important, if rather neglected, theorists of the mid to late twentieth century. One reason for this neglect is that Debord, as a self-confessed drunk, courted the bottle before the spotlight.

(Debord): "I wrote much less than people who write but I drank much more than people who drink."

Debord's ideas have changed the face of traditional anarchist thinking, which had remained entrenched in nineteenth century humanism. In his writings from the Lettriste journal Potlatch, to the many articles published in Internationale Situationniste and in his most important essay Society of the Spectacle written in 1967, Debord challenged the outdated belief that a revolution by the poverty stricken industrial proletariat would eventually lead to the overthrow of authority.

Page ninety-nine:

Debord describes how the industrial proletariat had radically declined as a class in the world of the late 1960s. Workers were no longer suffering poverty to the same extent that they had at the end of the nineteenth century. Many workers were even listening to the rhetoric of politicians.

(Mad consumer): "We've never had it so good"

Debord outlines in his writing how the improvement in the living conditions of working people were in fact an illusion created by what he terms the 'Spectacle'.

Workers may have felt that they were better off than ever before purely because they had automobiles and TV sets and a selection of forty different washing machines to choose from; but in truth they were far less liberated than at any other time in history and had much less freedom than they realised. Debord describes in his writing how the Spectacle makes it look as though we'd never had it so good.

What Debord means by the term **'Spectacle'** is the entirety of social activities, such as science, art, city planning and party politics, in which we find reality replaced by images. In the world of the Spectacle a process has taken place whereby images become the objects of our thoughts and desires and we mistake

these images for the real; whereas reality, whatever that might have been, no longer exists, it is lost to us because it ends up transformed into representations of its own distorted images.

The Spectacle doesn't simply reflect society it recreates society in its own reflected images for its own ends.

Page one hundred:
As soon as primitive societies had come to an end, replaced by organised structures of authority such as chiefs, Caesars and khans, the alienation of the individual set off on a journey from:
BEING TO HAVING TO APPEARING.

In other words, a movement away from an existence based upon the uncertainty of hunting, gathering and ritual to one based around owning and buying which eventually leads to a life where judgment and value is based purely upon the designer label and the appearance of living.

This impoverishment and fragmentation of life meant that no unitary aspect of existence remained.

Page one hundred and one:
The Spectacle appears to offer a reunification to life's chaotic fragmentation. Yet this reunification only exists at the level of the image.

A celebrity, whose spectacular life we only know through their image, seems to contain a completeness which our fragmented lives lack and a unity which we can only dream of. As isolated and fragmented individuals, we can only rediscover unity and some form of completeness within the Spectacle.

But the Spectacle contains nothing real it is a representation of the real, an image. The harmony it seductively offers and the promises of unity it makes are merely images of unity. In accepting these promises offered by the Spectacle the individual is divided further from any kind of unity and driven further into isolation by ignoring, like an ostrich, the chaos of existence.

Page one hundred and two:

(Copy of Debord): "Why are all contemporary authoritarian societies (capitalist, communist and fascist) controlled by the Spectacle?"

(Further copy of Debord): "Because they each construct an image of the real to ensure their own survival."

The Spectacle has become a new religion, a new god, offering promises of completeness and closure and pasting up images of unity as a façade to conceal a fragmented world.

As soon as primitive existence had been replaced by societies with institutional power structures, (kings and warlords etc.) an aspect of spectacular power raised its head in the form of images of leadership. In the modern era institutional politics and the mass accumulation of technological appliances saw the Spectacle completely dominate all aspects of society and everyday life; and within late capitalist society the separation of the individual from primitive society was complete.

Capitalist modes of economic production have been transformed from a 'means' by which society can function best, into a world in which the product becomes an 'end' in itself. In this sense the Spectacle simply aims at the reproduction of its own conditions of existence.

But just how real is the nostalgic primitive existence that Debord alludes to. Did this type of libertarian primitivism ever exist?

Page one hundred and three:

Human desires are not served or achieved in this society of the Spectacle, but are manipulated by it. The individual becomes isolated not only from a dialogue with other human beings but also from its own desires. Desires are no longer individual and tempestuous they have been turned into conveniently packaged mass-produced desires, passive, limp, but always available in a variety of colours.

The Spectacle is nothing more than the autocratic reign of the commodity economy.

Survival is promised and assured by the Spectacle and comfort is given, as it could never have been within the harsh realities of primitive society. Yet desires have been surrendered within the society of the Spectacle and complete Zombification reigns supreme.

In late capitalist society the economy has become self-governing and as individuals we have been alienated by the very thing we set up to make our lives easier. Ironically, as alienated individuals it is difficult for us to recognise this fact and we tend to see the self-governing economy as something real in itself as opposed to an artificial construction of our own design. In effect we are dominated by an autonomous construction of our own making. In the past humankind has been alienated by Religion, Idealist philosophies, Money, and the State, all of which we had once designed ourselves; but, according to Debord, the labyrinth of the Spectacle is by far the most advanced and the most highly developed form of alienation into which we have become so incredibly lost.

Page one hundred and four:

The controversial French thinker, **Jean Baudrillard** (1929-) has been both hugely influenced by Debord's work and highly critical of it.

Jean Baudrillard puts forward the notion that we exist in a realm of Hyperreality where reality is based upon a simulation of some nostalgic original that never existed in the first place. His world of simulation is similar to Debord's Spectacle but rather than attack the spectacle in some vain attempt to uncover the hidden 'real 'world' of freedom, as Debord does; Baudrillard celebrates the world of Hyperreality as the inevitable theatre of all existence. According to Baudrillard, the hyperreal does not cast an impenetrable veil over the real world; the hyperreal is the world in which we live.

(Jean Baudrillard): "The simulacrum* is never what hides the truth – it is the truth that hides the fact that there is none. The simulacrum is true."

*The Simulacrum, for Baudrillard, is a copy that has no original only the façade of an origin that is based upon a forgotten fiction.

Page one hundred and five:

"Who wants a world in which the guarantee that we shall not die of starvation entails the risk of dying from boredom."

Raoul Vaneigem's The Revolution of Everyday Life written between 1963-65 and published in the same year as Debord's Society of the Spectacle (1967) has become the source book for graffiti and bumper stickers the world over.

Taking a lead from the '*Critique of Everyday Life'* by the French philosopher and sociologist **Henri Lefebvre** and '*The Accursed Share'* by French novelist and philosopher **George Bataille**, Vaneigem's '*The Revolution of Everyday Life'* renews the Lettriste 'loathing of work', and as the English title suggests, sets out to transform everyday life away from an acceptance of the mundane and the ordinary.

Vaneigem attacks humanities headlong rush towards satisfaction in a world of vacuous commodities; in contrast he reveals a hidden world of creative fulfilment where dreams and desires become the existence of our daily lives.

Raoul Vaneigem "People who talk about revolution and class struggle without referring explicitly to everyday life, without understanding what is subversive about love and what is positive in the refusal of constraints – these people have corpses in their mouths."

Page one hundred and six:
ALEXANDER TROCCHI'S REVOLUTIONARY PROPOSAL:
The Invisible Insurrection of a million minds, written in 1963, puts forward the proposal for a 'spontaneous university' and advocates the gradual revolution of the mind in opposition to the politically based spectacular revolt.

(Gradually fading Trocchi): "Revolt is understandably unpopular. As soon as it is defined, it has provoked the measures for its confinement. The prudent man will avoid his definition which is in effect his death sentence."

The Scottish born Alexander Trocchi (1925-1984) became a journalist, a novelist and like his friend Guy Debord, became a member of both the Lettriste and Situationist International's. However, unlike Debord's dependence upon alcohol, Trocchi had a destructive compulsion towards hard drugs.

Trocchi didn't want to change society; he wanted to be rid of it.

(Gradually fading Trocchi): "With the world at the edge of extinction, we cannot afford to wait for the mass. Nor to brawl with it."

Trocchi shows how an intellectual change of mind will lead to a more complete insurrection than the violent revolution that consistently left the underlying structure of authoritarian society intact.

(Gradually fading Trocchi): "We the creative ones everywhere, must discard this paralytic posture and seize control of the human process by assuming control of ourselves."

Page one hundred and seven:

Trocchi saw that political revolution had several good ideas but ultimately it failed to achieve its objectives.

(Gradually fading Trocchi): "Trotsky seized the railway stations and the powerhouses, and the 'government' was effectively locked out of history by its own guard. However, the invisible insurrection must seize the grids of expression and the powerhouses of the mind…history will not overthrow governments, it will outflank them…Intelligence must become self-conscious and realise its own power."

One of Trocchi's key ideas was for a spontaneous university, which was to follow the design of the Black Mountain College of North Carolina (1933-1956), where no degrees were awarded but where many creative individuals emerged, including the painter Robert Rauschenberg, the anarchist composer John Cage, the choreographer Merce Cunningham and the film director Arthur Penn. Unfortunately the college closed in 1956 due to a lack of finances.

Trocchi believed that spontaneous universities were needed in a world where a line had been drawn between artistry and life.

(Gradually fading Trocchi): "At the end of a day's labour the worker comes twitching and tired off the assembly line into what are called, without a shred of irony, 'leisure hours'; where they are confronted by a world of mind numbing entertainments which treat them like salivating dogs. Yet contemporary man

expects to be entertained. His active participation is almost nonexistent and Art has been allowed to anaesthetize life.**"**

Trocchi saw the spontaneous university as leading to the anarchic invisible insurrection.

