

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI PADOVA

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, LAW,  
AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

**Master's degree in  
Human Rights and Multi-level Governance**



**ANARCHISM - BETWEEN IMPOSSIBLE SOCIO - POLITICAL  
PRACTICE AND POSSIBLE CULTURAL MOVEMENTS FOR  
LIBERTANIAN RIGHTS**

*Supervisor:* Prof. LORENZO MECHI  
*Co-Supervisor:* Prof. COSTANZA MARGIOTTA

*Candidate:* RUDCO STELIANA

Matriculation No. 121995

A.Y. 2021/2022



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### CHAPTER 1:

<b>1. Anarchist Reflections on the Typologies of Political Regimes.....</b>	
1.1. The Typology of Political Regimes: Quantitative Point of View.....	19
1.2. The Qualitative Perspective Over Political Systems.....	20
1.3. Confusions and Tangents About Democracy and Anarchy.....	21
1.4. Political considerations Over Anarchism as a political regime.....	22
1.5. Is Anarchy Viable?.....	25
1.6. Anarchy and Its degenerated form.....	26

### CHAPTER 2.

<b>2. The Reappearances of Anarchist Ideology Throughout History as a symbol of chaos, freedom and equality at the same time.....</b>	
2.1. Anarchism and Its Appearances in History from Antiquity until the Modern Age.....	28
2.2. Potential Anarchy and the legal theory of Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen.....	31
2.3. The Dictatorship of the Proletariat and Anarchism.....	32
2.4. Terror and Fear as the Foundation of Any government.....	34
2.5. The Marxism: The Dictatorship of the Proletariat or Revolutionary Dictatorship.....	35
2.6. What It's Like to Run Against the System?.....	38
2.7. The Dualism and Criticism of the "Legislator".....	39
2.8. Anarchism Against the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.....	40

### CHAPTER 3.

<b>3. Democratic and Revolutionary Dictatorships, The Problem of Its Duration, The Role of Proletariat and its role in International Relationships and Rights.....</b>	
3.1. The Theory of Mihail Aleksandrovici Bakunin, Seen as a Result of Various Anarchist Socialist Theories.....	44
3.2. Does the Proletariat Dictatorship Mean a New Despotic State?.....	47

3.3. Preaching A Pure Revolution.....	49
3.4. The Transitory Aspect of the Dictatorship and Subproletariat.....	55
3.5. Stalin and The Dictatorship of The Party.....	57
3.6. Democratic Anarchism or The Mature Form of Progressive Legitimate Regime.....	60
3.7. Anarchy in the Frames of International Law and Human Rights.....	64

## **CHAPTER 4.**

### **4. The Role of Anarchism as a Rebellious Educator in the Contemporary World. States that Survived Other Regimes and Live Now by Anarchic Rules. Anarchy as a Protest in Cultural Contemporary Society .....**

4.1. Anarchism as a Metaphor of Freedom in Contemporary Century.....	73
4.2. Anarchy - An Energetic but Gentle Dictatorship and Educational Influences.....	81
4.3. States that Fought Dictatorship and Despotism through Anarchy.....	92
4.4. Propaganda and Revolutionary Wave. Historical and Cultural Events that Influenced The Absorption of Anarchist Ideas From the End of Cold War Until Contemporaneity....	100
4.5. Feminist Movements and The Olympia Phenomenon.....	103
4.6. Punk Culture, The Aggressive Avant-Garde, Avant-Punk and Post-Punk.....	109
4.7. How Can We Live in An Anarchic Society? Is the Anarchy an Utopia or Anti-Utopia?...	113
4.8. Anarchic inclinations in contemporary protest and cultural movements .....	118

### **5. CONCLUSIONS.....124**

### **BIBLIOGRAPHY .....126**

## ABSTRACT

According to tradition, only three pure regimes - monarchy, aristocracy and democracy - are identified as being capable, under certain conditions, of achieving the "common good". This text suggests that a complete typology of political regimes must include anarchy not as a perverted form of democracy, but as an ideal type of pure political regime. The new typology should include monarchy (the reign of one), aristocracy (the reign of a minority), democracy (the rule of the majority) and anarchy (the self-government of all, by consensus, or the government of no one). In the end, it is necessary to remember that political life is not limited in the state, and that anarchy can be embodied - here and now - in communities and local and small political groups. The radical rejection of anarchy by philosophers who claim that its realization is impossible in our modern world is therefore deceptive and necessarily impoverishes our political thought.

What is the best political regime? This is the fundamental question to which Western political philosophy has traditionally taken it upon itself to answer, generally counting three pure types of regimes (monarchy, aristocracy and democracy) and a mixed regime (republic). Under certain conditions, those who exercise the power in these three pure regimes can seek, defend and promote the achievement of the "common good" for all of political community, as well as the "good life" for each of its members. Conversely, those who wield power in degenerate political regimes (tyranny, oligarchy, etc.) only seek to enjoy selfishness of a good life (from a material point of view rather than moral) to the detriment of the common good and the realization of a good life for their subjects. As for "anarchy", the philosophers and the most influential people in Western tradition have identified it as the degenerate and pathological form of democracy, understood here as its direct form where all citizens can participate in the assembly where political decisions are taken collectively and in the majority. To assimilate anarchy in this way to a distorted form of direct democracy constitutes a serious error which impoverishes political philosophy. On the contrary, I claim that a typology of political regimes must include anarchy not as a distorted form of democracy, but rather as one of the ideal types of regimes that legitimate policies. I will identify anarchy as a fourth type of pure political regime in which all citizens govern themselves together directly through consensual deliberations, without having recourse to an authority endowed with coercive apparatus. Therefore, It's about to offer a more complete and coherent picture of political regimes than does the tradition of Western political philosophy, and to demonstrate that anarchy should not be conceived

as a form derived from any of the other diets. To conduct this demonstration, it is first necessary to synthesize the quantitative discourse of political philosophers about pure types of political regimes, then to analyze the qualitative approach used by philosophers to distinguish between "good" and "bad" political regimes, then finally to discuss the nature of the anarchy. This approach, however, comes up against a major challenge, when anarchy is about to be distinguished from democracy. Particular attention will therefore be paid to the ambiguous relationship between these two regimes.

For more than two thousand years, the majority of influential Western philosophers confined themselves to identifying three ideal types of regimes pure politics: monarchy, aristocracy and democracy. Those regimes will sometimes receive different names depending on the philosopher (we swap, for example, aristocracy for oligarchy) and some philosophers will not always be constant and consistent in their manner to use this typology. Nevertheless, there are still three regimes left fundamental, mainly because this typology is based on a mathematical calculation since the official political authority can be in the hands of one (monarchy), a few (aristocracy) or all (democracy). This calculation is often presented as obvious, as with Aristotle for whom "it is necessary that either a single individual, a small number, or a large number." The Greek etymology of these diet names further emphasizes the mathematical basis of this typology. "Monarchy" comes from Greek and means government (kratia) of one (mona). "Aristocracy" also comes from the Greek, where aristos means "better". The aristocracy is therefore the regime in which the best rule. The term "better" suggests that there is a division between these and the others and that the aristocrats are a minority of individuals who are superior to the average person. An aristocracy therefore designates a regime in which a minority of individuals in the community wields power. Finally, the word "democracy" evokes the government of the "people", from the Greek demos. By democracy, traditional political philosophy means a democracy modeled on the Athenian model where all those who can claim the title of citizens - the people - have the opportunity to present themselves at the agora to participate in the Assembly and take part directly in the political decision-making process. If this typology is above all associated with classical philosophy, it will be taken up by historians of Antiquity and by philosophers and political actors at the beginning of modernity. During the debates surrounding the American War of Independence, for example, many texts - speeches, pamphlets, etc. - make explicit reference to this typology. Zabdiel Adams, cousin of the second President of the United States, John Adams, declared in a speech in 1782 that "three different modes of civil government were predominant among the nations of Earth, monarchy, aristocracy and democracy ". Aware that this first typology does not does not allow us to embrace all the complexity of political reality, some philosophers will believe it

is important to double this typology by identifying for each pure diet a possibly degenerate or pathological form.

Aristotle is the first to stress the importance of enriching the mathematical classification of regimes with a distinction linked to the morality of the regime. A regime is fair when its object is the common good, while an unjust regime is only for the good of the one or those who govern. Several philosophers will propose, following Aristotle, a typology of regimes which takes into account the moral aspect of the exercise of political authority. The risk of corruption is even higher in pure regimes than in their institutional structure. The Constitution prevents rulers from turning away from the research, defense and promotion of the common good, in order to unduly enjoy the power they have. The government of one then becomes a tyranny; the government of a few, an oligarchy; and the government of all, anarchy. This is where a new regime name comes in, the "republic." This notion somewhat muddies the waters. The name "Republic", from the Latin

"*respublica*" or "public thing", can be attributed to any fair regime, just as it can designate a mixed constitution made up of the three elements that embody the pure diets. A republic then proposes a balance of the various social orders, embodied by a monarch (or president), an aristocracy that sits in the Senate or House of Lords and the "people" who are represented by their delegates to the National Assembly or in the House of Commons, considered the democratic branch of the Republic. According to most political philosophers, including in the first place Aristotle and Cicero, this mixed constitution is necessarily a fair system because none of the three forces can impose his will on the other two. These three forces are neutralizing each other and are not able to impose their will, and the common good would come out on top. We can distinguish classical republicanism from modern republicanism. The first is based on an organic vision of the republic in which the three elements of society are brought together in the public sphere in order to jointly pursue the common good. Rather, modern republicanism is based on a mechanical vision where the various elements of a society pursue divergent interests (this is the modern idea of a pluralist society), in order to protect their privacy from public despotism, and it comes together to form a complex regime where the various powers are separated and balance each other. In its classic version as in the modern version, the republic is incompatible with a pure, absolute authority. Since the 19th century, politicians as well as philosophers, have become accustomed to using the term "democracy" (qualified as modern, liberal or representative) to designate the republic, so that the two names of regimes are today more or less synonyms. This modern "democracy" is nothing but a cousin far removed from the democracy of antiquity. Indeed, only those who at that time enjoyed the title of citizens could assemble at the agora and participate directly in the deliberative decision-making process. It was then the majority

that won (democracy as the rule of the majority). In what concerns modern "democracy", several forms of power coexist and compete within the formal political system itself. The majority of the people do not express their voice, even in the so-called democratic chamber, since it is only a extremely small minority of "representatives" who deliberate on behalf of of the majority or of the nation as a whole. As pointed out Jean-Jacques Rousseau, the majority only have the power to choose the small clique that will govern the whole community. As in comparison, would it be correct to label the term "monarchy" as a regime where an individual - called king or queen - would have the sole power to confirm every four or five years one or more individuals as representatives holding real powers and governing in his name? Such a regime would probably be recognized as being a false monarchy or an aristocracy. He could very well be called "monarchy", out of habit or for ideological reasons, despite its rather aristocratic character. Likewise, a regime in which the only power of the aristocrats would be to elect a single representative every four or five years who would govern in their name would probably be identified in fact as a monarchy. Modern "democracy", in which governs a clique of representatives elected by the people, therefore corresponds much more to an aristocracy (the rule of a minority) than to a democracy (the majority rule). The philosophical tradition has also recognized thereby. Aristotle, Spinoza, Montesquieu and many others, as well as several founders of modern republics (Thomas Jefferson and Maximilien Robespierre, among others), made it clear that the election - that is, the selection of a ruling elite – is by its aristocratic and anti-democratic nature. Modern "democracy" is therefore a "representative", "popular", "elective" or "liberal" aristocracy which is hidden under the misleading name of "democracy", following rhetorical games motivated by struggles policies. For the rest of this discussion, the word "democracy" will designate a regime in which the people govern themselves directly, a use which respects the meaning that this word had during nearly two thousand years in the philosophical tradition.

The mathematical relation established by the philosophical tradition between democracy (real and direct) and anarchy is based on a conceptual error in political philosophy with regards to attempt to understand the anarchy. If despotism (the reign of a single individual - the despot) cannot be distinguished from one point mathematical view of the monarchy (also the reign of one individual - the king), nor the oligarchy (the rule of a corrupt minority) of the aristocracy (the rule of the best), however, there is a clear mathematical difference between democracy and anarchy. Etymologically, "anarchy" comes from the Greek word "anarkhia", the root meaning "without", and "arkhia" meaning "military leader", which will subsequently designate a leader or ruler. From an etymological point of view, "anarchy" therefore means "absence of a chief". Mathematically it means zero (none) chief. If we refer to historical examples of anarchies (free communes, squats, militant groups, etc.), we will



see that there is no formal and official authority, no leader(s). And yet, anarchy is a form of political organization in which all members can participate directly in the decision-making process which is deliberative and collective, and during which the achievement of consensus will be sought. By respecting the mathematical rule of the traditional typology, it makes sense to add anarchy not as a corrupt form of democratic rule, but rather as *a particular form of political organization where no one exercises power over others*. Three questions then arise. First, is it legitimate to say that an anarchist community where there is no longer any government constitutes a political "regime"? Second, if it is a diet, is it sustainable and worth it seriously discussing? A final question refers to the qualitative element of diets: what is the pathological form of the anarchy ? These questions deserve answers.

Here we have to distinguish the concepts of "governing", "authority", "coercion", "power" and "violence" to better understand the specificity of anarchy. If we are loosely inspired by the distinction that proposes the philosopher Hannah Arendt, a political authority (exercised by a person, a minority or the majority) has the meaning to be coercive, and that can physically force an individual on which this authority is exercised to act or not to act at the will of an authority. The political authority has the physical meaning to impose its will in a coercive manner on individuals who suddenly lose their autonomy and freedom. Coercion is not synonymous with "power", according to Arendt, but with "violence" or threat of violence. All authority is potentially coercive and therefore violent. Still according to Arendt, power is distinguished from the violence: it is the result of a collective will constituted through a deliberation between free and equal individuals who seek to get along and give each other the power, or to achieve things together, to create a common world. From a theoretical point of view, anarchy does not mean so much the absence of government as the absence of leader(s), that is an official body of the authority. Citizens empower themselves to act collectively through their collective participation in the assembly, during which consensus is sought (to simplify, here I stick to the "political" sphere, although anarchism is also concerned with freedom, equality and self-management in other spheres including economics, love and sexuality, education, etc.). If we take up the myth of the social contract, anarchy would bring as a result a contract by which the contractors decide to live peacefully in common, but without delegating their sovereignty and their power to legislate to a political authority distinct from all citizens.

So there would be a popular assembly where common orientations would be discussed, but this assembly would seek to reach consensus rather than come up with a simple majority and this assembly would not have a coercive apparatus allowing it to impose its authority (coercion being useless when everyone agrees).

The preceding remarks demonstrate that it is possible to think of anarchy as a political regime by which a community accepts to govern itself without authority, that is to say without coercion or violence. This conceptual definition of anarchy must be understood within the framework of political theory. Political practice obviously responds to other imperatives when it is embodied in a world that is not, of course, so clear and orderly than philosophical typologies. Whether such an anarchist regime is possible from a military, economic or cultural point of view. This topic means a debate that deserves to be led, but too often philosophers have simply avoided thinking and discuss anarchy by claiming it is an unviable regime. In the real political world, anarchy, like other regimes, faces various challenges that threaten its stability and its consistency. And yet, many so-called traditional societies have sometimes functioned for millennia without political authority (neither State, nor police): the Inuit, the Pygmies, the Santals in India and the Tivs in Nigeria. More recently, experiments with anarchist organizations have taken place on a large scale (during Spain revolutionary of 1936-39, for example) and on a small scale (in municipalities or libertarian political groups). In anarchy, there is no leader (s) or authority exercising coercive power over people, because all govern together in a consensual manner, that means they are all agree with the collective decision. Introduce anarchy as a legitimate political regime therefore involves challenging the authority of a certain tradition in political philosophy, especially with regard to the definition of democracy inspired by mathematical considerations. Indeed, some political philosophers define democracy like the reign of the majority, but several like the government by all. Mathematical confusion is the result of a lack of distinction between the collective deliberative process and the taking decision itself. In conceptual and organizational terms, it may at first seem difficult to distinguish between democracy and anarchy: both regimes operate through a general assembly in which all citizens can participate and both regimes have no leader (s). But who says (directly) democracy does not have a lack of political authority and coercion? In a democracy, the assembly holds and exercises the authority which allows it - in the name of the general will - to make anyone obey him. According to the deliberation, the majority (many, but not all) will impose their will on the minority. Democracy is therefore the rule of the majority. In this which relates to authority and coercion, democracy is a regime where the majority (many) rule over the minority, and not a regime where decisions are made by all members of the community (consensus). If we stick to the mathematical logic of tradition of Western political philosophy, anarchy (the government by all) must therefore be distinguished from democracy (the reign of majority). Mathematically, "all" and "majority" are not synonyms and there is no mathematical correspondence between a democracy (the rule of the majority) and anarchy (the unaimous consensus). Therefore, to affirm - as philosophers do - that anarchy is the pathological form of democracy is equivalent to make a mathematical error. Anarchy cannot be the pathological form

of democracy for the simple reason that anarchy and democracy are not alike from a point of view mathematical.

Philosophers such as Marx, Nietzsche and Foucault, as well as sociologists and anthropologists have forcefully pointed out that the question of power, of its conservation and of its effects of domination and of resistance reactions, cannot be limited to the sole formal structure of the political regime. Whoever evokes these traditional societies without a state or a police force does not necessarily assert that there is no balance of power or situations of domination. In the same vein, one should not assume that a process of anarchist decision-making is free from tensions and social and psychological paradoxes. The search for consensus is a complex process in which social dynamics can arise psychological normalization, self-censorship, exclusion, etc.

Relationships of influence inevitably revolve around symbolic issues in an anarchist society. The realistic anarchist does not dream therefore no world without conflict or domination. But what is true for anarchy is also true for other types of political regimes: there is a multiplicity of forms, networks of informal authority and domination in a monarchy, aristocracy, democracy and republic. This remains true even if these regimes claim to be instituted for the common good. Anarchists, often inspired in this by radical feminists, have devised and experimented with several methods to answer to the problems of inequalities and informal domination in their communities and their political groups. Among these methods, we may mention the distribution of the floor in assembly by alternation between men and women (because the men in West are generally more inclined than women to speak in public, which gives them more influence in deliberations) and priority allocation of the floor to a person who is not still expressed in assembly, while others ask to speak for a second time, or more. It is also possible to practice role plays that help identify inequalities in ability influence, or to allow the temporary or permanent formation of single-sex groups made up of members of less influential sub-communities (women, for example) to help them to develop their self-esteem and strategies for dealing with more influential sub-communities (males, for example). In other words, and just like in other types of political regimes, not all anarchist communities offer exactly the same procedures in the decision-making process. These communities can adopt and adapt particular procedures and practices to cope with various challenges to their main values (freedom, equality, solidarity, consensus, common good) and they can modify them over time and with experience.

If the tyranny of the majority is the degenerate form of democracy, what is the degenerate form of anarchy? It is chaos, that is to say the absence of a collective political organization of common life. Here, the introduction of anarchy into the typology of political regimes reveals, while challenging it,

the simplicity of the mathematical scheme as traditionally proposed. Indeed, an individual, a minority or a majority which holds the authority can govern only for its interests which are incompatible with the common good. But if all govern by consensus, they cannot privilege their interests to the detriment of the common good. This does not mean that an anarchist assembly always makes wise decisions and executes them consistently. Anarchists can make mistakes and execute a consensus decision in such a way that it will cause unexpected problems for the community, which will harm the common good. Consensus, however, implies in principle that the decision is taken by all for the good of all, and not for the good of a few. Even if a consensual decision specifically concerns only part of the community (women or teenagers, for example), these decisions will be led by principles as freedom, equality, solidarity. Consensus is therefore by definition associated with the common good. But reaching consensus is not always easy. Moreover, within the conceptual framework of anarchy, a single individual has the capacity to block the process by opposing the majority insofar as he can block the achievement of consensus by expressing his dissent. If the pressure from the group is too strong, the individual who disagrees with others may decide to withdraw from the community and will no longer be bound by the consensus decision, nor its execution. It should be noted, moreover, that militant anarchist groups often grant the right to an individual who disagrees with the majority, to abstain or to say that he is "withdrawn" during a decision-making process if he is unwell. Faced with the decision is not the result of a fundamental disagreement, or the right to "block" (veto) the decision when there is a fundamental reason to oppose the majority. Those members who abstain and who block may act out of respect for the common good if they think the majority are wrong. Such methods can revive deliberation and lead the majority to reconsider its position and change their opinion, if the position of the dissident(s) appears in the thread of debates as the best for defense and promotion

of the common good. In practice, therefore, consensus is not synonymous with unanimity and anarchist communities can function even if members abstain or block a decision from time to time. However, anarchy is in danger of escalating if such attitudes - withdrawal or blocking - are inspired by interests, selfish, rather than out of considerations for the common good, or if the majority decides it is in their best interests to override the vote of dissidents. In such a situation, an individual, a minority or a majority, dissatisfied with the decision-making process or as to the decision itself, may state that the consensus process should be replaced by some other form of decision-making (by an individual, a minority or a majority). Such a crisis can lead to the overthrow of anarchy and the establishment of a monarchy, an aristocracy or a democracy. These political regimes can indeed be seen by some as solutions to the problems encountered in anarchy, or to be privileged because they would better serve their personal interests. So there is a tension - mutual rivalry - between regimes. That said, if the crisis remains confined within the conceptual

framework and political of anarchy, the regime passes from its pure form to its degenerate form, or chaos, that is, the dissolution of the community and the collective decision-making process. There is no when there is no longer any community or politics, since no one governs the community. From the mathematical perspective, we pass from all (anarchy) to zero (no one rules, so it's chaos). There is therefore no mathematical correspondence between anarchy and its degenerate form. Anarchy is a self-management by all, its form degenerate is the dissolution of the political, that is to say a situation where more nobody governs, where each one pursues only his personal interests to the detriment of those of the others. This discussion resulted in a new typology shown schematically in the table below.

If we accept to think of anarchy in its non-degenerate form, one can adopt either a pessimistic or an optimistic view. For the optimistic anarchist, it is only in a regime without formal authority(s) that the common good can be achieved. According to anarchism as a political philosophy, indeed, individuals in position of authority does not help social peace or the achievement of good common. The very exercise of formal authority changes the psychology and socio-political attitude of those who exercise it in such a way that they come to defend and promote as a priority their own authority rather than the common good. In short, as the exercise of authority inevitably corrupts the one who exercises it, any regime accepting formal authority is corrupt and incapable to defend and promote the common good. Consequently, anarchy offers the only conceptual and practical solution for the achievement of the common good understood as the good of all members of a community. Viewing political authority with such suspicion, the anarchist would be tempted to practice an arithmetical simplification where one would end up with a binary combination: on the one hand anarchy, on the other hand, tyranny which designates all other forms of regimes policies. But the supporters of republics or mixed regimes (Aristotle, Montesquieu, Madison) impose more restraint on the anarchist. Although imperfect, the relative balance of official political forces (between the presidency, the upper house and the lower house) and their separation (between the executive, the legislature and the judiciary), as well as the Charters of Rights adopted by many liberal republics, make it possible - in principle - to prevent the political authority is pure violence. Yet modern "democracy" is lacking, despite its inspired institutional organization. republican, with a real democratic element: there is no popular assembly where the people can directly express their will. Such a lack encourages authoritarian tendencies within modern republics. Moreover, even if such a democratic element was integrated by modern republics, this would only add a an additional form of authority, that of the majority. A pessimistic anarchist will say that the very idea of the "common good" is an invention of the rulers to fool the ruled. Monarchs as well as aristocrats and representatives claimed to rule for the common good. According to the anarchists pessimistic, each

society is made up of divergent interests, even opposites, and there will always be one or a few individuals who will not accept the way of being anarchist and against whom the anarchist regime will have to exercise some form of coercion (excluding them or by eliminating them). Even more problematic, there would be a plurality of ways of being an anarchist and self-proclaimed individuals "Anarchists" would undoubtedly be unable to get along during of a consensual deliberative process on a definition of the common good and even less on how to defend and promote it. In this sense, an anarchist regime is only an ideal-type forever unfinished. Such tension between optimistic and pessimistic anarchism does not prevent anarchy from finding its place in political philosophy as a type of regime that can inspire thought rather than provoke mockery and hatred. The silence shown political philosophy regarding anarchy as a type of regime possibly legitimate deprives the political imagination of a stimulating subject for reflection. Anarchism also invites us not to think of the policy exclusively in global and strategic terms. The philosophical tradition which revolves around the typology of regimes tends to conceive of political communities as groups defined as a whole by the nature of the political authority. Classical thinkers of anarchism, like Proudhon and Kropotkin, contemporary anarchists like John Clark and Todd May, as well as political philosophers like Michel Foucault and the "postmodernists" in various ways indicate other avenues for reflection, and thought may discover to follow them in a number of ways. Political world is made up of margins, interstices, intertwining and tactical balance of power. The West is now dominated by impure regimes, embodying the traditional principles of republicanism: balance and separation of the various authorities. On the territories they occupy. However, places may appear where politics is lived according to other principles. Anarchism is a political philosophy that drives any non-authoritarian mode of political organization, starting from a local level and hidden in the shadows of everyday life. Consequently, it can be embodied as well in groups policies than in squats, newspapers and publishing houses, self-managed businesses, etc.

Anarchism can be experienced here and now, and different conceptions of anarchism inspired by particular sensitivities and experiences can lead to organizations distinct from each other. The radical rejection of anarchism by political philosophers who claim that its achievement is impossible is therefore unreasonable and impoverishes our thinking philosophy and our understanding of the complexity of reality.

The objective of the research is to analyze the political and security conception that anarchists have education and understand the importance of this topic and its role in their political struggle. It is part of the field of political theory. Given that the anarchists are actively involved in education by opening schools, how did they manage to reconcile the anarchist ideals with the pedagogic practice?

More specifically, our research question is as follows: whereas anarchism advocates autonomy, including in education, the educational project of anarchists in fact represent indoctrination into anarchist ideology and militant recruitment, as some critics claim – which would mean that there is a logical and political contradiction between the stated objective on the one hand, and on the other, the means used and the result obtained - or an emancipatory education? This thesis challenges political science since it refers to related issues, including autonomy, authority, neutrality of knowledge and indoctrination. Through example, the anarchists criticize the false neutrality of the liberal school, while they, they are also accused of indoctrinating their students in anarchist schools. This question of neutrality is linked to that of the social autonomy of individuals, that education is supposed to allow. There is also the question of what type of individual to train, and for which company? And if we want to train individuals to function in systems other than current society, should we resort to social pressure to achieve social cohesion outside of valued norms in this company? Education would lead to the creation of new women and new men, through an education conceived as a process of social transformation in the here and now. These are the questions core of political science that will be developed and analyzed through this work. This research will be based on anarchist writings and educational theories. The anarchist thought on education will be studied from the writings of authors recognized anarchists from the late 19th century and early 20th century. It was during this period that anarchist writings on education were the most developed. The practical experiences of anarchist education analyzed in the research are just a few examples from the many experiences anarchist education which has developed since the end of the 19th century. We present the Prévost orphanage in Cempuis (France) run by Paul Robin from 1880 to 1894, the Modern School of Francisco Ferrer, opened from 1901 to 1906 in Barcelona and finally La Ruche by Sébastien Faure, active from 1904 to 1917 in France, in Rambouillet. These experiments were selected because of their importance in the anarchism and the influence they had on subsequent experiences, and the availability of documentary sources. Moreover, it would have been impossible, in the context of this thesis, to list all the educational experiences anarchist having been developed. In addition, several of these experiences have been ephemeral, leaving few traces. We can think of Madeleine Vernet's orphanage, The Social Future (1906-1923), schools created by the Mujeres Libres movement in Spain in civil war of the years 1936-1939, the Ferrer school (1910-1919), founded in Lausanne (Switzerland) by Jean Wintch following the principles of Francisco Ferrer, to all the Modern Schools inspired by Francisco Ferrer and open a little all over the world (United States, Spain, Belgium, Italy, Brazil and Mexico). Also inspired by Francisco Ferrer, the anarchist community of Gouliiaï-Polié, in Ukraine, organized itself to open primary and secondary schools in the spirit of the Modern School between 1917 and 1921. However, certain concepts should be

introduced, in particular on education and especially concerning anarchism.

What is education? It is more difficult than you might think at first to answer this question. the word indeed implies so many things. Olivier Reboul, French philosopher specialist in education, studied this question based on definitions of dictionary which he considers unsatisfactory (1971). He therefore proposes the following: "education is the action which enables a human being to develop his physical abilities and intellectual as well as their social, aesthetic and moral feelings in order to to accomplish his task as a man; it is also the result of this action ". The terms "educate" and "education" appeared in the 14th or 15th century. They derive from the Latin "educare", meaning "to take care of". Education is not limited to the school environment and is therefore different education, which establishes a political link, guaranteeing citizenship. Instruction therefore trains citizens. Education, on the other hand, is mainly concerned with development of the person. Education is different from learning, which is the acquisition of skills and know-how, through practice, of what one wants to acquire. These are trials, errors and their overcoming. Finally, teaching is different from education in that it aims at understanding, through the transmission of knowledge. Thus, it allows the entry of children in the human community, because its aim is human culture and the formation of judgment. For Franc Morandi, educational thought poses the question of social educability, rational, political and human ethics. The term, under the Old regime, in France, includes an idea of dependence, thus designating as much the "Children" in today's sense as low-income people. Education is therefore linked to childhood, a term whose primary meaning is "he who does not can talk. »The education developed then is a turnaround against childhood, considered a sin following the influence of Saint-Augustine.

Education is not a technique. It can teach techniques, skills practices, but it is not separable from the ends it pursues, which are not techniques. In addition, it has a limit: the freedom of a conscience, which is also its object. Education is in part defined according to the goals it sets out to achieve. However, these are far from universal. They change according to the authors, the theories of education, eras. The goals of anarchist education differ from those of liberal education, which is the conception of education that is attacked the anarchists, because being dominant in society. This debate shows that education is always part of a culture, a society, of values, which it is therefore always political. For Emma Goldman, anarchist activist and feminist of Russian origin who immigrated in the United States, education must enable the individual to be fulfilled. She defines her conception of education as follows: "If education should really mean anything at ali, it must insist upon the free growth and development of the innate forces and tendencies of the child. In this way alone can we hope for the free individual "(Goldman, 1972, p. 115). It is in this sense that the education offered by



the anarchists is an emancipatory. This insistence on the development of the child while respecting his personality and fields of interest is also very present in the New Education (Ehm, 1936, p. 36). Another definition found in the literature is that of liberal education, sometimes opposed to integral education (Hameline, 2004, p. 47-65). For Peters, liberal education can be interpreted in three ways. First, like the pursuit of knowledge for the sake of knowledge, not for instrumental ends. Then like general education, as opposed to too much specialization and compartmentalization of knowledge. Finally, as an education that does not impose dogmatic restrictions on the mind. It would be the opposite of indoctrination and authoritarianism (Peters, 1977, p. 47-48). Thus, liberal thinkers as well as anarchists have opposed a too much compartmentalization of knowledge which locks individuals into a number limited tasks. However, as the Liberals demand an education essentially intellectual, the anarchists demand an integral education, in order to that everyone should be both scientists and workers (Bakunin, 2005, p.175).

In an age of globalization, asking what would be the best possible regime leads to imagine seven political configurations staggered between the preservation of the interests of national states on the one hand and, on the other, the idea of a world state. Each option has its advantages and its limits, enlightened by the American philosopher who shows his preference for an advanced pluralist system, which would promote peace while maximizing justice, cultural diversity and individual freedoms. Each political regime has advantages and disadvantages, and the most dangerous in any regime is the imbalance or the impossibility to control the functionality of all state bodies. State security is in greater danger in an anarchic or dictatorial regime, but democracy does not guarantee a strictly better evolution, because everything depends on a single factor - the human factor.

## **CHAPTER 1:**

### **1. Anarchist Reflections on the Typologies of Political Regimes**

- 1.1. The Typology of Political Regimes: Quantitative Point of View
- 1.2. The Qualitative Perspective Over Political Systems
- 1.3. Confusions and Tangents About Democracy and Anarchy
- 1.4. Political Considerations Over Anarchism as a Political Regime
- 1.5. Is Anarchy Viable?
- 1.6. Anarchy and Its Degenerated Form

*“The anarchist”, wrote Theodore Roosevelt “is the enemy of humanity, the enemy of all mankind, and his is deeper degree of criminality than any other”.* These “criminals” from the years 1880 to 1920 were vilified by the press, they were imprisoned and beaten by the police, and, in many cases, deported and executed by the federal government. In France, as estimated, 10000 of them were butchered when the Paris Commune fell in 1871. But, during 1890, anarchism was adopted as a philosophy by lots of avant-garde artistic and literary figures such as the painters Georges Seurat, Gustave Courbet, Camille Pissarro and many writers including Paul Adam and Octave Mirbeau. The anarchist movement has a long and ancient tradition in Italy and because of that it has become a point of reference for all international anarchism. Its history can be divided into four phases: the resurgence of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the 1900’s to the advent of fascism, the fascism period and the postwar period till today. In Russia under the Tzars, thousands were rounded up by the law enforcement and shot like a bunch of dogs in the streets under the Soviets, thousands more were captured by the Cheka and sent in Siberian mines to work till death. After all these listings you might be asking yourself who these people are and why were they treated so brutal

*“Turns out, most of these people that were considered enemies to mankind were already members of oppressed and marginalized groups such as exiles, immigrants, refugees, artists, dissidents, freethinkers, women, homosexuals and ethnic minorities. They published newspapers and pamphlets, organized cooperatives and unions, initiated protests, strikes and demonstrations, preached “the idea” from street corners and even soapboxes, struggled militantly against a system that, far from being beneficent, appeared in their view fundamentally opposed to the goals of freedom, equality and peace.”*

Those people helped to achieve an eight-hour working day, the enactment of safety regulations in the work place, the abolition of child labor, the minimum wage and many other thing

### 1.1. The Typology of Political Regimes: Quantitative Point of View

Literally, we can easily associate the term of *''anarchism''* with a revolution, rebellion or significant change of the well-known social order. A revolution that operates legally is not a revolution, that is a simple political transaction. That doesn't imply the application of violence, instigation of chaos, hooliganism, vandalism or terrorism. Terror was mostly used by monarchs, autocrats, absolutists and totalitarians during different phases of human history. Terror was and still is the weapon that people use against their enemies, terror is the cornerstone, it is the foundation of some governments and political philosophies.