Page one hundred and eight:

THE YIPPIES

'REVOLUTION FOR THE HELL OF IT'

Free speech is the right to shout "Theatre in a crowded fire." *A Yippie Proverb.*

The name 'Yippie!' was **Abbie Hoffman**'s tongue-in-cheek play upon the 'Hippie cult' of the late 1960s, which he saw as an American media construction. Only later did the term 'Yippie' become an acronym for the Youth International Party (YIP) which swept into the mythical media spotlight during their 'Festival of Life' when the group placed a pig named 'Pigasus' up for presidential election during the 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago.

Abbie Hoffman: The original idea was to have some fun and show people how ineffectual the government can be, while making an obvious comparison between Pigasus and politicians.

"It didn't quite work out as planned. Riots ensued with police brutality causing the majority of the problems."

Political activist and fellow Yippie **Jerry Rubin**

"Ideology is a brain disease"

The end result was a trial with Abbie Hoffman and seven others, including Jerry Rubin, all being indicted for conspiracy. The 'Chicago 8', as they became known, were all eventually acquitted but not before a lengthy and fun filled trial.

Born into a Jewish family in Massachusetts in 1936, Hoffman became an icon of the 1960s and turned many flower children into political activists.

Page one hundred and nine:

On the 20th of May 1967, Hoffman and seventeen of his friends began throwing money from the visitors' gallery onto the floor of the New York Stock Exchange. The result was a near-riot as traders began scrambling for cash.

During an Anti-Vietnam-War demonstration in October '67, Hoffman handed out flyers to protesters calling on them to help 'exorcise evil spirits from the Pentagon'. Thousands of people circled the Pentagon in an effort to levitate the building 300 feet in the air.

"Ring-around-the-Pentagon-a-pocket-full-of-pot."

By 1971 Hoffman had written the infamous **'Steal this book'** which he described as 'a handbook of survival and warfare for the citizens of Woodstock Nation'. The book incorporates a whole host of information, much of it humorous, from how to get free food, housing and education to guerrilla warfare and bomb making.

Hoffman remained a committed prankster and anarchic activist up until 1973, when he was eventually arrested for the sale of cocaine. Facing a mandatory life sentence, Hoffman went underground for 6 years, taking on aliases such as the environmental activist 'Barry Freed'.

"Avoid all needle drugs - The only dope worth shooting is Richard Nixon"

After coming out of hiding in 1980, Hoffman spent a brief period in prison after which he re-entered the world of activism. He continued to organize people against authority and on environmental issues until his death in 1989.

Page one hundred and ten:
Page one hundred and eleven: (Situationist comic pages see illustrations)
Page one hundred and twelve:

Page one hundred and thirteen:

FOR SALE: ANARCHY FOR THE MASSES

During 1967, on New York's Lower East Side, the wonderfully named: UP AGAINST THE WALL MOTHERFUKERS emerged as a movement grouped around the anti-art magazine 'Black Mask'. The 'Motherfuckers' launch into a round of attacks upon what they saw as the 'Art Establishment' targeting gallery openings, museum lectures and rock-concerts.

In Britain, the late 60's and early 70s saw a dramatic rise in revolutionary activities which were partly inspired by the volatile political climate as well as by the 'Yippies!' and the 'Motherfuckers' from America and the events in Paris of May '68.

This era saw the emergence of groups such as **'The Angry Brigade'** who were massively influenced by Situationist ideas, eventually taking the critique of the Spectacle to its most radical and spectacular extreme with a sustained bombing campaign across London on embassies, political and financial institutions and the private property of high ranking politicians, judges and police officials.

Out of this milieu emerged the British **Punk** explosion, a movement of the disaffected youth of the late 1970s that manifested itself in fashions designed to shock and music which combined aggressive performance within a three chord, three minute format. Punk Rock as the music was termed took many of its influences from across the Atlantic, especially groups such as **MC5**, **The Stooges**, **The New York Dolls**, and **The Velvet Underground**. Punk was also inspired by various English youth culture influences from the proto-punk early albums of **David Bowie**, to **Stanley Kubrick**'s film version of **Anthony Burgess**'s novel **'A Clockwork Orange'** and **Richard Allen**'s pulp fiction paperbacks of working-class subculture such as *Skinhead*, *Suedehead* and *Boot Boys.*

Page one hundred and fourteen:

UK PUNK: The Sex Pistols

The Sex Pistols, the most recognisable icon of Punk-Rock, were managed by, Situationist influenced, art school educated, 'entrepreneur', Malcolm Mclaren and launched into the spotlight by the creative intelligence and charisma of Johnny Rotten aka John Lydon. The Sex Pistol's set themselves up as an attack on the music establishment and British social morality but, as is well documented, their own position was one of splendid irony; 'A Great Rock and Roll Swindle'.

The Punk ethic so evident in the early Pistol's lyrics was always about Do-it-yourself; but all to quickly Punk had become a consumer fashion and as such, part of the Spectacular society.

Punk contained the seeds of its own destruction from the outset; and perhaps self-destruction was part of its essential character. Punk set out to get its message across to as wide an audience as possible but its message was never, "follow me", it was rather "see what it is we do and dismiss us, 'Do-it-for-yourself'".

Unfortunately this message was tragically misunderstood.

Page one hundred and fifteen:
Lydon's lyrics are always entertaining and contained an energy and intelligence which is all too often overlooked. The bands 1976 release 'Anarchy in the UK' is a fine example of Punks so-called 'blank generation' and its adherence to style over content in terms of musical technique, while containing a subversive quality within its uses of language.

1977 saw the release of the controversial classic: 'God Save the Queen'.

Page one hundred and sixteen:
Yet Punk, a form of existentialism, was about anarchist negation and not about nihilism.

NIHILISM: a desire for oblivion, the belief in nothing and the wish to become nothing. The nihilist position denies the existence of all reality and adheres to a position that ignores the existence in the world of everybody else except the nihilist actor.

ANARCHIST NEGATION: assumes at all times the existence of other people in the world and calls them into existence by recognising their situation in the world. But most importantly, anarchist negation is the act of making it patently obvious to everyone that the world is not as it seems. Only when this act has been completely absorbed can it be appreciated that the world may be nothing, that nihilism as well as creation may occupy this recently uncovered and unfurnished space. Anarchist negation perceives the possibility of infinite realities and not a world made permanent through bourgeois fears and values.

'Punk' saw life as the creative ability of each individual to do-it-for-themselves and the freeing up of 'Reality' was seen as a significant step in this direction.

Page one hundred and seventeen:

CRASS were a vastly different Punk band from 'The Sex Pistols' and other 'first wave Punk groups' such as 'The Clash' and 'The Buzzcocks', because they wrote songs with overtly anarchist lyrics and refused to compromise their ideas and beliefs, while remaining close to the Punk slogan of DIY.

Drummer Penny Rimbaud and singer Steve Ignorant formed Crass in 1978 when they began recording songs at their open commune in Essex. Soon other members of the commune joined in the creativity including vocalists Eve Libertine and Joy de Vivre, lead guitarist Phil Free, rhythm guitarist N.A. Palmer, bassist Pete Wright and artist G. Sus (say her name aloud!) who played piano and provided cover art for the band, combining collage and anarchist slogans.

Crass wrote songs that were a critique of moral, religious and political hypocrisy. Their attacks concentrated upon oppositions that were all too often indistinguishable from one another.

Listen to the lyric from '*White Punks on Hope'* from *our* **Stations of the Crass** (1979) album of Punk parodies.

Crass's first album **The Feeding Of The Five Thousand** (1978) ran straight into trouble and saw the beginning of the band's long conflict with public moral opinion and authority. At the end of the Falkland's war the band released the record **'How Does It Feel To Be The Mother Of A Thousand Dead?'** referring directly to Prime Minister Thatcher. These attacks brought the band into conflict with established authority including the left and right wing music press who called them traitors; which, of course, as the enemy of war and xenophobic nationalism, they were.

The re-emergence of serious anarchism, the travelling life-style, the campaign for nuclear disarmament and a deeper awareness of environmental and ecological issues can be traced to the concerns expressed in Crass lyrics from songs such as '*They've got a Bomb*', '*You Pay*' and '*Contaminational Power*'.

Page one hundred and eighteen:

ANARCHY & ECOLOGY

(Murray Bookchin): "Anarchy must be released from its nineteenth-century outlook and be redirected towards contemporary situations while retaining its libertarian principles."

Murray Bookchin was born in New York City to Russian Jewish immigrants on January 14th 1921. He was for a time a member of the Communist party and worked in the automobile industry, participating in the infamous General Motors strike of 1948. After these events, Bookchin began to question his established Marxist beliefs, especially those concerning the revolutionary role of the industrial working class.

In the 1960s Bookchin became deeply involved in counter-cultural movements and began to establish the ideas of '**SOCIAL ECOLOGY'**: the synthesis of anarchy and ecology, which recognises that almost all current ecological troubles arise from deep-rooted social problems.

(Murray Bookchin): "Ecologists far too often overlook cultural, economic, ethnic, and gender conflicts when investigating the causes of ecological devastation."

Bookchin felt that many ecologists tended to blame technology for environmental problems and in doing so ignored the underlying causes, such as trade based on profit, unwarranted industrial expansion, and the misguided identification of 'Progress' with notions of 'success' and 'well being'.

Page one hundred and nineteen:
Social Ecology contains both a critical and a creative dimension in demanding an anarchist decentralization of society as the best means of eradicating the immanent ecological crisis.

(Murray Bookchin): "The way we interact with each other as social and human beings is crucial to addressing the ecological crisis."

Bookchin suggests that our hierarchical mentality and class bound relationships, which so completely saturate our societies, also determines the way in which we interact with the natural world.

We turn the world into something that exists merely for us to consume.

The entire world and everything in it, or on it, becomes a commodity ready for our use. We section off the world into consumable bits and pieces and assume these things have no value apart from the values we give them. Rather than seeing the world as filled with other beings, each having their own independent existence, we see it in terms of its use to us. Humanity becomes the centre of the universe, a view which is termed: '**ANTHROPOCENTRIC**'.

Our Patriarchal, hierarchic and exploitative society is the main reason why we see the world as existing for our use. In Western cultures especially, an attitude has arisen which sees the world as a commodity for use by those with the power to exploit it.

Page one hundred and twenty:

Under Capitalism, the commodification of the world gradually roses to prominence and then as the years passed progressively began to fade into the background as its character took on greater and greater complexity. Capitalism is so efficient at this, that a veil is inevitably cast over the world through which this commodification disappears and becomes the natural order of things.

(Marx): "If one ton of iron and two ounces of gold have the same market value, then common sense suggests that a natural relationship exists here; in reality the relationship concerned is only between the quantities of labour that have produced the one and the other."

Yet Bookchin is also critical of Marxism.

(Bookchin): "The Marxist's desire for conflict between worker and capitalist merely serves to strengthen Capitalism. Why fight to remain a 'worker', even if it is under the so-called 'dictatorship of the proletariat'? Everyone should loathe their class status and revolt against the dominant culture by living a subversive lifestyle, no matter what class they're from. Yet Marxism prizes so highly the work ethic, the respect for hierarchy, the obedience to leaders and consumption, in other words it prizes Puritanism."

Bookchin is also critical of the anarcho-Syndicalists attitude towards large-scale industry. He suggests that factories are intrinsically authoritarian and dehumanising in the manner in which they have all but eliminated the artisan and craftsperson from the world by reducing humans to cogs within the machine of mass production.

Page one hundred and twenty-one:

Bookchin's Social ecology is also critical of what has become known as DEEP ECOLOGY: a biocentric rather than anthropocentric philosophy. Deep Ecologists claim that Western cultures anthropocentric view of placing humans above nature will lead to the destruction of the planet.

(Bookchin): "Yet, Deep Ecologists are merely imitating, in reverse, the opposition between humans and nature. They are misanthropic in their desire to see humanity dominated by nature."

1. Some Deep ecologists suggest that diseases are a natural check on human overpopulation; helping to maintain a balance in nature;
2. that children in the third world should be left to starve because of overpopulation in these regions;
3. and that the migration of third world peoples to 'The West' is a drain on our resources and not the result of Western cultures plunder of third world resources which has caused their poverty.

(Bookchin) "Clearly anthropocentrism is implicated in the global environmental crisis but the Deep Ecologists misanthropic view is not a creative response; nor is its mystic belief in the 'oneness' of all nature an adequate response."

Humanity is not an undifferentiated whole in the way Deep Ecologists suggest; this view ignores the historical and political differences between male and female, black and white, rich and poor. Not all of humanity is the source of all values; rather it has been the economically privileged, white western males whose anthropocentrism has treated women, blacks and the poor as raw materials for profit at the expense of the individuals well being and the well being of the environment.

Page one hundred and twenty-two:

"MAKE LOVE NOT WAR"

Wilhelm Reich: "Love is the well spring of our life. It should also govern it."

Wilhelm Reich (1897-1957) was an anarchic Austrian psychologist who described modern civilization as having been established upon a foundation of sexual repression.

Reich examined the relationship between physical and emotional energy and discovered that the emotions which control psychological behaviour are themselves the direct manifestation of physical energy which he named the **COSMIC ORGONE**.

Sexual repression creates a defensive barrier against pleasure, love and peaceful living which entomb the individual and society.

(Knight in amour): "Analyse this!"

Reich believed that physical health was dependent upon orgastic potency, seeing mental illness as the result of a disturbance in the natural capacity for love.

Wilhelm Reich: "Anti-social behaviour springs from the suppression of sexuality."

Page one hundred and twenty-three:
In the 1942 publication of **The Function of the Orgasm**, Reich outlines his idea of the Cosmic Orgone and its effects upon individual psychology and behaviour.

Wilhelm Reich: "The suppression of the orgasm generates a fear of pleasure and a heightened state of anxiety that reveals itself through '**CHARACTER ARMOUR**'; a stiffening of ones body posture and an irrational desire for order and control. This state induces a self-loathing causing the individual to be susceptible to domination and oppression."

In **The Mass Psychology of Fascism** (1933) Reich questions why the German people desired their own oppression.

(Wilhelm Reich): "I reject the idea that fascism is the ideology or action of a single individual, or that it is part of a national character trait within the German people. Rather, I suggest that fascism is the expression of the irrational character structure of every human being whose basic biological needs and desires have been suppressed for over 5,000 years by the authoritarianism inherent within patriarchal societies."

Reich thought that patriarchal duty had replaced the natural enjoyment of work and activity.

Page one hundred and twenty-four:

Reich saw the family, the school and the Church as all playing a crucial role in the way that the masses are conditioned to accept fascism.

(Father): "The family structure is authoritarian; children must accept the undemocratic 'Daddy-Mummy-Me' chain of command in the organised family."

(Priest): "My congregation see themselves as a flock led by the Father and watched over by an all seeing God."

(Teacher): "The main lesson to be learnt in the classroom is discipline and socially acceptable behaviour."

(Mother): "Although children benefit from a stable upbringing, this is not synonymous with an authoritarian one."

(Reich): "All forms of organised mysticism, including religion and fascism rely upon the unsatisfied orgastic longing of the masses. Their self-loathing leads them to demand a father figure who will provide them with order, oppress them and take away the stress of having to make their own decisions."

Reich died from heart disease in an American penitentiary after being given a two-year prison sentence for being in contempt of court. He'd been accused of making fraudulent claims for his **Bions**, the vessels for isolating life energy, and **Orgone Boxes**, in which life energy was stored. Reich refused to accept the courts injunction considering them totally unqualified to make such as a ruling.

Page one hundred and twenty-five:

THE LAW

"From the inception of authoritarian society there has been conflict between libertarians and the State."

Page one hundred and twenty-six:
Page one hundred and twenty-seven: (Comic pages see illustrations)
Page one hundred and twenty eight:
Page one hundred and twenty-nine:

Page one hundred and thirty:

DIRECT ACTION has often been used as an effective way to challenge the system, the Suffragettes, anti-war protesters and genetically modified crop-smashes have all used this method, but its days are numbered.

After recent protests and demonstrations against the 'World Trade Organisation' and Carnivals against Capitalism; new laws have been enforced in many countries designed to prevent this type of public disruption.

Page one hundred and thirty-one:
These protests brought attention to particular issues but played into the hands of those who wanted to maintain the status quo. New laws were sanctioned to prevent acts of terrorism against authority, riding on a wave of media reports of violent demonstrations.

But what constitutes terrorism has been radically altered in recent times.

(Riot police): "Any opposition to authority can now be labelled terrorism."

The use of serious violence against persons or property, or the THREAT to use such violence to intimidate or coerce the government, or any section of the public, for political, religious or ideological ends.

These laws threaten individual freedom by allowing the State to completely outlaw any organisation it sees as a threat to its authority.

An individual can be held for 14 days in Britain without being charged, if the arrest is 'terrorist' related.

Even wearing clothing or a pin associated to an outlawed group will be illegal under the new laws, as will failing to report a friend or family member who belongs to such as group.

Page one hundred and thirty-two:

SECTION
FOUR
POST-ANARCHIST
ANARCHY

Page one hundred and thirty-three:

"Why should I accept that the removal of authority and government will inevitably lead to a better society?"

"Why is the idea of 'Human Nature' such a problem?"

"Are justice and power mutually opposed?"

To believe in the idea that there is an essential human nature is to suggest that what it is to be human is fixed and unchangeable; as opposed to more recent thinking which suggests that, existence precedes essence. In other words, our identity is conditioned and constructed by our social, historical and cultural existence.

At the heart of the traditional anarchist projects of Proudhon, Bakunin and Kropotkin, there was a belief in an essential human nature and an acceptance that this nature was fundamentally good, corrupted only later by the evils of power and authority.

As important as these 'traditional anarchists' were to their nineteenth century audience, their faith in Humanism and a benign human essence has much less relevance for us today.

So why did these anarchists place the linchpin of their demand for freedom upon a metaphysical vehicle; and why was their call for liberty left balancing precariously upon an *a-priori* belief in benign human essence?

Were they blinded by the Enlightenment into accepting the unreliable and dubious foundations of human nature as a first premise?