Someone with a great opinion is *Hegel's critique*: ''Marx's sovereignty and democracy do not acknowledge the predominant role that Hegel attributes to the "political state" to the detriment of "civil society" in which individuals, their problems and interests are as if neglected. Marx is deeply critical of certain pages of *Hegel's Philosophy of Law*, Hegel states:

*"How the spirit is real only in so far as it is known, and how the state, as the spirit of the people, is at once the law which penetrates all relations, the morals and the constitution of these individuals, and it causes a relationship of interdependence. The constitution of the people generally depends on the way in which the self-consciousness of a nation is formed."*

Marx also reports that *"we are dealing with trivialities", because a constitution must "logically" progress with consciousness" and" to progress once with humanity" which is possible only if mankind becomes the principle of the constitution"*.

Over turning this report, Hegel turns out to be a sophist in this case. In Plato's most famous dialogue, *The Republic*, Socrates falls into conversation with the bold and intimidating Thrasymachus, who was a sophist- that is one who offers instructions on how to argue a case, no matter its merit. In order to define the "general character of the constitution and the laws", Hegel specifies the notion of the sovereignty state, which must be related to the power of the prince. The sovereignty state is based on the fact the particular functions and powers of the state have no independence and no basis either in themselves or in the particular will of individuality but are rooted in the unity of the state.

In Marx's view, the Hegelian view of the state sovereignty betrays to its author an abstract and quasi-mystical conception of the state. Hegel conceives of the function and activities of the state in

an abstract way and forgets that the particular individual is a human and that the function and activities of the state are human functions.” If Hegel was one of the subjects of the state, as the foundation of the state, he would not have needed to let the state, in a mystical way, become the subject. Ignoring *“this fundamental defect,” according to Marx, “what matters to Hegel is the presentation of the monarch as the true “Man-God” as the real incarnation of the idea. Thus for Hegel the sovereignty state is reduced to the monarchy.”*

## 1.2. The Qualitative Perspectives Over Political Systems

The ideas of domination and conquest will be specified in the notion of dictatorship of the proletariat, one of the first mentions of which, if not the first, appears in an article in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* in March 1850. The expression reappears in the *Class Struggle in France*, between 1848-1850, where Marx analyses in more detail the historical reasons for the republican success of the Paris days of February 1848 and of the workers' defeat in June. In an essay on the "June 1848 Defeat," Marx extols the February Revolution, which was *"a beautiful revolution, a revolution of general sympathy."* In retaliation, he condemned the June Revolution, *"a hideous revolution, a repulsive revolution"* which, as a result of the revenge of the bourgeoisie, allowed the Constituent Assembly to overthrow General Cavaignac with quasi-dictatorial powers. Marx resumes the words *"the bold revolutionary slogan: The overthrow of the bourgeoisie! The dictatorship of the working class!"* He returns to this expression in his essay on the *"Consequences of June 13, 1849"*, in which he analyses the characteristics of the *"so-called party of social democracy, party of the Red Republic,"* christened by his opponents *"party of anarchy."*

The program can be summarized as follows: *"Revolt against the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie; the need for change in society; the maintenance of republican democratic institutions; the regrouping around the proletariat as a decisive revolutionary force."* Marx thus opposes the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, fatal and evil, to the dictatorship of the proletariat, of that proletariat which is increasingly grouped around revolutionary socialism, around communism, for which the bourgeoisie itself invented Blanqui's name. This socialism is the dictatorship of the permanent revolution, the class dictatorship of the proletariat as the necessary transition point to the abolition of all class differences, to the abolition of all the relations of production on which it is based, to the abolition of all social relations, corresponding to these relations of production. to upset all the ideas that arise from these relationships.

The dictatorship of the proletariat, also called the *"revolutionary dictatorship"*, is a dictatorship as beneficial as it is desirable in contrast to that of the bourgeoisie, which it designates as bourgeois terrorism. In 1850, in the revolutionary program from the first article from the Universal Society of Revolutionary Communists, Marx and Engels promote them as representatives of the League of Communists, supported by an English "chartist", George Julien Harney, and by emigrants who were French supporters of Blanqui.

*"The aim of the association is to abolish all the privileged classes, in order to subject these classes to the dictatorship of the proletarians, maintaining the revolution permanently until the realization of communism, which must be the last form of constitution of the human family."*

In this article, the Marxist notion of dictatorship seems to have lost its essential provisional character, in order to acquire a character of permanence until the triumph of the revolution. Despite the break with the Blanquists in September 1850, this first Marxist conception of the *"dictatorship of the proletariat"* was marked by Blanqui's influence and, in all likelihood, dependent on the Jacobin dictatorial experience and the Babuvist vision of revolutionary strategy. However, Marx wants to emphasize his personal contribution to this conception, the invention of which he claims it, in a way or another.

### **1.3.Confusion and Tangents About Democracy and Anarchy**

For individualist anarchists, "the system of democracy, of majority decision, is held null and void. Any impingement upon the natural rights of the person is unjust and a symbol of majority tyranny". Libertarian municipalist Murray Bookchin criticized individualists anarchists for opposing democracy and said that majority rule is consistent with anarchism. While preferring the term assembly rather than democracy, Bookchin renounced anarchism to identify himself as an advocate of Communalism.

On 15 June 2020, the President of the United States delivered a speech (at a White House press conference) in which he claimed that an area of Seattle had been occupied by a far-left group. "These people have taken over a vast part, for the most part, a very good part of a place called Seattle," President Trump said. to see before we do something, I'd like to see the press get in there and cover it ". In response to this threat, which is likely to spread ("The problem with what happened in Seattle is it spreads. And all of a sudden they'll say, 'Let's do some other city. And let's do another one.' we're not going to let it happen.", the American leader proposed a solution of 'pacification' through the

intervention of the army. In parallel, we saw footage of the "free zone" in which a "check" is made at the entrance and in which the headquarters of the police station was "renamed" also as the headquarters of the police, but of the "people", to show that the protesters I want to reform the current police service (as in any city in the United States, the police is a local government service, similar to our local police). In other words, the "anarchists" do not deny any need for order, but only deny the right of a certain authority to be the order enforcement body. The attribution of the monopoly to state "violence" is practically denied.

#### **1.4. Political Considerations Over Anarchism as a Political Regime**

In 1999 activists in Seattle spectacularly sabotaged the meeting of the World Trade Organisations. The event launched what became known as the alterglobalization or global justice campaign, a complex, anti-capitalist "movement of movements" widely described as anarchist. The same year, James Bond went head-to-head with Victor Zokas aka Renard in the movie *The World Is Not Enough*. Renard, an ex-Soviet army and KGB officer, brutal even by the standards of Bond's antagonists, is also reportedly anarchist. His back story tells how he worked as a freelance assassin for anti-capitalists organizing before the alterglobalization movement fell under the media spotlight.

On one level, it is easy to distinguish the fact from the fiction. Renard is an invention of scriptwriters and moviemakers. The Seattle shutdown of the WTO is documented history. Yet on another level, the attribution of the anarchist label to both the killer and the street movement is confusing: the fiction appears to capture something about the reality. Film-goers may have to suspend their disbelief about the bullet permanently lodged in Renard's brain, but the emotional instability his injury explains and which underpins his anarchism hardly seems demanding. On the contrary, his ruthlessness and single-mindedness play to a deeply rooted view of anarchism which continues to influence public analysis of activist movements. Admittedly, the anarchism of the alterglobalizers was not automatically condemned as sadistic, aggressive or vengeful, but leading politicians of the time commented on the dangerous mix of vandals and carnival clowns it attracted: the movement was by turns dismissed as unbalanced and unthinking. And once street protests resulted in property damage, as in Gothenburg in 2001, it was possible for authorities to mobilize against "anarchists" in its ranks. Both before and since, the use of the 'A' word has provided a green light to aggressive policing. The global justice movement was no exception. The protesters who converged in Genoa in 2001 for the meeting of the G8 met with savage police violence.

The cultural stereotypes of the anarchist that furnish Renard's characterization are not only distorting, they are also disabling. They conceal a history of critique and resistance that is empowering and normalize practices that are discriminatory and oppressive, even in instances where unfairness and injustice are patently obvious and widely acknowledged. Being anarchist means challenging the status quo to realize egalitarian principles and foster co-operative, non-dominating behaviours. Anarchist actions can take multiple forms, many of which are easily absorbed into everyday life. As we will see in the following pages, Renard is far from being anarchism's default setting.

The word anarchism is used as synonyms for "chaos" or "social disorder", so it is implicitly stated that anarchists want a return to the "law of the jungle". I have shown that anarchism is against authority, not social order. A key question is who is in charge if not an authority. The classic anarchist answer is that order will come naturally with the proposed social organization: anarchy.

*Errico Malatesta: "Since it is believed that government is necessary and without it there can only be disorder and confusion, it has become natural and logical to say that anarchy, which means the absence of government, should sound like the absence of order."*

Change this opinion, convince the public that government is not only unnecessary but extremely harmful and the word anarchy, just because it means the absence of government, will become clear to everyone: natural order, union of human needs and desires of all and complete freedom within complete solidarity. Note that anarchism is not the first political theory wrongly stated (intentionally or unintentionally) that it brings chaos and confusion. The monarchists said the same about the Republic during its appearance.

Some like to define anarchism etymologically by tracing the roots of the doctrine to the ancient Greek word *anarchia*. This translates roughly as '*the government of no one*'. Self-identifying anarchists have done this too, usually to draw attention to the oppression they claim government entails and the equality anarchists advocate. While monarchists accept the government of one, anarchists call for the government of no one. It's a powerful strapline and easy to understand. The problem with it is that it situates anarchism in a framework of government that uses the rejection of anarchy for its justification. So anarchy immediately becomes a condition of disorder. In political thought, the same applies. The prevailing view is that human beings want to escape from the inconvenience or violence of anarchy and, because they have to wit to do so (uniquely, we are told),

they submit to government. Anarchy is the order they run away from. It implies chaos, sometimes vigilantism, sometimes mob rule, and it cannot guarantee peace or security.

How then, should we start thinking about anarchism? Finding a starting point that fits the spirit of the subject is difficult because anarchists typically resist the categorization of their movements and principles. They are usually suspicious of attempts to fix anarchism's origins, either in time or space, and they reject selective accounts that lavish special attention on particular historical figures. Why? Because labelling looks like an attempt to determine boundaries that anarchists themselves have not fixed, because the identification of origins seems an unwelcome first step towards the ideological construction of a set of fixed traditions that anarchists prefer to see as permeable and fluid, and finally, because dating and locating the emergence of anarchism to the foundation of particular groups appears both arbitrary and exclusionary. This last move can also create a Eurocentric bias which is exaggerated and further distorted by the elevation of special individuals or identification of key texts. Overall the effect is to attribute the power of anarchist invention to a collection of individuals of particular genius-characteristically, white men- who cleverly articulated a great idea, parcelled it up and exported it across the world.

My entry point is that anarchism began to emerge as a distinctive movement in mid-nineteenth-century Europe- France, Germany, Italy and Spain- in a period of European state dominance. That is not to say that it appeared as ready-made or that this location fixes anarchism's ideology. What I would like to suggest is that anarchism emerged through critical engagement with other radical and progressive movements and in the face of concerted opposition from conservative and reactionary forces. This circumstance gave anarchism a particular political flavour. Anarchists came to be distinguished from non-anarchists by their responses to specific issues and events. They are frequently identified by their expulsion from other political groups and by the targeted repression of religious and government institutions.

My second proposition is that anarchism was elaborated by critics as well as figures like P.-J.-P. Proudhon, Michael Bakunin, Louise Michel and John Most who proudly called themselves anarchists. For the first group, the writings and practices of these anarchists were critically important to its ideological construction. Some early commentators understood that there was a relationship between the principles that anarchists expounded and the movements they were associated with. But even though they realized that anarchism was not a conventional philosophy, they still focused their attention on a small number of key figures. So while the field of anarchist studies is extremely wide (there are no key statements, no primary modes or sites for action, just endless examples of resistance,



reaction and re-recreation), it is still possible to talk about anarchist traditions. Anarchism has been shaped by multiple histories and experiences which are recognizably anarchist because the branding of anarchism in the nineteenth century by advocates and opponents alike makes it possible to identify family resemblances across time and space.

### **1.5. Is Anarchy Viable?**

After answering the questions above I have got a lot to say about anarchy, some good, some not so, but anyway lets start on why anarchy is a very sensitive and fragile ideological, ethical and political form. First of all anarchy is mostly known for its wild protests and free people that think in life got no rules or consequences that can be controlled and monitorized by any system, on the other hand people that think freely, are not easily manipulated and can make their own decisions that will help the entire society to evolve and progress. In general I do think that anarchy is viable. The break-up of the International Workingmen's Association (IWMA or First International) in 1872 is sometimes said to be the watershed moment for the European anarchist movement. In histories of socialism the split tends to be seen as the point at which the movement divided into two separated wings, one Marxist and the other anarchist. This is a simplification. The significance of the First International's collapse grew only as hostilities between anarchists and Marxists deepened, and it is more obvious in retrospect than it was at the time. In itself, the split left the designation of socialists uncertain. However, the timing of the collapse was indeed important for the subsequent development of the socialism. For those who adopted the label anarchist the collapse of the IWMA crystallized an understanding of the state that had been discussed until that time in largely abstract terms.

The First International had been founded in London in 1864 by British and French labour leaders to advance workers' struggles against exploitation. Members were committed to a number of principles, but two were particularly significant: the idea that the struggle for emancipation could only be achieved by workers themselves, and the belief that class equality transcended distinctions based on colour, creed or nationality. This was the commitment to internationalism. Beyond these general rules little else kept the IWMA together, and throughout its history the association was plagued by factional rivalries and disputes.

### **1.6. Anarchy and its Degenerated Form**

Anarchists have often been portrayed as dangerous and violent due mainly to a number of high-profile violent acts including riots, assassinations and insurrections involving anarchists. However, the use of terrorism and assassination is condemned by most anarchist ideology, although there remains no consensus on the legitimacy or utility of violence. Some anarchists have opposed coercion while others have supported it, particularly in the form of violent revolution on the path to anarchy. One estimate of the economic impact of the anarchic border blockades puts it as high as a billion dollars a day. Estimates from Export Development Canada are lower, at about \$600 million US a day in trade delays at three blockaded crossings.

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **2. The Reappearance of Anarchist Ideology Throughout History as a symbol of chaos, freedom and equality at the same time**

- 2.1. Anarchism and Its Appearances in History from Antiquity until the Modern Age
- 2.2. Potential Anarchy and the legal theory of Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen
- 2.3. The Dictatorship of the Proletariat and Anarchism
- 2.4. Terror and Fear as the Foundation of Any government
- 2.5. The Marxism: The Dictatorship of the Proletariat or Revolutionary Dictatorship
- 2.6. What It's Like to Run Against the System
- 2.7. The Dualism and Criticism of the "Legislator"
- 2.8. Anarchism Against the Dictatorship of the Proletariat

## **2.1 Anarchism and Its Appearances in History from Antiquity until the Modern Age**

The history of anarchism is as unclear as anarchism itself. It is difficult for scholars and scholars to define the term anarchism itself, which makes it difficult to outline its history, or to make it clear and concise. There are a number of landmarks on anarchism and its history. Some consider anarchism to be a distinct, well-defined movement from the 19th and 20th centuries, while others identify anarchist traits long before the first civilizations existed.

In formal prehistoric society we can say that there were a variety of hierarchies, which some anthropologists have described as similar anarchism. Some of the first signs of widespread anarchism were found in Greece and China, where philosophers expressed the need for the individual to live individually by the constraint of society. During the Middle Ages, some religious sects adopted libertarian thought and the Age of Enlightenment, and the widespread rise of rationalism and science signaled the birth of the anarchist movement that continued into the modern era.

We can define anarchism in the gloomy society as a revolutionary movement of the workers themselves, along with Marxism at the end of the nineteenth century. Some of the characteristics that sustained the development and spread of anarchism were: modernism, industrialization, reaction to capitalism, and mass migration. communism, anarcho-syndicalism, and individualistic anarchism. As the labor movement grew, so did the division between anarchists and marxists. The two currents formally split at the Fifth Congress of the First International in 1872, and the events that followed did not help close the gap. The anarchists enthusiastically participated in the Russian Revolution, but as soon as the Bolsheviks established their authority, the anarchists were severely harsh, especially in Kronstadt and Ukraine.

During the Spanish Civil War, narcissism played a very important role, when the anarchists established an anarchist territory in Catalonia. Revolutionary Catalonia was organized along anarcho-syndicalist lines, with strong unions in the cities and collectivized agriculture in the country, but the war ended with the defeat of the anarchists and their allies and the solidification of fascism in Spain. In the 1960s, especially in association with the New Left, anarchism reappeared as a global political and cultural force. Since then, anarchism has influenced social movements that support personal autonomy and direct democracy.

There has been some controversy over the definition of anarchism and its history. While the first group examines anarchism as a phenomenon that took place in the nineteenth century, the second group is concerned with analyzing ancient history to trace the roots of anarchism. The anarchist philosopher Murray Bookchin describes the continuation of the "*legacy of freedom*" of mankind (that is, of the revolutionary moments) that has existed throughout history, in contrast to the "*legacy of domination*" of states, capitalism, and other organizational forms.

Some of the three most common forms of defining anarchism are "etymological" (anarchism, without a leader, but anarchism is not just a denial); "*Antistaticism*" (although this seems essential, it certainly does not describe the essence of anarchism); and the definition of "*anti-authoritarianism*" (denial of any authority that oversimplifies anarchism). The question of whether it is a philosophy, a theory or a series of complicated actions along with the definition debates. A professor of philosophy Alejandro de Agosta proposes that anarchism is "a decentralized federation of philosophers, as well as practices and ways of life, formed in different communities and affirming various geohistories."

Many scholars of anarchism, including anthropologists Harold Barclay and David Graeber, argue that some form of anarchy dates back to prehistory. The longest period of human existence was experienced without a separated class of established authority or formal political institutions. autonomous companies without special leadership or political class.

One of the most controversial ideologies that absorbed the anarchist theory is Taoism. Taoism was formed and developed in ancient China, which was linked to the anarchist thinking of some geopolitical scholars. Taoist thinkers Lao Tzu and Zhuang Zhou, whose principles were based on an "*anti-political position and a rejection of any involvement in movements or political organizations*" have developed a philosophy of "*non-government*" in Tao Te Ching and Zhuangzi. There is an ongoing debate over whether urging leaders not to lead is somehow an anarchist goal. In the Wei-Jin period a new generation of anarchist-minded Taoists emerged. Taoism and neo-Taoism had principles more associated to philosophical anarchism- an attempt to erase the social habit that states the

government and question its morality. Schools of thought were pacifist, unlike their Western counterparts a few centuries later.

Some deep-rooted beliefs and ideas of modern anarchists were first expressed in ancient Greece. The first known political use of the word anarchy (ancient Greek: ἀναρχία) appeared in the plays of Aeschylus and Sophocles in the 5th century BC. Ancient Greece also saw the first Western situation of anarchy as a philosophical ideal, mainly, but not only, by Cynics and Stoics. Both the cynics of Diogenes of Sinope and the Cynics of Thebes are believed to have supported anarchic forms of society, although little remains of their writings. Their most significant contribution was the radical approach to nomos (law) and physis (nature). Unlike other Greek philosophers, who try to mix nomos and physis in harmony, some, about five, rejected nomos (and, consequently, the authorities, hierarchies, institutions, and moral code of the polis), while promoting a way of life based exclusively on physis.

Zeno of Citium, the founder of Stoicism, who was heavily influenced by cynics, described his vision of a utopian egalitarian society around 300 BC. What does Zeno's democracy advocate? For a form of lawless society in which no state, authoritarian structures are required, he prefers freedom and anarchism, the free and whole existence. He argued that the instinct for self-preservation leads people to selfishness. Like many modern anarchists, he believed that if people followed their instincts, they would not need laws or courts, without temples and without a cultured audience and without using money.

Some of the first opinions about anarchism were offered by Socrates. At the heart of his philosophy was the right of every human being to freedom of conscience, which is why he questioned authority and autotolitarists. Aristotle, a student of Socrates and founder of the hedonistic school, saw the state as a danger to personal autonomy, claiming that he did not want to lead or to be led. But despite this, not all Greeks had anarchic tendencies. Other philosophers, such as Plato and Aristotle, used the term negative anarchy in association with democracy, which they did not trust to be inherently vulnerable and prone to deteriorating tyranny.

The execution of Mazdak, an anarchist forerunner in the Middle East whose followers faced the same fate, was an Zoroastrian prophet in the Persian Middle Age, is now considered a crime and Mazdak and his actions are considered to take part of the protosocialist movement. He was calling for the abolition of private property, free love, and the overthrow of the king. He and thousands of his followers were massacred in 582 AD, and he was influenced by future Islamic sects, and some of

their teachings were taken from his teachings. Basra and Baghdad among the Mu'tazili ascetics and Najdiyya Khirijites are some theological predecessors of anarchism. This form of revolutionary Islam was not communist or egalitarian. It does not resemble the current concepts of anarchism, but he preached that the state is harmful, illegitimate, immoral and useless.

All aspects of life have been oppressed by Christianity. Brothers of the Free Spirit was the most notable example of heretical faith that had some vague anarchic tendencies. The anthropology of anarchism has changed in the contemporary period, as the traditional lines and ideas of the nineteenth century have been abandoned. Most anarchists are now well-informed young activists with feminist and environmental concerns. The most common activities in which they are involved: in counterculture, black power, the creation of temporary autonomous zones and events such as the Carnival against capital. We can consider these movements as not anarchist, but rather anarchic.

Alternatively, at the beginning of the 21st century, there was another example, like Mexico, that witnessed a great uprising in the domain of anarchist concepts. The Zapatistas have taken control of a large area of Chiapas. They were organized in an autonomous, self-governing model that has many parallels to anarchism, inspiring many young anarchists in the West. The Kurdish area of Rojava in northern Syria is another region that has been considered anarchist. The conflict arose during the Syrian civil war, and Rojava's decentralized model is based on Bookchin's ideas about libertarian municipalism and social ecology in a time frame and ethnic diversity, this conflict having a great importance and a twist with a great influence. Chiapas and Rojava shared the same goal of creating a libertarian community, despite being surrounded by state apparatuses.

Anarchism has grown in popularity and influence as part of anti-war, anti-capitalist and anti-globalization movements. Some anarchist factions in the protests have engaged in riots, property destruction and violent clashes with police. These actions were precipitated by anonymous ad hoc cadres, without a leader, known as black bricks. Other organizational tactics initiated during this period include security culture, affinity groups, and the use of decentralized technologies such as the Internet.

*"Contemporary anarchism can be seen as a strong critique of contemporary pseudo-libertarianism, of neoliberalism [...] it comes from a conscious experience of the various ways in which the West devastates the rest; it is an ethical scandal over the inequality, impoverishment and lack of open freedom that are so palpable locally and globally. "*

*- Simon Critchley, scholar anarchist*

## **2.2. Potential Anarchy and the legal theory of Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen**

*"Human rights are respected to the extent that they are known and become known only insofar as they are appropriated."*

Spreading knowledge about the respect for fundamental human rights and freedoms is an essential field of activity of state authorities.

The dynamics of the human rights movement in the twentieth century has been and is marked both by the activity of international organizations and by ideologies. While ideologies have provided the basis and legitimacy of human rights, international intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations have played a key role in the process of codifying the rule of law. As well as in monitoring the implementation of human rights by the Member States. The evolution of these rules cannot be understood without emphasizing the close connection with the international organizations that emerged after the World War II, both globally and regionally. Within the universal system, the decisive role has been played by the United Nations as well the 15 specialized agencies (International Labor Organization, World Health Organization, United Nations Children's Fund, Scientific and Cultural Organization, etc.).

The United Nations is the most important international association in the world, created on October 24, 1945, with the ratification of the Charter of the United Nations, which establishes the basic principles of international relations.

The primary objectives of the United Nations are to prevent the outbreak of violent conflicts, to proclaim fundamental human rights, to guarantee respect for international law, and to improve living standards around the globe. United Nations represents a wide and complex structure for such concerns, in its system coexisting organisms with various structures and competencies. All these bodies take into account the human rights

conventions adopted under the auspices of the UN, including, in turn, some structures that assess the way in which States parties fulfill their obligations. The promotion and protection of human rights are their main functions organizations. The UN is the only international forum in which all states can be represented and participate in the debate on global issues. When states become members of the UN, they accept and assume their obligations of the Charter of the United Nations. Currently, 193 countries are members of the UN. However, they are the main ones in terms of their autonomy and

power which exercise in different situations. Other decisions are voted by simple majority. The assembly cannot force states to act, but its recommendations are the indicator of general international opinion and represents the moral authority of the community nations. The General Assembly exercises its mandate through six Main Committees - Committee I (Security and Disarmament), Committee II (Economic and Financial), Committee III (Social-Humanitarian), Committee IV (Special Policies and Decolonization), Committee V (Administrative-Budgetary). Organizations like UN is dealing with cases of suppression of human and citizen rights, especially cases in which the state oppresses and tyrannizes its own citizens.

### **2.3. The Dictatorship of the Proletariat and Anarchism**

The dictatorship of the proletariat is a notion of Marxism that designates a phase of hypothetical transition of society between capitalism and communism. This expression originally used by Louis Auguste Blanqui, in line with the thinking of Jean-Paul Marat and Gracchus Babeuf and sometimes used by Karl Marx, is at the heart of lively debates, especially regarding its implementation. Work and nature should take over the state during this phase.

Marx and Friedrich Engels conceive of the dictatorship of the proletariat as a transitional phase of the revolutionary dictatorship, supposedly necessary to destroy the power of the bourgeoisie. At the economic level, it results in the suppression of private ownership of the means of production and, therefore, in the establishment of economic collectivism and a democracy in the workplace through a process of socialization of goods. According to Marxist and Leninist theory, the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the "inferior" phase of socialism, will then lead to a natural process of state extinction and the transition to a classless society, the so-called "superior". A phase that will correspond to communism itself.

After the Russian Revolution of 1917, the concept was taken over by Lenin: the Bolsheviks presented their government as a "*dictatorship of the proletariat*", but this qualification is disputed by many of their opponents. Opponents of Marxism (including the Social Democrats, in the current sense of the term) see the notion of a "*dictatorship of the proletariat*" as a danger to freedom and to parliamentary democracy, and claim that bureaucracy and nomenclature have seized power in a bloody way. One of the countries that experienced both the power of the terror and the power of revolution is France, in its modern history.

### **2.4. Terror and Fear as the Foundation of Any government**



At the beginning of the 1830, interpretations of events from 1793 converge towards an increasingly pronounced legitimation of dictatorships. This dictatorship, the true despotic power established in the interest of as many people as possible, was in reality the despotism of the people, the expression of its sovereign will. A revolution that would operate legally is not a revolution, simple political transaction.

*"Terror really is a system. He is neither blind nor retaliatory just, it is a firm and rational option, a violent manifestation and legitimacy of the sovereignty of the people ... There were, at that time, ideas that they had to be killed, and people representing these ideas they had to be destroyed. That is why it was necessary to create a revolutionary government of the terror ."- Maximilien Robespierre*

Legitimation of the terror as a necessity arising from circumstances gain great prominence even among historians who have not rejected Christian tradition, but which received the socialist ideas of Saint-Simon (Claude Henri de Rouvroy, 1760-1825). This reminder of moral values and the principles of the Christian religion are a characteristic in the History of the Parliamentary History of the French Revolution, an important work in forty volumes published in 1838 by Philippe-Joseph-Benjamin Buchez (1796-1865) and Pierre-Célestin Roux-Lavergne. Any action must be carried out in the light of *"moral certainty"* *"the only judge of all discussions and all facts of society."*

Also, we need to pay attention to safeguarding the public good, especially in critical times, because the authors theorize a legitimation of terror as a political method, distinct from fear as a system of government. Cavintal designates terror as a transient state, invoked in certain circumstances to stand against a definite danger, and in most of the cases, citizens represent that danger. When the danger has passed and fear has been used, the state puts the tools of terror in political reserve or, in opposite, maintains the despotic regime to assure the total control over all the public structures.

In the history of the French Revolution (1847-1853), after blaming the terror generally, however, historians of the French Revolution did not share unanimously the same opinion. The majority face the theme of terror from a libertarian point of view, such as Adolphe Thiers (1797-1877) and Auguste Mignet (1796- 1884) , and democratic historians such as Jules Michelet (1833-1867). But everyone recognize that a political tyranny leads to military tyranny and repressions. The history is the same to Robespierre. Robespierre must have been absorbed by the Jacobin Inquisition. This despotism and absolutism would precede military tyranny. Robespierre was the leader of the Jacobins, the main conductor of revolutionary terror in France. In 1793, The Jacobin terror was gaining the momentum, and at its leader became Maximilian Robespierre. Not a single monument has been erected to this man in France, neither streets nor squares are named after him - he left a too bloody a memory about

himself. "Go to hell, cursed ..." - people shouted in the face of Robespierre, when he himself, in the cart of the "executor of punishment" Samson, set off on his last journey - to the guillotine.

At 27, he passionately called for the abolition of the death penalty, at 35 he argued that its application was an indispensable duty of the revolutionary government; at the beginning of his political career, he defended the interests of workers, at the end of his life he pushed them away from him; a strict legalist - who later put an end to the appearance of the legality of legal proceedings. This revolutionary, who was first called the "patriot Robespierre", then the "incorruptible Robespierre", then the "valiant Robespierre", grew into the "great Robespierre", but the day came - and he was called a tyrant. *"The thirst for power"*, Madame Tussaud wrote about him, *"was an incentive that prompted him to sacrifice any principles and overcome any obstacles,"* and C. Fouché, a member of the Convention, recalled in his memoirs: *"... Robespierre, full of pride and cunning; an envious, malicious, vengeful creature who could never get enough of the blood of his comrades and who, thanks to his abilities, constancy ... clarity of mind and stubbornness of character, took advantage of the most dangerous circumstances, taking advantage of his dominant position in the Committee of Public Safety, he openly rushed to tyranny "*.

## **2.5. The Marxism: The Dictatorship of the Proletariat or Revolutionary Dictatorship**

*"If anything is certain, it is that I myself am not a Marxist.*

*[In a letter about the peculiar 'Marxism' which arose in France 1882]*

*-Karl Marx*

*"Fear of the mob is a superstitious fear. It is based on the idea that there is some mysterious, fundamental difference between rich and poor, as though they were two different races, like Negroes and white men. But in reality there is no such difference. The mass of the rich and the poor are differentiated by their incomes and nothing else, and the average millionaire is only the average dishwasher dressed in a new suit. Change places, and handy dandy, which is the justice, which is the thief? Everyone who has mixed on equal terms with the poor knows this quite well. But the trouble is that intelligent, cultivated people, the very people who might be expected to have liberal opinions, never do mix with the poor. For what do the majority of educated people know about*

The concept of "dictatorship of the proletariat" is an integral part of Marxist socio-political doctrine. This capacious term introduced more than a century and a half ago, remains debatable still. Its interpretation in the scientific literature and in numerous political currents varies from a literal understanding of how rigid authoritarian or even totalitarian rule to almost allegorical interpretation, very far from any dictatorship. Such a breadth of views is quite understandable, since this category is a key element for understanding the paths building a socialist society. The foundations of the doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat were given by Marx already in those of his first works, where he clarifies the worldwide role the proletariat as the bearer and creator of communist society.

Thus, in the article *"On a Criticism of the Hegelian Philosophy of Law"* (1843), Marx connects the emancipation of mankind with the emancipation of the proletariat and with the uprising of the latter against the bourgeoisie. Marx proclaimed the need for violent revolution and the establishment of domination the proletariat as a symbol for the destruction of classes and the state and for building a classless communist society. The traditional justification for the category *"dictatorship of the proletariat"* researchers of Marxism associate with the *"Manifesto of the Communist parties."* But back in October-November 1847, F. Engels in his work *"Principles communism"*, written in the form of a kind of political catechism says directly that the revolution will create a democratic a system which by itself will determine the inevitable dominance proletariat. And yet the doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat was first developed by K. Marx and F. Engels in *"Manifesto of the Communist Party"*. In it, the authors emphasized that the first step in the proletarian revolution is the transformation of the proletariat into the ruling class. At the same time, the proletariat uses its political dominance in order to wrest from the bourgeoisie all capital, to concentrate all the means of production in the hands of the new proletarian state. The founders of Marxism furiously insisted: *"Political power in the proper sense of the word is organizing violence of one class to suppress another"*. These words of Marx and Engels give one of the first formulations of the idea of dictatorship of the proletariat. In fact, not only the letter, but also the spirit of the manifesto meant a program for the future domination of the former exploited class. There was only one step left before the introduction of the concept of dictatorship. But that's when was it made? It is generally accepted that on March 5, 1852, in a letter from Marx to I. Weidemeier. In general, an analysis of the experience of revolutionary events, participants and witnesses of which were the founders of Marxism, played huge role in shaping their political theory, leading to its radicalization. In his work *"The Class Struggle in France from 1848 to 1850"*, written in January - March 1850, K. Marx was analyzing the

course revolution in France and, speaking about the role of the working class, came to this conclusion: "Overthrow of the bourgeoisie! Dictatorship of working class!". The very connotation of the slogan speaks of its identity with the concept of *"dictatorship of the proletariat"*.