Page one hundred and thirty-four:

Nineteenth century anarchy was unable to cope with the inhumane world of the 20th century and as a result Anarchy began to fade from view and was lost as a viable alternative to the all-conquering corporate state.

The 20th century was the age of mass production and bureaucracy; a period that fashioned the ubiquitous assembly-line and the three R's of Rules, Red tape and Regulations.

(Time and motion woman): "**Faster! Faster!**"

Mass production and bureaucracy became the foundation stones of authoritarian ideologies such as Communism, Capitalism and Fascism and this period is symbolised most horrifically in the cold and efficient image of 20th century warfare and concentration camps.

Page one hundred and thirty-five:

There are perhaps three main reasons why nineteenth century anarchist ideas failed to thrive in the 20th century:

1. The steady decline of the industrial working class throughout the twentieth century, a class always thought to be the natural audience for anarchist ideas;

2.   Orthodox anarchist ideas had relied far too heavily upon Humanism and Science, categories which rather than giving support to anarchist ideas of freedom and non-coercion were in fact the bedrock of bourgeois capitalism;

3.   Its misplaced faith in an essential human nature, benign or otherwise.

As we enter the 21st century, anarchist ideas are beginning to rekindle from the embers of May '68. It is a version of anarchy quite different from that of the nineteenth century, but it still contains that same spirit of freedom, non-coercion and a **D**o **I**t **Y**ourself attitude to life.

(Foucault, Deleuze and Lyotard all thinking): "**Anarchy is dead; long live anarchy**"

The new wave of anarchist thinking is post-humanist and draws upon an anti-Enlightenment tradition that rejects the equation of reason, emancipation, and progress, arguing that modern forms of power and knowledge are creating new forms of domination. This re-emergence of anarchist ways of thinking takes its lead, perhaps surprisingly, from the writings of the nineteenth century German poet/philosopher, **Friedrich Nietzsche**.

Page one hundred and thirty-six:

(Nietzsche): "I know my fate. One day there will be associated with my name the memory of something tremendous - a crisis without equal on earth, the most profound collision of conscience, a decision evoked against everything that has been believed, demanded, sanctified so far. I am no man, I am dynamite."

(Passer by): "As well as being very modest, wasn't Nietzsche also an opponent of anarchist ideas?"

(Nietzsche): "I'm critical of traditional anarchy for the same reason that I'm critical of all Enlightenment ideas, they're based upon a naïve faith in logic, reason and humanism."

Page one hundred and thirty-seven:

Nietzsche's philosophy is partly an attempt to make oppositions, such as order & chaos, and mind & body, free floating rather than fixed. However, he's not a naïve relativist, suggesting that anything goes. In fact Nietzsche remained acutely aware of the effects of historical and social context upon our existence and upon our acceptance of truth.

In his writings Nietzsche is at pains to insist that every individual must overcome their own ideological constraints and create his or her own life:

(Nietzsche as Superman): "We must be noble, free, creative and passionate."

"There are no moral phenomena at all, only a moral interpretation of moral phenomena…"

Nietzsche suggests that we must choose to live in-between simplistic binary oppositions; he is asking that we live beyond good and evil. But this is a dangerous place to exist because we are being asked to live no-where, to live in the gaps between safe stability, to live as human beings independent of 'slavish', 'herd morality' and remain constantly sceptical of all claims to rationality and logic.

Page one hundred and thirty-eight:
"We are misguided if we believe that we are uniquely individual or that our strength of mind is entirely our own. This belief is naïve because it sees personal autonomy as a first premise, as the foundation of some mythical human essence."

For Nietzsche, family, church and state all force morality upon us from the outset by means of severe discipline.

We each live in constant fear of punishment, a form of education that encourages us to remember and take personal responsibility for our actions. This method supposedly constructs us as 'autonomous' individuals who are let loose upon the world as paranoid moral robots who have societies moral rules programmed inside us as 'conscience'.

In this way we each become components within a 'civilized' society whose morality is designed to turn us not into autonomous free thinking human beings but into human herds, 'ordered, quantifiable and homogeneous'.

Page one hundred and thirty-nine:

The process that Nietzsche uses to investigate morality he calls '**GENEALOGY**'; a technique which traces morality's complex emergence to a position of authority and truth within society.

Genealogy doesn't seek to rediscover the facts or origin of an object or idea like morality, but rather sets out to explore the intersecting discourses and practices, such as science, religion and the law, that bring morality into being.

Nietzsche suggests that through morality, humanity has institutionalised its values, projected and enforced them and then mistaken these morals as unquestionable truths rather than human inventions.

Page one hundred and forty:
Nietzsche uses the genealogical approach to examine social morality at the moment it appears in history as a system of constraint upon the sovereignty of the individual.

(Man looking over the top of the maze hedge): "Genealogy is never a reaction or revenge but an action and a creative critique."

Genealogy questions the validity of all claims to truth, revealing them to be a facade of intersecting systems and practices that strive to dominate one another. Genealogy doesn't set out to rediscover the truth; on the contrary, it strives to dissipate the idea of a single fixed truth, and to reveal all the inconsistencies that pass through such a concept.

In this sense Genealogy is an anarchist technique; it reveals the lack of stable foundations within social morality and all other claims to Truth.

Page one hundred and forty-one:
If we set out to find a single source from which an object or idea springs we are assuming that there is an essence behind existence; this Nietzsche perceives to be a huge mistake.

The post-human anarchist project, takes a genealogical approach towards social institutions and forms of state control, not to uncover the truth of our enslavement, but rather to critique any object or ideas claim to control us through some essential and unquestionable truth.

In Nietzsche's view, ethics and morality make us slavish and far from freeing us, actually deepens our enslavement. Nietzsche, like the anarchist, suggests that it is imperative for us to create our own values and break the chains of our moral enslavement.

Page one hundred and forty-two:

Reality for Nietzsche is never fixed but is rather in an endless state of 'becoming'. That which we call the universe is *a monster of energy without beginning and without end*. It is energy in a constant state of chaotic change and movement. Therefore, any permanence or rationality we unveil is that which we ourselves have invented. We constantly delude ourselves into believing that we have knowledge, when this knowledge is nothing more than the absurd categorising of chaos, the boxing up of 'becoming', a dividing up which makes the world useful for us and gives us a sense of authority and control.

All knowledge is a pinning down and destruction of the unknown and the unknowable. This is not to deny that knowledge is a useful tool, but it has no claims to truth or reality. By cleaving up the world and categorising it into bits of knowledge we can alleviate our fear and anxiety of the unidentifiable but where has it led us.

Page one hundred and forty-three:

The image of authority that emerges out of this new anarchist perspective is one of intersecting networks of power rather than the traditional hierarchical or vertical model.

This being the case a full frontal revolutionary attack upon the institutions of power would appear to be an act of folly.

(Foucault): "The role of theory today is not to formulate the global systematic theory which holds everything in place, but to analyse the specificity of mechanisms of power, to locate the connections and extensions, to build little by little a strategic knowledge."

The French historian/philosopher **MICHEL FOUCAULT** (1926-1984) following in Nietzsche's genealogical footsteps, investigates the intersecting networks of power which position us in the world.

Page one hundred and forty-four:

(Man escaping): "**I will not be pushed, filed, stamped, indexed, briefed, debriefed or numbered; my life's my own."**

Foucault suggests that humans or 'subjects' are historically constructed and are turned into objects under investigation through the discourses and practices of politics, science, medicine, psychiatry, economics, the law and philosophy etc.

Each of these practices claims to have a particular knowledge of the subject; however, by relying upon these practices ourselves we relinquish the responsibility for our own lives and passively accept this knowledge and its definitions of who and what we are. In this way we turn ourselves into the objects which these discourses describe.

The term *Subject* can be understood as either, a subject of someone else's control or a subject tied to a constructed identity through conscience or self-knowledge.

Page one hundred and forty-five:

In The Order of Things (1966) Foucault proclaims: **'The Death of Man'.**

"Man is just a momentary fold in the fabric of discourse, an invention of comparatively recent date, a figure drawn in the sand at the oceans edge soon to be erased by the incoming tide."

Foucault is implying that human beings become subjects by way of particular discourses and practices of power which are slowly beginning to lose their authoritative claim to legitimate truth and knowledge.

He follows the French psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan, in suggesting that it is only through the acquisition of language that the human came into being in the first place. Only through language and knowledge, which we created ourselves, were we able to label ourselves as human and turn ourselves into subjects.

(Foucault): "Yet we have forgotten that we are an invention of our own discourses and processes of categorisation; we have allowed ourselves to become subjects of our own invention."

Page one hundred and forty-six:

In <u>Discipline and Punish</u> (1975) Foucault's genealogical examination illustrates how judicial and political practices use power both upon and within the body.

Foucault traces the changes in methods of punishment from the 18th century spectacle of public torture, where physical pain upon the body was the main purpose, right through to the compulsive over regulations of the disciplinary society of the 19th and 20th century.

18th century methods of torture secured not only a confession from the guilty but also gave both the fated and the masses the opportunity to oppose the cruelty of the state while fearing its power.

By the beginning of the 19th century physical pain and public torture were less effective against crimes committed against society and property rather than against authority figures. Rules and regulations were introduced and the body was made passive under a perception of constant surveillance.

Page one hundred and forty-seven:

The Panopticon prison, design by the eighteenth century English philosopher Jeremy Bentham, is Foucault's example of the modern disciplinary society. This all-seeing eye had a central guard tower from which all the prisoners could be seen at all times. They had no way of knowing whether they were under observation but the thought of being watched from the central tower was an ever present threat. The power of social discipline was active from within the prisoners themselves; the Panopticon worked very effectively as a form of self-discipline.

This model was also used to confine the insane, to treat the sick, to instruct the young, to supervise the worker, to monitor the poor and to entrap the idle. The Panopticon method constructs an entire disciplinary society whose power of control is not centralised in any particular institution but is within an intersecting network of power relations and most importantly within us, our conscience, which makes us toe the line.

Our enlightened liberalism has rid us of overt cruelty but this has been replaced by a far more insidious form of control that reaches into every part of our public and private lives.

Page one hundred and forty-eight:

Foucault also questions the accepted view that knowledge is power by proposing that power and knowledge are in relation but never the same. In effect Foucault suggests that:

POWER IS KNOWLEDGE

Those in power control knowledge which in turn regulates power in a vicious and continuous circle.

The most respected discourses and practices, such as science and the law, wield the most power because they are able to assert with 'authority' what is to be accepted as 'knowledge'. However, Foucault reveals that power doesn't merely suppress its objects but also creates objects by giving them importance. Power is thus conceived as operating not upon its object but within it. In this way power is understood as not only a suppressive force but also as a creative one.

If power is a creative force then it not only gives rise to systems of authority but also, more insidiously, to forms of resistance within those systems of authority. Therefore, if power creates its own resistance, then methods of liberation must take into account the type of resistance that is being used to confront systems of authority in order to avoid repeating the pitfalls of resistance to power.

(Foucault): "But it has also been argued that resistance precedes power."

On a more positive note, if power is creative then discourses and practices are never fixed and can be altered and changed. Their structures are not so brittle that they need to be smashed but there is enough give and play in any system of authority for it to be playfully undermined.

Page one hundred and forty-nine:

The philosopher who explores this 'play' and 'give' most creatively, through an approach he calls '**DECONSTRUCTION**', is **JACQUES DERRIDA** (b. 1930).

"And deconstruction is?"

An investigation into the nuts and bolts of Western thought to reveal the instabilities within all claims to fixed and stable meanings. Making Deconstruction an anarchist tactic par excellence.

(Derrida): "By re-reading the texts of other philosophers, I find contradictions and inconsistencies within their arguments and within their use of language that undermines their claims to have identified 'permanent truths' about the world. One such inconsistency suggests that **speech** is a 'natural' and self-evident route to truth whereas **writing** is seen as some kind of 'evil' parasite contaminating this truth."

The Swiss linguist, Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913) implies that meaning is not inherent in the relationship between the written word and that to which it refers, but exists in the arbitrary relationship of signs to one another.

The relationship between the word 'dog', the concept of 'doggy-ness' and a dog that bites and barks is not fixed, it has been chosen merely at random; a dog could quite easily have been called a 'cat' or a 'bog' or a 'god'.
Words are identified and carry meaning only through their difference from one another; **CAT** is **CAT** because it isn't **BAT**, **FAT**, or **SAT** etc. And we must bare in mind that all words require other words to give them meaning; for example, the meaning of '**CAT**' is never completely clear because it's meaning isn't inherent within the word itself or able to transcend all other words and carry its meaning all alone.

Page one hundred and fifty:
All words require other words to carry meaning i.e.:

(Cat): "Cat: a carnivore of genus Felis"

(Dog): "What's Felis?"

(Cat): "It says 'of the cat genus'."

(Dog): "what's 'genus'?"

(Cat): "LOOK IT UP!"

The meaning of a word is always deferred, put off until later, which implies that meaning and all human thought, which is made up of language, is built upon this self-enclosed and arbitrary system of difference and deferral without any positive terms which stand outside of the system.

Derrida exposes Saussure's thesis on the signs 'arbitrariness' as simply one more unfounded metaphysical assumption which implies that 'natural' thought and speech are closer to the truth because they somehow avoid languages endless deferral. What Derrida shows is that speech is not a self-present truth but is simply another form of writing, never fully present and always deferred. He also goes on to argue that if our methods of representing the world are unreliable, then our knowledge and meanings must also be inherently unstable because they are based upon the same arbitrary system of signs.

Page one hundred and fifty-one:
For the anarchist, Deconstruction opens up a perfect mode of attack. If all human thought is made up of language and this language is in a constant state of flux and instability, then our means of representing the world are as unstable as our system of randomly chosen signs. This indicates that all claims to truth, which have a tendency towards fixity, institutionalisation, centralisation and totalitarianism, have no claim to a position of authority. Their legitimacy is based upon spurious grounds; all claims to truth can never be confirmed because they are based upon the instabilities of difference and deferral, always put off until later.

For Derrida there is no fixed and knowable world existing behind representation, there is no origin or unquestionable truth; there is only our means of re-presenting the world and nothing outside of this context.

Derrida points out how philosophers have excluded the process of representation from their findings by sweeping it under the carpet. Their longing to nail down meaning to a fixed and stable truth or centre has made them ignore not only the instability of language but also the fact that language is the only game in town.

Page one hundred and fifty-two:

Truths and central positions have a tendency to produce fixed binary oppositions (e.g. male/female, Speech/writing, nature/culture, and good/evil) in which one term is privileged as central and the other is marginalized. This act of creating centres is a totalitarian act which freezes the play of difference within any system. It creates a fixed truth where none exists and causes a whole heap of trouble in the process.

Derrida's tactic is to reintroduce the 'give' and 'play' into the system to thaw this fixity of dividing the world into binary opposition. By continually deconstructing these 'truths' or centres that support hierarchies and freeze opposition, Derrida sets out to highlight the tenuous foundations upon which all truths (and systems of authority) are based.

This tactic of finding the play in a system, although appearing on the surface to be something far less grand than revolution, has the possibility to be more devastating and creative than all the revolutions of history put together.

Although Derrida says, "there is nothing outside of the *(con)* text" this text he speaks of is not a 'prison-house of language' in which we are trapped and confined. This is because there is no outside to escape to, we are both in and of the text, and, if, as many contemporary anarchist thinkers suggest, we dwell in language, and its limits are the limits of our world, then to meet others within its fabric is to stretch it, multiply it, investigate it and remake it. In this way the text becomes a place of creativity where we can expand the (con) text of our world and make it our own through this anarchist DIY philosophy.

Page one hundred and fifty-three:

In *The Postmodern Condition* (1979) the French philosopher **Jean-François Lyotard** (1924-1998) argues, in a similar way to Jacques Derrida, for a rejection of all '*rationally consistent'* foundations for Truth. He calls for a questioning and scepticism towards all total explanations of reality offered up by science, religion or political ideologies such as Fascism or Communism.

(Jean-François Lyotard): "I define the postmodern condition as the incredulity towards all metanarratives."

Lyotard questions the legitimacy of these 'meta' or 'grand' narratives to authorize knowledge and suggests that they no longer work.

Some of the most dominant grand narratives Lyotard observes are:

- the concept of progress embedded in the Enlightenment, especially its promise of democracy, knowledge and freedom;
- the notion of social liberation embedded within Marxism;
- the release from unconscious trauma promised by Freudian psychoanalysis.

Lying beneath the seeming neutrality of grand narratives is a dominant discourse of practical politics based not upon the morals and ethics of benevolence but upon the exercise of power and terror.

Page one hundred and fifty-four:
Lyotard suggests that grand narratives are violent and authoritarian in their totalising methods and blueprints for the world and within their bogus claims of universality.

(Lyotard): "Total explanations lead to totalitarian societies."

Against these grand narratives, with their despotic connotations, Lyotard champions the cause of the little narratives, essentially the narratives of individual human beings, which require no authoritative foundations or justifications.

(Lyotard): "We live in a world of micro narratives; no longer can we look for one big story to explain our world or two competing stories which reach for the absolute answer. The postmodern condition is one of competing local stories, densely interwoven."

Lyotard argues that the individual must attempt to wrestle back power by telling our own little narratives and haul language back from the dominant discourses of power. Science, perhaps the dominant discourse in the West, has become the sole arbiter of truth and justice. It has become the dominant 'language game' whereby things established through science are acknowledged as universal truths and these truths are believed to equal justice.

Page one hundred and fifty-five:
Language games are ways of interpreting the world; take the ambigram above as a metaphor.

One language game, lets say, science, might describe the young woman, another, let us say, religion, might describe an old woman; yet, both of these language games are competing for the crown of absolute provider of truth. Which language game gets to wear the crown depends upon the grand narratives a society uses to legitimate its truth and knowledge.

In his later work Lyotard changes the term 'language games' for '**PHRASE'**; this term he suggests forms the basic unit of linguistic meaning.

(Lyotard): "Whereas language games encourage a sense of easy manipulation by game players the phrase is always incomplete and densely interwoven with other phrase regimes in a constant state of flux which ask questions but defy answers."

Phrase regimens include, categorising, counting, reasoning, and describing etc. Science is taken to be a wider pattern of interlocking phrase regimes that Lyotard calls '**GENRES OF DISCOURSE**'.