In the mentioned letter to I. Weidemeier dated March 5, 1852 and then in *"Critique of the Gotha Program"* (1875) and in a number of other works by Marx and Engels, they created a coherent doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Although it should emphasize that the term itself occurs only a few times as in Marx and Engels. Let me cite the classical *Marxist Definition*: *"As far as I am concerned, no merit belongs to me in discovering the classes in modern society, nor the merit of discovering their struggle among themselves."*

The existence of classes is connected only with certain historical phases in the development of production, while classes struggle necessarily lead to the dictatorship of the proletariat, and this dictatorship itself constitutes only a transition to the abolition of all classes and to a society without classes.

So, is it a transition or a permanent form of the state? Obviously, ideas about this went through the founders of Marxism during the ideology's evolution. Romanticism of the 40s was not crushed even by failed revolution that engulfed several countries of Europe at once. Comprehensive critical capitalism seriously influenced the upcoming historical events- the construction of socialism, and finally, new revolutionary events in France in 1870-1871. It could be considered a kind of frontier that determined a new stage in the development political theory of Marxism. In the preface to *The Civil War in France*, written as analysis of the experience of the Paris Commune in April-May 1871, K. Marx and F. Engels say: *"The working class cannot simply master ready-made state machine and set it in motion for their own goals."* And then, in the same 1871, in a letter to L. To Kugelmann, Marx emphasizes that the proletarian revolution must *"... not to transfer from one hand to another the bureaucratic-military machine, as happened so far, and to break it ... - this is the precondition any really popular revolution on the continent."*

In the way of understanding the Marxism, the dictatorship of the proletariat is a new type of state, which is fundamentally different from all previous ones. First of all, the difference lies in the development of society and political organization. Engels writes in *Anti-Dühring* (1878) that *"the proletariat seizes state power and transforms the means of production first of all in public ownership. But in doing so, he stops its existence as a proletariat, destroys class distinctions and their antagonism, as well as the state itself as a state."* And here the main question that has so far remained unanswered. How long the process of *"refining"* the old capitalist states? This could only be established empirically. At the same time, such uncertainty opened up for followers Marxism is a

wide field for all possible interpretations. Marx believed that in all cases the dictatorship is the power of that or some other class that mercilessly suppresses its class enemies. The dictatorship is a power based on force and not on law, but this does not mean at all from actual ruling class does not create any laws. Such laws are, of course, issued, as Marx emphasized that every right is a will elevated to a law ruling class. And yet the ruling classes always draw the law, but from their own power, which they express among other forms of coercion and in the law. It turns out that the law is not a limitation of the dictatorship of a class, but its fixation and formulation. Ultimately, the dictatorship of the proletariat was meant to become some kind of transitional form to the construction of a socialist society, and at the same time a permanent form of the state.

Such an interpretation of the key-term of the Marxist political theory was close to the Russian Bolsheviks. It was them who were to in practice, checked many of the theoretical developments of K. Marx and F. Engels. The Bolsheviks believed that the highest type of social revolution is a socialist, proletarian revolution. Such a revolution must abolish all power of the bourgeoisie and establish the political domination of the proletariat. The leader of the Bolsheviks very clearly outlined the possibility of a long (even a very long) existence of the state in the form of a proletariat dictatorship in his fundamental work *"State and Revolution"* (1917). In it, he says: *"Whoever recognizes only the struggle of classes, he was not yet a Marxist, he may yet prove to be within the framework of the bourgeois thinking and bourgeois politics. The limitation of Marxism to a doctrine of class struggle means curtailing Marxism, distorting it, reducing it to what is acceptable to the bourgeoisie. A Marxist is only the one who extends recognition of class struggle to recognition of dictatorship proletariat"*. Lenin believes that the dictatorship of the proletariat is stubborn struggle, bloody and bloodless, violent and peaceful, military and economic, pedagogical and administrative - against the forces and traditions of the old society. In the future, taking into account the existing experience in the implementation of the revolution and state building, with characterization of the class struggle in the era of the dictatorship of the proletariat, Lenin speaks of its five forms:

- 1) suppression of the resistance of the exploiters,
- 2) civil war,
- 3) struggle for the peasantry,
- 4) use bourgeoisie,
- 5) education of a new discipline

*"Karl Marx was right, socialism works, it is just that he had the wrong species"*

*-Edward O. Wilson, The Ants*

## 2.6. What It's Like to Run Against the System?

This part is about another myth of our time, invented by marketers to promote a particular product. It grew up on the basis of romantic notions of the beatniks of the 1940s, and the hippies of the 1970s. Reflected in many artistic effects, although it took "The Wall". It is understood that in the world there is a certain "gray mass" of "office plankton", "cattle" - a "crowd" that lives by animal instincts and is not interested in anything sublime, just spending their lives stupidly in consumption, boring and useless "work" and, of course, it used the "oligarchy" and the "police park" (no matter how), as a source of money and a stronghold of her throne. All this is a "system". Those who are against this concept usually "go against the system", in their posts on social networks, in their actions, where they write that the "system" is bad and that they go against themselves. That's why the urban graffiti speaks about the protests and manifests.

Real walkers "against the system" are different people. Everything else is another simulacrum calling from the TV screen to "fight the system". This idea is implanted in the nature of people who got the courage to walk against the majority.

Naturally, there are always people who simply like to be "rebel".

People tend to think in patterns, labels are applied to all possible animate or inanimate objects of being. Marketers are familiar with all sorts of techniques for influencing the human psyche, but the truth is that each person is unique in some way, and under certain circumstances can stand out from the masses. I don't know how much this can be called precisely some specific ailment of our time, because even in primitive tribes various kinds of rituals were carried out, and the roles intended for each member of the tribe inevitably lead to the creation of certain social patterns.

What does it mean to be against the system? How many people are now throwing anti-system slogans, how many people are taking a stand against the system, not even understanding what the System is, against which they are so vehemently opposed. In most cases, all these slogans and anti-systemic sentiments are due only to pathos, play, youthful maximalism and do not carry any really sensible ideas and understanding of the essence of the issue. For such people, it doesn't matter who to fight, the main thing is to throw out their excess energy against some enemy, and in this case this enemy is this System.

But do not think that in this article I am trying to expose the desire to be against the System. Not in any way. What is a system? There are a huge number of systems, there are even special sciences like systems methodology that study the world with the help of systems. That is, roughly speaking, just

our whole world that consists of systems and not all of them are harmful - many are necessary for our life.

## **2.7. The Dualism and Criticism of the 'Legislator'**

The dualist parliamentary system was originally the only parliamentary system practiced. Appearing in European monarchies, in England (from 1792 to 1834), in France (from 1830 to 1848) and in Belgium (from 1831), it marks a major stage between royal absolutism and the sovereignty of the people.

In a dualistic parliamentary system, the government is accountable to both parliament and an active head of state, heir to the former absolute monarch (who became king of the people or president). This responsibility of the executive before the legislature is based on the principle of equality and cooperation of powers and, as Auguste Burdeau wrote about the monarchy from July 1830 to 1848, under an "authentic parliamentary regime" (in other words dualistic):

*"Parliament and the King [constitute] substantially equal forces ."*

The dualist theory is based on two postulates: the possibility of equality between powers; that this equality is achievable through a balanced play between ministerial responsibility and the right to dissolution.

Monarchs, the collapse of royal legitimacy in favor of that of the government (especially in England in the early nineteenth century), led to a transformation of plans. The head of state will increasingly play only a formal role in the exercise of power. Therefore, we often switch to a monistic system.

## **2.8. Anarchism Against the Dictatorship of the Proletariat**

According to tradition, only three pure regimes - monarchy, aristocracy and democracy – are identified as being capable, under certain conditions, of achieving the "common good". This text suggests that a complete typology of political regimes must include anarchy not as a perverted form of democracy, but as an ideal type of pure political regime. The new typology should include monarchy (the reign of one), aristocracy (the reign of a minority), democracy (the rule of the majority) and anarchy (the self- government of all, by consensus, or the government of no one). In the end, it is necessary to remember that political life is not limited in the state, and that anarchy can be embodied - here and now – in communities and local and small political groups. The radical rejection of anarchy by philosophers who claim that its realization is impossible in our modern world is therefore deceptive and necessarily impoverishes our political thought.

“What is the best political regime? This is the fundamental question to which Western political philosophy has traditionally taken it upon itself to answer, generally counting three pure types of regimes (monarchy, aristocracy and democracy) and a mixed regime (republic). Under certain conditions, those who exercise the power in these three pure regimes can seek, defend and promote the achievement of the "common good" for all of political community, as well as the "good life" for each of its members. Conversely, those who wield power in degenerate political regimes (tyranny, oligarchy, etc.) only seek to enjoy selfishness of a good life (from a material point of view rather than moral) to the detriment of the common good and the realization of a good life for their subjects. As for "anarchy", the philosophers and the most influential people in Western tradition have identified it as the degenerate and pathological form of democracy, understood here as its direct form where all citizens can participate in the assembly where political decisions are taken collectively and in the majority.

To assimilate anarchy in this way to a distorted form of direct democracy constitutes a serious error which impoverishes political philosophy. On the contrary, I claim that a typology of political regimes must include anarchy not as a distorted form of democracy, but rather as one of the ideal types of regimes that legitimate policies. I will identify anarchy as a fourth type of pure political regime in which all citizens govern themselves together directly through consensual deliberations, without having recourse to an authority endowed with coercive apparatus. Therefore, It's about to offer a more complete and coherent picture of political regimes than does the tradition of Western political philosophy, and to demonstrate that anarchy should not be conceived as a form derived from any of the other diets. To conduct this demonstration, it is first necessary to synthesize the quantitative discourse of political philosophers about pure types of political regimes, then to analyze the qualitative approach used by philosophers to distinguish between "good" and "bad" political regimes, then finally to discuss the nature of the anarchy. This approach, however, comes up against a major challenge, when anarchy is about to be distinguished from democracy. Particular attention will therefore be paid to the ambiguous relationship between these two regimes. For more than two thousand years, the majority of influential Western philosophers confined themselves to identifying three ideal types of regimes pure politics: monarchy, aristocracy and democracy. Those regimes will sometimes receive

different names depending on the philosopher (we swap, for example, aristocracy for oligarchy) and some philosophers will not always be constant and consistent in their manner to use this typology. Nevertheless, there are still three regimes left fundamental, mainly because this typology is based on a mathematical calculation since the official political authority can be in the hands of one (monarchy),



a few (aristocracy) or all (democracy). This calculation is often presented as obvious, as with Aristotle for whom "it is necessary that either a single individual, a small number, or a large number."

The Greek etymology of these diet names further emphasizes the mathematical basis of this typology. "Monarchy" comes from Greek and means government (kratia) of one (mona). "Aristocracy" also comes from the Greek, where aristos means "better". The aristocracy is therefore the regime in which the best rule. The term "better" suggests that there is a division between these and the others and that the aristocrats are a minority of individuals who are superior to the average person. An aristocracy therefore designates a regime in which a minority of individuals in the community wields power. Finally, the word "democracy" evokes the government of the "people", from the Greek demos. By democracy, traditional political philosophy means a democracy modeled on the Athenian model where all those who can claim the title of citizens - the people - have the opportunity to present themselves at the agora to participate in the Assembly and take part directly in the political decision-making process. If this typology is above all associated with classical philosophy, it will be taken up by historians of Antiquity and by philosophers and political actors at the beginning of modernity.

During the debates surrounding the American War of Independence, for example, many texts - speeches, pamphlets, etc. - make explicit reference to this typology. Zabdiel Adams, cousin of the second President of the United States, John Adams, declared in a speech in 1782 that "three different modes of civil government were predominant among the nations of Earth, monarchy, aristocracy and democracy". Aware that this first typology does not allow us to embrace all the complexity of political reality, some philosophers will believe it is important to double this typology by identifying for each pure diet a possibly degenerate or pathological form.

Aristotle is the first to stress the importance of enriching the mathematical classification of regimes with a distinction linked to the morality of the regime. A regime is fair when its object is the common good, while an unjust regime is only for the good of the one or those who govern. Several philosophers will propose, following Aristotle, a typology of regimes which takes into account the moral aspect of the exercise of political authority. The risk of corruption is even higher in pure regimes than in their institutional structure. The Constitution prevents rulers from turning away from the research, defense and promotion of the common good in order to unduly enjoy the power they have. The government of one then becomes a tyranny; the government of a few, an oligarchy; and the government of all, anarchy. This is where a new regime name comes in, the "republic." This notion somewhat muddies the waters. The name "Republic", from the Latin "respublica" or "public thing", can be attributed to any fair regime, just as it can designate a mixed constitution made up of the three elements that embody the pure diets. A republic then proposes a balance of the various social orders, embodied by a monarch (or president), an aristocracy that sits in the Senate or House of Lords and the "people"

who are represented by their delegates to the National Assembly or in the House of Commons, considered the democratic branch of the Republic. According to most political philosophers, including in the first place Aristotle and Cicero, this mixed constitution is necessarily a fail system because none of the three forces can impose his will on the other two. These three forces are neutralizing each other and are not able to impose their will, and the common good would come out on top. We can distinguish classical republicanism from modern republicanism. The first is based on an organic vision of the republic in which the three elements of society are brin sphere in order to jointly pursue the common good. Rather, modern republicanism is based on a mechanical vision where the various elements of a society pursue divergent interests (this is the modern idea of a pluralist society), in order to protect their privacy from public despotism, and it comes together to form a complex regime where the various powers are separated and balance each other.

In its classic version as in the modern version, the republic is incompatible with a pure, absolute authority. Since the 19th century, politicians as well as philosophers, have become accustomed to using the term "democracy" (qualified as modern, liberal or representative) to designate the republic, so that the two names of regimes are today more or less synonyms. This modern "democracy" is not, however, than a cousin far removed from the democracy of antiquity. Indeed, only those who at that time enjoyed the title of citizens could assemble at the agora and participate directly in the deliberative decision-making process. It was then the majority that won (democracy as the rule of the majority). In what concerns moder "democracy", several forms of power coexist and compete within the formal political system itself. The majority of the people do not express their voice, even in the so-called democratic chamber, since it is only a extremely small minority of "representatives" who deliberate on behalf of of the majority or of the nation as a whole. As pointed out Jean-Jacques Rousseau, the majority only have the power to choose the small clique that will govern the whole community. As in comparison, would it be correct to label the term "monarchy" as a regime where an individual - called king or queen – would have the sole power to confirm every four or five years one or more individuals as representatives holding real powers and governing in his name? Such a regime would probably be recognized as being a false monarchy or an aristocracy.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **3. Democratic and Revolutionary Dictatorships, The Problem of Its Duration, The Role of Proletariat and its role in International Relationships and Rights**

- 3.1. The Theory of Mihail Aleksandrovici Bakunin, Seen as a Result of Various Anarchist Socialist Theories
- 3.2. Does the Proletariat Dictatorship Mean a New Despotic State?
- 3.3. Preaching A Pure Revolution
- 3.4. The Transitory Aspect of the Dictatorship and Subproletariat
- 3.5. Stalin and The Dictatorship of The Party
- 3.6. Democratic Anarchism or The Mature Form of Progressive Legitimate Regime
- 3.7. Anarchy in the Frames of International Law and Human Rights

#### **3.1. The Theory of Mihail Aleksandrovici Bakunin, Seen as a Result of Various Anarchist Socialist Theories**

Mikhail Alexandrovich Bakunin (/bə'ku:nɪn/; 1814–1876) turned into a Russian progressive anarchist, socialist and founder of collectivist anarchism. He is taken into consideration as one of the most influential figures of anarchism and a chief founding father of the progressive socialist and social anarchist subculture. Bakunin's status as a revolutionary also made him one of the maximum famous ideologues in Europe, gaining tremendous affect amongst radicals at some stage in Russia and Europe.

Bakunin grew up in Pryamukhino, a circle of relatives' estate in Tver Governorate. From 1840, he studied in Moscow, then in Berlin hoping to enter academia. Later in Paris, he met Karl Marx and Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, who deeply stimulated him. Bakunin's growing radicalism ended hopes of a professorial career. He was expelled from France for opposing Russia's profession of Poland. In 1849, he changed into being arrested in Dresden for his participation in the Czech riot of 1848 and deported to Russia, wherein he was imprisoned first in Saint Petersburg, then in the Shlisselburg castle from 1854 and ultimately exiled to Siberia in 1857. He escaped via Japan to the United States after which to London, where he worked with Alexander Herzen on the magazine *Kolokol* (The Bell). In 1863, Bakunin left to sign up for the rebel in Poland, but he failed to reach it and instead frolicked in Switzerland and Italy.

In 1868, Bakunin joined the worldwide running men's association, leading the anarchist faction to swiftly grow in have an impact on. The 1872 Hague Congress was ruled via a war among Bakunin and Marx, who turned into a key discern inside the popular Council of the global and argued for the use of the state to result in socialism. In comparison, Bakunin and the anarchist faction argued for the substitute of the kingdom via federations of self-governing workplaces and communes. Bakunin could not reach the Netherlands and the anarchist faction lost the controversy in his absence. Bakunin was expelled from the worldwide for preserving, in Marx's view, a mystery organisation within the global and based the Anti-Authoritarian worldwide in 1872. From 1870 until his demise in 1876, Bakunin wrote his longer works which includes “Statism and Anarchy” and “God and the state”, however he endured to at once take part in European employee and peasant moves. In 1870, he became involved in an insurrection in Lyon, France. Bakunin sought to participate in an anarchist insurrection in Bologna, Italy, but his declining health compelled him to return to Switzerland in hide.

Bakunin is remembered as a prime parent in the records of anarchism, an opponent of Marxism, specifically of the dictatorship of the proletariat and for his predictions that Marxist regimes might be one-birthday celebration dictatorships over the proletariat, now not via the proletariat. His book “God

and the state" has been widely translated and remains in print. Bakunin maintains his influence anarchists including Noam Chomsky. Bakunin has had a giant effect on thinkers including Peter Kropotkin, Errico Malatesta, Herbert Marcuse, E. P. Thompson, Neil Postman and A. S. Neill in addition to syndicalist corporations consisting of the Wobblies, the anarchists inside the Spanish Civil warfare and current anarchists worried inside the modern-day anti-globalization movement.

For this political theorist, governments have been born to protect the rights of aristocrats and belongings proprietors to the detriment of the lower classes. But, not like Marx, Bakunin did not trust that the authorities need to be controlled by using the so-referred to as proletariat or the working magnificence, but ought to damage it absolutely and now not reconstitute it.

In fact, he rejected all forms of outside authority, such as the idea of God. It did not count if he agreed with all the individuals or if he emanated from accepted suffrage.

Experts agree that Bakunin's theories and wondering revolved around the following interdependent concepts like freedom, socialism, federalism, anti-statism, anti-theism, and variations with Marxism.

- *"Seeking my happiness in the happiness of others, my dignity in the dignity of those around me, being free in the freedom of others, this is my whole belief, the aspiration of my life. I considered that the most sacred of all my duties was to rebel against any oppression, regardless of the perpetrator or the victim. "*

*M.A Bakunin*

Starting in 1869, Bakunin finished several clandestine tasks with the Russian progressive and nihilist Sergei Nechayev, from whom he might later distance himself. He additionally led a failed rebellion in Lyon.

In 1870 he set up the Committee for the Salvation of France and became a staunch defender of the Paris Commune, which acquired brutal repression from the French government. Italy, Spain and France themselves have been prompted by Bakunin's thoughts, particularly with the help of Italian Giuseppe Fanelli.

In parallel, Bakunin joined the first international, a federation of working-class parties that sought to convert capitalist societies into socialist groups.

However, the incompatibility with Karl Marx, who had an exceptional impact on the primary worldwide, led to the expulsion of the Russian anarchist and his followers for the duration of the Hague Congress of 1872. The decision changed into completed like a closed-door courtyard. He became accused of founding secret societies and turned into rejected for his connection to Nechayev, who was arrested after killing a colleague.

On the grounds that then, Bakunin and Marx have maintained competition, making Bakunin anarchism the antithesis of Marxist communism. Inside the following years, the Russian teamed up with immigrants from the United States of America, as well as Poles, Serbs and Romanians, to plot innovative agencies and make proclamations.

Bakunin favored now not to deal with the submit-revolution problem in depth, limiting himself to supplying some simple ideas. If he had given unique indications as to the functioning of anarchist societies, in fact, he could have denied the want for his or her self-determination. First, Bakunin's anarchist thinking is based at the absence of human exploitation and domination of guy.

A principle that predicts a scale of bottom-up assemblies from the outer edge to the middle is the so-referred to as libertarian federalism.

All of Bakunin's theories and aspirations were motivated by means of the "Joint Professor of a generation of Revolutionaries: Hegel." In one among Bakunin's maximum popular speeches wherein he units out his function on the sector of his time: Europe at the end of the nineteenth century, from the point of view of a Russian and anarchist philosopher. In this speech, anarchy manifests itself as a perfect social version, however, like all political doctrine committed to motion, its miles taken into consideration in reality potential.

### **3.2. Does the Proletariat Dictatorship Mean a New Despotic State?**

What is Proletariat Dictatorship?

The dictatorship of the proletariat, an idea that designates, in the classics of medical socialism, the country energy of the running magnificence, mounted with the aid of the socialist revolution, exercised with the help of the non-proletarian hundreds in cities and villages and that can materialize

in the shape of alliance among running magnificence and peasantry. Contrary to time period of bourgeois dictatorship.

Expressing the interests of most people of the populace against the minority of exploited oppressors, the premises are created for the fulfillment of the widest democracy, making sure via a couple of kinds of participation in political activity, debating and solving financial problems, concentrating forces and assets to construct socialism. Emphasizes the paramount significance of the monetary-organizational feature, the cultural-instructional characteristic develops.

Karl Marx mentioned that the nation energy corresponding to the length of transition from capitalism to communism is the dictatorship of the proletariat (Critique of the Gotha program). V. I. Lenin evolved the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat, applying it to the situations specific to revolutionary Russia in the age of imperialism, emphasizing both its goal necessity and the reality that it changed into a unique shape of the alliance of the proletariat with the non-proletarian working loads. The running peasantry, an alliance wherein the proletariat has the leading position.

What does despotic mean?

Despotism is a form of presidency in which an unmarried entity policies with absolute electricity. That entity can be a person, as in an autocracy, or it may be a collection. The word despotism approach "to guide in the manner of a despot" and does no longer always check with a single "despot," that is, an individual.

The word *despot* comes from the Greek phrase *despotes* this means that "grasp" or "effective" and has been used for a wide style of titles and positions. It was used to describe the unlimited energy of the pharaohs of Egypt, was adopted by way of the Byzantine court docket as a noble identify, utilized by the rulers of the Byzantine vassal states, and followed because the identity of the Byzantine emperors. Therefore, the phrase *despot* has special meanings and interpretations in sure ancient durations and cannot be incorporated right into an unmarried definition. It is much like the Greek titles *basileus* and *autocrat*, which, together with *despot*, had been used regularly to explain everything from a simple tribal chief to kings and emperors.

We are able to say without a doubt that its miles the dictatorship of the proletariat that expresses a hypothetical section of society's transition among capitalism and communism, because of this the

energy of the country concentrated within the fingers of a grasp or a set of human beings, which leads to despotism being a shape of presidency a single entity leads with absolute electricity. That entity may be a man or woman, as in an autocracy, or it may be a set. An exceedingly well-defined instance may be Leninism. Lenin asserted that the proletariat should gain innovative focus best via the efforts of a communist birthday party which assumed the position of "innovative leading edge." Lenin also believed that such a party ought to simplest attain its goals through a disciplined business enterprise referred to as democratic centralism. Further, Leninism claimed that imperialism was the closing shape of capitalism, and that capitalism should only be overthrown by means of modern method (any try and "reform" capitalism from inside turned into doomed to failure. Lenin believed that the destruction of the capitalist state could be accomplished). By way of the proletarian revolution and by changing bourgeois democracy with the dictatorship of the proletariat (a device of workers' democracy, wherein they could have held political energy through councils known as soviets). That is why many theories of Lenin and this Leninism aimed at shaping society and questioning, in addition to the advent of capitalism right into a worldwide system. Having criticism from each the left (for instance: social democrats, anarchists and even different Marxists), from the center (as an instance: liberals) and from the proper (for example: conservatives, fascists, and so on.).

### **3.3. Preaching A Pure Revolution**

“Pure anarchism” became the dominant modern inside jap anarchism for the duration of the interwar years. Its adherents had been anarchist communists who wanted to rid anarchism of the ‘impurity’ of syndicalism. It might properly be asked: why write an e-book on these pure anarchists? In the end, did they now not ultimately fail in their try to set up an anarchist communist society and are they now not in large part forgotten nowadays even within Japan? Except, changed into no longer Spain where anarchism’s lifestyles-and-demise battle changed into fought inside the 1930s? Why, then, must we in Europe, pay a whole lot of attention to what came about during kind of the identical duration in an East Asian us of a, a long way removed from the drama in Spain? In respond, I’m able to give as a minimum three reasons why a study of eastern natural anarchism is profitable. First, the picture of the Japanese (such as jap working ladies and men) which has prevailed inside the West in the course of recent many years has been of an overwhelmingly conformist and docile human beings. The oft-repeated epithet ‘economic animals’ has been used to describe the apparent character of the Japanese in the course of much of the postwar length and has conveyed their seeming indifference to political ideas or ethical questions. At an early level of my research into natural anarchism I study a paper on



'The Communist idea in Japan' at a seminar in Oxford, wherein I was criticised because I had supposedly not noted the 'reality' that the Japanese are the most unrevolutionary, order-loving and conformist people within the global. Of route, this widely held photograph derives from attributing to all jap in all eras certain characteristics which, although present today (and it's miles arguable that they are nowhere near as popular as is regularly claimed), are of very quick historic duration. Now not most effective does this picture warfare with the belief of the Japanese as an innovative human beings, which become massive all through East Asia within the years following the upheaval of 1868, but it additionally clashes with the supposedly unJapanese concern for political principles and ideological clarity which changed into proven by the pure anarchists of the interwar years. Therefore, one reason for writing a e-book on the pure anarchists is that I assume it's miles instructive to draw the eye of Western readers to the ones 'other eastern', the ones whose very existence (no matter their concrete success) modifies the poor picture projected with the aid of their depressingly conformist countrymen and countrywomen. A second motive for my interest in the pure anarchists is they represent an authentically eastern expression of the usual ideas of communism. With the aid of communism I imply, of path, no longer the system of bureaucratic electricity, birthday celebration domination, and nation manipulation of the economy observed in nations together with (till these days) Russia and China, but the mission to reorganise society in an effort to acquire a community of social equals who could manipulate the means of production communally, cooperatively organise production for the direct delight of desires, and consume by way of taking freely from the typically held wealth of society. This type of imaginative and prescient of social reorganisation were given its first absolutely worked-out presentation in Japanese while Petr Kropotkin's (1842–1921) *The Conquest of Bread* was translated in 1909. Although *The Conquest of Bread* struck a responsive chord among many radical jap of that era, it remained very lots a Japanese translation of an essentially European work. The very name *The Conquest of Bread* (in place of *The Conquest of Rice*) suggests the (for many jap) exotically European flavour of Kropotkin's passionate arguments for communism. Kropotkin remained the dominant have an effect on the natural anarchists throughout the interwar years and this was bolstered when his accrued Works were published in eastern from 1928. Nonetheless, by means of that length communism have been fully assimilated with the aid of its jap exponents, so that with the aid of then the pure anarchists were capable to narrate it very well to Japanese society and present it to a Japanese audience in an authentically Japanese form. Accordingly, whilst the pure anarchists wrote texts in their own to popularise communism, the commune which they, like anarchist communists anywhere, advocated as the unit of communist society had ceased to be an **eu** transplant from Kropotkin's texts and become genuinely an Eastern farming village, transformed with the aid of an anarchist revolution absolute confidence, but none the less eastern for that. Likewise, folks who were expected to result in this social transformation were now not

cosmopolitan revolutionaries expressing European standards in katakanaesque jap, but flesh and blood merchandise of eastern society, together with the tenant farmers. Several years in the past Maximilien Rubel and I edited a volume of essays below the identify Non-market Socialism within the nineteenth and 20th Centuries. 'Non-marketplace socialism' turned into a synonym for what I've stated right here as 'communism'. Even though in that earlier e-book we selected no longer to use the word 'communism' due to our concern that it is probably misinterpreted as having a connection with the political structures previously or absolutely determined in Russia, China and some other places, there's no alternative to employing the time period here, seeing that 'anarchist communism' was the declared goal of the natural anarchists. Our theme in Non-marketplace Socialism in the nineteenth and 20th Centuries become that, despite the fact that a communist society has so far never been executed anywhere, communism has despite the fact that had a consistent, if unsteady, life at some stage in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries as a venture to the ideology of capitalism. For so long as there was business capitalism, organizations of working males and females have reacted to its lifestyles, and to the indignities and irrationalities which necessarily accompany it, by formulating a communist opportunity.

The e-book argued that neither social democracy nor bolshevism represented communist challenges to capitalism, on the grounds that both had been versions on the capitalist subject matter, in that they left intact the fundamental constituent factors of capitalism (the wages machine, commodity manufacturing, nation strength and so on). The real venture to capitalism has come from quarters apart from social democracy or bolshevism, and the currents we tested as specific variations of this communist undertaking in the diverse chapters of our e-book were the following:

- a) Anarchist communism, represented from about 1880 onwards with the aid of a string of thinkers and activists, such as Kropotkin and Alexander Berkman (1870–1936).
- b) The impossibilism of currents such as the Socialist birthday celebration of exceptional Britain, which turned into founded in 1904 inside the direction of the split among 'possibilists' and 'impossibilists' in the ranks of the Social Democratic Federation in Britain.
- c) The council communism related to the German Revolution of 1918 and its aftermath, which turned into articulated by means of theoreticians which includes Anton Pannekoek (1873–1960), Otto Ruhle (1874–1943) and Paul Mattick (1904–81).
- d) Bordigism, which takes its name from Amadeo Bordiga (1889–1970), the first leader of the Communist birthday celebration of Italy, before the leadership of that celebration passed in 1924 to others greater suitable to the Comintern, which includes Antonio Gramsci (1891–1937).

- e) The situationism of the Situationist international, whose interest spanned the period 1957 to 1972 and became one of the streams feeding the upheaval in Paris in May also 1968.

Taken into consideration in isolation, it's far tempting to brush aside anyone of those 5 currents as too vulnerable to be of a lot of importance. Taken collectively, but they represent a sustained critique of capitalism and a constantly posed, communist opportunity to it. Obviously, there had been differences among those currents, that have stored them divided and over which they have got argued (mainly in regard to the query of approach), but every in its personal manner has effectively stored alive the aim of a communist society and has therefore prevented capitalism from enjoying unchallenged ideological supremacy. What gives those currents added significance as a collective phenomenon is that they have got emerged in large part independently of one another at exceptional historical junctures and in different geographical places. Bordigism is as recognisably the manufactured from Italian influences and occasions as impossibilism owes plenty to its Anglo-Saxon origins. The repeated emergence of these organisationally separate and culturally distinct formulations of what nonetheless remains essentially the equal communist opportunity to capitalism indicates that it's miles in the nature of capitalism, anyplace it exists, to evoke a communist reaction which does now not range in its basics. From the viewpoint of the overdue twentieth century, it can look as though capitalism guidelines the sector untroubled and has efficiently countered all tries to update it by communism. Yet, because the existence of those communist currents demonstrates, despite its equipment of ideological domination, capitalism has proved unable to eliminate an alternative communist imaginative and prescient of how society might be organised. So long as forms of this communist opportunity remain to haunt capitalism, its supremacy is much less than general and the opportunity of reaching communism cannot be discounted.

---

### *Japan Anarchism to 1923*

It is an arbitrary selection in which one locates the historical origins of anarchism in Japan. After the implantation of Western anarchism into Japan, jap anarchists diagnosed a native anarchist lifestyle within their personal way of life. For example, the *Nihon Heimin Shinbun* (Japan not unusual human beings's Newspaper) of 20 January 1908 carried a piece of writing on the eighteenth century thinker Andō Shōeki, describing him as 'an anarchist of one hundred fifty years ago', and in 1979 the Tōkyō-based totally *Libertaire* group referred to Andō as an propose of 'agricultural communist anarchism'. [39] For the functions of this ebook, however, it is not vital to go returned in addition than 1906. In 1906 the maximum influential socialist of his technology, kōtoku Shūsui, returned from six

months spent in California and astounded his social-democratic comrades by using wondering the usefulness of contesting parliamentary elections in a speech which he made at a public meeting held in Tōkyō on 28 June to welcome him returned to Japan. Jap Anarchism to 1923 It is an arbitrary selection in which one locates the historical origins of anarchism in Japan. After the implantation of Western anarchism into Japan, jap anarchists diagnosed a native anarchist lifestyle within their personal way of life. For example, the Nihon Heimin Shinbun (Japan not unusual human beings's Newspaper) of 20 January 1908 carried a piece of writing on the eighteenth century thinker Andō Shōeki, describing him as 'an anarchist of one hundred fifty years ago', and in 1979 the Tōkyō-based totally Libertain group referred to Andō as an propose of 'agricultural communist anarchism'. For the functions of this e-book, however, it is not vital to go returned in addition than 1906. In 1906 the maximum influential socialist of his technology, kōtoku Shūsui, returned from six months spent in California and astounded his social-democratic comrades by using wondering the usefulness of contesting parliamentary elections in a speech which he made at a public meeting held in Tōkyō on 28 June to welcome him returned to Japan.