(Lyotard): "In the west science has become a 'genre of discourse' which only the rich can play because scientific truth is based upon the outcome of the best-funded research and the best funded research is the most convincing."

Page one hundred and fifty-six:
The *Différend* is the name given by Lyotard to the silencing of a player within a phrase regime. It exists when there is no procedure for that which is different to be presented in the current domain of discourse. A *différend* occurs when something that may be said cannot be phrased because it doesn't fit the existing 'genres of discourse' that are approved by societies 'grand narratives'.

The différend marks a point of dispute where no common ground can be found and where no criteria exist for judgement. The différend marks a point where existing representational frameworks are unable to deal with that which is marginal or different without repressing or reducing it to something that it is not.

This slightly abstract linguistic preoccupation has profound political implications for post-human anarchist ways of thinking. The task of anarchy is to induce and demonstrate the différend, to exacerbate

them so as to resist the injustice that silences those who cannot and will not speak the language of the 'master'.

Lyotard uses the Situationist technique of the dérive or drift to show a way of bringing the différend to light while the player can remain undetected, invisible. This player is then free to attempt to re-write the world through micro narratives by opening up phrasing and altering the genres of discourse to give a voice to those whom society has rendered mute.

Page one hundred and fifty-seven:
NOT ALL THOSE WHO WANDER ARE LOST

Gilles **Deleuze** and Félix **Guattari** pick up on the idea of the *Dérive* in their work. These two collaborative thinkers bring into play an anarchic style of writing that drifts between the creative and the critical in a style of thought which could be termed **'nomadic'**.

Both volumes of 'Capitalism and Schizophrenia', *Anti-Oedipus* (1972) and *A Thousand Plateaus* (1980), are difficult works to get to grips with because the writers are continuously creating new terms.

(Deleuze and Guattari): "The drift of philosophy is the creation of new concepts."

Their work is a refusal to accept the world as it is given and an attempt to set about creating new concepts *"to bring forth a new earth and a new people"*

Deleuze and Guattari explore the question of identity and difference through an approach they term '**SCHIZOANALYSIS'** which sees the self as multiple rather than singular, fixed and knowable.

(Foucault): "Schizoanalysis is anti-fascist and anti-power and seeks to find the fascism buried beneath our society and within all our heads."

Page one hundred and fifty-eight:

(Guattari): "Capitalism produces a schizophrenic response to the world with its intolerable pressures and contradictions but it also represses these responses fearing the consequences of multiple and partial selves."

Deleuze and Guattari are not referring in their work to the pathological condition of schizophrenia, but rather to a mode of action in response to capitalism's binding of desires to identity and repetition rather than difference.

The obscure language Deleuze and Guattari use can often sound rather confusing:
"'**SCHIZOANALYSIS**' suggests that the **DESIRING MACHINE**, that **RHIZOMATIC** assemblage in the form of a fuzzy **BODY WITHOUT ORGANS**, can become a **NOMADIC WAR MACHINE** by creating **LINES OF FLIGHT** which **DETERRITORIALISE** the **EXTENSIVE MOLAR MULTIPLICITIES** of **STATE FORM**."

(MAN CONFRONTED BY ENIGAMA MACHINE): "WHAT THE *@#%!!!"

However, their work repays the effort required in decoding its creative energies.

Page one hundred and fifty-nine:
Q. So what's a desiring machine?

By machine, Deleuze and Guattari are referring, quite literally, to anything that arranges and connects fragmentary and disjointed partial objects into continuous flows of energy. The machine is everything from an engine to a society.

The 'desiring machine' is us; the human being, a fragmented assemblage of parts which never constitutes a whole.

An 'anarchist desiring machine' is a flow of energy producing more energy, desire producing desire. Whereas the despotic desiring machine is the desire of the master over the slave, it is the attempt, not to produce endless desire, but to use desire to gain power over others in a blind attempt to fulfil the endless void or lack which they perceive to exist at the core of modern life. It is reactive desire rather than a creative one.

The anarchist response is to unleash active and productive desire unrestricted into capitalism's world of repressed desire. Capitalism wants us to desire commodities, but this desire must be controlled and controllable. If it were unleashed as a desire producing more desire, rather than desire as the irrational wish to have something we lack, then the capitalist system would implode.

Page one hundred and sixty:

Q. "But why does desire come to desire its own repression? Why do we desire what oppresses us, be it capitalism, fascism or the controlling and regulating hand of government?"

(Deleuze): "Because these powers which crush desire are themselves part of desire."

In other words desire is caught up in its own repression. There is no fundamental benevolent aspect to human nature which stands in opposition to the forces which block the free flows of desire; rather, like the masochist, desire is responsible for its own domination.

(Guattari): "Power does not suppress desire, it is implicated in every assemblage of desire."

The task for the 'anarchist desiring machine' is to work out which aspects of repression we desire and resist these habits by creating free flowing and un-regimented lines of flight.

Page one hundred and sixty-one:

These lines of flight are **RHIZOMATIC,** a term which refers to the astronomical mass of interconnecting roots which spread horizontally under a plant such as crabgrass. Rather than one central root that burrows vertically to support the tree, the rhizome is an unregulated random network of interconnections whereby each and every line can relate to every other line, a bit like the Internet.

The tree, a central metaphor in western culture symbolising knowledge, time and the human body; is always fixed, stable and defines being. The rhizome, on the other hand, continually alters directions and connections and implies a mode of existence not of being but of becoming, a question of being in the middle rather than at the beginning or the end.

(Deleuze): "The desiring machine is never a blank tablet and never at the end; we slip in, enter in the middle and take up or lay down rhythms."

Page one hundred and sixty-two:

The rhizome creates new modes of thought which Deleuze and Guattari call nomadic. The nomad wanders or drifts and is bound to no given place or territory and in this way creates new lines of flight by opening up space, blurring boundaries and making new connections.

In this way the nomad becomes a **WAR-MACHINE,** a mode of thought and action which stands outside the modes of thought regulated by the state. The war machine stands in opposition to the state apparatus. As such, the nomadic war machine is a spanner in the works of logical, subject centred thinking which validates all modern states. The nomadic war machine destroys the parasitic and binding modes of state thinking and creates an anarchic assemblage of free flowing lateral thought.

The nomadic war machine creates rhizomatic multiplicities, which consistently take lines of flight that free desire from established routes and **DETERRITORIALISE** the fixities of state thinking.

(See image for this page which incorporates a paragraph being herded into a pen)

The anarchist desiring machines must attempt to keep desire free flowing, allowing desire to produce desire unimpeded by the over coding of state control.

Page one hundred and sixty-three:

Deleuze and Guattari suggest that part of the state over coding, or ideology, is the view of the body as a unitary structure.

(Deleuze): "The body is not monolithic, but flowing, leaking, spreading and disjointed."

(Guattari): "The idea of a bounded body is a myth produced by ideology which reflects the capitalist urge to stop property from escaping the boundaries of the owner's domain."

Deleuze and Guattari prefer a **BODY-WITHOUT-ORGANS,** a deterritorialised body without definite form or meaning. The body without organs is not a body subject to constraining definitions; it functions as a screen or recording surface between body and consciousness which has the potential for freedom and anarchic lines of flight which seeks pleasure in difference, variation and improvisation rather than identity.

Deleuze and Guattari don't look to promote large visible revolutionary war machines but rather nomadic 'invisible' war machines that will undermine state control by producing undetected and uncontrollable desire. Their work together is an attempt to stop desire from being bound to repetition by delighting in the difference of new connections and concepts. Their anarchist approach takes pleasure in a situation where desire produces desire; they see with enthusiasm the modern state eating itself out of existence.

Page one hundred and sixty-four:

Anarcha-Feminism

In the climate of post-revolutionary May '68 a new form of feminist emerged who was concerned with difference and individuality. They were quite different from the Anglo-American Marxist feminists and liberal feminists of the previous era who strove for equality. The post '68 feminists or 'Anarcha-Feminists' signify a shift away from the old dogmas of man-hating matriarchy towards a celebration of diversity within the speaking subject, in other words they celebrate you and me.

(Woman): "The problem with equality is that it homogenises us, it makes us all the same."

These feminists work mainly in France and are in the Emma Goldman, Louise Michel tradition of anarchist feminism. They aren't calling upon women to adopt the disturbing mantle of authoritarian masculinity; instead they set out to celebrate the feminine and embrace individuality.

Page one hundred and sixty-five:

Although many of the French Post-Feminist philosophers such as **Julia Kristeva**, **Hélène Cixous** and **Luce Irigaray** do not refer to themselves as anarchists, their anti-essentialist approach, which sees individual subjects as socially constructed into gender positions, has relevance for anarchist ways of

thinking. These post-feminists look at the ways in which women have traditionally been subordinated within patriarchal societies through simplifying binary oppositions which relegate women to the negative pole.

Some examples: MASTER/slave, Active/passive, Father/mother, Sun/moon, Head/
Heart, Man/woman, Serious/playful, Nature/culture.

The Anarcha-feminists cast off the old subject/object; self/other views of human relationships and take up an anarchist approach in which the role of power becomes obsolete.

And they certainly don't believe Sigmund Freud when he suggests that women are merely castrated men who lack a penis.

(Tank Girl): "And why should we?"