### *Kōtoku Shūsui and Anarchism*

Kōtoku had been a founder member of the Shakai Minshutō (Social Democratic Party) when it used to be fashioned in May 1901, even though this task had proved abortive due to the fact the birthday celebration was once right now banned. He originated from Kōchi Prefecture which, beneath its pre-revolutionary title of Tosa, had been one of the cradles of the Japanese Revolution (the 'Meiji Restoration') of 1868. After transferring to Tōkyō for greater education, Kōtoku had end up a journalist in 1893. Ten years later, in October 1903, he resigned from his newspaper when it got here out in aid of the impending Russo-Japanese War (1904–5). The following month, Kōtoku and his comrades launched an anti-war journal, the weekly Heimin Shinbun (Common People's Newspaper), as a end result of which he used to be imprisoned for 5 months in February 1905 on prices bobbing up from the Draconian press laws. It used to be Kōtoku's direct trip of country repression, and his disgust with the way in which the figurehead of the Emperor was once used to justify exploitation at domestic and militaristic aggression abroad, that led him from social democracy in the direction of anarchism. For these reasons, his remain in the USA can be stated to have added to a head a improvement in his political thoughts that used to be discernible even earlier than he left Japan. Kōtoku's speech on 28 June 1906 used to be accompanied by means of more than a few articles written through him for the socialist press in which he expounded his innovative ideas. In one article he analysed the effects of the generic election held in Germany in January 1907: What the European working category desires is now not to decide on most deputies however to obtain the assurance of

meals and garments and shelter. It does now not want the eloquent phrases of Bebel or Jaures. What it does want is to acquire the social revolution. It is now not legal guidelines which produce meals and clothes, any greater than it is votes which can be the ability of revolution. We agree with that if the European socialist events persist in their adherence to nothing however a parliamentary policy, they will in the stop be incapable of functioning as the modern events of the working class. They will stop up as nothing extra than alternative bourgeois parties. As a result, the people themselves will all wilderness them and flip to anarchist communism.

### *Theoretician of Pure Anarchism*

In addition to his popularity as a public speaker, Hatta got here to be viewed through his comrades as ‘the best theoretician of anarchist communism in Japan’. An exact examination of Hatta’s theoretical writings will be left till Chapters 5 and 6, however right here it is excellent to point out the goals which lay in the back of this facet of his activity. In particular, it is vital to display that his theoretical output used to be in response to the twin enemies which he noticed confronting anarchism—namely, capitalism and bolshevism. Japan endured to improve as a capitalist and imperialist energy during the interwar years. For many years, the material enterprise led this development, with the range of cotton spindles in operation growing from 2.4 million in 1914 to 6.7 million in 1929. Consequently Japanese textiles had been penetrating the world’s markets and have been posing a serious hazard to Western manufacturers, such as the as soon as unrivalled Lancashire cotton mills. Other industries as various as coal mining, iron and metal production, shipbuilding and desktop building have been growing too, laying the groundwork for Japan’s growing army energy as nicely as its financial power. It would be tedious to recite the financial facts for all these industries but, typically, between 1913 and 1929 coal manufacturing expanded from 21.3 to 34.3 million tonnes and the output of completed metal rose from 255,000 to two million tonnes. Linked with Japan’s upward push as the dominant monetary electricity in East Asia, step-by-step it received an empire. In 1910 Korea used to be brought to Taiwan as any other colonial territory, and, through judiciously siding with the ‘right’ aspect in the First World War, Japan took over a string of previously German-held islands in the North Pacific. Parallel to this acquisition of a formal empire, there used to be a chronic procedure below way of casual financial and army penetration of China, specially of its North-Eastern area of Manchuria, which used to be prosperous in many of the uncooked substances wanted by means of Japanese

industry. Eventually Manchuria was once to be indifferent from China by using the advent of the puppet nation of Manchukuo in 1932. Rivalry on the world's markets and the ambition to tightly closed reliable resources of uncooked substances inevitably led to increasing anxiety between Japan and different imperialist powers in the years after the First World War. It is no longer solely the gain of hindsight that approves one to comprehend the roots of the Second World War here. Already in 1927, when Japanese troops had been dispatched to China, Kokushoku Seinen (Black Youth) had argued that what was once occurring in the Far East was once 'preparation for the Second World War'. Hatta was once as conscious as any of his comrades that hostilities and financial disaster have been inherent points of capitalism and he wrote in apocalyptic phrases about the destruction and distress that would observe if present society had been allowed to proceed unchecked. For Hatta, capitalism intended the division of labour, centralised power, country wide aggrandizement, and the enlargement of manufacturing at the fee of the people's consumption. These had been the motives why he fought in opposition to capitalism with such passionate intensity. Not a few of capitalism's opponents in Japan throughout this length believed that opposition to capitalist society robotically entailed aiding bolshevik Russia. Hatta would have none of this. For him, capitalism and bolshevism have been reduce from the identical material and displayed in truth the equal characteristics. As a outcome of bolshevik tries to industrialise, the division of labour was once intending apace in Russia and destroying patterns of communal dwelling that had survived for centuries amongst the peasants. In order to put this in force, strength was once being focused greater and greater in the arms of a despotic nation and a tyrannical party. The supposedly worldwide creed of bolshevik-style 'communism' furnished an ideological gloss for these techniques however was, in fact, only a car for advancing Russia's countrywide interests. Similarly, as soon as the succession of bolshevik monetary insurance policies and plans had been stripped of the propaganda which accompanied them, it may want to be considered that they unfailingly gave priority to elevating manufacturing as a substitute than enhancing the people's livelihood. All these elements of bolshevism intended that it was once no greater than a version on the capitalist theme and in no way a choice to capitalism.

### **3.4. The Transitory Aspect of the Dictatorship and Subproletariat**

According to the online political dictionary (annex (1.))

dictatorship is - a form of domination of one or more social classes in a certain social order.

It is exercised politically, economically and ideologically; it has, in the order of capitalist exploitation (bourgeois dictatorship), different positions: relatively moderate (constitutional monarchy,

parliamentary republic) or discretionary (personal dictatorship, military dictatorship, fascist dictatorship).

Subproletariat - the poorest group within the working class

*"We are all on the brink of poverty, but on different sides of it."*

*classic quote by V.I. Lenin*

A naccurate instance of the transitional impact between dictatorship and the subproletariat would be the Russian revolution, in which Leninism appeared, is section of the way of life of Marxism.

This time period virtually refers to the theories of the Bolshevik ideologue and chief Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov acknowledged as Lenin and their implementation all through and after the Russian Revolution. The aggregate of Marxism with this present day gave rise, in accordance to his supporters, to Marxism-Leninism, developed through Stalin after Lenin's dying to legitimize the work of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Comintern, and later formally grew to be the ideology of the Soviet Union. The phrase "Leninism" was once first used by way of Anatolij Vasil'evič Lunačarskij in 1907 with controversial intent, to point out Lenin's authoritarian fashion in the Bolshevik current.

The Russian Revolution used to be a sequence of activities that led in February 1917 to the spontaneous overthrow of the Russian tsarist regime, and then, in October of that year, to the Bolsheviks taking electricity and the institution of a Leninist ("communist") regime. The latter led to a very violent civil war, in which the Bolsheviks have been antagonistic through the White Army and a range of different adversaries (Mahnovshcina, the Green Army, etc.). The fighting was once accompanied via a fall of the Russian economy, which had begun for the duration of the war, and a famine that resulted in many deaths: it ended with the victory of the Bolsheviks, and the merging, beneath the auspices of the USSR, of most territories of the former empire. The Russian revolution additionally gave upward push to communism in the cutting-edge feel of the term.

It used to be for the duration of this revolution that anarchism was once asserted in the inclined social type as a shape of protest in opposition to the Bolsheviks.

The dictatorship that took over the society used to be a terrifying one, with a hard and lengthy process. those in the prone category persisted starvation and many different horrible things.

As a result of this revolution, a country wide consciousness, many anarchist ideologies, awoke. This country wide awareness aroused in the Russian state a experience of rebellion in opposition to the Bolshevik regime which imposed a coverage of Leninist dictatorship.

Following this move, a lot of penalties have taken preserve of society, each effective and negative.

After the Civil War, a very vital trade took location in the discipline of sexual morals. The Marxist critique of the bourgeois household had already led the Bolsheviks to amend the regulation on divorce, marriage, and voluntary termination. In 1922, gay practices have been additionally decriminalized. Throughout the 1920s, the want for get right of entry to freer sexuality prompted a social motion known as by using Wilhelm Reich the "sexual revolution." Imposed from the grassroots, it used to be no longer sufficiently supported through senior officers of the regime, and regularly misplaced its importance.

More generally, the Bolshevik power, particularly below the management of Alexandra Kollontai, would take necessary steps to enhance the social fame of women. In addition to the morals law, a quantity of decrees diagnosed on the grounds that the stop of 1917 the proper of ladies to the 8-hour working day, to the negotiation of wages, to the safety of the place of business in case of pregnancy, methods to make certain care teenagers all through working hours, as properly as political rights equal to these of men. Women's work has been encouraged, each from an emancipatory viewpoint (the regime reviews that "chained at home, the spouse can now not be equal to the man") however additionally to fill the labor scarcity brought on by means of hostilities and famine.

But this national ideological conflict was present in the time of Stalin, another Bolshevik with communist dictatorial party principles.

### **3.5. Stalin and The Dictatorship of The Party**

*I became a Marxist because of my social position ... but also because of the intolerance and harsh discipline I was subjected to in the seminary ... The atmosphere in which I lived was overloaded with hatred against tsarist oppression.*

*Stalin in talks with Emil Ludwig (December 1931)*



Here is Stalin in his discussion with Emil Ludwig, he says that it was the tsarist society and Marxist ideas that made him his personality, and represents the man who created the atmosphere in which he grew up.

Stalin had very few contributions to communist (or alternatively Marxist-Leninist) theory, however the few he made have been frequent all through his lifetime by using all Soviet researchers in the political science.

In 1936, Stalin declared that Soviet society used to be made up of two non-antagonistic social classes: the employees and the kolkhoz peasants. These corresponded to two distinct types of possession of the capability of manufacturing that existed in the Soviet Union: country possession (for workers) and collective possession (for the peasantry). In addition, Stalin extraordinary the social stratum of intellectuals. The thought of non-antagonistic lessons used to be absolutely new to Leninist theory.

Stalin and his supporters, at some point of his rule from then till today, emphasised the concept that socialism ought to be constructed and consolidated in one country, even in an underdeveloped one, such as Russia at the flip of the century.

Stalin carried forward Leninist ideas and put into practice all the party's communist "dreams." He had a harsh policy based on Leninism, he being the child formed in a society in which you were a predator or prey. He did not bring many new concepts as I mentioned earlier but he certainly had a big impact on society and the millions of people who were under his thorny wing.

But notwithstanding all this, Stalin, like Lenin, created an ideology referred to as "Stalinism."

Stalinism is an ideology and a political-social and financial machine brought by using Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin in the Soviet Union. Lev Trotsky described this device as totalitarian, and this characterization has come to be extensively used via critics of Stalinism.

Stalinism is Joseph Visarionovich Stalin's interpretation of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine. Stalinism is now not a Marxist doctrine however a Marxist-communist doctrine, Stalinism does now not interpret Marxism-Leninism from the factor of view of Marx, Engels and Lenin however strictly of Stalin who preferred in his very own opinion the standards of Marxism-Leninism which he patented in accordance with his consideration. in accordance to Lenin. Stalinism is a Marxist model of communism and is located in the Authoritarian Left. it would be an ideology shut to Nazism, an absolutely false fact. Stalinism differs from n Stalinism is antagonistic to racism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism, whilst Nazism encourages them. in fact, being supported via the bourgeoisie and used

in desire of political pluralism in capitalist-liberal society as a weapon towards leftist regimes (Marxism, communism, etc.), Stalinism differs from Nazism in that Stalinism is Christian-Orthodox as antagonistic to Nazism which is a promoter of atheist and neo-pagan currents, right here the two proving their belonging on the ideological axis, Nazism belonging to the Right and Stalinism Left and of path we can talk about the struggle that Nazism and Stalinism introduced lower back in the Second World War World War II between the Nazi Germany and the U.S.S. Stalinism differs from Marxism-Leninism however is stimulated from the truth that it is totalitarian-authoritarian, and belongs to the Communist Left, no longer the Marxist Left, even though it is comparable in many respects. Although we can discover these ideas in Marxism-Leninism notwithstanding the incorrect views in positive conditions that Marx, Engels and Lenin had, respectively, so we can think about Stalinism a unique structure of communism fashioned via adapting Orthodox Christianity. Marxism-Leninism.

## 1. NOTE

Stalin's self-proclaimed communism of the Soviet Union used to be in many methods the final perversion, in reality an antithesis, of Karl Marx's communism, proving that dictatorship can without problems put on communist robes as gently as capitalist ones. Stalin's Marxism used to be superficial if no longer non-existent. If the way Stalin acted, and if the Stalinist fashion and gadget of authorities resembles some thing or someone, then this is Ivan the Terrible. The identical is real for Mao Tedung. If 5% of his ideology can be attributed to Marxist influences, there is little doubt that the ultimate 95% had been rooted in Chinese culture, in the aspirations and desires of the Taiping rebels and different individuals in the many nineteenth-century riots.

But if the communism of our handy theologies was once false, so used to be capitalism. When capitalism manifested itself in its purest form, in the days of John D. Rockefeller, his acquisitions of Texas oil lands have been due, if now not more, to the velocity of his gunmen and his accountants. (Baran and Sweezy, 1996). And the monetary insurance policies of the Reagan technology ("reaganomics") that ended the generation of duality of superpowers had been as plenty a perversion of the declared beliefs as have been these of Moscow. With a tax gadget that appreciated the immediately extraction of wealth at the fee of wealth creation, and which penalized each financial savings and long-term investment, it unleashed the feudal obscenity of death enterprise executives who paid their salaries. greater than a hundred instances their employees, plus hundreds of thousands of bucks in bonuses that ended up hurting each morale and competitiveness. This coverage has institutionalized greed and decrepitude. It used to be a sketch and a perversion of capitalism - even though some Marxists, of course, will see this perversion as the very straightforward essence of the

capitalist system. (The self-proclaimed communism of Stalin's USSR was once in many approaches the closing perversion, certainly antithesis, of that espoused with the aid of Karl Marx, and proved solely that dictatorship can as without problems undertake communist as it can capitalist garb. Stalin's Marxism was once shallow, if no longer If anything, his modus operandi, his governing fashion and system, used to be that of Ivan the Terrible - whose Russian nickname is greater top and greater evocatively translated as Ivan the Awesome. The identical holds proper of Mao Zedong. If 5% of his ideology can be ascribed to Marxist influences, there is little doubt that 95% was once rooted in Chinese way of life - in the aspirations and goals of the Taiping and different rebellions of the nineteenth century.)

Next, I would like to talk about democratic anarchism a little from another period, a little more modern, about the importance of anarchism for democracy and vice versa, and we will clarify what progressivism is.

### **3.6. Democratic Anarchism or The Mature Form of Progressive Legitimate Regime**

What is progressive legitimate regime?

Progressivism is a political present day that promotes or promotes social, political, and financial reform. As a philosophy, it is primarily based on the thinking of progress, which states that advances in science, technology, financial improvement and social agency are quintessential to enhancing the human condition. Progressivism emerged as section of an extra familiar response to the modifications delivered about with the aid of industrialization and as a choice to the normal conservative response to social and monetary problems.

The modern motion commenced in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in cities with newly set up employees and reformers fascinated in supporting these dealing with hard dwelling conditions. Progressives spoke of the want for laws to modify the trouble of rents and toddler labor. They have additionally known as for higher prerequisites for women.

Anarchism's Importance for Democracy is this important?

We can see what occurs when radicals strive to enhance democratic concept besides incorporating anarchism. Often it is little extra than "democratic socialism" restated, that is, reformist country socialism. For example, David Trend's Radical Democracy (1996) is in most cases articles by means

of participants of Democratic Socialists of America. They are rather embarrassed by way of the identification of their socialism with statism, however they nevertheless have no choice to the use of the present kingdom to intervene in the economy. A democratic principle which is surely radical would strongly deny that the present patriarchal/racist capitalist nation is in reality democratic, would oppose the total socially-alienated, bureaucratic-military country machine, and would advocate alternatively a democratic federation of assemblies and associations. Anything much less will gloss over the undemocratic—anti-democratic—nature of our society and its state. A sizeable try to enhance a radical democratic idea which consists of socialism has been made via Chantal Mouffe and these related with her. She is clear that her “radical democracy” is now not a choice to the current country however an extension of it. “What we recommend is a sort of ‘radical liberal democracy’—we do now not exist it as a rejection of the liberal democratic regime or the organization of a new political shape of society” (1996; p.20). Her intention is “...extending democracy inside the framework of a liberal-democratic regime” (1992; p. 3). She is essential of direct democracy or neighborhood as goals. In truth, the sole time she appears to immediately deal with the country is in a dialogue of these who oppose “civil society” to “the state”. It is now not challenging to exhibit that “civil society”—the realm of capitalism, patriarchy, and racism—is no longer the floor for salvation from the state. But “civil society” is internally antagonistic, based totally on the tensions between oppressed and oppressors, such as the struggles of classes, genders, and races, among others. This strain from under for freedom is the supply of all social progress. Mouffe claims that the country additionally has interior antagonisms, consequently implying that it is incorrect to reject the nation as such. She notes, for example, that the country may also omit rules in opposition to gender discrimination or in protection of peasants towards landlords in negative countries. This is true, however these are like raises which the administration of a commercial enterprise may additionally provide its workers. It might also do this due to the fact the employees pressure it to or due to the fact it is far-sighted and offers advantages earlier than the people shape a union—but anything the reason, administration stays capitalist and the enemy of the workers. There are divisions inside management, as inside the state, however they are over how first-rate to suppress and/or coop the oppressed. Neither administration nor the country is the pal of employees or female or peasants. Laclau and Mouffe add that there are instances when the nation is adverse to “civil society.” “...This is what occurs when the kingdom has been converted into a bureaucratic excrescence imposed with the aid of pressure upon the relaxation of society, as in Eastern Europe, or in the Nicaragua of the Somoza...” . That is, in countries, such as the U.S., where the majority do guide the regime, the kingdom is not, they claim, a bureaucratic-military excrescence upon society. This is an opinion held by means of many people, which include that U.S. majority. It can be argued for, however I do no longer see how it can be known as “radical.”

*(Bookchin, Murray (1996). The Third Revolution: Popular Movements in the Revolutionary Era. Vol. 1. New York: Cassell.)*

### Democracy's Importance For Anarchism?

If democratic idea wishes anarchism, so anarchism wishes democracy. There is an authoritarian fashion inside the records of anarchism. It starts off evolved with Proudhon, who was once racist, anti-Semitic, patriarchal, and who imagined himself ruling France as dictator over his federation of associations. Bakunin, the 2d "father of anarchism," stored on making an attempt to prepare secret societies which would manipulate mass agencies from at the back of the scenes (Guerin, 1970; Woodcock, 1962). Anarchist terrorists and bomb throwers (including the Unabomber) acted as elite heroes besides (or against) the people.

From then till now, anarchists have frequently capitulated both to reformism (support of the contemporary state) or to modern dictatorships. Proudhon ended up getting elected to the French parliament. Kropotkin, the 1/3 "father of anarchism," grew to become an enthusiastic supporter of the Western imperialist states in World War I. Goodman (1965) and Chomsky (1994) should pretty be known as reformists. This anarchist guide for reformism grew to be a serious be counted when the Spanish anarchists of the 1930s, confronted with a innovative situation, grew to be ministers in the liberal capitalist government. On the different side, many anarchists joined with the Bolsheviks after the Russian Revolution. In the 1960s, the anarchist-pacifists of Liberation journal grew to be apologists for Castro and Ho Chi Minh. Further examples are without problems found.

The Marxist Hal Draper has argued that the simple hassle with anarchism is its supposed rejection of democracy. "...Anarchist 'libertarianism'...is now not involved with the triumphing of democratic control-from-below, however with the destruction of 'authority' over the person ego, even the most extraordinarily democratic model of authority imaginable" (1969; p. 93). He costs Proudhon, "Any man who can't do what he desires and whatever he wishes has the proper to revolt, even alone, in opposition to the government, even if the authorities had been anyone else" (same). Draper comments, "The solely man who can revel in this 'freedom' limitless by using society is a despot" (same).

While there is an authoritarian facet of the anarchist tradition, it would be ridiculous to deny that there is additionally a libertarian-democratic side, in each idea and practice. Whether or no longer they used the phrase "democracy," socialist-anarchists have lengthy encouraged changing bureaucratic establishments through self-governing associations, that is, by means of democracy (and, as I have argued, a sturdy protection of character and minority rights does no longer always contradict

democracy or majority rule). Anarchists have prepared mass democratic, labor unions, famous armies, and self-managed peasant collectives and employee cooperatives. Marxism too has each democratic and authoritarian sides, however the dominant tendency of its important wings, social democracy and Stalinism, has been authoritarian statism (as Draper would agree). Between Marxism and anarchism, it is anarchism which has the greater democratic and freedom-loving idea and tradition.

Also, anarchists have a specific relation to their theoreticians. Unlike Marxism and Leninism, anarchism is no longer named after its historical figures. It has no sacred writings same to Capital or State and Revolution. It has no hassle rejecting the blunders of its founders.

However, Draper has a fundamental point. Anarchism, if no longer inherently antagonistic to democracy, has had a contradictory relationship with it. The individualist dispositions are the worst in that regard, as has been identified via socialist-anarchists. What is wished is for anarchists to become aware of anarchism as extreme, progressive democracy. The weaknesses of anarchism are real, but they can be corrected from inside the anarchist tradition.

The application of anarchism is to substitute the bureaucratic-military kingdom computer with a federation of famous assemblies and associations, as decentralized as is practically possible. This is democracy except the state. Any different program, such as staying inside the limits of the current country however making it “more democratic” (“democratic socialism” or “radical-liberal democracy”) falls for “democracy” as an ideological cowl of the rule of a minority—of patriarchal/racist capitalism and its bureaucratic state.

This anarchic democracy has influenced anarchy more and more into the international system of human rights and human rights.

*(“Woodcock, George (1962). Anarchism: A History of Libertarian Ideas and Movements. New York: World Publishing.”)*

*(“Draper, Hal (1969). “A Note on the Father of Anarchism. ”New Politics. Vol. VIII, no. 1. Pp. 79–93”)*

### ***3.7. Anarchy in the Frames of International Law and Human Rights***

#### **WHAT IS INTERNATIONAL LAW?**

First, let's clear the ground from the first problem: what is international law. To say that it is not a right does not at all mean precluding the possibility of recognizing a minimum order in international relations. "The anarchy that prevails in interstate relations does not necessarily mean sheer force. It only means the absence of the legal rule. Even without this, human gifts assert themselves by producing a certain degree of order, through factors other than the law ". "The Tsarist regime in Russia was defined as a form of despotism tempered by assassination." Similarly, the anarchy among the states of the world is tempered and attenuated by various factors that prevent the current condition of the absence of the law from escalating into extreme disorder. Among these factors it is necessary to mention: religion, the sense of humanity, reciprocity, inertia, the limits of the power of each state, the balance of power, agreements for collective security, fear "(p. 14).

Even Hobbes had noted that in the state of nature, the *bellum omnium contra omnes* is only potential, and does not mean a violent struggle constantly taking place: "When men live without a common power that respects them, they live in a state called of war ... and the nature of this state consists not in the actual fighting, but in the known disposition to fight, for as long as there is no guarantee to the contrary ». The difficulty in understanding such a concept may constitute a first explanation of the emergence, affirmation and persistence of the illusion of international "law".

It may be that at its origins this illusion had a certain sense, when the set of international norms was supported by such an effective sanction as "faith in God and fear of the devil"; but it is certainly "an irony of fate that modern international law was formulated by Grotius and others with the tacit premise that it had medieval Christian universalism as its substantial basis, and Roman law as its formal expression, when these two premises had been definitively challenged by the Renaissance and the Reformation. In this sense, the work of the modern fathers of international law can be defined as posthumous "(p. 74 and p. 108 and following). Indeed, it is certain that that type of sanction has

completely disappeared. To the classic image of Henry IV who in Canossa waits for three days barefoot in the snow for the forgiveness of the pontiff, N.Y. Park rightly contrasted that of Mussolini who squared the chips against corporate sanctions, "whereupon the League's representative stood in penitence outside Il Duce's office in Rome begging and prying for forgiveness". [15]

International law also "evolves like all human things; but in the diametrically opposite sense to that claimed by his inexperienced theorists. It may well be that in some of them the aversion to recognize such a state of affairs derives from the moral inclination - more or less conscious - not to contribute to determining it and to endorse it, but the policy of hypocrisy, of the leader in the sand, has never benefited ethical progress, which presupposes sincerity (*oportet ut eveniant schandala*).

#### AN "ANARCHIC" RIGHT: INTERNATIONAL LAW

Pasquale Galluppi, who went so far as to illustrate Kantian "transcendental dialectics" in his Philosophical Letters, observed that once established the doctrine of judgments, on the basis of which only a priori synthetic judgment is valid, as a synthesis of empirical data and concept, Kant would he could have deduced the impossibility of metaphysics as a science "with the stroke of a pen." But that excellent man, he added, was not satisfied with such a cheap conclusion and proved his thesis in detail in "Transcendental Dialectics." Not otherwise, it seems to us, the unlawful nature of international law could be inferred with a stroke of the pen from the simple definition of law, which contemplates, as the case may be, the two indispensable elements of coercion and authority over capable parties. [16] and if the meaning and scope of the principle of absolute national sovereignty, *Superiorem non recognoscens*, is taken into account, which in itself automatically excludes the existence of a normative order above states.

But even admitting the superfluity of a thorough demonstration and even if it had been provided several times - in the philosophical field by Machiavelli, Spinoza, Hobbes, Hegel, Lasson, Gumplovicz, Binder, Mochi; at the political level by the Hamilton of the Federalist and, in general, by the theorists of modern international federalism (from Streit to Robbins, to Reves); for more strictly technical-legal reasons by Austin, Lundstet, Olivecrona, Somolo, Campagnolo, etc. [17] - A detailed re-demonstration seems far from superfluous, and for two reasons. First of all, because international law professors, concerned with defending their discipline (and the department), and completely absorbed in their Chinese discussions, consider them to be of infinite subtlety and require undisputed insight and flexibility. mere mortals, they treat in depth enough those who dare to challenge so simply the validity, indeed, the very intrinsic conceivability of such a "right," and regard him as the elephant in the porcelain shop. And secondly, and above all, because the demonstration of



the non-legal nature of international law is neither complete nor persuasive if it is not able, at the same time, to qualify this reality of international relations with an appropriate definition, in consistent with fact and experience, which are alleged to be illegal in nature. A reality that shows, however, that in all really important cases, and in terms of state security, peace and war, they often behave as if in a "state of nature", outside the law; but which shows that in many other cases, especially apolitical in nature (think of organizations such as the International Postal Union, or the International Organization of Railways, which operate as clocks), the same states often, without exception, honor their commitments. and behave as if there were a right to which they felt obliged. This fact also shows that the litigation, proceedings and decisions of international courts, the inferences and counter-arguments of the "plaintiff" and "defendant" states in the various existing courts, from the Court of Justice in The Hague to the Council, have a rigorous external legal character. and the pedantic form of the UN Security

Such a demonstration - a true "transcendental dialectic" of international law - was given, in the most comprehensive form possible, in a volume by a young Israeli scholar, Levontin, [18] who has the almost unique merit of accepting discussions. on absurd ground. of international lawyers; to follow them with the patience of a Carthusian for the packaging of all their sophistry; to dismantle victoriously piece by piece the castle of books of their illogical and contradictory constructions.

If anarchy has an influence as mentioned above in international law, in human rights it has about the same influence and voice. We realize that the wording of anarchism in human rights is different, but it is essentially the same.

## CHAPTER 4

### **4. The Role of Anarchism as a Rebellious Educator in the Contemporary World. States that Survived Other Regimes and Live Now by Anarchic Rules. Anarchy as a Protest in Cultural Contemporary Society**

- 4.1. Anarchism as a Metaphor of Freedom in Contemporary Century
- 4.2. Anarchy - An Energetic but Gentle Dictatorship and Educational Influences
- 4.3. States that Fought Dictatorship and Despotism through Anarchy
- 4.4. Propaganda and Revolutionary Wave. Historical and Cultural Events that Influenced The Absorption of Anarchist Ideas From the End of Cold War Until Contemporaneity
- 4.5. Feminist Movements and The Olympia Phenomenon
- 4.6. Punk Culture, The Aggressive Avant-Garde, Avant-Punk and Post-Punk
- 4.7. How Can We Live in An Anarchic Society? Is the Anarchy a Utopia or Anti-Utopia?
- 4.8. Anarchic inclinations in contemporary protest and cultural movements

Throughout history - regardless of the type of formations and the nature of power - there have been and, apparently, for a long time to come there will be strong anarchist tendencies in the moods and behavior of large social groups.

The opinion about the petty-bourgeois nature of anarchism still dominates in Marxist literature. In our opinion, this phenomenon has a broader meaning, reflecting a certain psychological attitude and

form of behavior of various social strata, including groups of workers, students, and intelligentsia. Anarchism is not an accident, not an invention of Proudhon or Bakunin, but a completely natural phenomenon in the life of any society. In the Soviet country, as a result of the post-October "Red Terror" and then under the conditions of a harsh totalitarian regime, there were no opportunities for the manifestation of any kind of ideological and political nonconformism. Anarchist aspirations against the existing government could only be realized illegally or in the zone of criminal behavior, whether it be individual or group criminal acts.

But that's how it was before. Now the situation has changed. Glasnost, democratization, political pluralism have created an opportunity for legal self-expression of anarchist and anarcho-syndicalist sentiments - subject to compliance with constitutional requirements that prohibit actions aimed at the violent overthrow of power. A number of anarchist and anarcho-syndicalist groups are already being formed in the country, and a Confederation of anarcho-syndicalists has been created. Therefore, anarchism is not some kind of "academic" historical problem, but in many respects a problem of the present and future, including our present and future. That is why we consider it timely to draw attention to anarchism as a kind of universal phenomenon. Of course, the topic, taken as a whole, is too broad for a journal article, so we deliberately limit ourselves to an analysis of only the ethical side of anarchism.

In October 1989, an interesting and fruitful discussion took place, which determined a new approach to assessing the theoretical and political legacy of M. Bakunin. - See Questions of Philosophy, 1990, No. 3, p. 165-169. This choice is due to two additional considerations. The first boils down to the fact that it is the internal contradictions of the ethics of anarchism that are of greatest interest. Their comprehension to a large extent helps to understand some of the general processes of moral development. By the way, beginning with K. Marx and F. Engels, anarchism was most of all condemned precisely for its, as they said, "immoral essence." It is time to deal with these accusations, to look at the problem from the point of view of common human values, and not only from the standpoint of the class political struggle of the times of the First International.

The second consideration boils down to the fact that in general the problem of universal morality was almost forgotten by us and relegated to the department of "petty-bourgeois sentimentalism" and "priestly". In Marxist theory, the idea of the priority of "class morality" completely prevailed. All universal criteria of morality were evaluated as harmful inventions of the church and bourgeois propaganda.

With a change in our view of the meaning of universal human values, an opportunity opens up to abandon the old dogmas and look with a fresh look at all non-Marxist doctrines and political movements, including anarchism in general and its ethical principles in particular.

At first glance, the very combination of morality with anarchism is absurd: is it possible to speak of some bright colors of the "black banner of anarchism"? After all, it has long been known from Marxist literature that anarchism is just a "bourgeois worldview turned inside out"<sup>^</sup>, the ideology of individualism of the "petty bourgeois "enraged" by the horrors of capitalism",<sup>^</sup> carried "bourgeois immorality to the extreme", "pompous nonsense", buffoonery, criminality, fanfare, Jesuitry, etc.

In any Marxist philosophical reference book one can find a list of the "abominations of anarchism" - and egoism, and banditry, and irrationalism, and voluntarism, and subjectivism, and counter-revolutionarism, and much more. In any case, one cannot find any positive opinions about anarchism anywhere. But what is interesting is that almost all criticism is directed at the political face of anarchism, at its role in concrete politics. As for the analysis of the strictly moral (or, if you like, immoral) aspects of the doctrine, they are placed in a dependent position on politics. The logic is this: is it possible to talk about any kind of morality of anarchism, if its political role is reactionary and harmful from the point of view of the revolutionary proletariat and Marxist-Leninist theory? Of course not. And if so, then all anarchists are children of the Father of lies, i.e. devil. After all, it is not for nothing that the father of Russian anarchism, Mikhail Bakunin, rejecting belief in God, defiantly worshiped "the first free thinker and emancipator of the worlds" - Satan.

Since the condemnation of the subversive activities of the Bakunin International Socialist Alliance against the International Association of Workers (1873), an extremely negative assessment of anarchism has been firmly established in Marxist literature. At one time, harsh political assessments were, of course, fully justified. But if we take the moral doctrine of Bakuninism, then it will reveal many elements of a positive nature. This does not allow one to unequivocally judge anarchism as an immoral phenomenon.

To clarify the truth, three interrelated aspects of anarchist doctrine and practice should be disassembled: moral criteria for common ultimate goals; moral approaches to determining the ways and means of achieving the set task; ethical standards for self and others. All three moments, of course, are interconnected, but nevertheless they have their own nature and character.

In the literature devoted to anarchism, as a rule, instead of analyzing each issue separately, first of all, a general political assessment of anarchism as an opponent of the organized labor movement was given. This approach made it possible to absolutize any one or several characteristics of anarchism and its morality.

According to the anarchist doctrine, for example, clearly immoral ways and means of struggle were allowed, but on this basis it would be unfair to deny that the majority of ideological anarchists (and not the dark personalities who clung to them) proceeded, as V.I. Lenin, "from the best, noblest, loftiest motives."

History knows dozens of unprincipled and immoral adherents of anarchism, like S.G. Nechaev. But at the same time - and thousands, tens of thousands of supporters of "direct actions" - honest, selfless, noble people: Prince P.A. Kropotkin, Ya. Novomirsky, Lev Cherny (Russia), A. Pereira (Brazil), E. Malatesta (Italy), brothers Ricardo and Flores Magon (Mexico) and many others. This difference should by no means be discounted because we are talking about the morality of living people, and not about some kind of self-contained doctrine. That is why the analysis of the moral face of anarchism as an ideology and trend cannot be carried out without taking into account its various aspects - both negative (and they certainly exist) and positive (they also exist).

In other words, it is high time to abandon the habit of contrasting Marxism and anarchism as "light and shadow", which, for example, did Jacques Duclos, and calmly, impartially and honestly reveal the essence of anarchist ethics.

But first, let us recall the original meaning of the very concept of "anarchy". Contrary to common philistine views on anarchy as a kind of chaos and licentiousness, almost banditry, etc., the root meaning of this Greek word means "anarchy", "anarchy". This is exactly how the greatest representative of anarchism, Mikhail Aleksandrovich Bakunin (1814-1876), interpreted anarchy.

"Freedom! Only freedom, complete freedom for everyone and for everyone! This is our morality and our only religion. Freedom is a characteristic feature of a person, this is what distinguishes him from wild animals. It contains the only proof of his humanity," Bakunin wrote about the moral content of the anarchist model of the organization of life. Especially resolutely and consistently he defended the principle of linking the freedom of one with the freedom of all in the future society: "Consequently, freedom is not a limitation, but an affirmation of the freedom of all. This is the law of interconnection." The triple relationship - the brotherhood of people in mind, in work and in

freedom - that, in his opinion, "is the basis of democracy ... The implementation of freedom in equality - this is justice." It is difficult to disagree with this judgment. There is only one single dogma, one single moral basis for people - freedom, and therefore the entire organization of social life must be built in accordance with this principle. This ideal meant, according to Bakunin, anarchy. In essence, it was nothing but the communist system.

.  
K. Marx, attacking the Bakuninists with criticism, wrote:

"Anarchy is the warhorse of their teacher Bakunin, who borrowed nothing but labels from the socialist systems. All socialists understand the following by anarchy: after the goal of the proletarian movement - the destruction of classes - has been achieved, the state power, which exists in order to keep the vast majority of society, consisting of producers, under the yoke of an insignificant exploiting minority, disappears, and government functions are transformed into mere administrative functions.

The whole difference in the understanding of anarchy, or communism, between Marx and Bakunin actually boiled down to the fact that for the first, a stateless structure was conceived as a consequence of the revolutionary transformation of society, and for the second, as the primary and immediate task (stage) of the social revolution itself.

Both Marx and Bakunin saw the humanistic side of their ideal in the striving to outlive the state in the future and the transition to self-government. The discrepancy concerned not the content, but the ways and speed of achieving the goal. For Bakunin, a simple leap from classes and the state to a classless and stateless society was both possible and desirable. Marx maliciously ridiculed this naive utopia, calculated to "leap in one fell swoop into an anarchist-communist-atheistic paradise."

According to scientific socialism, the path to the complete freedom of man and society is long and lies through the dictatorship of the proletariat, through the temporary expansion of revolutionary state violence. Bakunin sought at all costs to reduce the time of transition from an exploitative and unjust society to a free and just system. It was for this reason that he vehemently opposed the theory of scientific communism:

"Because I demand the economic and social equality of classes and individuals ... I hate communism because it is the denial of freedom and because humanity without freedom is incomprehensible to me. I am not a communist, because communism concentrates and absorbs all forces society in favor

of the state ... while I want the destruction of the state, the final eradication of the principle of authority. One can easily prove the utopianism of the course towards the simultaneous destruction of all state power, but it was an eminently noble utopia.

Absoluteizing the idea of the freedom of the human person, Bakunin naturally came to the conclusion that its main enemy is the state and, in general, any power. He unhesitatingly extended this assessment to the dictatorship of the proletariat, opposing to it the image of radiant powerlessness - anarchy. "Revolutionaries - politicians, adherents of the dictatorship," he wrote, "wish the first victories of calming passions, they want order, the trust of the masses, submission to the authorities created on the path of the revolution. Thus, they proclaim a new state. We, on the contrary, will nourish, awaken, unbridled passions bring anarchy to life."

Bakunin, with some unshakable conviction, believed that it was the state, the power, regardless of anything, always and everywhere that was "the very essence and center of any reaction." And if so, then the main task is to "try to form a force that is clearly revolutionary, negative, destroying the state," and by no means fight for the creation of a new (workers') state, which K. Marx and F. Engels called for.

The Program of the Bakunin International Socialist Alliance stated: "We are not afraid of anarchy, but call for it, convinced that from this anarchy, that is, from the full manifestation of the liberated people's life, freedom, equality, justice, a new order and the very strength of the revolution against reaction must be born. This new life is the people's revolution - no doubt it will not be slow to organize itself, but it will create its revolutionary organization from the bottom up and from the periphery to the center - in accordance with the principle of freedom, and not from top to bottom, not from the center to the periphery, following the example of any authority - for it does not matter to us, it is called whether this authority is a church, a monarchy, a constitutional state, a bourgeois republic, or even a revolutionary dictatorship. We all equally hate and reject them as the inevitable source of exploitation and despotism."

So, every state is "equally" hateful, anarchy is a synonym for freedom and revolution, the source of a "new order": without power, property, religion. Such was the creed of the secret associations of "international brothers" - the Bakuninists, who believed that the new revolutionary power could only be "even more despotic" than the former, and therefore should be completely denied a priori. Otherwise, the popular masses, governed by decrees, will again be forced "to obedience, stagnation, death, that is, to slavery and exploitation by the new pseudo-revolutionary aristocracy."

Sadly, this prediction of Bakunin, unfortunately, was largely confirmed. This does not mean, of course, that K. Marx and F. Engels took an erroneous position in assessing the role of the state at the stage of transition to a new society. No, they were definitely right. But, apparently, the possibility of the moral degeneration of revolutionary power was not acutely felt precisely because of its pragmatic power principle. In his movement towards an understanding of anarchism as the highest stage of humanism and freedom, Bakunin went through a difficult and difficult path.

The spiritual father of anarchism, in his youth he was a passionate and sincere apologist for religion and Christian morality. Admiration for God and the harmony of nature, the desire to find harmony in "absolute love" for truth - this is the main aspiration of the young Bakunin. In a letter to his family dated June 23, 1834, a 20-year-old cadet of the St. Petersburg Artillery School sincerely stated: "Love is the main reason for life, the main law of the harmonic connection that reigns in nature ... life without love is groveling!". At this time, romantic ideas feed his soul.

The mood of active spiritual activity and personal moral improvement prompted him to take a position of critical attitude to reality. In a letter dated May 7, 1835, Bakunin wrote: "I am a man of circumstances, and the hand of God has inscribed in my heart the following sacred letters, embracing my whole existence: "He will not live for himself." I want to realize this wonderful future. I will make myself worthy of it. To be able to sacrifice everything for this sacred purpose is my only ambition."

Gradually, the apology of philanthropy is replaced by a persistent search for effective ways to improve society. In a letter to his brother (March 1845), Bakunin declares: "To free a person is the only legitimate and beneficent influence ... Not forgiveness, but inexorable war against our enemies, because they are enemies of everything human in us, enemies of our dignity, our freedom".

Since then, the motive of freedom has come to the fore in Bakunin's worldview. Humanity develops into its political incarnation - "love of freedom".

#### **4.1. Anarchism as a Metaphor of Freedom in Contemporary Century**

The article reveals the main provisions of anarchist ideas about freedom as social value in the 19th century. The solution of the problem of freedom in classical anarchism is considered. Key words: freedom, social freedom, anarchy, equality, anarchism, socialism, state.



In the middle of the 19th century, along with liberalism, one more current of social thought is gaining popularity, which has made the basis of its attitude to reality defense of freedom as the main value. This socio-philosophical trend, which absolutized freedom, considered it the main principle of social device, is anarchism. philosophy itself anarchism is, at its core, a philosophy freedom. It is the demand for the liberation of the individual from all forms of social coercion combines the various teachings of the thinkers of these directions. A major anarchist theorist of the early 20th century. A. A. Borovoy wrote: "An anarchist cannot tolerate the diminution of his freedom, from whomever it didn't come out" [8]. A well-known domestic philosopher, an expert on anarchism P. I. Novgorodtsev noted in this regard that "the main principle that animates anarchism is the idea of freedom in its exclusivity and unconditionality".

Anarchist conceptions of freedom have numerous and varied sources. Among the thinkers who influenced them, one can point to utopian socialists and communists, J. J. Rousseau, W. Godwin, J. G. Fichte, G. W. F. Hegel. The first attempts to construct an anarchist theory are found in Proudhon and Stirner. Particularly interesting is the concept of freedom the latter, representing a sequential an attempt to carry out the anarchist principle in this issue. Stirner's views expressed them in the essay "The Only One and His Property", are distinguished by paradox and aphorism. Under the word "freedom" the thinker understands different phenomena, and the meaning of this concept can only be deduced from the context in which which they use it.

Freedom is proclaimed by M. Stirner as the highest human value, but the "freedom" that exists in the modern thinker's bourgeois society does not satisfy him. Society proclaims freedom of conscience, state, religion. However, this does not mean at all that a person is free, but on the contrary, Stirner believes, emphasizes increasing arbitrariness on the part of the state and religion in relation to the individual. The arbitrariness of the ruler-despot is replaced by bourgeois society by the arbitrariness of the law. Not it is so important who restricts a person's freedom, it is important that it is limited. The position is not in power to change even a revolution. All revolutions and the transformation ended only with a change ruler, but they did nothing to eliminate power altogether. Meanwhile, it is the power is the main source of restriction of freedom. People, as a rule, do not strive for freedom in its true sense, they want to achieve some goods, for the possession of which they allow society to dictate their will to them [10]. The German philosopher believes that the only way to freedom is the desire to act on one's own impulses, regardless of with no one and nothing. "... To be personally free, - Stirner argued, "means

to be only so free that no other person can dispose of me, or that what I can do or what I dare not do, does not depend on the personal determination of the other” [19]. Here Stirner is still close to the understanding of freedom by liberals because a similar definition can be found among them. However, following this statement, we meet others that are fundamentally different from the doctrine of liberalism. The philosopher notes that objective conditions, although they play important role in a person's life, cannot limit or increase the measure of his freedom.

Right to freedom cannot be given to the individual, she must herself take your freedom. Most people are unable to enjoy freedom, therefore "have no right to freedom, or rather, they have no freedom, and therefore they do not have the right to freedom” [19, p. 176]. For the meaning of his concept to become more understandable to readers, Stirner notes, that a truly free man is different from the image of a free individual that has developed in everyday consciousness and the previous philosophy. A truly free man Stirner calls "peculiar", emphasizing by the very name of his dissimilarity to others. In the thinker we can meet one more the designation of such a person is “owner”. Using these concepts, Stirner seeks to show the difference between true freedom and its false understanding. "A peculiar man is free by nature, "originally free", free on the contrary, he only strives for freedom, he -dreamer and visionary" [19, p. 153]. A “peculiar” person who takes into account only his own interests turn out to be frank egoist, although one should not identify the views Stirner with the ordinary idea of egoism. In order to be able to act in their own interests, a person must be independent of the need to do what he is not wishes. However, this is not enough, "you still need to have what whatever you want, you need to be not only “free”, but “owner” [19, p. 145]. Ownership here means right and opportunity manage something. Freedom as understood by the majority people is not really a great boon.

The progress of civilization does not at all lead to growth of real freedom. The "free" cultured person feels more depressed and oppressed than the unfree savage. Violence increases with the course of history, and a person does not have hope that one day he will be free. As N. A. Berdyaev rightly noted, M. Stirner “concrete human personalities disappear in the universal claims of the One, the ultimate individualism absorbs an individual who has nothing to rely on” [7]. Reality itself is hostile to man's freedom, so he can win independence from world only by rebellion, rebellion against the laws of this world, by acquiring "property". Although the achievement of absolute freedom of man from the world is impossible, the "owner" of the feels free. Stirner characterizes this circumstance in this way: “The shackles of reality every moment cut into my body with sharp scars. But with my own

I always I remain" [19, p. 147]. Identity and property cannot be taken away from a person, but a person can acquire them. can only do it on its own. The gift of freedom does not make a person free. Achieve freedom of the individual can only in society, in alliance with other people, although Stirner calls to consider only his own interests. Given the contradiction shows the impossibility of interpreting Stirner's teaching only as egoism. Man achieves freedom through development its originality, which is "nothing else, as the development of one's own individuality in in a form in which everything that connects people is not imposed on them by coercion but is established by themselves" [2]. According to Stirner, originality is most essential personality trait. It is in an effort to destroy this originality, to deprive a person of individual traits, the philosopher sees the hostility of the state and in general any power over the individual. The thinker puts forward one of the fundamental principles anarchism, according to which "society should refrain from any interference with the autonomy of individuals" [1]. Thus, Stirner develops the liberalist ideas about the state's non-interference in the private life of citizens to the point of declaring the need for complete independence of the individual from the state and all forms of public administration and control.

In the process of criticizing the existing at the time of the forms of social structure, the philosopher faced the question of how a society should look like, which allows to realize the principles of freedom proclaimed by the thinker and originality. In resolving it, Stirner encountered the greatest difficulties, since it was necessary to explain how a fully autonomous "owner" can interact with another such "owner" without losing any part of his autonomy. So, and without giving a detailed answer to this question, the thinker pointed out that the most acceptable form of social structure is the union free individuals, noting that the union, unlike the state, is "property" personality. This union or association is plastic and mobile formation, striving to meet the needs of each personality and changing in accordance with the free desires of its members. Stirner did not create a coherent concept of freedom; his paradoxical style of presentation, somewhat similar to Nietzsche's discourse, makes it difficult to reconstruct the logic of the text. Ideas Stirner did not receive much fame with his life, however, the subsequent development of the social philosophy of anarchism revealed much in common in the writings of the German thinker and more late theorists. Stirner's fate is similar to the fate of Kierkegaard - if the first developed the provisions of anarchism, anticipating many later theorists, then the second predicted many ideas of existential thinkers.

Anarchism as a socio-philosophical theory also developed by such domestic thinkers, like M. A. Bakunin and P. A. Kropotkin. And their works were not a simple reflection of Western theories, they became products of both European and Russian philosophy at the same time. Exactly representatives of domestic thought took a leading place in world anarchism. Main merit in

this belongs to M. A. Bakunin, who possessed great philosophical erudition and depth of thought. Like every anarchist, he puts at the center of his concept of the problem of freedom, the understanding of which formed under the influence of classical German philosophy, primarily Fichte and Hegel. At the same time, Bakunin focused on the role of the negative principle in Hegelian philosophy (for more on Bakunin's philosophy, see the work V. A. Karimova [11]). Bakunin also builds his own concept of freedom on denial, but is denied in it, first of all, the existing social system, the state in all its forms. Considering freedom "the only source and the only purpose" of human life [5], the thinker argued that its character is determined level of social life. Unlike Stirner, the Russian philosopher considers freedom as a collective, social principle. In his opinion, realizing the possibility of his freedom, a person realizes it only in collective labor, and human activity becomes free only if when its goal is to satisfy the needs of the individual as an intellectual being. Emphasizing the role of the social principle in the formation of a person, Bakunin wrote: "Outside of society, a person would not only not become free, but would not become a person in the true sense of the word" [4].

In the spirit of communist theories, the thinker asserted the attainability of freedom for each person only in the coming society of universal equality and fraternity. However, through reforms to achieve this ideal is not possible. We need a revolution, a rebellion [13]. Moreover, a person must himself go to rebellion, himself win freedom for yourself. Like Stirner, the Russian philosopher asserts the impossibility of enjoying the fruits of freedom granted from outside. Man must himself transform this world, which hostile to him. However, Bakunin, as a materialist, seeks the origins of human freedom in the very material world. "Nature itself," wrote the thinker, "in its progressive modifications strives for liberation... The comparatively most individual and freest being, from the point of view of the animal kingdom, is undeniably human." If man must obey the laws of nature, then the laws of society must be transformed according to the principle of freedom. Home The obstacle on this path is the state, the demand for the immediate destruction of which constitutes the essence of Bakunin's anarchist doctrine. The state is an instrument of violence and exploitation, and therefore it provides freedom only to the exploiters, being hostile to the masses.

The presence of the state implies "absolute limitation ... the denial of the freedom of each ... Where the State begins, individual freedom ends, and vice versa" [6]. Bakunin opposes all forms of the state, against statehood as such. Revolution, rebellion have as their main goal precisely the liquidation of the state, this source immorality and despotism. Organization future society without a state should be built on the principle of federalism, excluding any power. The philosopher says this about it: "Under

such a system, there is no longer proper power. Power is based on the collective and becomes a frank expression of the freedom of each, their true faithful embodiment of the will of all. At the same time, everyone obeys only because the one who directs him at the moment orders him what he himself wants” [6, p. 194]. Leader and subordinate are constantly changing in places, each one voluntarily occupies one thing, another place in society. Humanity will have to form a federation of autonomous unions of free individuals, in which independence and autonomy each part will become a reality. This world union of free productive associations eliminate all exploitation of labor, provide every individual with opportunities for the full disclosure of his abilities and the use of all social wealth. At In this the thinker opposes "everything that will at least somewhat resemble state socialism and communism” [6, p. 40]. In his critique of Marxism, Bakunin pointed out, that “restriction of freedom, violence by state (dictatorship of the proletariat) cannot in principle lead to the freedom of the individual and free society” [21]. Thus, with all the elements of utopianism in the views of Bakunin, many of his judgments on issues of real achievement of freedom both by society and by an individual are very relevant.

Criticism of bureaucracy and centralization, preaching the harmony of interests and needs of the working classes in the future society, search for ways to realize the liberation of man were the subject of reflection not only subsequent anarchists, but also representatives other socio-philosophical directions. The further development of the anarchist concept of freedom is associated with the name of P. A. Kropotkin, who also considered the state, which is a system of certain social relations, the purpose of which is to enrich the classes that have real power, as the main obstacle on the path of a person to freedom (for more details on Kropotkin's views, see the work V. A. Karimov [12]). Every state is denial of freedom, arbitrariness and violence, including the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Kropotkin believed that "the workers' state, ruled by an elected assembly is one of the most pernicious dreams instilled in us by an upbringing that recognizes power and authority” [16]. The thinker denies that the ideal social organization or communism can be achieved only by sacrificing freedom. on the altar of the state. According to Kropotkin, “it is possible to achieve communism, i.e., to own in common with all our social heritage and to produce all wealth together - only through the destruction of the state, the conquest of complete freedom of the individual, voluntary agreement and completely free association in unions and in federation of unions” [14].

Communism is understood by Kropotkin as a society unlike any other classical socialist utopias, in which strict centralized regulation of all aspects of life reigned. His communism is anarcho-

communism, or anarchy, which is the ideal of the future social order. According to the anarchist theorist, state socialism and communism, which does not get rid of strict regulation, has no prospects. Compared to him, anarchist communism "will do everything possible to expand individual freedom in all possible directions. In this latter case, the freedom of the individual, increased by her leisure, the opportunity to secure her well-being and free labor, with fewer working hours, will not suffer more than, for example, now from the conducted city gas, or city water, or from a modern hotel, and from the fact that we now, during working hours, they are forced to work together with thousands of other people. Having anarchy as an end and as a means, communism becomes possible, while without this end and means it should turn into a enslavement of personality and, therefore lead to failure" [14, p. 616].

In an anarchist society, the relationship between people should be built based on free agreement, general equality and lack of any form of power. Production will be focused on meeting the needs of people. In such a society, a truly free person will be formed, who does not accept any coercion. A necessary condition for achieving freedom the thinker considered equality, believing it to be synonymous with justice. However, it does not show how universal equality will be reconciled with the freedom of each individual. Kropotkin emphasized that a person living under anarchist organization of society, will do exactly as he pleases. Contradictions of people's interests do not arise, since their very desires will be directed towards the common good, "a huge number of people, as they become more enlightened and get rid of the fetters of our modernity, they will always act and act in a certain direction: for the benefit of society" [15]. Philosopher believes in good nature person, believes that without external coercion the individual will behave morally. According to Kropotkin, slavery reigns in modern society and there can be no talk of real freedom, although bourgeois philosophers assert their commitment to ideals of freedom. These thoughts of Kropotkin show his confidence in the needed transformations of the established orders, rejection of all former regulators of social activity people [10]. Concluding the consideration of the concept of freedom Kropotkin, we can conclude that he came to the absolute freedom of the individual in the future anarchist society. Considering freedom inherent in human nature, the thinker could not reveal the reasons why people still do not come to anarchy, as well as those criteria on the basis of which it would be possible to draw a conclusion about the need for an anarchist revolution. Kropotkin's optimism in his views on the future of mankind was not supported by theoretical studies, which determined the utopian character. his concepts.

Anarchism has always had the character of a utopian doctrine, while its theorists had different a look at the goals and ways to achieve their ideals. As the well-known researcher of anarchism P.

Elzbacher noted, “anarchist teachings have with each other only that which they deny state for our future” [20]. In addition, as shown in this work, combining the beginning for widely differing anarchist concepts is, along with calls for destruction of the state, relentless preaching freedom. The extreme individualism of Stirner and the anarcho-communism of Bakunin and Kropotkin is connected precisely by the justification of the priority of freedom among all other human values. The freedom proclaimed by the anarchists turns the whole world upside down, overthrows all past authorities. Unlike liberals, thinkers the anarchist direction is not concerned with the problems of reforming and the gradual improvement of society. Only complete annihilation entire past social order and dispensation society on the principles of unlimited individual freedom can pull a person out of shackles. However, such a fierce defense of freedom, which is largely identified with arbitrariness, predetermined the inability of the anarchists to show the positive nature of the free activity of the subject. characteristic of the anarchist the concept of freedom is its utopianism, the lack of sound implementation programs for practice of anarchist ideals. extremes and exaggerations made by anarchist thinkers gave rise to criticism of anarchism representatives of various branches of social thought. Disapproving of revolutionary aspirations anarchism, P. I. Novgorodtsev believed that in the that in the future serious theorists will move away from orthodox anarchism to more liberal positions, anarchism as a socio-philosophical theory of freedom is gradually “losing the power of spontaneously destructive egoistic daring and acquires the character of an abstract universal desire for freedom. And in this sense it has an indisputable significance among the ideas that are fighting for predominance and creating, in their totality, the foundations of future social transformations” [17, p. 629]. Indeed, for recent decades in the world anarchist

The movement no longer had theorists of the scale of Bakunin and Kropotkin, and many of his ideas on the issue of freedom were borrowed by liberalism in the form of libertarianism [18]. It cannot be said that anarchist theorists do not understood the impossibility of achieving absolute freedom of the individual in society, but they preached it as an ideal to which one must strive, and, speaking of freedom, they primarily mean the liberation of the individual from external coercion, the achievement of man's independence from the oppression of the state. And now retains its relevance the position that no “goals, no matter how tempting and majestic they were not formulated and cannot be implemented to the detriment of freedom” [9]. Although the destructive principle present in anarchism was often taken into service various radical currents, should recognize the undoubted humanistic value many principles of classical anarchist theory of freedom, which will not lose relevance until humanity gets rid of all forms of oppression and social coercion. At the same time, the study of the real processes of life of society allows most researchers conclude that it is impossible to the present moment of elimination of the state from social connection systems.

This is not only theoretically problematic, but should, if we admit such a possibility, be very negative. affect the lives of all citizens. Anarchist theorists generally proceeded from utopian ideas both about the possibilities of social transformations and about human nature. Considering personality modern era completely ready for life in the society of the future, they believed that only imperfection social institutions hinder the full realization of their dream. Therefore, the establishment anarchy was seen by them as a matter of the near future. These aspirations were not destined to become true. However, the pathos of the anarchist understanding of freedom remains in demand even today. time, and more relevant are the humanistic aspects of the anarchist concept freedom.

#### **4.2. Anarchy - An Energetic but Gentle Dictatorship and Educational Influences**

The rejection of Christian humility and the transition to the position "there really was a contact between life and the people" and the revolutionary struggle for freedom marked a new stage in Bakunin. In the "Appeal of a Russian Patriot to the Slavic Peoples", written under the renunciation of freedom in 1848, he emphasized: "It is necessary to destroy the material and moral conditions of our modern life, tipping over into the later current obsolete social world, which has become powerless and fruitless."

It was another step towards anarchism. In moral terms, Bakunin still stands on the positions of Christian philanthropy, but already demands the overthrow of the power of the state and the church, "the realization of freedom in equality." He believes: "Everything that is ahead of him, as well as the conditions for development and its full implementation, is GOOD. Everything that is disgusting is EVIL." It was a humanistic view of life and its small updates. Based on such a vision of good and evil, Bakunin came closer and closer to the idea of rebellion: a downtrodden and oppressed people, he writes, have only three ways out of a slave state, "of which two are imaginary and one is real. - social revolution", "complete moral and social revolution".

Fundamental disagreements on questions of tactics, violations of discipline, factional behind-the-scenes investigations - all this is undertaken by Bakunin to a serious conflict both with the idea of scientific socialism by K. Marx and F. Engels, and with the course of a number of individual workers' associations. The break between Marxists and anarchists became inevitable.

The Commission of the First International, which included K. Marx and F. Engels, after analyzing



in detail the documents on the activities of the Bakuninists, issued a special report in July 1873, which collected accusations against other persons, it was concluded that "all-destroying anarchists" in the government with Bakunin "they want to present everything in a state of amorphousness in order to establish anarchy in the field of morality, to push bourgeois immorality to the brink."

This characteristic characterized the ultimate goal (anarchy, i.e. freedom) with the method of achieving it. In the highest degree, this confusion was also characteristic of Bakunin himself. But in his original positions he remains an honest revolutionary and defender of the new morality. Regardless of his bad quality qualities - pride, irascibility, individualism - his behavior, even his very demands with the unquestioning authority of Marx and Engels for the right to have his own point of view, his organization cannot be established as a characteristic of characterless behavior. What was needed here was not criminal charges, but sober assessments. As for morality, it should be borne in mind that Bakunin himself, increasingly immersed in observations and moving away from religion, experienced a strong moral shock, abandoning the radical ideas of freedom from his own deep religiosity. It would be more accurate to say this: by rejecting the official religion, he actually defended the Christian idea of human freedom, bringing it to full implementation. This point is very important for understanding his orientation towards anarchy.

Recognizing the progressive role of early Christianity, Bakunin attacked the official religion and the church with all his fury, accusing them of perverting the true Christ, of inciting violence and exploitation. He contrasted "Divine morality" with its humiliation of man with a new "human morality" - the morality of the complete freedom of man.

Defending the idea of socialism and anarchy, he wrote: "Finally, isn't socialism, by its very goal, which is the realization on earth, and not in heaven, of human well-being and all human aspirations without any heavenly compensation, the completion and, therefore, the negation of every religion, which will no longer have any basis for existence, once its aspirations are realized? In this he, in a certain sense, connected with W. Weitling's "Christian communism", trying to find a direct connection between Christian and communist ideals. To realize true freedom, according to Bakunin, it is necessary to abandon the omnipotence of private property and the authoritarian pressure of the state, dependence on religion and the church: "The human mind is recognized as the only criterion of truth, human conscience is the basis of justice, individual and collective freedom is the source and only basis of order. in man."

What is immoral in this orientation? Which postulate means immorality? In our opinion, this is a noble, humanistic and highly moral version of the goal setting for the creation of a new just society,

moreover, corresponding to the communist ideal.

That is why V.I. Lenin repeatedly emphasized the idea of the coincidence of the ultimate goal of the communists and anarchists. The discrepancy was not about goals (the complete destruction of the state, the elimination of private property and the establishment of freedom for everyone and everyone), but principles: the principles of scientific communism recognize the need for a transitional period and the revolutionary state power of the proletariat, anarchists "want the complete destruction of the state from today to tomorrow, without understanding the conditions the feasibility of such destruction."

Bakunin rejected the idea of a revolutionary dictatorship not on a whim, but in strict accordance with the absolutization of the principle of freedom. Any state power, even the most revolutionary, is fraught with violence, the denial of freedom. However, the denial of the state concerned only its violent, but not organizing function. According to Bakunin, the political organization of the future society was to be based on the following principles: the separation of church and state; freedom of conscience and worship; the absolute freedom of every individual who lives by his own labor; universal voting rights, freedom of the press and assembly; autonomy of communities with the right of self-government; provincial autonomy; abandonment of imperial ambitions; cancellation of the right of inheritance, etc.

All these attitudes are fully consistent with the humanistic ideal, they are moral and progressive. This fact must be recognized and appreciated.

"Social solidarity is the first human law, freedom is the second law of society. Both of these laws complement each other and, being inseparable from one another, constitute the whole essence of humanity. Thus, freedom is not a negation of solidarity, on the contrary, it is a development and, if I may say so, the humanization of the latter". Such were Bakunin's views on the ultimate goals of the struggle. You can't call them immoral. In them, first of all, the bright side of Bakunin's anarchist ethics was manifested. Let us now turn to the moral principles of the second founder of anarchism - Prince Peter Alekseevich Kropotkin (1842-1921).

He just as ardently and energetically stood up for the freedom of man, for the destruction of the state, property and religion, while always and in everything assigning a certain role to the "moral principle". He never allowed the thought of the possibility of any immoral, or not completely moral, methods of struggle, even for the sake of the speedy achievement of "powerless communism."

In his lecture "The Moral Principles of Anarchism" (1918), Kropotkin, starting from the idea of the natural biological origin of morality, considered the main principle of anarchism to be "the principle that commands you to treat your friends the way you yourself want to be treated." Here Kropotkin actually quotes Kant but calls the main moral principle not a "categorical imperative", but only "advice". Acting according to this principle "has become a habit. Without this principle, the very existence of society is impossible," wrote Kropotkin.

Almost openly arguing with Nechaev's "Revolutionary Catechism", Kropotkin wrote: "Without mutual trust, struggle becomes impossible, without courage, without initiative, without solidarity, there is no victory, defeat is inevitable... in the world of animals and man, the law of solidarity is the law of progress ". The great ideologist of "powerless communism" saw this as the main moral core of the revolution and anarchism.

The quintessence of Kropotkin's views on the role of the moral factor can be the following emotional passage from the mentioned lecture: "We declare war not only on the abstract trinity in the person of Law, Religion and Power. We declare war on the entire stream of lies, cunning, exploitation, debauchery, vices - in a word, inequality with which he filled all hearts.

Kropotkin's humanistic concept was built not only on a Christian one, like Bakunin's, but also, mainly, on a natural scientific foundation. And this circumstance to a large extent predetermined the difference in the views of the two founders of anarchism on morality.

Kropotkin himself, in Notes of a Revolutionary, explained the starting point of his assessment of morality by a special interpretation of the Darwinian law of the struggle for existence and the desire to revise "its application to the human world. The attempts made in this direction by some sociologists did not positively satisfy me, and I thought about this issue when he found a new, excellent understanding of the struggle for existence in the speech of the Russian zoologist Professor Kessler, delivered at the congress of Russian naturalists in 1880. "Mutual assistance," he said, "is the same natural law as mutual struggle, but for progressive development the first view is incomparably more important than the second. "This thought ... was for me the key to the whole problem."

Bakunin expressed the same idea in his own way. "In the intellectual and moral world," he noted, "as in the physical world, only the positive exists; the negative does not exist, it is not a separate

entity, but only a more or less significant decrease in the positive ... Stupidity is nothing else, as a weakness of the mind, and in the realm of morality, ill-will, greed, cowardice are only benevolence, generosity and courage, brought not to zero, but to a very small amount. strengthened and increased by education."

Without objecting to the idea of the role of the social environment and education in the formation of morality, Kropotkin saw the beginning of human morality mainly in the natural laws of the development of the animal world. "In the practice of mutual aid, which we can trace back to the most ancient beginnings of evolution, we thus find the positive and undoubted origin of our ethical conceptions, and we can affirm that mutual aid, and not mutual struggle, has played the main role in the ethical progress of man. In the widespread use of the principle of mutual assistance, even at the present time, we also see the best prerequisite for an even more sublime further evolution of the human race, "- with these words Kropotkin ends his fundamental work.

As we can see, both Bakunin and Kropotkin, and thousands of their sincere followers, proceeded in their understanding of the goals of progress and revolution from the categories of high morality and philanthropy. This was the strongest and most attractive side of the anarchist ethic. But there was another, contradictory side of their worldview. It is about the approach of anarchism to the means and ways of achieving anarchy as a goal.

The question of the conformity of ends and means is perhaps the most difficult in any moral system, because here politics and morality are equivalent.

For the sake of achieving the goal, it is considered in politics that any means are acceptable. And such a line gives a specific effect.

Morality also prohibits the use of wrong, dirty means to achieve even the brightest goal. But then the goal is often unattainable. Does this mean that morality puts the means above the end and is ready to sacrifice the main thing? This dilemma confronts anyone who would like to reconcile politics and morality. But in most cases, the hope for such reconciliation is a chimera, a utopia and self-deception.

How did Bakunin solve this insoluble problem? Did he have any doubts about this? In our opinion, if they were, then only at the beginning of his political career. In the future, he, giving priority to anarchy as a goal, subordinated all his concrete actions to this.