The Anarcha-feminist approach is anti-essentialist in that they highlight the absurdity of a fixed notion of gender which is supposedly determined by nature.

If, as many Anarcha-feminists believe, "the liberation of women and the emancipation of feminine flows of desire is the biggest step towards the eradication of totalitarian politics and patriarchal fascism"; why is this and how do they go about achieving this goal?

Page one hundred and sixty-six:
Their methods are not visible revolutionary actions which attempt to render impotent patriarchy by attacking its social structures and institutions, such as the family and the state, head on. This action is seen as playing into the hands of a system which is set up to assimilate or destroy any challenge which it can see coming. The Anarcha-feminist approach is an attempt to alter the very discourses which construct and establish these social institutions; discourses such as education, medicine and the law which dominate the state and the traditional family with their masculine, authoritarian and hierarchical structures.

The Anarcha-feminist approach is an attempt to undermine patriarchy by placing the woman and the body back into language. This form of writing, termed 'Écriture féminine', literally, feminine writing, is open to both men and women, although women are said to find it easier. It is a form of writing not dominated

by the head alone and not directed towards pure reason, knowledge and closure, in other words it is not obsessed with finality, ejaculation and death; rather, it's about an endless becoming which foregrounds excess and escapes simplistic closure. Écriture féminine emphasises the qualities of tone & rhythm and a plurality of voices that open up meaning and resist authoritarian closure and monolithic Truth.

Page one hundred and sixty-seven:

Zenarchy

(Pirsig on a bike): "Our plans are deliberately indefinite, more to travel than to arrive anywhere. We ride along Secondary roads because we want to make good time, but for us now this is measured with emphasis on 'good' rather than 'time' and when you make this shift in emphasis the whole approach changes."

These lines taken from **Robert M. Pirsig's** 1974 novel '*Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance*', encapsulate the modern anarchist approach, and sounds much like Gilles Deleuze when he writes:

(Deleuze): "It is never the beginning or the end which are interesting; these are just points. What is interesting is the middle."

In taking Secondary roads on his journey from Minneapolis to San Francisco, Pirsig becomes the nomad; he's interested in the journey and not the final destination. His approach, which has been favoured by both Zenists and Taoists as well as the Situationists and Anarcha-feminists, is concerned with the revolution of everyday life where each and every moment is seen as precious; a moment to be lived to the full and in freedom away from the constraints of regimentation and binding tradition.

Page one hundred and sixty-eight:

Pirsig's novels take an anarchist, nomadic approach to the journey in seeing both the physical and the mental journey as a way of opening up spaces which become zones of uncertainty and creativity. These zones can be the spaces at which state control is abandoned in favour of the individual choice, freedom and 'quality'.

Pirsig's approach is a rejection of the old adversarial tactic of revolution in favour of a transformation of the physical via the mental.

"To tear down a factory or to revolt against a government or to avoid the repair of a motorcycle because it is a system is to attack effects rather than causes; and as long as the attack is upon effects only, no change is possible. The true system, the real system, is our present construction of systematic thought itself, rationality itself, and if a factory is torn down but the rationality which produced it is left standing, then that rationality will simply produce another factory. If a revolution destroys a systematic government, but the systematic patterns of thought that produced that government are left intact, then those patterns will repeat themselves in the succeeding government. There is so much talk about the system. And so little understanding."

Page one hundred and sixty-nine:

Where's Anarchy Today?

"Are we who live in the present doomed never to experience autonomy, never to stand for one moment on a bit of land ruled only by freedom? Are we reduced either to nostalgia for the past or nostalgia for the future? Must we wait until the entire world is freed of political control before even one of us can claim to know freedom? Logic and emotion unite to condemn such a supposition. Reason demands that one cannot struggle for what one does not know; and the heart revolts at a universe so cruel as to visit such injustices on *our* generation alone of humankind."

'The Temporary Autonomous Zone' or TAZ, written by the poet/philosopher Hakim Bey (the *nom de plume* of Peter Lamborn Wilson) is a rhizomatic essay operating as a network of interconnecting thoughts and suggestions concerned with the possibility of sovereignty and with our ability to construct transitory insurrections of invisibility (in the tradition of Alexander Trocchi, see pages 106-107, and Deleuze and Guattari, see page 157-163). The TAZ overthrows all notions of permanence and political control and creates nomadic, anarchist, 'lines of flight'.

"The greatest strength of the Temporary Autonomous Zone lies in its ability to remain undetected from the prying eyes of the state. This it achieves via its '*tactic of disappearance*' which renders it invisible to the Spectacle and the agents of Simulation."

Page one hundred and seventy:

Hakim Bey deliberately refrains from defining 'The Temporary Autonomous Zone' and suggests that it might best be understood in terms of action rather than as a fixed idea or method.

"As soon as the TAZ is named (represented, mediated), it must vanish, it *will* vanish, leaving behind it an empty husk, only to spring up again somewhere else, once again invisible because indefinable in terms of the Spectacle. The TAZ is thus a perfect tactic for an era in which the State is omnipresent and all-powerful and yet simultaneously riddled with cracks and vacancies. And because the TAZ is a microcosm of that "anarchist dream" of a free culture, I can think of no better tactic by which to work toward that goal while at the same time experiencing some of its benefits here and now."
(Exert taken from page 101 of 'The Temporary Autonomous Zone')

Hakim Bey's invisible approach is not a counsel of despair which abandons the anarchists dream of freedom; but is rather a guerilla uprising which liberates an area (of land, of time, of imagination) and then dissolves itself to re-form elsewhere/elsewhen, before the state can crush it.

Hakim Bey puts forward many positive tactics for temporary autonomous zones such as the abandoning of the closed and patriarchal nuclear family in favour of a *band* of nomadic or semi-nomadic hunter/gatherer groups numbering around 30 to 50 people.

Page one hundred and seventy-one:

The Temporary Autonomous Zone is critical of revolution and of the 19th century anarchist utopian dream with its undercurrent of systematic ideology.

"Anarchism staggers around with the corpse of a Martyr magically stuck to its shoulders - haunted by the legacy of failure & revolutionary masochism."

"Between tragic Past & impossible future, anarchism seems to lack a present - as if afraid to ask itself, here & now, WHAT ARE MY TRUE DESIRES?"

But sadly, how many of us could answer this question without taking refuge in ideological platitudes or impotent consumer fantasies?

Hakim Bey suggests that if it is freedom we truly desire, then the Temporary Autonomous Zone can sidestep the state which is preoccupied with simulation and the spectacle.

Because the TAZ offers ways of gratifying our desires and our thirst for freedom, it can secretly occupy whole areas, both physical and mental, for quite some time and perhaps even for a whole lifetime?

Page one hundred and seventy-two:
Colin Ward is another anarchist thinker whose work has great relevance today.

(Colin Ward): "…an anarchist society, a society which organises itself without authority, is always in existence, like a seed beneath the snow, buried under the weight of the state and its bureaucracy, capitalism and its waste, privilege and its injustices, nationalism and its suicidal loyalties, religious differences and their superstitious separatism."

Both Colin Ward and Hakim Bey suggest that it is futile for those who truly desire freedom to wait for the vicious circle of revolution. They each reach the conclusion that far too often those who wish to destroy the existing order via revolution only wish to do so in order to replace it with its mirror image.

(Invisible Man): "Let us study invisibility, nomadism - and who knows what might happen."

"Anarchy is chaos - the principle of continual creation & chaos never dies"

Page one hundred and seventy-three:
"Since mankind's dawn, a handful of oppressors have accepted the responsibility over our lives that we should have accepted ourselves. By doing so, they took our power. By doing nothing, we gave it away."
Taken from '*V for Vendetta*' by the British comic scriptwriter Alan Moore.

"Anarchism does not mean bloodshed; it does not mean robbery, arson, or murder. These monstrosities are, on the contrary, the characteristic features of Capitalism and democracy. Anarchism means peace and freedom to all."

—August Spies, Haymarket Anarchist

Page one hundred and seventy-four:

ANARCHY ON THE WEB

SOME USEFUL WEBSITES:

Anarchy Archive (An excellent site that includes works by all the major anarchists, as well as bibliographies and pictures.):

http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/anarchist_archives/index.html

Spunk Library (despite the name this is a wonderful site jam-packed with informative and interesting articles etc.:

http://www.spunk.org/library/index/titleall.html or http://www.spunk.org/

Anarchy – Mid Atlantic Infoshop.org: ('A Guide to On-Line anarchy' News, views and reviews)

WWW.Infoshop.org

Freedom Press Home Page: (search through the freedom press archive, if that's your thing?)

WWW.ecn.org\freedom

Disinformation site: (weird and wonderful, always worth a look) **www.disinfo.org**

An Anarchist FAQ Webpage: (Useful stuff)

www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/1931/

Practical Anarchy (a nice website with plenty of articles and debate): **http://www.practicalanarchy.org/**

Anarchy for Anybody: (A site which includes some useful links) **http://www.radio4all.org/anarchy/**

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bakunin, Mikhail. *God and the State* (Dover Publications, New York, 1970).

Berkman, Alexander. *ABC of Anarchism* (Freedom Press, London, 1995).

Berkman, Alexander. *What is Communist Anarchism?* (Phoenix Press, London, 1989).