The question of acceptable means has always worried moralists, but while they were looking for an answer, politicians without a twinge of conscience resorted to the most cynical methods, to the most brutal violence, to any terrible sin for the sake of the goal, whether it was the seizure of power, the removal of an opponent from the road, the enslavement of a foreign people. or some other task. Nicolo Machiavelli, in many ways ahead of his time, justified the harm to morality in order to achieve an effect in politics.

The principles of anarchism were based on a romantic-egalitarian interpretation of ideas about the freedom and dignity of the individual, about the parasitism of the state, about the need for the complete destruction of old customs and practices, about the revolutionary role of violence. And talented scientists of the XIX century. (Proudhon, Stirner), and self-taught workers like Weitling, and rebellious youth (Nechaev), and some people from the upper strata (Bakunin) - all of them, each in his own way, wanted to overthrow the old society, the old morality and open the way to people's freedom.

One of the first with the idea of a new "revolutionary morality" came out in the mid-40s of the XIX century. Wilhelm Weitling. With the help of 20,000-40,000 "dexterous and brave fellows" from among the lumpen, he hoped to "submit everything around to extermination fire." This project pursued a bright goal but was distinguished by obvious promiscuity in means. It was precisely in opposition to such sentiments that K. Marx remarked: "A goal for which wrong means are required is not a right goal."

We often quote these words of Marx, but do not bother to interpret them. How can the essence of the goal change if it is achieved by black means? Who determines the nature of means as right or wrong? Take, for example, individual terror. Can we say that this method is immoral? What about the conspiracy against Hitler? Apparently, there is not and cannot be any universal and eternal criteria for the legitimacy of certain means. Marx's words are a declaration and nothing more, since everything in life is relative and one can only strive for the most complete moral correlation of means and ends.

Weitling, while defending the thesis of moral politics, nevertheless considered it possible to use everything, including violent, inhumane means, to achieve the goal of man's liberation. As for his calculation on the use of all kinds of criminals and lumpen, this is tantamount to disbelief in the strength of the proletariat. This unbelief was even more characteristic of Stirner and Proudhon, who were the first to try to put a theoretical basis under anarchism.

Max Stirner (pseudonym of Kaspar Schmidt, 1806-1856) published in 1845 the book "The Only One and His Property", in which he substantiated the priority of "I" over the rest of the world. The latter was considered as a kind of "property" of each "single" egoist. "Revolutionary minds were busy choosing a political system ... But to be free from any political system - that's what the rebel is striving for," he declared. The spirit of extreme individualism and elitism of the "union of egoists" was the essence of Stirner's extremism.

Pierre-Joseph Proudhon (1809-1865) also substantiated the anarchist doctrine in his own way. He tried to put anarchism on an economic footing, defending small property and opposing it to "stolen" and therefore condemned to death large property. "Down with the party; down with power; absolute freedom of man and citizen - this is our political and social credo," Proudhon declared.

The essence of the anarchist method was frankly expressed by the German publicist Karl Heinzen (1809-1880), who substantiated the idea of the retributive role of violence in relation to those in power: "Their slogan is murder, our answer is murder. They need murder, we pay with murder. Murder is their argument, in murder is our refutation." Heinzen ridiculed "humanists" and "moralists" who are tormented by conscience and would like to avoid bloodshed. "Even if we had to strike half a continent or shed a sea of blood to put an end to the party of barbarians, we would not be tormented by conscience," he declared, determining the number of "barbarians" to be destroyed at 2 million people. A.I. Herzen, who during the years of emigration met Heinzen more than once, called his statement a "cannibal trick", summing up Heinzen's ideas in an ironic phrase: "It is enough to beat two million people on the globe, and the cause of the revolution will go like clockwork."

Anarchism in Europe was increasingly linked with extremism. Political terror began to spread rapidly throughout the countries of the continent. In the 40-60s of the last century, more than 20 attempts were organized on the life of the highest royal persons: the Duke of Parma, Ferdinand III of Naples, the Spanish Queen Isabella and other dignitaries. The number of terrorist acts and political assassinations has exceeded several hundred.

In Russia in the 1950s and 1960s, the peasant movement grew. The students came out against the "satanic force" of tsarism. Under these conditions, part of the youth also took an anarchist position. N.A. Ishutin and his friends ("Ishutins" - a secret revolutionary society of 1863-1866) even intended to create a conspiratorial society "Hell", whose members were to be freed from moral restrictions and to subordinate all forces to the terrorization of the enemy, i.e. . tsarism.

In the conditions of the growing spontaneous protest of the "lower classes" in the 1950s and 1960s, both in Europe and in Russia, anarchism flourished as a special political trend.

Bakunin was a resolute supporter of revolutionary violence, spontaneous mass rebellion, which alone is capable of destroying the world of "the legal state and the entire so-called bourgeois civilization." In his opinion, the real "revolutionary puts himself outside the law both in practice and emotionally (more precisely: morally. - B.K.). He identifies himself with bandits, robbers, people who attack bourgeois society, engaging in direct robbery and destroying someone else's property.

Bakunin liked to shout such shocking slogans, as if on purpose demanding from every revolutionary a complete rejection of any kind of moral hesitation and restrictions. Evaluating these slogans, K. Marx and F. Engels wrote: "All the abominations that inevitably accompany the life of declassed people from the upper social strata are proclaimed ultra-revolutionary virtues ... It is difficult to say what prevails in the theoretical balancing act and in the practical undertakings of the Alliance - buffoonery or meanness".

Indeed, any normal person is struck by some kind of inflamed desire of the Bakuninists for general destruction. Even the very concept of "revolution" was drawn in their eyes as an all-consuming fire, burning all the evils of life and opening the way to the bloody cleansing of the "filthy society" for the sake of the liberation and happiness of the people. Revolutionary messianism was in some strange way combined with the most obvious amorality, which gave K. Marx and F. Engels reason to define Bakunin's morality in the sphere of choosing means as Jesuit, i.e. double-dealing, hypocritical, deceitful.

Violence and immorality were indeed tolerated by the Bakuninists. In one of his letters, Bakunin wrote: "Poison, a knife, a noose, etc. The revolution sanctifies anyway. So, the field is open! with fire and sword, uniting fraternally with those who will do the same throughout Europe."

Poison, knife, loop - a set of tools, suitable, perhaps, only for a medieval robber, and not for an organized revolutionary movement. But it was precisely in the revival of the traditions of robber freemen and individual rebellion against those in power that Bakunin saw the task. He quite sincerely wrote: "Only in robbery is proof of the vitality, passion and strength of the people." The idealization of medieval forms of protest by common people against princes and feudal lords was extended by the founder of anarchism to other times and customs. This indicated, among other things, that Bakunin did not like and did not understand the city, and even more so the demands of the labor movement.

Speaking against the absolutization of violent methods of struggle, the great Russian democrat and educator H.P. Ogarev wrote to Bakunin: "Suppress the anxiety, the vacillation of thoughts and actions, humble yourself until you doom yourself to preparatory work." But it is precisely the organic rejection of any "preparatory work" as boring, monotonous, invisible, dull, etc. and gave rise to a passion for terror, the rejection of political methods of struggle.

Thus, the attitude of anarchists to the choice of means to achieve a noble goal was distinguished by the most unprincipled pragmatism. Any pangs of conscience were considered immoral, if it was about the interests of the "revolutionary cause." The "deed" itself, according to the anarchists, is the moral justification of any means for the accomplishment of this "deed".

This logic was adopted in the following decades not only by anarchists and leftist elements, but also by the most orthodox Marxists. In essence, immorality was elevated to a revolutionary virtue. So, there is no reason for Marxists to feel any superiority over anarchists. Here we, alas, are equal with them.

The priority of the "ultimate goal" over the method of achieving it was based on the priority of "class" morality over common human values. Everything that served to protect the "class interests" of the proletariat formulated by party ideologists was considered moral, permissible, and even noble-heroic. Such a pernicious approach to the choice of means for the sake of a "bright communist goal" was especially widely used during the years of Stalinism. Even in recent times, the false concern about the "world revolution" seemed to justify military intervention in the life of sovereign states (recall the events in Afghanistan).

The eternal problem - how to achieve harmony between the means and the end - confronts every politician, whether he is a revolutionary or a conservative. That is why the tragedy of the discrepancy between means and ends was inherent not only to anarchists. Often, alas, too often even the communist movement became entangled in its contradictions.

In this case, of course, we are not talking about cases of conscious and depraved use of the most immoral means to achieve selfish and vile interests. No, we are talking about honest people who sincerely wanted to do good, but were forced to voluntarily choose unkind, inhumane means to achieve this goal. Even the great democrat VG Belinsky once remarked that people should be led to happiness by force. What this meant in practice was shown by the totalitarian "path to communism."



The contradictions of the anarchist doctrine only help us to understand the general logic of the discrepancy between ends and means.

The humanistic attitude is even more contrary to the demands that the anarchists made of themselves and people. Here stands out the famous Catechism of the Revolutionary. Modern science considers S.G. Nechaev (1847-1882), although, according to the Commission of the First International, the text was written by Bakunin." But for us it is important not who wrote this document, but what is written in it.

In the first section, "Attitude of a Revolutionary to Himself," it was said: "A revolutionary is a doomed man... Everything in him is absorbed... by a single passion - the revolution." It seemed that this passion could only be welcomed, but then something unimaginable followed: the revolutionary is obliged to break with all "civil order and with the whole educated world, with all the laws, decency, generally accepted conditions and morality of this world." It is difficult to say why and why this demand was put forward. Apparently, in order to facilitate the complete subordination of the will and mind of the "revolutionary" to the will and mind of the leaders of anarchism. The author of the Catechism declared: "A revolutionary ... knows only one science - the science of destruction ... Everything that hinders him is immoral and criminal."

In the section of the Catechism on the relation of a revolutionary to his comrades in the revolution, we see very remarkable passages: duties in relation to such a comrade is determined solely by the degree of his usefulness in the cause of the all-destroying practical revolution. Solidarity was declared the main force, but at the same time the presence of "revolutionaries of the second and third categories, that is, not entirely initiated" was allowed.

One of the paragraphs sounded completely strange: "When a comrade gets into trouble, deciding whether to save him or not, the revolutionary must ... weigh the benefits brought by the comrade, on the one hand, and on the other, the expenditure of revolutionary forces required for deliverance, and on which side he will drag, so he must decide. This is how the problem of comradely duty and solidarity was solved simply. It is a priori clear that in the majority of cases it will not be the salvation of a comrade that will "stretch," but the striving to "preserve the revolutionary forces."

The ideas expressed by Nechaev that a "comrade" can be deceived, blackmailed and even killed for disobedience were put into practice by him (for example, on his orders, student Ivanov was killed in 1869, who rebelled against the dictates "the leaders were suspected by him of betrayal).

Nechaev's despotic messianism was also expressed in the section of the "Catechism" on "the relation of the revolutionary to society." The whole society was divided by Nechaev into six categories.

The first category - immediately sentenced to death.

"The second category should consist of such people who are granted only temporary life, so that by a series of brutal deeds they will bring the people to an inevitable revolt."

"To the third category belongs many high-ranking cattle, or individuals who are not distinguished by either a special mind or energy, but who use wealth, connections, influence, power according to their position. We must exploit them in possible ways; entangle them, confuse them and, if possible, having mastered their dirty secrets, make them your slaves."

"The fourth category consists of statesmen ambitious and liberals with different shades. You can conspire with them according to their programs, pretending that you blindly follow them, and meanwhile take them into your hands, master their secrets, compromise them utterly ... with their hands disturb the State."

"The fifth category are doctrinaires, conspirators, revolutionaries, all idly talking in circles and on paper. They must be constantly pushed and pulled forward into practical puzzling statements, the result of which will be the death of the majority without a trace."

"The sixth and most important category is women, who should be divided into three main categories: some are empty, senseless, soulless, who can be used as the third and fourth categories of men; others are hot, devoted, capable, but not ours ... should be used as men of the fifth category; finally, women are completely ours, that is, completely dedicated.

What an ominous game of the sick imagination of two people - old Bakunin and young Nechaev, who stirred up with their ideas many fine and honest people who wanted to "go into the revolution", but found themselves in a swamp of immoralism and falsehood! Anarchy in the interpretation of Bakunin, according to the fair definition of K. Marx, turned from freedom and classlessness "into general destruction; revolution - into a series of murders, first individual, then mass; the only rule of conduct is exalted Jesuit morality; the example of a revolutionary is a robber."

So, high morality in determining the goal and the rejection of moral restrictions in the choice of means - such is the contradictory essence of the ethics of anarchism.

Now, in an extremely nervous and unstable situation and as a result of the rejection of administrative-command compulsory orientations of behavior, it turned out that significant groups of people do not have sufficiently strong internal guidelines for moral behavior. Here and there spontaneous outbursts of violence occur. Such asocial behavior is fuelled by moods of nihilism, unaddressed criticism and protest, and a desire to quickly stabilize life. Anarchist sentiments are increasingly coloring even massive populist movements in their own tones, but this topic requires a special discussion. Some people sincerely think that anarchism embodies the true freedom of the individual, the right of everyone to choose the means and ends of the struggle. However, history shows that the path of anarchism is not capable of leading a person to true freedom, for it individualizes it and thereby dooms it to self-denial. Man cannot be free alone. A person, as Kropotkin said, needs solidarity. This, strictly speaking, is the main essence of the most ordinary and at the same time universal human morality. This is our main moral guideline today.

#### **4.3. States that Fought Dictatorship and Despotism through Anarchy**

On March 11, 1892, the building inhabited by the magistrate Benoît was blown up by the anarchist Ravachol. It was the start of a series of bloody attacks that would outrage public opinion and culminate in 1894 with the assassination of the President of the Republic, Sadi Carnot. Who were these terrorist apprentices, distant inspirers of the Baader gang and the Red Brigades?

On June 24, 1894, in Lyon, the President of the Republic Sadi Carnot was assassinated to cries of "Long live the Revolution, long live anarchy!" by a young Italian, Santo Jeronimo Caserio. His gesture is the culmination of a series of murders and attacks which for two years have shaken French society. It is also the last of the anarchist crimes. Because, after two long years of attacks and government repression, even the most convinced revolutionaries are disgusted by the strategy of terror. The assassination of the President of the Republic was the line not to be crossed. Between June 26 and July 1, a huge crowd comes to pray over the remains of Sadi Carnot, in a burning chapel installed at the Élysée. On July 5, the President of the Council, Charles Dupuy, told the Chamber that he would be pitiless towards the ringleaders and the excitors. He knows that public opinion, overwhelmed by the violence, is behind him. In a few months, the terrorist attacks succeeded in destabilizing the regime, but the anarchists lost their soul.

However, originally, violence was not on the agenda for the French anarchists, disciples of Pierre Proudhon (1809-1865) and Mikhail Bakunin (1814-1876). It was through mass education, propaganda and pedagogy that libertarian leaders, such as Jean Grave (1854-1939), the "pope" of the

anarchists, installed rue Mouffetard with his newspaper *Le Révolté* (later *La Révolte*), Sébastien Faure (1858-1942), the defrocked Jesuit novice, or Emile Pouget (1861-1931), director of *Father Peinard*, wanted to promote anarchist ideas. But, during the 1870s, the intransigence of “bourgeois” power, in particular the trauma of the bloody repression of the Commune (May 22-28, 1871), gradually led them to more radical positions. Renouncing collective action, deemed ineffective, they decided to resort to the terrorist act, defined as “the most effective means of propaganda”.

In March 1881, the assassination of Tsar Alexander II by the militants of the nihilistic group “The Will of the People” provided them with a model. Then, in July of the same year, the congress of the Workers' International, organized in London, officially recognized this new strategy: it was necessary “by all means to spread the revolutionary idea and the spirit of revolt in the great part of the mass of the people who still do not take any active part in the movement and still have illusions about the modality and the effectiveness of the legal means”. Consequently, the congress adopted a “Charter of Propaganda by Deed”, which went so far as to advocate the use of “technical and physical sciences” - that is to say, explosives - in the service of the cause.

From then on, French anarchist publications did not hesitate to devote regular sections to the manufacture of bombs and other explosive devices, modestly entitled “Scientific studies”, “Anti-bourgeois products” or “Scientific arsenal”. In September 1883, *Le Drapeau noir* published the “Manifeste des nihilistes français”, which advised the owners to be poisoned with hemlock, saturn extract and other sweets. We even organize raffles whose main prizes are a revolver, a pistol or a hunting knife [4]. As Jean Grave himself later acknowledged: “All of us, more or less - rather more than less - dreamed of bombs, attacks, 'brilliant' acts capable of undermining bourgeois society. »

From dream to reality, there is however a bloody abyss that the French anarchists will take about ten years to cross. Throughout the 1880s, anarchist attacks remained rare, isolated and most often ineffective. We can nevertheless evoke the two shots fired at random on a bourgeois of Neuilly by Emile Florion, a young weaver “mounted” from Reims to Paris, on October 20, 1881, to shoot Léon Gambetta. Hearing of his sentence to twenty years of forced labor by the Assize Court of the Seine, he exclaims: “Long live the social revolution! But his gesture, although cited as an example by the anarchist press, appears above all to be the act of desperation. Similarly, on November 26, 1883, the assassination attempt on Jules Ferry perpetrated by a poor orphan barely seventeen years old, Paul-Marie Curien. Controlled by the usher of the President of the Council, the teenager will pay for his gesture of three months in prison.

Louis Chaves, who proclaimed himself a “convinced and active anarchist”, would do much less well a few months later. After killing the mother superior of a convent in the suburbs of Marseilles,

because she had fired him from his job as a gardener, he was shot by the gendarmes who had come to arrest him. His exploits will be magnified by the anarchist press and the libertarian newspaper *Le Droit social*, in its first issue dated May 1885, will even open a subscription "for the purchase of the revolver which must avenge the companion Louis Chaves". But, here again, one cannot speak of an anarchist act as such. On the other hand, Charles Gallo, a former bailiff's clerk, chose to strike at the very heart of bourgeois exploitation, on March 5, 1886, by throwing a bottle of acid and firing three bullets at the basket of the Paris Stock Exchange. . Although he did not hurt anyone, he was sentenced to twenty years of hard labor and deported to New Caledonia by the Assize Court of the Seine. At least his trial will have given him the opportunity to explain, for more than an hour and a half, his conceptions of "propaganda by deeds".

But it was only in the 1890s that the terrorist epidemic really spread. To the economic and social crisis that has affected France since the beginning of the 1880s, with its procession of bankruptcies, unemployment and above all worker disillusionment, the moderate republic, known as "opportunist", opposes only its social conservatism and its instability chronic. Discredited by the scandals - the Wilson affair in 1887, then the Panama affair in 1892 -, the parliamentary regime lends itself to the combined attacks of the monarchist right, the nationalist leaguers and the labor movement [6]. But the latter is divided, crumbled, into irreconcilable small groups. Despite the electoral breakthrough of 1893, which brought fifty socialist deputies to the Palais-Bourbon, the prospect of overthrowing bourgeois society seemed very remote to those desperate for anarchy. Moreover, during the constituent congress of the Second International, organized in Paris in July 1889, they were banned from the socialist movement. Disappointed by their own comrades in struggle, marginalized, many anarchists no longer see any other way out than terrorism to destabilize the bourgeois order.

Certainly, this is not the opinion of libertarian theorists and intellectuals. "It would be lost in illusion and utopia to believe that similar acts can become the object of reasoned, active and continuous propaganda", can we read in *Le Révolté* of September 4, 1886. And *La Revolt* of March 18, 1891 will publish this declaration of Prince Kropotkin, conscience of European anarchism: "It is not by heroic acts that revolutions are made, the Revolution is above all a popular movement. » The same newspaper will consider again, on April 16, 1892, that the terrorist attacks « do more harm to anarchist evolution than they favor it ». Unfortunately, many fellow anarchists, no doubt the most desperate or the most fragile, refuse to listen to this sage advice.

This is first of all the case of François Ravachol, whose real name is Francis Claudius Koenigstein. Born in Saint-Chamond in 1859, abandoned at a very young age by his father, a Dutch sailor, he learned the trade of wire drawing worker. Intelligent, sensitive, but revolted by social injustices, he was fired several times for strike action and became the leader of the anarchist group in Saint-Étienne.

On March 30, 1886, he departed for the first time from the right path of militant anarchy, by assassinating an eighty-six-year-old annuitant, Mr. Rivollier, and his sixty-eight-year-old servant, the "woman" Fradel, to rob them of their meager savings. This double crime remaining unpunished, he resumes a regular life. It was not until 1891, after being kicked out once again, that this flayed alive decides to truly live on the fringes of the society he refuses, and begins his murderous run.

On the night of May 14 to 15, 1891, he desecrated the tomb of Baroness de la Rochetaillée, buried a fortnight earlier, in order to remove her jewelry. The following June 18, he suffocates with his handkerchief a certain Jacques Brunei, a nonagenarian hermit of Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Chambles), in order to take his savings. Having escaped the police who came to arrest him, on June 27, he took refuge with his anarchist friends in the region of Saint-Etienne. On July 28, he resurfaced by assassinating with a shoemaker's hammer Mrs. Marcon (seventy-six years old) and her daughter (forty-eight years old) who run a hardware store in Saint-Etienne. Then he fled to Barcelona, where he was welcomed by the anarchist Paul Bernard, condemned in absentia.

There he learns to make bombs, which will be very useful to him in his new career as a vigilante. Returning to Paris, it is now in the name of the anarchist cause that he will indeed "express himself". On March 11, 1892, he blew up a building located at 136 boulevard Saint-Germain. It is the home of Judge Benoît, who distinguished himself, a few months earlier, by directing with an iron fist the trial of three anarchist demonstrators from Clichy, guilty of having fired on the police. This trial caused a stir in libertarian circles, and Sébastien Faure even had the report of the proceedings published in brochures.

This is why Ravachol decided to avenge his companions, unjustly persecuted by the inflexible judge. But the latter having emerged unscathed from the explosion, it was the turn of Attorney General Bulot, who had requested the death penalty against the anarchists of Clichy, to see his building destroyed on March 27. There again, there are no victims, but all of Paris now knows the name and face of Ravachol, whose description has been communicated to the press.

Denounced by a waiter from the Véry restaurant, he was arrested on March 29, but his anarchist friends were behind him. On April 25, 1892, the eve of the opening of his trial before the Seine Assize Court, the Véry restaurant was blown up by a bomb: two victims were deplored, including the owner. The Palace of Justice is then guarded as if it had to sustain a siege. Throughout the debates, Ravachol appears very calm, very comfortable in his role as an anarchist vigilante. The death penalty was expected; he was only sentenced to forced labor for life, while three of his four accomplices were acquitted. The satirical press makes its headlines, ironically about the cowardice of judges and jurors.

But it was only a prologue: in June, Ravachol returned to another assize court, that of the Loire, to answer for the crimes committed in the region of Saint-Etienne in 1886 and 1891. This time, the jurors condemned to death whoever they consider to be a simple common criminal. However, by mounting the scaffold of Mont-brison, on July 11, 1892, it was the anarchist militant Ravachol who entered into legend, singing a famous song by Father Duchesne before being guillotined: "If you want to be happy, / Name of God / Hang your owner, / Cut the priests in two, / Name of God! »

This libertarian heroism propels him to the rank of martyr. "I know few men who surpass him in generosity", exclaims the anarchist geographer Elisée Reclus [7]. His life becomes a novel, appearing serially in the Saint-Phanois newspapers; it inspires several songs, including the famous Ravachole. sung to the tune of La Carmagnole: finally, its name even gives rise to the verb "ravacholiser" which will inspire apprentice terrorists. Indeed, the Ravachol affair opens the bloody cycle of attacks and repression, which will upset France for two years. From July 16, 1892, the newspaper La Révolte set the tone for this open war between the anarchists and the state: "He will be avenged! Yes, avenged! Not on the person of this or that of his executioners. It takes victims of another caliber to balance the scales, and if not quality, quantity. From now on, the threatening letters flock to the police headquarters: in one year, there are more than 2,600. However, in the first months, we do not yet dare to take action.

It was not until November 8, 1892 to see the first bomb, initially placed in front of the Société des mines de Carmaux, then brought back by the police to the police station in rue des Bons-Enfants, where it exploded, killing five people. Then everything accelerates. On November 13, it was the man named Leon-Jules Léauthier, a young shoemaker from Manosque, who, in a restaurant on the avenue de l'Opéra, struck a blow with his knife at the Minister of Serbia, Georgewitch, seriously injuring him. The day before, he had written to the anarchist leader Sébastien Faure of his intention to "create a bourgeois". He will be sentenced to forced labor for life, as will Marpeaux, a young anarchist bicycle thief, who, on November 29, killed the police officer who came to arrest him. Both deported to Guyana, they will in turn become martyrs of anarchy.

But their gestures are far from having the symbolic significance and the media repercussions that will accompany that of Auguste Vaillant, on December 9, 1893. Around 4 p.m., the latter launches a bomb of an extraordinary power, equivalent to that of four cartridges of dynamite. A very bright light illuminates the room, followed by a loud bang and a hail of projectiles falling on the deputies. In the general panic, the President of the Chamber, Charles Dupuy, showed composure by maintaining the session. Twenty people were immediately arrested, including Auguste Vaillant, injured, who confessed his guilt during the night. Abandoned by his father, fostered by his mother, alone in Paris since the age of twelve, Vaillant, known as Marchai, is the archetype of the downgraded. After having

dabbled in all the small trades, from 1890 to 1893, he left to try his luck in Argentina, but without success. Former secretary of the socialist group "Les Indépendants de Montmartre", converted to anarchism, he wanted his act to be a kind of political sacrifice, that his death, as he will say at the Assizes, be the "cry of a whole class who claims his rights and who will soon match words with deeds". He also pointed out to the jurors that his intention was not to kill the deputies, because he placed nails and not bullets in his bomb. The fact is that this spectacular attack did not cause any casualties, as Abbé Lemire, deputy for the North, points out, asking for Vaillant's pardon and collecting more than sixty signatures from deputies in his favour. But, despite a poignant letter written by Sidonie, the daughter of the condemned man, to the wife of President Sadi Carnot, the latter refuses the pardon. Vaillant was executed on February 5, 1894, to cries of "Death to bourgeois society!" and "Long live anarchy!" If his gesture is condemned by all parties, including the socialists, it is on the contrary hailed by all the anarchists.

In the hearts of anarchists, *La Complainte de Vaillant* now replaced *La Ravachole*. And revenge was not long in coming: on February 12, 1894, barely a week after Vaillant's execution, a bomb was thrown into the Terminus café at Saint-Lazare station, killing one person and injuring around twenty. After a chase and an exchange of gunfire, the terrorist is finally brought under control: barely twenty-one years old, his name is Emile Henry, and he also admits to being the author of the attack on the Bons police station. -Children of November 8, 1892. Son of a Communard convicted in absentia, brilliant student, eligible for Polytechnique, Emile Henry is far from being downgraded like his terrorist predecessors; we can say that he is a real anarchist "intellectual".

His trajectory is also revealing of the evolution of many libertarian militants: initially hostile to blind terrorism, Henry was very quickly fascinated by the political echo of the attacks, which, he wrote, "awakened the masses, the shake with a violent whiplash and show him the vulnerable side of the bourgeoisie" [8]. Unlike a Ravachol, perpetually rebellious, or a Vaillant, moved by despair, his gesture is part of a logic of terrifying coldness, which will make him nicknamed the "Saint-Just of anarchy". . Unlike Vaillant, he says he wanted to kill and not hurt. Until the day of his execution, May 21, 1894, it was important for him to transmit his message, and Maurice Barrés was shaken by "the tragic beauty" of the young, condemned man who exclaimed: "Courage, comrades, long live anarchy [ 9]! »

However, if they admire the heroism of Émile Henry, many of his fellow anarchists are increasingly disturbed by this murderous fanaticism. As Octave Mirbeau wrote on February 19, 1894, in *Le Journal*: "A mortal enemy of anarchy could not have acted better than this Émile Henry... Each party has its criminals and its madmen since each party has its men. In fact, the terrorist epidemic did not end with the execution of Henry, quite the contrary: on February 19, 1894, the Belgian anarchist



Pauwels (known as Rabardy) exploded two bombs in Paris, before being himself even shredded by one of his infernal machines, on March 15, in front of the Madeleine church; then, on April 4, the explosion of a bomb at the Foyot restaurant cost an eye to the poet Laurent Tailhade, who had nevertheless defended Auguste Vaillant with this formula: "What do the victims matter, if the gesture is beautiful! No one among the anarchist leaders now ventures to justify such an assessment. Disgusted by this bloodbath, they believe that the end does not justify the means, and that "propaganda by the fact" discredits the movement more than it serves it.

Moreover, it was by playing on the indignation of public opinion, carefully nurtured by the mainstream press, that the government authorities took advantage of terrorist discredit to muzzle the anarchist movement. This is the meaning of the repressive laws promulgated from December 1893 to July 1894 - which the left will qualify as "rogue laws" (see box, p. 60). It is clear that they are less intended to repress individual terrorist acts than to undermine the very structures of the anarchist movement and, beyond that, the entire labor movement. This is how the government was able to launch from the beginning of 1894 a veritable campaign to demolish anarchist circles, forcing most libertarian newspapers to disappear, notably *Le Père Peinard* by Emile Pouget and *La Révolte* by Jean Grave. , while the main activists were arrested or forced to flee.

On August 6, 1894, this same Jean Grave figured in the first row of the thirty defendants appearing before the Assises de la Seine for association with criminals, under the last "rogue law", alongside other theoreticians of anarchism, such as Sébastien Faure or Félix Fénéon, but also true criminal adventurers of common right, such Ortiz, Bertani or Chericotti - Emile Pouget and Paul Reclus, as for them, preferred to flee. Yet it is for Favre and his friends, law-abiding intellectuals but considered leaders, that Advocate General Bulot is calling for the harshest sentences. However, faced with the total absence of evidence, the jurors were forced to acquit all the accused, with the exception of Ortiz, Chericotti and Bertani. Contrary to what the authorities wanted, the trial of the Thirty did not mark the end of the anarchist movement. On the contrary, it allowed him to rebound, putting an end to the strategy of terror.

The summer of 1894 marks a decisive break in the anarchist strategy. Weakened by the "rogue laws", by the raids and by the censorship of their newspapers, the libertarian leaders understood that terrorism had ultimately only served to justify state repression, and this for non-existent political results. Especially since a new force is appearing within the workers' movement, offering the anarchists the ideal platform for carrying out the struggle against bourgeois society: it is revolutionary syndicalism, whose privileged weapon will be the strike. general. The creation of the Federation of Labor Exchanges in 1892, then that of the CGT (General Confederation of Labor) in 1895, opened a

new era in the history of libertarian militancy, allowing it to return to the masses and carry the message anarchist on the concrete terrain of social confrontations.

It is therefore no coincidence that Fernand Pelloutier, theoretician of the general strike and federator of labor exchanges, collaborates with the anarchist newspaper *Les Temps nouvelles*, which succeeded *La Révolte*. Similarly, it is not surprising to see Emile Pouget become, in 1900, editor-in-chief of *La Voix du peuple*, the CGT weekly. Only "individualists", such as Albert Libertad or Mauricius, intransigent founders of the newspaper *L'Anarchie* in 1905, stubbornly refused to choose the path of class struggle and anarcho-syndicalism, which during the Belle Époque would play an essential role in the labor movement. This is why, between 1895 and 1914, only two isolated acts of "propaganda by the act" are recorded.

At the turn of the century, the new marginals of anarchy turned instead to "illegalism", advocated in the 1880s by Clément Duval, the leader of the "La Panthère des Batignolles" group, specializing in the burglary of mansions. For these illegal anarchists, theft is in fact only the restitution of wealth unduly monopolized by the bourgeois. Moreover, Sébastien Faure himself endorsed them: "We fight the exploiter and the parasite, he wrote in 1892, but we approve of the thief [10]. This is how the famous Alexandre Jacob [11] - model of Maurice Leblanc's Arsène Lupin - claimed anarchy when he was condemned in 1905, after having organized more than six hundred thefts with his gang: "It is the means of revolt to combat the most iniquitous of all thefts: individual property," declared the gentleman-burglar to his judges.

At the beginning of 1912, it was another famous tape, that of Jules Bonnot, which gave a bloody and dramatic dimension to illegalism. Even if Bonnot and his "tragic bandits", Callemmin, known as Raymond la Science, Garnier, the vegetarian, Soudy and the others are presented by the mainstream press of the Belle Époque as highwaymen, there is in their revolt the expression of absolute despair which makes them like the terrorists of the 1890s. But on the eve of the First World War, anarchist romanticism went out of fashion. Bonnot and his followers no longer represent anything for the anarchist movement, which has long been versed in the trade union and revolutionary struggle.

The outbreak of terror only lasted a few months, between March 1892 and July 1894. In the history of the French libertarian movement, "propaganda by deed" appears as a marginal episode. As Jean Maitron points out, the terrorism of the 1890s constituted the "infantile disease of anarchism" [12]. But it was above all the disease of a social system. One would not understand the legend of a Ravachol, martyr of the oppressed, if one did not take the measure of the discontent and the violence which rumbled in the working class. After several decades of social immobility and employer

repression, after the crisis of 1882, the Republic was no longer credible. It is not surprising that part of the working class youth has sunk into despair. In the troubled Europe of the last decades of the 19th century, the German Red Army Faction or the Italian Red Brigades returned to blind violence to express their rejection of the established order. From Ravachol to Direct Action, it is the same cry of despair and revolt, which signals, among other symptoms, the deep malaise of democratic societies.

#### **4.4. Propaganda and Revolutionary Wave. Historical and Cultural Events that Influenced The Absorption of Anarchist Ideas From the End of Cold War Until Contemporaneity**

In 1975, the Sex Pistols gave their first concert at St Martin's College of Art in London, or rather, they performed only five songs, after which a frightened college employee turned off the electricity. From that moment on, the punk revolution began in England - the promotion of personal freedom, anarchy and outrageousness. Strangely dressed guys and girls appeared on the streets, who behaved defiantly and drank alcohol in front of everyone. Punk was not only a musical direction - it became a kind of ideology, demeanor and fashion style.

Several factors contributed to the emergence of punk culture: in the 1970s, the UK had the highest rate of youth unemployment. A depressive atmosphere of social hopelessness reigned in society. The level of trust in the authorities was rapidly falling. The peace-loving ideology of the hippies did not give way to the accumulated aggression. Rock, who was gradually moving into the musical mainstream, could no longer satisfy the needs of young people in demonstrating protest and rebellious moods. Therefore, the emergence of a new subculture became quite logical.

Punks are a youth subculture, the main features of which were ideological nihilism, nonconformism, denial of social principles, a critical attitude towards power, a protest against material values and career growth, a shocking demeanor that provokes clothing style. Punk culture originated in the 1960s in the United States, and in the 1970s the UK became its center.

The word "punk" is ambiguous: "scum", "scoundrel", "rot", "dirt", "scum". Before the advent of the musical style, it was used as a swear word. The musical term characterized "garage rock", the word "punk" in the meaning of "rotten" was used as a metaphor for American bands that sang obscene songs and behaved provocatively.

The famous designer Vivienne Westwood is considered the founder of the punk style in fashion. Her husband - Sex Pistols manager Malcolm McLaren - created the ideology of the punk movement, and she visualized it in fashion. Ripped T-shirts with provocative slogans, leather collars, belts and chains, shoes on high platforms, leather jackets with studs, ripped jeans, studded wristlets appealed to young anarchist rebels.

1971, Vivienne Westwood opened Let It Rock, later renamed Sex, which became the fashion center of British punk culture. All members of the Sex Pistols wore Vivien's designs. It was she who first began to wear a mohawk, which has become an invariable attribute of punk style.

Punk culture has left a significant mark on the history of youth subcultures and is still of interest. a good example of this is the exhibition “Pretty Vacant: The Graphic Language of Punk” at the Philadelphia College of Art and Design. Moore.

Revolutionary spirit in music: this inventive punk  
Two weeks ago, the CMI hosted an intellectual flea market, the theme of which was the revolution in all its forms. I prepared a very revolutionary playlist for the event, which as a result was never needed. But there was a reason to talk about what unites the compositions included in this playlist. What are the musical means to express protest against any system?

Two weeks ago, the CMI hosted an intellectual flea market, the theme of which was the revolution in all its forms. I prepared a very revolutionary playlist for the event, which as a result was never needed. But there was a reason to talk about what unites the compositions included in this playlist. What are the musical means to express protest against any system?

The first thing that comes to mind when you think about protest in popular music is punk rock. Everyone knows that punks are carriers of the DIY culture, and disagreement with social inequality in society and the duplicitous behavior of politicians occupies a large place in their ideology. But musically, punk was originally a protest against the need to “know how to play,” against the conviction that musical compositions should make the listener think, as happened in progressive rock, which was popular in the 1970s. Punk rock rediscovers that music is, it turns out, a means for expressing emotions, including aggression.

The content of the playlist is not just background music, it really has to do with revolutionary themes, and below I will explain why. I will briefly describe the most salient characteristics of the brightest bands whose compositions I wanted to use as a soundtrack to our intellectual flea market, namely the Americans The World/Inferno Friendship Society and the Dresden Dolls and the Danish Horrorpops. All of these groups experienced the most activity in the 2000s. Their punk image and punchy sound make for a great form for spreading revolutionary ideas. The variety of instruments, arrangements and connotations in the new music exploiting punk style suggests that all these elements come from different subcultures, countercultures, minority cultures fighting for recognition.

The World/Inferno Friendship Society is a punk-inspired cabaret, a hodgepodge of instruments, a circus performance, and everything that can evoke tricksterism and marginality. There are a lot of

people on the stage - a whole orchestra. In front, a drunken man in a jacket and hat is dancing - the vocalist under the broken pseudonym Jack Terriplot (Jack Terricloth), in fact, bearing a long Italian surname. He is so charismatic in his persona that moralists accuse him of promoting the scam and irresponsibility he sings about. The accordion - one of the key instruments in WIFS music - hints at France with its revolution, and in the meantime, jazz elements are heard very close, and this is not abstruse, technical white jazz, but the madness of black swing of the 30s. WIFS is definitely multicultural dance music.

The style to which Horrorpops belong is called psychobilly, psychobilly is crazy rockabilly. In the foreground we see here an aggressively made-up large woman with a huge cream-colored double bass. This is the vocalist and face of the group, Patricia Day. She is dressed in a feminine dress - American 50s kitsch, and her beefy arms are covered with tattoos. Behind her are three shabby guys with mohawks. Such a “banter” over the culture of the 50s, like the image of Patricia Day, such a play with meanings and manipulation of visual images is a direct reference to punk - to a space where all sorts of boundaries are destroyed and anything can happen.

The Dresden Dolls, which I've mentioned many times in the "listen to talk" column, definitely have something to do with the sexual revolution, and you can see it even if you don't know what their songs are about. Brian Viglione, the band's drummer and male half, is clearly on the sidelines here, while vocalist and keyboardist Amanda Palmer is the primary focus. At the same time, Palmer's mannerisms and her appearance are quite defiant and clearly related to the shamelessness of punk. But her widely spaced legs, protruding elastic bands for stockings and bright makeup are not debauchery, but rather part of a circus or dramatic performance, again, in a certain space where the rules and restrictions of the external, “real” world of society do not apply.

The unifying factor for the playlist for the event dedicated to the revolution was that all the songs seemed to be filled with youthful vitality. Even in the relaxed songs, there is an energetic release of tension – something like a ritual dance on the bones of the system. At the same time, if negative topics slip through here, they are necessarily presented with self-irony. No time to despair! Indeed, in a revolutionary mood, the main thing is the joy that there will soon be a new world.

#### **4.5. Feminist Movements and The Olympia Phenomenon**

How to evoke, without risking giving back to this term its Latin meaning of "pulling to oneself", a feminist current which never ceases to engage in games of hide and seek with all that is closely related

to the frame, to the formal? How to capture, without distorting, the essence of a phenomenon that practices a form of constant " self-volatilization " and present, without erasures, a social group whose practices fall within the palimpsest? Why look for a cohesion, so difficult to justify, to speak of a current which makes it a point of honor not to form a coherent movement and which, starting from there, does not even leave us a name to which we could have clung. It will be understood, it will therefore be a question here of presenting one of the many ways (x ?) allowing to apprehend an essentially polyphonic current.

In order to have a grip, however labile, to describe a disparate, informal and "underground" feminist network, and because in many cases its members recognize its influence, we have chosen to put its French protests in perspective with the practices of a North American feminist punk faction that emerged in the early 1990s called Riot Grrrls. The kinship seemed to us all the more defensible since Ladyfest (which we will discuss later), which constitutes one of the most visible forms of feminist activism by French collectives, was originally instituted in the United States in 2000 , by some of the initiators of the Riot Grrrls phenomenon. We will therefore allow ourselves a preamble "outside the walls", before looking more specifically at the French case, by trying to highlight the multiple facets of this interstitial feminism, as lively as it is fleeting.

The current Riot Grrrls was therefore born in the small town of Olympia, Washington State, in the North West of the United States, a small town known for its " counter-cultural " and experimental university, as well as for its fertility and inventiveness. of the local music scene. At the end of the 1980s, the American punk scene, particularly under the influence of hardcore groups, became very masculine, very violent and very coded, leaving the principles of this movement far behind. In this hostile context, a few young women (they are generally between 15 and 25 years old) decide to mobilize to make their voices heard. The catchy slogan launched by the first Riot Grrrls, " Revolution Grrrl style now ! " sums up quite well the state of mind in which they want to register their actions. It is a question, in fact, of denouncing and combating sexism head-on in the world of music and in the rest of society, of creating a space in cultural production which has hitherto been tacitly denied to women. Added to this feminist stance is the anti-capitalist posture characteristic of punk, manifested in particular by obedience to a Do-It-Yourself " esth-ethics ", the desire to stay away from the networks of mass communication and the questioning of the precedence given to the quality of the finished product over the creative process.

The network is gradually organized informally around an independent music scene and an abundant literary production in the form of fanzines which, at a time when the use of the Internet is not yet trivialized, constitute a vector of vital exchanges for the movement. Single-sex weekly meetings of the type of feminist awareness groups of the 70s are also organized. In August 1991, a festival was

organized with concerts, but also many discussions around various subjects (sexism, homophobia, racism, validism, to name a few) and knowledge exchange workshops. The movement is federating a little more, which is starting to give it more visibility. From that moment on, partly thanks to media coverage towards which the young women nevertheless harbored frank circumspection, collectives were created in several cities in the United States and the ideas of the Riot Grrrls were expatriated. to England.

The feminism that these young women are working to spread is more practical, so to speak, than theoretical. In many of the testimonies of the protagonists of this movement, we find the intention to develop a form of feminism that would better meet the expectations that a young audience could manifest, to extract feminism from a context that they consider too academic and to express a facet of it in the cultural field. Thus, for example, Corin Tucker (singer-guitarist of the group Heavens to Betsy) affirms:

“ The whole point of Riot Grrrl is that we were able to rewrite feminism for the twenty first century...For teenagers there wasn't any real access to feminism. It was written in a language that was very academic, that was inaccessible to young women. And we took these ideas and rewrote them in our own vernacular. »

It is indeed a kind of introductory feminism, an incitement to “click”. It is also and above all a question of encouraging as many young women as possible to associate, to speak, write, create, exchange: the conception that the Riot Grrrls have of the revolution is, so to speak, epidemic and daily. This desire to make the movement participatory results in a recurring form of ambivalence, suspense, blurring of intentions and discourse, somehow creating a game, a loose space authorizing possible re-interpretations by other young women. In fact, the variety of fanzine content, the nature of the collectives that have been formed, the multiplicity of manifestos that have been produced, reflect this refusal to establish a banner of common intentions, this emphasis on the need to recognize the diversity of individual experiences and makes this culture a polymorphic and elusive current. So, for example, Kathleen Hanna explains:

“Part of the point was to challenge hierarchies of all kinds. We didn't have a “statement” we were all willing to agree with, and we didn't even want to do that, because we didn't want to be a corporation or a corporate identity [...]It was not cohesive and easily consumable. We didn't have [...] a sentence that encapsulated it, we didn't have one unified goal, we didn't have one way to dress or look. »

Furthermore, as Marion Leonard points out, the Riot Grrrls have also cultivated ambivalence and

contradiction in order to guard against too immediate a takeover of their culture by the mass media. Because, from the very beginning, the question of the representation of their practices was at the heart of their concerns and went so far as to shape the (or rather the a-) structure of the movement. The plurivocity that they work to cultivate and the variety of intentions with which they invest their practices, participates in a desire not to let itself be digested by the media apparatus by means of a reductive label. In this same perspective, they disqualify a form of hieratic posture of contestation, preferring to indulge in constant adjustments of positioning. In his fanzine *Ablaze !* #10 Karren states: “ We are aware of the dialectical nature of protest, which ensures that dissenters are relegated to the role of 'other', thus playing a necessary supportive role to the mainstream ideology. We refuse to give credibility to traditional modes of protest. Nevertheless, despite all the strategies put in place, the mass media will get the better of the first-generation Riot Grrrls, who will end up being undermined by internal dissension related to these questions and will end their most visible activities towards the middle of the world. 1990s.

However, a new initiative will find many echoes all over the world, breathing new dynamism into this changing and unstable form of feminism. In 2000 some of the early Riot Grrrl activists collaborated again to organize over several days, again at Olympia, a feminist festival which they called Ladyfest and described in these terms: " a non-profit, community based event designed by and for women to showcase, celebrate and encourage the artistic, organizational and political works and talents of women ". This event is spread over six days and is in line with the Riot Grrrl festival a few years earlier, offering discussions, workshops, concerts, performances and exhibitions. The organizers emphasize from the start their desire to make Ladyfest a nomadic festival, so to speak. Thus Tobi Vail (formerly drummer of Bikini Kill, member of many other groups thereafter, and co-organizer of the first Ladyfest) affirms: “Ladyfest was deliberately created... with strategy in mind [...] It became clear that we should try to create something that could be reproduced by women in their own communities [...] We tried to develop a method that would foster localism. “It seems that the method worked since since then, more than a hundred Ladyfest have taken place all over the world, taking various forms.

In France, seven of these events were held between 2003 and 2010, in the cities of Grenoble, Dijon, Toulouse (three times), Nantes and Bordeaux. The nature of each of these Ladyfests remained similar to that of the first American festival, all remaining non-profit events, organized by associations or informal feminist collectives and consisting of concerts, discussions, workshops, performances, readings, video projections and exhibitions, with diversity policies varying according to the towns and the nature of the activities offered. Except in the case of Ladyfest Bordeaux, all the festivals were self-financed. The acceleration in their frequency (five took place between 2008 and 2010) testifies to the vivacity of the networks involved and reflects a certain appetite for this form of feminist



mobilization on the part of a population whose spectrum of age has widened (between eighteen and forty years for the most part). As a rule, these events attract an audience that goes beyond the strictly local level, and reveal the existence of links between different networks, more or less "underground", at a national and transnational level. In this regard, the Ladyfests constitute moments of encounters and exchanges between different poles, moments that punctuate more daily and more local collective activist journeys taking various forms. This heterogeneous character thus favors the emergence of new ideas and the mutual influences make these events evolving both in form and in substance.

In many cases the influence of the actions and cultural productions of the Riot Grrrls is proven and assumed. Although obviously not the only component of Ladyfest, the Riot Grrrl tradition comes into play in a kind of common cultural reference base. The Do-It-Yourself ideology dear to the Riot Grrrls notably occupies a fundamental place in these "underground" protest networks that often refuse to come to terms with the means and frameworks of capitalist and heteropatriarchal society. The implementation of this ideology applies not only to the field of cultural production (as was essentially the case for the Riot Grrrls) whether musical, literary, or other, but it is coupled with a political character. by participating in the development of alternative lifestyles and consumption.

Thus, on the one hand, the promotion of a form of amateurism and simplicity, palpable in the productions of musical groups and in fanzines, contributes to creating a galvanizing climate and to encouraging everyone to appropriate the process. creative. On the other hand, the workshops, during the Ladyfest, for example, constitute the means by which a form of theory of practice is built and disseminated. By way of example, we can mention a few workshop titles offered during the French Ladyfest which illustrate this desire to get out of a dependency generated by a system that splits and specializes: bicycle repair workshop, mechanics, workshop : “ make your own dildo ”, gynecological self-examination, self-defense, workshop : “ make your own bread ”, fanzine and serigraphy/platrogravure, blacksmithing and welding, stencil making, binding, sound system. In a similar spirit, during certain festivals (in Toulouse for example) food recovery sessions at the end of the market are organized and groups of volunteers are in charge of cooking for the assistance a meal offered at free price.

Finally, much more than was the case in the United States, this feminist network cultivates numerous acquaintances with the culture of the squat, the embodiment par excellence of the Do-It-Yourself ideology applied to everyday life. In Toulouse, the network gradually expanded and was able to continue thanks to the existence of squats such as the “Clandé ” or the “ Pavillons Sauvages”, which offer spaces of freedom and gratuity essential for the holding of this kind of events (in fact the organizers are for the most part committed to ensuring that the profits, used mainly to pay for the

groups and buy equipment, come from voluntary donations). In many cities, collectives have also opened feminist housing squats, as in Grenoble for example.

Like the Riot Grrrls, the French underground feminist network attaches great importance to the question of identity and the variety of life experiences and feelings. In the same way that the former endeavored to question all hierarchies, the current constantly puts all forms of oppression into perspective and recognizes similar mechanisms in them. The fight against racism, homophobia, transphobia, classism, validism, aesthetic tyrannies, in fact constantly joins the fight against sexism. The question of the tactics to be put in place with a view to a possible convergence of struggles is regularly debated during discussions. It should be noted here that this feminist network is closely linked with the queer and “transpédégouines” networks, an affinity which was already confirmed between the Riot Grrrls and the “queercore” punk current in the 1990s in the United States.

This particular attention paid to the diversity of backgrounds and this sensitivity to the multiplicity of oppressions potentially suffered also lead to an express desire not to give the movement an identity, not to circumscribe it, not to establish a predominant discourse so that no one speaks for anyone. The result is a moving and protean network, one of the only real characteristics of which lies in the circulatory aspect of the ideas and practices developed. Moreover, this circulation also participates in a kind of diffraction tactic, of scrambling of tracks, linked to a desire not to let oneself be seized, to freeze in one more category.

Thus, this network draws its strength from the fact that each of its protagonists adds their person to a base of common values which is updated, readjusted and nourished precisely by this constant flow. It is a sort of “work in progress” whose objective is to remain so, an activism of punctuality, whose form is ephemeral but the opportunities are numerous. This circulatory, almost interactionist aspect is verified at different levels: from a geographical point of view, firstly, as the very concept of Ladyfest can illustrate, but also because a large part of the protagonists of these networks are themselves show great mobility and rarely look at the kilometer expenditure when an event is held. Circulation of knowledge, know-how and information also, thanks to workshops and discussions, but also through fanzines. Consequently, it is also cultural, practical and theoretical influences that constantly travel and reshape local expressions of this form of feminism. This is verifiable at a formal level: local collectives are inspired by what has been done elsewhere to constitute themselves or set up actions, and in turn will inspire other collectives thereafter. This is also true at an ideal level, insofar as the variety of the nature of collectives constantly allows the germination of new problems of reflection. Finally, we can see this in the cultural field and in particular in music: to American punk influences are added the more recent “electro” and “electro-clash” trends from London or Berlin, or even the contributions of French or American hip-hop culture by example.

If this predisposition to change is partly the translation of a desire for openness and constant renewal, it also seems that it is envisaged as a strategy of atomization of the movement aimed at thwarting the traps of a frontal opposition to a essentializing system. In the same way that the Riot Grrrls disqualified the effectiveness of a dialectical conception of protest, everything suggests that the polymorphic activism practiced by the French and more generally European underground feminist networks testifies to an attempt to circumvent the logic dominant. It is a contestation, in fits and starts, oscillating, which plays with visibility and invisibility by engaging in a kind of subversive teasing in an attempt to annoy a hegemonic system. There seems to be a kind of willingness to be where you didn't expect anything to be, to use tactics that you didn't think could be used otherwise. It should be emphasized in this regard that a certain use is made of "diversion", a "diversion" imbued with ambivalence here again, which, in the same way as the resistance offered by these feminists is not completely frontal, does not fall entirely into accusatory derision. This culture is, for example, largely inspired by certain aspects of television or radio broadcasting mass culture, and recognizes and accepts the impact of the media on their tastes and practices. Finally, the massive recourse to the second degree and to self-mockery stems from this same annoyance, from this same juggling with the acceptable and the inappropriate, although these also result from a cautious relativism vis-à-vis all the types of assertions and a disengagement vis-à-vis the concept of certainty that could be embodied in first-degree discourse.

The feminism that we have just attempted to describe in this presentation, a presentation that remains to be considered with all the necessary circumspection and relativism, is thus in a way interstitial, disruptive. To use the terms of Dick Hebdige, it constitutes a "parasitic interference" in the well-oiled mechanics of current logics, a kind of fleeting televisual snow but appearing at regular intervals. Both present and absent in the world, he has created a parallel space for himself, which interacts sparingly with a main space perceived as globally hostile. This is a feminism that squats the spaces that Big Brother has forgotten or neglected to peek into. While registering their actions in a very practical field, the protagonists of these networks also devote themselves to a kind of activism of the absurd, an activism which tries to unearth parcels where the logics in progress have somewhat loosened their hold. . It remains to be seen how far the chase will lead.

#### **4.6. Punk Culture, The Aggressive Avant-Garde, Avant-Punk and Post-Punk**

This style of music and life has raised fierce controversy to this day. Some consider it to be a revolt against society, of great importance in entertainment, which involves a bunch of clowns who cannot play instruments.

The very formula of punk rock worked in the 1974-1975 region, although the origins of the style must be sought ten years earlier, in the work of such bands as the Sonics, Seeds, Count 5, 13th Floor Elevators, Standells, Q-65 and Troggs, similar names groups are legion. It was they who developed the main pillars of the style - "solid", direct rhythm 4/4, based on rhythm and blues and rock and roll, a simple pattern of rhythm guitar, a minimal solo, often supplemented by an organ, which created a dense sound if take those times. This formation is called "garage rock" as most bands rehearsed in garages. Around 1967 there was a wave of psychedelic experimentation on the wing of the US and European rock scene, and much of that wave had broken up or moved on to other music. The revival of the "garage" occurred around 1976, when many punks remembered where the news of their style came from. Bands like the Fuzztones, Chesterfield Kings, Miracle Workers and the like weren't backyard copycats of trendy bands like the Seeds or the Troggs - they positioned themselves as a counterculture opposed to the "artificial" pop band sound of our time.

Around 1967, a number of bands in the US (MC5, Stooges, Velvet Underground) began experimenting with a simple and aggressive hybrid of hard rock and "garage", overlaid with aggressive lyrics, all of which accompanied defiant shows with revolutionary slogans and attacks on the audience. or self-torture. Now this style is called "proto-punk", and a number of later bands (Modern Lovers, Dictators, Dils, Avengers, Neon Boys) are put here, combining unbridled protest and aggressive sound with an avant-garde approach and manners of the intellectual elite. The decoration of this stage was completed by 1971-72, when in New York the audience at the clubs "Max's Kansas City" and "CBGB's" began to gather and exchange musical and literary experiences. It must be said right away that not all groups of this stream are directly related to punk (here we can mention Blondie, Talking Heads, Devo), it is more difficult to determine their attitude to this style exactly.

It was the classic formula of punk that the Ramones brought out - an extremely simple rhythm, a minimal melody, a harsh sound, lyrics from the category of street life, black humor and personal experiences, and, very rarely, truly socially oriented. The appearance of the Ramones became a model for the bulk of punks - Harley Davidson leather jackets, worn or simply torn jeans, a short, not very well-groomed haircut, old sneakers. This style varies a little, but it is usually repelled by those who consider themselves punks. Many will now say: \* "But what about the Sex Pistols? And besides, don't punks put on colorful "Iroquois" and stick pins in their rags?

And this too. Only this is a slightly different culture of punk, English, although its prototype is the American Richard Hell from the Neon Boys, who also played in Television and Void-Oids. And it

was hybrid - after all, skinheads, football fans, bikers, intellectuals came to concerts. And everyone brought something of their own to the style, and those who created the group sang about their own: socially concerned Clash, lovers of black humor Damned, singers of personal experiences Buzzcocks. And since the "model of the season" was, of course, the Sex Pistols, they were most imitated.

However, not everyone did so. There were bands such as Jam, Purple Hearts, Jolt - neat and taut, whose music and image originated in the work of the mods of 1964 - 1966 (The Who, Small Faces, Creation), although these groups differed from the mods of previous years by a more active social position - in particular, were participants in the anti-nuclear movement. Bands such as the Stranglers, Tom Robinson Band, X-RAY-SPEX or the French Metal Urbain experimented with sound and played something far from the primitive "chass" of traditional punk - from psychedelia to jazz and avant-garde. There was a strong trend towards ska and reggae (ska, reggae, rock steady) - Clash, Slits, Angelic Upstarts were very fond of this, paving the way for modern ska-punk like Operation IVY, Voodoo Glow Skulls, Mighty Mighty Bosstones. In general, this music was very popular among punks, mods and skinheads then, and then it was 2Tone-ska that raised the wave in the face of Madness, Selecter, Specials and a host of other bands.

The 1975-1977 season was the era of the formation of punk. It was at this time that the development of what most know as punk culture begins. And it was at this time that two branches of British punk became popular, as well as American, in part - Dead Boys, Germs, early Black Flag. On the one hand, these were tough, often very social groups of working youth (SHAM 69, Skrewdriver, Cock Sparrer) or similar-sounding heirs of counterculturists like MC5, Stooges or Dictators (U.K. Subs, Crass, Stiff Little Fingers). These groups became the object of close scrutiny by the authorities and censorship, and the youth saw in them a "genuine rebellion", which in many ways was true. This became part of the legend of punk rock: punks sing songs of a socially critical orientation, but it was these groups that took a lot from skinheads and are often very fond of them, moved away from the main principle of punks - life in the space "here and now". A culture like Oi was born here! - hard, simple punk rock, aimed at working youth (especially skinheads) and built on the image of people from the working class, that is, no torn, no pins and spikes, clothes are simple and functional, which is combined with a very short haircut and plentiful tattoos - although this is not so necessary. It is from here that later punks took the suspenders and tall construction boots that many perceive as an integral part of the punk image. Also popular were cheerful, light-sounding, but energetic, often far from the politics of pop-punk bands (Vibrators, Rezillos, Boys, Americans Dickies). These didn't focus on any particular image and could be like the Ramones or garage bands, or they could be incredibly theatrical. Now the role of these teams is often underestimated, while forgetting that Green Day, Queens, Blink 182 and the like took a lot from this scene. The rest developed between these two components, borrowing

new trends from outside, this gave a culture like post punk. This disgrace lasted until 1979, when, with the persistence of a spring drowned man, the paradigm began to emerge: "Punk is dead", first revealed to the world in 1978, on the album of the legendary Crass "The Feeding of The 5000" and refuted by later generation groups. By the way, the famous "Punks Not Dead" is a misreading of the title of the debut album of the heroes of the next wave of punk rock Exploited "Punk's Not Dead".

In general, this wave begins in 1978, when such teams as Blitz, Business, Vice Squad, Exploited, New Model Army, Toy DOLLS, and a little later - Chumbawamba, Discharge, Conflict, The Mob, Rudimentary Penny, Pogues and many others. It was at this time that the formation of the modern image of punks began - the same mohawk that was worn by such groups as the Americans Germs, represented by their vocalist Darby Crash, or the British G. B. H., Discharge, One Way System and Exploited, the early Sigue Sigue Sputnik, parodying classic punk pieces, multiplied by electronic post-punk, Harley Davidson jacket, high boots, lots of rivets, spikes and patches. It is at this time that the scene of Oi! represented by the already mentioned Blitz, Business, as well as Last Resort, Criminal Class, Oppressed, 4 Skins and a lot of other teams. Unfortunately, the scene has been littered with fascist bands like Skrewdriver, No Remorse, Brutal Attack or Skullhead. These bands have largely made super-heavy sounds fashionable in the punk environment, exactly matching the vicious lyrics that reflect social concerns and intolerance towards "traitors". Although there were melodic, sometimes folk bands like the Pogues, Levellers, Chumbawamba or the late New Model Army, and pop punk like the British Toy Dolls and the Americans Angry Samoans, Descendents or Queers was also popular, although then the latter played quite differently - damp, primitive and hard.

By the way, the Americans by that time had created their own version of punk culture, not so focused on appearance: a simple T-shirt, jeans and cheap sneakers were enough for the eyes, but even more aggressive and socially uncompromising than it was in Europe. It's called hardcore. Hardcore was focused on changing social life by creating its own cultural environment. It is here that the main trends of modern "positive punk" will appear, for example, punk skateboarders like Jody Foster's Army or activists straight edge Minor Threat, Society System Decontrol, 7 Seconds. Local skinheads began to develop here (Agnostic Front, Warzone, Cro Mags - the latter will later go to Krishnaism), and a number of related musical cultures will later develop here - cross over, rap core. The approximate heyday of this music coincided with the English "third wave" punk, it is also called streetpunk - this is 1980-82.

Gradually, by the 1985 region, this wave faded into the background, many groups broke up or played other music. But punk did not disappear - it returned underground, and the new generation already consciously stopped supporting "major" companies, focusing not on music, which became diverse, and the groups did not rely only on heaviness or melody, but on the content of the text, message. In

addition, the culture of alternative music was largely oriented towards punk aesthetics, which is clearly seen in the example of grunge and related styles. Quite often such bands used and still use a punk approach to performing and recording music, thus processing a wide range of styles - from dance electronics to industrial.

In 1994, the return of punks to the mainstream began (Green Day, Offspring, Rancid, No Doubt, Blink 182). As a rule, it was pop-punk, with a large proportion of bands experimenting with ska and veterans of the scene. Although there were those who played and are playing quite hard and aggressive punk rock of a textbook type. But this is precisely what those who consider punk to be a culture of underground and social protest did not like, and now there are a lot of them. They talked about how the "majors" want to buy up punk rock and make it socially safe, although this is a moot point, as evidenced by the recent decline of the 1994 punk wave.

#### **4.7. How Can We Live in An Anarchic Society? Is the Anarchy a Utopia or an Anti-Utopia?**

Before getting to the heart of the matter, I would like to clarify the title of my speech. Why, indeed, choose to speak of "anarchist utopian imaginary" and not quite simply of "anarchist utopias" or even of "anarchist visions of the future at the turn of the century", as had been planned for the first time? A number of preliminary points are in order.

Anarchism, let us not forget, has often been assimilated to a sort of utopian current par excellence, embodying in itself the very quintessence of utopia, namely a dream that is undoubtedly fascinating, but unrealizable. And yet, one only has to take a casual look at the way the main libertarian thinkers have tried to justify their theories to realize that things are far from being so simple. The case of Proudhon seems to us particularly enlightening. With the "father" of anarchy, as with Marx, the concern to distance himself from the utopian tradition of his time is constant. His entire mutualist doctrine could even easily be qualified as anti-utopian insofar as it explicitly presents itself as a "realistic" alternative to the artificial constructions proposed by other social reformers. Whether it is a question of Fourierist constructions and other system makers, followers of Cabet's communism or

of Louis Blanc's association, what Proudhon particularly reproaches them for is their arbitrary character. That is to say, a conception of social change aimed at imposing on individuals' ready-made ways of producing and living in society, without taking into account the real aspirations of workers. The success of such projects, moreover, rested either on a preliminary and improbable transformation of human nature, or on the establishment of a coercive power denying the freedom of the individual and source of new privileges. But Proudhon was convinced that to solve the social question, it was not necessary for the producers to renounce their independence and associate themselves in vague Phalansterian or communist systems. It was not even necessary for them to engage in a bloody civil war against the representatives of the new financial feudalism. To move on the road to social liquidation, it would suffice for the producers to take their affairs directly into their own hands and begin to mutually guarantee outlets for their products after having fixed the value of the goods according to the hours of work necessary for their production. Production.

This observation, however, is far from exhausting the question. In particular, it would be extremely easy to show the many links which connect, despite his denials, the work of Proudhon to that of the social reformers before 1848. distancing themselves from utopia will in no way prevent them from using the utopian genre for propagandistic purposes when the time comes. In any case, there are many renowned libertarian militants who, at one time or another, have not hesitated to write utopian stories in the purest tradition inaugurated by More or Campanella to describe the vision they had of future anarchist society.

To stick to the French example, it is possible to mention at least three utopias published during the period that interests us here: *The Humanisphere: anarchic utopia* of Joseph Déjacque (1899)

The materials for studying "anarchist utopias" are therefore not lacking. Such a study, however, would not be of great interest to us. It should not be forgotten that these are works of propaganda, that is to say works (except for the particular case of Déjacque) agreed in which the authors strive, for the sake of pedagogical explanation, to expose or popularize the rudiments of the doctrine. Grave's work, for example, was commissioned by the Spanish pedagogue Francisco Ferrer for the Modern School of Barcelona.

"I chose the form of the tale, he explains, for two.... Thus, apart from a few vague romantic intrigues and a style that sometimes leaves something to be desired, we find in these utopias practically nothing that we cannot already know by reading the press or the innumerable pamphlets of libertarian propaganda. Under these conditions, opposing anarchist utopias to socialist ones

Among the texts most commonly cited to show the... to show that among the former, the state is



absent while among the others it is present, is not of very great interest. Such an approach, in any case, can only be limited to noting the existence of doctrinal divergences, which is all the same a disappointing result for the historian of ideas. And besides, is it really possible to establish a clear distinction between socialist and anarchist utopias as we have too often tended to do? The case of *News from Nowhere* by William Morris, a novel in which both libertarians and Marxists could recognize themselves, shows that the chases are much more complex.

Here we touch, it seems to me, one of the major limits of a study of utopia which would limit itself to exegeting a certain number of literary texts belonging to the so-called "utopian" genre.

In addition, and for me this is the most important limit, by focusing on this type of source, we risk missing the essential point. The same utopian discourse, in fact, can cover different meanings and fulfil opposite functions depending on the era and the context, even, in certain cases, taking on an openly dystopian dimension. We must therefore stop considering utopia exclusively as a separate literary genre that can be identified from a certain number of formal characteristics. As rightly pointed out by Karl Mannheim, what makes a speech, a posture or a mentality, can be qualified as utopian rests on its subversive charge, that is to say on its capacity at a given moment to radically oppose the existing order. Mannheim draws a crucial distinction between utopia, the negation of the present, and ideology, a term used to designate any discourse aimed at legitimizing the status quo. "A state of mind is utopian, he writes, when it disagrees with the state of reality in which it occurs. [When its orientations] tend to undermine, partially or totally, the order of things that reigns at that moment.

However, if we take up this distinction on our own, it seems obvious that the multiplication of texts or statements explicitly of a utopian nature is in no way in itself a guarantee of radicality. The opposite would be rather true. As Georges Sorel forcefully underlined regarding the social reformers before 1848, it is possible to show the existence of a very close link between the abstract affirmation of the utopian dream and the existence of a practice aiming social peace. Let us recall the famous opposition established by this author between myths, "means of acting on the present", and utopias accused of presenting to the people "a deceptive mirage of the future" with the consequence of maintaining their passivity or let him believe "in the magic forces of the state". "Also," he comments, "our socialist politicians are careful not to effectively fight the utopia of easy happiness. The proliferation of utopian references within European socialism before 1914, even as the parties of the Second International practiced an increasingly reformist policy seems to me to be a completely revealing element of this tendency underlined by Sorel. But social democracy is not the only force concerned with the "opportunistic" use of utopia in order to legitimize or hide opposing practices because a similar discourse can be held vis-à-vis anarchists and trade unionists.