Bey, Hakim. *The Temporary Autonomous Zone* (Autonomedia, New York, 1991).

Blake, William. *Blake: Complete Writings* (ed. Keynes, G. Oxford University Press, 1972).

—, Marshall, Peter. *William Blake Visionary Anarchist* (Freedom Press, London, 1994).

Bookchin, Murray. *Toward an Ecological Society* (Black Rose Books, Montreal, 1980).

Bookchin, Murray. *Philosophy of Social Ecology* (Black Rose Books, Montreal, 1987).

Debord, Guy. *Society of the Spectacle* (Black & Red, Detroit, 1983).

Debord, Guy. *Comments on the Society of the Spectacle* (Verso, London, 1991).

—, Jappe, Anselm. *Guy Debord,* trans. Nicholson-Smith, D. (University of California Press, 1999).

Deleuze, Gilles. & Guattari, Felix. *Anti Oedipus: Capitalism & Schizophrenia*, (Athlone Press, London, 1996)

Deleuze, Gilles. & Guattari, Felix. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism & Schizophrenia*, (Athlone Press, London, 1999)

Deleuze, Gilles. & Guattari, Felix. *What is Philosophy?* (Verso, London, 1996)

Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology,* trans. Spivak, G. C. (Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1976).

Derrida, Jacques. *Margins of Philosophy*, trans, Bass, A. (Harvester Press, Brighton, 1982).

Derrida, Jacques. *Writing & Difference,* trans, Bass, A. (Chicago University Press, 1978).

Foucault, Michel. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of Human Sciences* (Routledge, London, 1990).

Foucault, Michel. *Madness & Civilization: a history of insanity in the age of reason* (Routledge, London, 1990).

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline & Punish: the birth of the prison* (Penguin, London, 1991).

Freedom Press Pamphlets. *Fighting the Revolution. 2 vol.* (Freedom Press, London, 1985).

Godwin, William. *Enquiry Concerning Political Justice,* ed. Kramnick, I. (Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1976).

—, Marshall, Peter. *The Anarchist Writings of William Godwin* (Freedom Press, London, 1986).

Goldman, Emma. *Anarchism and Other Essays* (Mother Earth Publishing Association, New York, 1910).

Goldman, Emma. *Living My Life. 2 vols.* (Dover Publications, New York, 1970).

—, Haarland, Bonnie. *Emma Goldman: Sexuality and the Impurity of the State* (Black Rose Books, Montreal, 1993).

Gray, Christopher. *Leaving the 20th Century: the Incomplete Work of the Situationist International* (Rebel Press, London, 1998)

Guérin, Daniel. *Anarchism,* trans. Klopper, M. (Monthly Review Press, New York, 1970).

Harper, Clifford. *Anarchy* (Camden Press, 1987).

Hoffman, Abbie. *Steal This Book* (Four Walls Eight Windows, London/New York, 1996).

Hoffman, Abbie. *The best of Abbie Hoffman* (Four Walls Eight Windows, London/New York, 1990).

Home, Stewart. ed. *What is Situationism?* (AK Press, London, 1996).

Hopton, A. ed. *Winstanley, Gerrard: Selected Writings* (Aporia Press, 1989).

Knabb, Ken. (ed. & trans.) *Situationist International Anthology* (Bureau of Public Secrets, California, 1989).

Kropotkin, Peter. *The State: Its Historic Role* (Trans. Richards, V., Freedom Press, London, 1997).

Kropotkin, Peter. *Anarchism & Anarchist Communism* ed. Walter, N. (Freedom Press, London 1993).

Kropotkin, Peter. *The Conquest of Bread* (Vanguard Press, New York, 1926).

Kropotkin, Peter. *Mutual Aid* (Heinemann, London, 1910).

Lowry, B. & Gunter, E.E. (ed. & trans.) *The Red Virgin: Memoirs of Louise Michel* (University of Alabama Press, 1981).

Lyotard, Jean-François. *The Postmodern Condition: a report on knowledge* (Manchester University Press, 1997).

Lyotard, Jean-François. *The Differend: Phrases in Dispute* (Manchester University Press, 1999).

Malatesta, E. *Anarchy*, trans. Richards, V. (Freedom Press, London, 1995)

—, Richards, Vernon. *His Life & Ideas* (Freedom Press, London, 1965)

Marcus, Greil. *Lipstick Traces: A Secret History of the 20th Century* (Picador, London. 1997).

Marx, Karl. *Selected Writings,* ed. McLellan, D. (Oxford University Press, 1977).

May, Todd. *The Political Philosophy of Postmodern Anarchy* (Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994).

Miller, David. *Anarchism* (Dent, London, 1984).

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Portable Nietzsche* (Viking Press, New York, 1954).

Parry, Richard. *The Bonnot Gang* (Rebel Press, London, 1987).

Perez, Rolando. *On An(archy) and Schizoanalysis* (Autonomedia, New York, 1990).

Pirsig, R. M. *Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance* (Vintage, London, 1989).

Plant, Sadie. *The Most Radical Gesture: The Situationist International in a Postmodern Age* (Routledge, London, 1995).

p.m. *Bolo Bolo* (Semiotext(e), New York 1995).

Proton, Richard. *Film & the Anarchist Imagination* (Verso, London, 1999).

Proudhon, Pierre-Joseph. *What is Property?* (Trans. Tucker, B. R. Dover Publications, New York, 1970).

Orwell, George. *Homage to Catalonia* (Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1986).

Reich, Wilhelm. *The Function of the Orgasm,* trans. Carfagno, V.R. (Souvenir Press 1999).

Reich, Wilhelm. *The Mass Psychology of Fascism,* trans. Carfagno, V.R. (Souvenir Press 1997).

Richter, Hans. *Dada: art & anti art* (Thames & Hudson, London, 1997).

Ridley, Matt. *The Origins of Virtue* (Viking, London 1996).

Rocker, Rudolf. *Anarchism & Anarcho-Syndicalism* (Freedom Press, London, 1988).

Sabine, G. ed. *The Works of Gerrard Winstanley* (Cornell University Press, 1941).

Stirner, Max. *The Ego and its Own* (Rebel Press, London, 1993).

Trocchi, Alexander. *Invisible Insurrection of a Million Minds: A Trocchi Reader*, ed. Scott, A. M. (Polygon, London, 1992).

Vague, Tom. *King Mob Echo + Supplement* (Dark Star, London, 2000).

Vague, Tom. *Anarchy in the UK: The Angry Brigade* (AK Press, London, 1997).

Vaneigem, Raoul. *The Revolution of Everyday Life* (Rebel Press/Left Bank Books, London 1994).

Viénet, René. *Enrage and the Situationists in the Occupation Movement, France, May '68* (Autonomedia/Rebel Press, New York/London, 1992).
Ward, Colin. *Anarchy in Action* (Freedom Press, London, 1996).
Woodcock, George. *Anarchism* (Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1963).
Zerzan, John. *Future Primitive & other essays* (Autonomedia/Anarchy, 1994).

Page one hundred and seventy-eight:

INDEX

Biographies

i@n hornsby occasionally visits University College Chichester where he enters large rooms filled with students and begins talking to them about issues related to the Arts and Humanities; they haven't asked him to stop yet so he figures on keeping it up until somebody points the finger and calls him a charlatan. Ian has written at length on both anarchy and Robert M. Pirsig and lives with the real architect and inspiration for this book, his teenage son, Tim. Ian is currently working on a book about 'The mating habits of nocturnal worms', he knows nothing about this subject either but says, "why let ignorance and a lack of talent hold you back".

Joseph Barber is a graduate of Portsmouth University where after three years of doodling and mayhem, the college gave him a degree in art and design; he was too polite to refuse this gift so took the accolade with a handshake and a smile. Joseph lives with his long suffering partner Tracy and their two sons Joe and Charlie. He started illustrating way back at the beginning of this book and has stopped now that it's finished.

Back cover Blurb

What is Anarchy? Is it the zenith of libertarian ideas or is it the end of civilisation? Is it a prescription for violence and disorder or an approach intent on providing freedom and an opportunity to fulfil individual desires? Is it the ultimate consequence of socialism or merely a naive belief in altruism and innate human goodness? **Introducing Anarchy** addresses these and many other questions by examining both the history and the present position of anarchist thoughts and actions.

In the following pages you will find an accessible and informative introduction to this wide ranging and extraordinary subject. You will meet many of the men and women who have written and fought for anarchist ideas and beliefs.

Introducing Anarchy is an illustrated guidebook to anarchist thought and begins by discussing the major anarchists of the nineteenth century; men and women like Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, Mikhail Bakunin, Peter Kropotkin and Emma Goldman. The book also investigates the relationship between anarchy and subjects such as ecology, psychology, the law, direct action, art, revolution and popular culture. The author also looks at the influence of anarchist thinking on the events of Paris in May 1968 and concludes by bringing anarchy into the twenty first century by examining anarchist views in the work of philosophers such as Michel Foucault, Jean-Francois Lyotard, Gilles Deleuze & Felix Guattari, Robert M. Pirsig and Peter Lamborn Wilson.

If you have dismissed anarchist ideas in the past for whatever reason; if you have lost faith in government, church and the state; or if you have distrusted politicians and those in positions of authority and power, then this book is for you, read on and discover for yourself what anarchy means to you.