Any utopia, as a social dream which postulates, either directly or indirectly, the self-institution of society by itself, is therefore inevitably the bearer of an "imaginary" which it is impossible to apprehend exclusively. from the fixed and agreed framework of its doctrinal expressions. The representations conveyed by utopian imaginaries, in fact, have the particularity of being fragmentary, simplifying, even distorting in relation to the official discourse that a political current can hold about itself. These images are never limited to identically reaffirming the ideal end to be achieved, but they also inform us about the hopes they arouse and the dreams they entertain with both activists and other individuals. The study of the utopian imaginaries of contemporary currents of political thought therefore appears to be an exceptional tool for gaining access to the value systems and mentalities of the social forces that claim them, as well as to understand the logics that motivate their action.

Admittedly, the use of the concept of the utopian imaginary also poses formidable problems insofar as it lends itself to indisputable polysemic interpretations. This concept, moreover, is not directly and immediately graspable by the historian who finds himself in the obligation to compose it progressively by multiplying the sources and the references. However, if such an epistemological approach is adopted, many of the difficulties that we have highlighted above can easily be overcome. The opposition established by Sorel between myth and utopia, in particular, collapses on its own. All the effort of Sorel and his friends of the C.G.T. does it not consist in wanting to deny by their corporative practice the bourgeois order? Don't they want to radically oppose it by relying on the dynamics of class confrontation? How then would it be possible to deny the utopian dimension, in the sense given to it by Mannheim, of the Sorelian conception of the general strike? Let us not forget that, according to Sorel himself, what makes the strength of the myth is its ability to mobilize the energies of the proletariat through "an organization of images capable of instinctively evoking all the feelings that correspond to the various manifestations of the war waged by socialism against modern society. We can thus legitimately interpret the myth of the proletarian strike not as the negation of utopia, but rather as the affirmation of one of the major features of what could be called the unionist utopian imagination of the turn of the century.

The case of the syndicalist-revolutionaries is not, however, unique. Among the anarchists, especially, alongside the cold and accepted discourse of official propaganda literature, it is possible to show without difficulty the existence of a real utopian imaginary bearer of dreams and hopes, of which the majority of militant activities carry the trace. Trying to define its contours is not, however, an easy task because, on many points, the libertarians indisputably shared the same dreams, the same hopes as the other components of socialism in the 19th century. The anarchist, like the latter, wants to achieve a just and fraternal society, free from need, aiming for the well-being and development of the individuals who compose it. A society that values work as a form of human achievement and as

a means of mastering nature. A society finally pacified where, thanks to the suppression of the abuses of property and political power, the conflict between individuals or groups would become secondary and where, in accordance with the Saint-Simonian formula, the administration of things would replace the government of men. The utopian imaginary of anarchism is thus indisputably linked to the ideological matrix provided by the utopia of Thomas More, the essential elements of which constitute a veritable paradigm of human emancipation in the modern era. This imaginary, in any case, extends and radicalizes the dream that runs through all of modernity: that of man controlling (finally) his destiny, influencing the course of his history instead of undergoing it. It is therefore not surprising that the reference to the image of Prometheus, breaking his chains forged by the Gods and leading the human race to its emancipation, is found both within the anarchist and socialist traditions.

The anarchist utopian imaginary, as it flourished and solidified during the years 1880-1890, nevertheless broke on essential points both with that conveyed by the social reformers of the first half of the nineteenth century and with that of workers' socialism before 1914. However, this rupture, let us emphasize, cannot be assessed exclusively in ideological terms. Its first manifestations, moreover, are well before the formation of a distinct and separate libertarian current because they occur the day after the failure of the revolutions of 1848-1849.

The bloody repression of the June 1848 uprising marked a real turning point in this respect. Even though recourse to violence continues to be proscribed by Proudhon and his disciples, it is possible to find in the pen of a new generation of revolutionary anarchists, such as Joseph Déjacque and Ernest Cœurderoy, fiery calls in favor of the civil war and the assertion of the need for the violent destruction of the old society to replace it with a radically new one. For these authors, despite the influences undergone by the teaching of Proudhon and Fourier, the fraternal dream of a conciliation of classes definitively gave way to images of social war which would henceforth become dominant. The proposed hierarchy is no longer the same. The exalted values are often the opposite of those conveyed hitherto by the old utopians. So where social reformers appealed to fraternity, Cœurderoy appealed to "Hate. The break on this point could not be more total.

Cœurderoy's texts, in particular, are all traversed by visions that embody almost in a pure state the new demands for radicalism aimed at making a clean sweep of the past in which the vast majority of libertarian militants will eventually recognize themselves over the years. following. In his abundant prose, halfway between poetic reverie and messianic exhortation, all the main constituent elements of the end-of-the-century anarchist utopian imagination are already united, starting with the catastrophic vision of social change.

Strong in the conviction that the revolution should be considered as a sort of “cataclysm”, Cœurderoy began in 1852 to advocate in an increasingly insistent manner the arrival of the “Cossacks”, to whom he assigned the task of annihilating the cogs of the old world. “Since it is necessary..., he writes, let them come, the hordes of the North! let them rush on Europe at the gallop of their mares, lance in hand, shaking with wild cheers the glaciers of the Alps, the old castles of the Rhine, the echoes of Versailles and the City of the seven hills. Let them down, the Barbarians! that they transfuse their young blood into the veins of our decrepit, constitutionally, organically bourgeois societies. May they come and be blessed! are they not our brothers? To us sons of France, Republicans-Democrats-Socialists, it is long to see the Cossacks arrive, because we understand the REVOLUTION.

#### **4.8. Anarchic inclinations in contemporary protest and cultural movements**

Between 1880, moment of revival of political propaganda in France with the return of amnesties from the Commune, and 1914, the year when "the First World War collapses the belief in a possible and immediate fraternity of peoples", illustrated anarchist propaganda multiplies under the form of more or less long-lasting newspapers and magazines, making France a pole essential for the distribution of textual and visual documents of the main European figures associated with anarchism.[3] Through networks dissemination established with both artistic, literary and social journals contemporary and with international anarchist groups, periodicals Parisian illustrated anarchists analyze and represent the political crises and of Europe as so many symptoms of a “dying society” [4], victim of the decadence of the capitalist world. In a hurry to accelerate the disappearance of the latter and to prepare for the advent of the inexorable “golden age of humanity”[5], number of participants in political, artistic and literary magazines and newspapers want to assign the press a central role in mediating relations between art and social discourse, as well as in the discussion and dissemination of their new moral principles. By reserving considerable space for reflection on art and for the work of art as such, the anarchist newspaper offers, through its relationship with political news, a specific case combining imagination and press work according to the terms of a shifting political struggle. This article wishes to highlight

the main characteristics of the conceptions of art discussed in the anarchist press and in the literary and artistic periodicals associated therewith, as well as the context of theorization and the historical filiations of these conceptions of art. Encompassing literature and plastic arts under the same premises, these conceptions constitute so many calls to writers and artists to modify their practised arts and to make the newspaper the preferred medium for their works. Their review will make it possible to identify the main intellectual issues set in motion by anarchist periodicals in their relationship with the artistic imagination, through the analysis of artistic practices ranging from literary gleaning to the elaboration of amoralizing imagery. The debate on art that fills the pages of literary and artistic periodicals in the last twenty years of the nineteenth century requires the reader to pay attention sustained as the twists and turns are numerous, the alliances ephemeral and the frequent bifurcations. Throughout the articles, reports of events, criticisms and replies, a recurrence of themes, concepts and postulates unveils, letting appear the heart of a dispute, namely the nature of art, its nature past, present and future which, understood as relating to the socio-political world, must be transformed into the image of this world. Motivated by the impression that the art of their era is out of step, that it is more misunderstood than that of previous eras and that its decadence is so advanced that it requires radical and immediate actions,[6] the debaters compete with pleas, manifestos, discussions and editorials inviting artists and writers to concern themselves with the “morality of the Beautiful”[7]. The variations of meaning induced by such a postulate constitute the essence of the debate, each one having its nuance to add to the moral acceptance of the Beautiful or to the aesthetic design of the Good, all having an interest in promoting an idea of the Beautiful or Good close to their own aesthetic conceptions.

The vicious infertility of artists is generally noted and is not without compelling us to a little pity. They are the pariahs of a society of which they do not don't feel horror. Bourgeois ignominy is cynical, theirs is unconscious. Today, however, a movement of recovery is taking place as a result of the progress of the anarchist idea. Outside in Paris, The struggle for art in Brussels, fight for the anarchist revolution, they understood that the artist is also a man, that he can only live in freedom, and at present, in revolt.

The sheer naivety of artistic genius is in the eyes of art theorists social a manifestation of the false bourgeois consciousness and the analogies of processes between rebellion against academic art forms and revolution against the social order are viewed with suspicion. If, by their descriptions radical and dry of the evils of contemporary society, the novels of Zola, Maupassant and Edmond de Goncourt are considered manifestations of a social art capable of revealing the worldly rituals and the scandals which, therefore, can no longer be ignored, the visual arts require more lengthy justifications. Indeed, with the exception of the caricaturist depicting the mores bourgeois and the illustrator participating in anarchist propaganda, the artists struggle to demonstrate the legitimacy of

their practice in the face of this realistic imperative and social claimed by activists of social art. Apart from a few affiliations periodic and isolated with the art of Jacques-Louis David or Honoré Daumier, the artists constantly find themselves in an unenviable situation where the slightest aesthetic association with the past is scrutinized to be finally judged little convincing in revolutionary terms. Far from seeking at all costs to historicize their affiliation with the social art of previous generations, its end-of-the-century defenders like to situate their contemporary literary and artistic production. Although the examples revolutions of 1789, 1848 and 1871 may indicate the potential of some patterns and provide information on the origin of certain productions, analogies with the past are necessarily limited insofar as social art establishes itself as purpose of changing the economic conditions of the artist's work and the values at basis of aesthetic judgement. If it is possible to establish a filiation between the forms of Saint-Simonian or Fourierist social art with that of the end of the century, it is necessary to emphasize that very few direct references are made to it by the socialist or anarchist artists of the end of the century. Since the imagination of defenders of social art draws its references from the short term, it is necessarily the society of the Second Empire which becomes the example of the decadent reign of the bourgeoisie and not the July Monarchy. Moreover, the memory of the revolutions of 1848 seems definitively dissipated by the aura of the Paris Commune, considered by anarchists as the only form of popular government that has lived and whose pure and simple crushing constitutes, according to them, the example par excellence of the repression carried out by a bourgeoisie solidly installed at the top of the society. In this sense, if relations with Saint-Simonian or Fourierist social art can serve as models of comparison, it is necessary to contextualize the new values and new uses of art. Deeply transformed by social struggles, moving from an elitist Saint-Simonian social art to a social art inspired by the international artistic production disseminated in the press, the art social is, in the minds of the debaters, in the process of being constituted at the end of the century, literature and the plastic arts being, according to them, the corollary of the revolution and not its anticipation. The Third Republic is envisaged by the defenders of social art as a place and a time of passage, offering fertile ground for experimentation with the potential to accelerate the advent of socialism. Explaining this vision of the time in their texts, they resort by calculation to contemporary freedoms, to eclecticism, taste and general enthusiasm for certain so-called republican values in order to expand their sphere of influence. Convinced that the empowerment of the sphere of art is integrally linked to the form of economic exchanges at the center of which artists find their means of subsistence, these focus their reflections and discussions on the social and economic determinants of preferred forms art. Several artists are also convinced that it will not be possible for them to significantly modify their production only insofar as their conditions of existence will have changed profoundly. The nuance is fundamental, especially that it makes even more tangible the relationship between the debate on social

art with the contemporary commitment to education, morality and usefulness. Social art finds its place in the press as its definition and its manifestations, both literary and artistic, are the result of a reflection on the contemporary world and its social crises, associating with the imaginary part of art social, a relationship to the news of which the press wants to be the bearer. Sharing with contemporary publications a desire to talk about art, to define its forms of productions and receptions by clearly favouring controversy to stimulate debates,[27] the anarchist press also asserts itself as a space for creation, wanting to simultaneously news newspaper and historical library, heritage museum and Art Gallery.

If the awakening of anarchist propaganda, written and illustrated, preceded by several years the anarchist attacks that polarized French public opinion between 1891 and 1894, it is undoubtedly the propaganda by the fact which motivated the Figaro literature to devote its special issue of January 13, 1894 to a presentation before educate the French public about the forms of anarchist propaganda, its theoretical sources, its organization and its network [28]. Felix's Claims Dubois, editor of the issue, are mentioned from the outset as responding to a direct threat against which the alarm must be raised: Propaganda by the image, propaganda by the writings, one will be able to realize all the hatreds, all the blasphemies that are sown in the name of a humanity better, and also of all the chimeras, of all the utopias evoked for stir up these hatreds! Reproducing on three pages numerous propaganda images taken from the newspaper *Le père peinar*d, but also administrative documents as well as a score of “*La Ravachole*”, the report is illustrated with caricatures and images “synthesizing best, and in an artistic form, the hatred of revolutionaries”. *Le Figaro* presents the works of “classified artists [31]”, such as Félix Pissarro, Maximilien Luce and Henri-Gabriel Ibels, whose participation attests to the influence of periodicals anarchists in the French artistic landscape. The question of the relation of anarchism with the propaganda image is explained therein by referring to the use made of the illustrations in *Le père peinar*d and posters decorating newsrooms newspapers or meetings of anarchist groups, but also by making an allusion to the portraits adorning the walls of the office of the newspaper *La révolte*. The presence of etching portraits of Proudhon and Michel Bakunin and a mystical image representing the martyrs of Chicago is presented by Félix Dubois as a proof of the fundamentally subversive use that can be made of the image.[32] To the printed and reproduced image is joined the public and private exhibition of portraits, adding to the social utility of the propaganda assumed through its theorization, its reproduction and its dissemination, a dimension of devotion more subtle than Dubois wish to highlight. The sample of images gathered by *Le Figaro littéraire* and featuring *Bourgeoisie*, *Capital*, *Justice*, the *Peasant* and a portrait of *Ravachol*, is not only partially representative of the diversity of types of images associated with the anarchist propaganda. To these reproducible images created by artists are added numerous visual documents of all origins produced for the propaganda or diverted

to serve its purposes. If the illustration takes multiple forms in the anarchist press, the privileged image remains the moralising or mobilising, and Félix Dubois underlines the quality of these images which draw forms and subjects in the iconography of contemporary artistic trends: [Am]ong artists, as among writers, anarchist theories have found if not formal adhesions, at least certain sympathies. We guess enough naturally that they are found among the "dangers" in matters of art, among the Impressionists and Symbolists.

The design of a considerable part of the images offered to propaganda by artists refers to Symbolist and political production, including the Group of XX in Brussels, Walter Crane, the English Pre-Raphaelites and Neo-Impressionism are iconic. In addition to this relationship to contemporary aesthetics, the mobilizing images of anarchist propaganda are historicized by the direct affiliations with important artistic figures such as Honoré Daumier, Francesco Goya and Eugène Delacroix, creating a moral illustration program heterogeneous. Far from the simple realism with which social art is often associated in the theoretical texts of the end of the century, the iconographic sources of the artists are numerous, creation ex nihilo being more difficult to envisage than the appropriation of various references that they freely combine with the postulates intellectuals of anarchism. The links between art and anarchism find their expression, not in a synthesis, but in a practice of gleaning whose transience perfectly suits the vicissitudes of the press. If from the outset visual propaganda constitutes the most artistic dimension visible of anarchism, many theoretical and literary works are also published in the form of extracts or serials in the newspapers. Although relevant more of an appropriation of eclectic speeches and an exercise in rhetoric, one of the first materializations of the interest of anarchist periodicals for art and literature is the literary supplement to *La révolte* and *Les Temps nouvelles*. Teaming up theoretical and literary works from the past to the latest novelties, the supplement literary wishes to both testify to the vitality and topicality of anarchism and historically justify its principles. It was to his comrade Auguste Baillet that Jean Grave borrowed the idea of "taking from both ancient and modern literature, especially among the warmest defenders of the capitalist and authoritarian regime, everything who could find their confessions in favor of the anarchist idea, and publish a review entirely composed of excerpts of this genre"[36], an idea which gave its initial form to the literary supplement. Baillet had tried to launch such a publication in Geneva under the name of Anarchist Gleaner, but difficulties of all kinds forced him to stop publication from the second issue [38]. Wishing to improve his journal to distinguish it of the mass of Parisian anarchist publications, Grave put Baillet's idea to contribution. This literary supplement, offering, sometimes in the form of aphorisms, sometimes long passages, extracts from the works of Rousseau, Voltaire, Diderot, Dumas fils, Alphonse Daudet and Zola, among others, were highly appreciated, as evidenced by Grave in his memoirs: "Some even wrote to me to find that he was much more interesting than the newspaper. If it was flattering in a way, it lacked to be of another. The authors reproduced appreciated



it as much as the readers.” Confirming the interest of anarchist newspapers for the contemporary press, we also find in the supplement numerous excerpts from articles from the general press, forming with literary quotations an eclectic set, as evidenced by the pages an issue of the supplement to *La révolte* [40], including among other texts “L’art in the future society”, first published by Edmond Cousturier in the Interviews political and literary [41], a short excerpt from *The Old Regime* by Hippolyte Taine Sensé confirm “the uselessness of universal suffrage”, a quote discussing “the fallacy of law” taken from a work by Lieutenant-Colonel Floridor Dumas, as well as a text by Remy de Gourmont entitled “Le vin”, dedicated to Paul Verlaine in the pages of the Journal. However, these practices of appropriation and misappropriation of texts show quickly their limits, intellectual property being openly criticized, or even simply denied, by the practice of gleaning. Indeed, from 1890, Jean Grave found himself at the center of disputes with the Society of Literary People newly chaired by Émile Zola. The latter had initially authorized Grave to reproduce extracts from his works in the literary supplement, before retracting to comply with the statutes of the Company. In addition to subpoenaing Grave to appear in corrections, the Society warns its members by means of an insert in *L’Éclair*, that they exposed themselves to a fine or to cancellation if they themselves authorized the reproduction of their works. Certain members of the Company, including Hector France, Aurélien Scholl and Pierre Bonnetain, challenged this way of proceeding and actually received a fine. Grave points out that they hastened to pay out of pocket, at the rate of the Society, the reproduction of extracts from their works in the literary supplement making the argument that the newspaper was a more direct means to expose their works to the eyes of the people. The massive reproduction of artistic and literary works is indeed designed by some anarchist theorists as the concretization of the moral utility of the work of art in French society, and this reproduction is opposed to intellectual property. In a text entitled “The writer and social art”, Bernard Lazarewrote in 1898:

*“[T]he artists also claim to enjoy art on their own, art that feeds on everyone. labor of the centuries, of the art which is made possible only by the civilization which is the work of all, thousands of beings who died, conquering for their descendants a parcel of beauty which is added to the common treasure.”*

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

The essence of anarchism Anarchism is a political philosophy based on freedom and aimed at the destruction of all types of coercion and suppression. Anarchism proposes to replace the cooperation of individuals with the power that exists due to the suppression of some by others and due to the privileges of some in relation to others. This means that, according to anarchists, social systems and institutions should be based on the interest and voluntary consent (carrot method, encouragement) of each of their participants, and power (the stick method, coercion) should be eliminated as such in all its manifestations. Five Basic Principles Anarchist theory revolves around five basic principles:

1. Lack of power
2. Freedom from coercion
3. Freedom of association
4. Mutual aid
5. Diversity

Lack of power, the refusal of the anarchist community from the decision-making procedure by a majority of votes, and the fundamental impossibility for anarchists to use coercion and violence otherwise than in the form of retaliatory measures against aggressors. Anarchism excludes the call to build a society of a totalitarian type, in which everyone would have to look the same and do the same thing. Anarchism, on the contrary, presupposes diversity, in which communities freed from coercive-power relations will be able to solve issues of self-defence, self-sufficiency and collective security on their own. Various forms of democracy - as forms of power - are considered unacceptable to the anarchist community.

Freedom from coercion involves not forcing people to participate in social activities or structures against their will. Freedom of association implies that in an anarchist society, associations to meet all social needs, any social structures should be created by freely united people who have an equal right to determine the future of society.

Anarchists believe that power should be distributed at the grassroots level, that people's associations should grow from the bottom up, and not vice versa. As larger forms of organization (up to worldwide), anarchists propose the creation of federations of free collectives that can take control of the collection and disposal of waste, the development of computer technology, the use of natural resources, self-defense or industrial production. Federations are based on the same basic principles, but operate through representation from collectives. Representatives (delegates), in the anarchist sense, are not professional politicians, but members of their collectives, elected only temporarily to represent their collective in certain matters at the federation level.

The last two principles are interrelated. Mutual assistance is synonymous with cooperation. When people work together, in some cases they can achieve much greater results. Diversity is the key to future survival. The desire of the authorities to normalize everything and apply the conveyor principle to all aspects of public life alienates and divides people. This desire is also largely responsible for the destruction of the environment. Diversity is a greener form of organization. Refusing to confine reality to the state-bureaucratic framework of the concepts of order imposed by the supreme power, anarchists believe that public organizations serve the interests of their members more effectively when they have the opportunity to form them at their discretion. When people live diversely, they interact more naturally and directly. In addition, the diversity of people leads to the fact that it becomes more difficult to control them.

Anarchism is possible only under the so-called "spatial uncertainty", that is, when total control "from above" is impossible. Unfortunately, the development of modern technologies only strengthens this control, as if not giving an opportunity to such a system as anarchism. Meanwhile, in the free technology community there is another uncertainty: between the customer and the consumer of the product. So in this sense, as a system, anarchism in modern society is possible.

### **BIBLIOGRAPHY:**

- Dyer Lum, *The Economics of Anarchy: A Study of the Industrial Type* (1890)
- John Rae, *Contemporary Socialism* (1891)
- John Henry Mackay, *The Anarchists: A Picture of Civilization at the Close of the Nineteenth Century* (1891)
- Jean Grave, *Moribund Society and Anarchy* (1893)
- Peter Kropotkin, *Memoirs of a Revolutionist* (1899)
- Paul Eltzbacher, *Anarchism* (1899)
- Joseph Stalin, *Anarchism Or Socialism (Stalinism)* (1924)
- Erich Mühsam, *The Liberation of Society from the State: What is Communist Anarchism?* (1932)
- Paul Avrich, *The Russian Anarchists* (1967)
- Murray Bookchin, *Post-Scarcity Anarchism (Communalism)* (1971)
- April Carter, *The Political Theory of Anarchism* (1971)
- Paul Avrich, *The Modern School Movement: Anarchism and Education in the United States* (1980)
- Caroline Cahm, *Kropotkin and the Rise of Revolutionary Anarchism* (1989)
- Paul Avrich, *Anarchist Portraits* (1988)
- Jacques Ellul, *Anarchy in Christianity* (1991)
- Paul Avrich, *Anarchist Voices: An Oral History of Anarchism in America* (1995)
- John Zerzan, *Future Primitive and Other Essays* (1994)
- David Andrews, *Christi-Anarchy: Discovering a Radical Spirituality of Compassion* (1999)
- Robert Graham, *Anarchism: A Documentary History of Libertarian Ideas* (2005)
- Richard J.F. Day, *Gramsci Is Dead: Anarchist Currents in the Newest Social Movements* (2005)

James C. Scott, *The Art of Not Being Governed: An Anarchist History of Upland Southeast Asia* (2009)

Stuart Christie & Albert Meltzer, *The Floodgates of Anarchy* (1970)

Colin Ward, *Anarchy in Action* (1973)

James Joll, *The Anarchists* (1964)

Daniel Guérin, *Anarchism: From Theory to Practice* (1965)

Harold Barclay, *People Without Government: An Anthropology of Anarchy* (1982)

David Goodway, *For Anarchism* (1989)

Sam Mbah & I.E. Igariwey, *African Anarchism: The History of Movement* (1997)

Anselme Bellengarrigue, *The World's First Anarchist Manifesto* (1850)

Gerrard Winstanley, *The Law of Freedom in a Platform* (1652)

Luigi Galleani, *The End of Anarchism?* (1925)

Rudolf Rocker, *Anarcho-Syndicalism: Theory and Practice* (1938)

George Woodcock, *Anarchism: A History of Libertarian Ideas and Movements* (1962)

Ryan, L. and Carr, E. (2019, June 27). Mihail Bakunin.

Mihail Bakunin. (2019, July 8). Wikiquote, Compendium of famous quotes.

*The Dictatorship of the Proletariat: Marxism's Theory of Socialist Democracy* by John Ehrenbe(1992)

Paul Avrich, *The Anarchists in the Russian Revolution* (1973)

Hatta Shūzō and *Pure Anarchism in Interwar Japan* – (1993) John Crump

Article “Another view of Stalin” Progesive labor party

Bookchin, Murray (1995). *Social Anarchism or Lifestyle Anarchism: An Unbridgeable Chasm*. London: AK Press.

Woodcock, George (1962). *Anarchism: A History of Libertarian Ideas and Movements*. New York: World Publishing.

Tucker, Benjamin R. (1888). *State Socialism and Anarchism: How Far They Agree and Wherein They Differ*. Alpine, MI: Charles W. Bergman.

Bookchin, Murray (1996). *The Third Revolution: Popular Movements in the Revolutionary Era*. Vol. 1. New York: Cassell.

Draper, Hal (1969). “A Note on the Father of Anarchism.” *New Politics*. Vol. VIII, no. 1. Pp. 79–93

Woodcock, George (1962). *Anarchism: A History of Libertarian Ideas and Movements*. New York: World Publishing.

N.Y. PARK, *The White Man's Peace*, Boston, Meador Pub. Co., 1948, p. 76.

H. LAUTERPACHT , Recognition in International Law , Cambridge, Macmillan, 1947, p. 172.

N. Machiavelli, Prince; Florentine stories; Speeches about the first decade of Tito Livio, B. Spinoza, Political Treaty, tr. This one. edited by A. Droetto, Torino, Ramella, 1958; Th. Hobbes, Leviathan, tr. This one. Bari, Laterza, 1911-12; GF Hegel, Outlines of Philosophy of Law, Bari, Laterza, 1913; A. Lasson, System der Rechtsphilosophie, Berlin-Leipzig, J. Guttentag, 1882; L. Gumplowicz, Allgemeines Staatsrecht, ed. III, Innsbruck, Wagner, 1907; J. Binder, Philosophie des Rechts, Berlin, G. Stilke, 1925; A. Mochi, Science and Morality in Social Problems, Paris, Alcan, 1931 and Civilization: the terms of a crisis, L'Universale di Roma, 1947.

- A. Hamilton, J. Jay, J. Madison, The Federalist, tr. it., Pisa, Nistri-Lischi, 1955; CK Streit, Union Now, New York-London, Harper, 1939; L. Robbins, The Economic Causes of War, tr. it., Torino, Einaudi, 1944 and The Planned Economy and the International Order, tr. Milan-Rome, Rizzoli, 1948; E. Reves, Anatomy of Peace, tr. it., Florence, U Editions, 1946.

J. Austin, Lectures on jurisprudence, ed. 5th, London, J. Murray, 2 vols., 1911; AV Lundstedt, Legal thinking Revised, Stockholm; Almqvist and Wiksell, [1956] (and its bibliography); U. Campagnolo, Nations et Droit, Paris, Alcan, 1938; K. Olivecrona, Law as Fact, Copenhagen, E. Munksgaard (and London, H. Milford, Oxford University Press), 1939. By F. Stier-Somolo see above both monumental works in which he was a collaborator, Grundrisse der Rechtswissenschaft, Berlin, Vereinigg. Wissensch. Verleger, 1919 ff.; And Handbuch des Völkerrechts, Stuttgart, W. Kohlhammer, 1930 et seq.

See also for a quick summary of the various theories of A. Nussbaum, A Concise History of the Law of Nations, ed. rev., New York, Macmillan, 1954.

V Levontin, The Myth of International Security, Jerusalem, At the Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, 1957, pp. XXIII, 346.

« Complot contre Sadi Carnot », by Jean Sagnes, L'Histoire n° 177

2. A. Daniel, L'Année politique, 1894

3. Letter to Malatesta, quoted in Jean Maitron, Le Mouvement anarchiste en France, F. Maspero

4. Jean Grave, The Libertarian Movement under the Third Republic, Representative Works

5. Cf. "La République des businessistes", by Jean Garrigues, L'Histoire, n° 185

6. Quoted in J. Maitron

7. Outside August 28, 1892

8. The Journal of May 22, 1894

9. Anarchist Almanac for 1892

10. Cf. "Alexandre Jacob, gentleman burglar", Jean-Marc Berlière, L'Histoire n° 127

8 Alphonse Germain, “On moral beauty and formal beauty”, *l’Ermitage*, vol. 6, No. 4 (April 1895), p. 193-197; Gustave Kahn, “Mental Life. Social art and art for art’s sake”, *La revue blanche*, no. 62 (January 1896), p. 416-423.

9 Founded in 1889, the Club de l’art social became the Groupe de l’art social in 1896, and the *Revue of social art* was, during this transformation, itself renamed *Social art*, from then on sporadic pamphleteering. The Social Art Club was formed, under the direction by Adolphe Tabarant, Louise Michel, Lucien Descaves, Jean Grave, Émile Pouget, Léon Cladel, Jean Ajalbert, Camille Pissarro and Auguste Rodin. The Social Art Group for its part was made up of the same members under the direction of Fernand Pelloutier. The group made himself known above all through conferences which were organized in 1896: “The writer and social art” given in April 1896 by Bernard Lazare, “L’art et la révolte” given in May 1896 by Fernand Pelloutier and “Art and Society” by Charles Albert in June of the same year. Information taken from the article by Adolphe Tabarant, “Le Club de l’art social”, *La revue socialist*, no. 11, 1890, p. 101-106.

10 On this subject, see Neil McWilliam, *Dreams of Happiness. Social art and the French left*, Dijon, Presses du Réel, 2007. Although Neil McWilliam's body of research concerns the first half of the 19th century century, lines of thought on the second half, sketched in conclusion, anticipate the relationship between the new version of social art at the end of the century and anarchist circles.

11 Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, *On the principle of art and its social destination*, Dijon, Presses du Real, 2002.

1 E. Museux, “Mission”, *L'art social*, December 1891, p. 27.

2 Jean Maître, *The anarchist movement in France, from its origins to 1914*, 1975, p. 481.

3 For a complete overview of periodicals associated with the anarchist movement, see René Bianco, *A century of French-speaking anarchist press, 1880-1983*, doctoral thesis of State, University of Aix-Marseille, 1988.

4 This is the thesis developed by Jean Grave in his book *La société mourante et anarchy*, published in 1893 with a preface by Octave Mirbeau and which was the subject of a wide reception throughout the literary and political press. Many authors devoted a review to him, among others: Adolphe Retté, “La société mourante et

anarchy”, *La plume*, n° 106 (September 15, 1893), p. 384-386; A.F. Herold, “Society dying woman and anarchy”, *Political and Literary Interviews*, no. 47 (July 1893), p. 76-80; Émile Portal, “Notes on anarchism. About a recent book », *L'art social*, June 1893, p. 209-213.

Anonyme, « L’art », *La révolte*, supplément littéraire, vol. 6, n° 28 (25-31 mars 1893). Anonyme, « Mœurs artistiques et littéraires », *La révolte*, suppl. au vol. 3, n° 15 (21-27 décembre 1890), p. 358-360. Anonyme, « Réponse d’un artiste », *La révolte*, vol. 7, n° 16 (30 décembre-5 janvier 1894). Aron, Paul, *Les écrivains belges et le socialisme (1880-1913) : l’expérience de l’art social*, Bruxelles, Labor, 1985. Cousturier, Edmond, « L’art dans la société future », *Entretiens politiques et littéraires*, n° 32 (novembre 1892), p. 212-218. Crane, Walter, « Le socialisme et les artistes », *La révolte*, supplément littéraire, vol. 6, n° 26 (11-17 mars 1893), p. 200-203. Dubois, Félix, « Le péril anarchiste », *Figaro littéraire*, vol. 20, n° 2 (13 janvier 1894), p. 4. Grave, Jean, *Quarante ans de propagande anarchiste*, Paris, Flammarion, 1973. Hobsbawm, Eric J., « Socialism and the Avant-garde in the Period of the Second International », *Le mouvement social*, n° 111 (avril-juin 1980), p. 189-200. Jullien, Jean (dir.), « Éditorial », dans *Art et critique*, vol. 1, n° 1 (1er juin 1889), p. 1-2. Lazare, Bernard, *L’écrivain et l’art social*, Paris, Publications de l’Art social, 1898. Maître, Jean, *Le mouvement anarchiste en France, des origines à 1914*, Paris, Maspéro, 1975. Museux, E., « Mission », *L’art social*, décembre 1891, p. 26-28.

J. Grave, *Terre libre: Les Pionniers*, Paris, Librairie des Temps nouvelles, 1908, 321 p. [3]

E. Pouget, E. Pataud, *How we will make the Revolution [1909]*, Paris, Ed. Syllepsis, 1995, 189 p. [4]

"I chose the form of the tale, he explains, for two reasons: Embellished with adventures, it would be easier for children to read, and then, in this form, it retains more of the vague and hypothetical, which any glimpse of future society must always retain", *Terre libre*, op. cit. p. 17. [5]

Among the texts most commonly cited to show the state character of “socialist” utopias: É. Bellamy, *One Hundred Years After or the Year 2000*, Paris, Dentu, 1891. [6]

Max Nettlau, for example, cites Morris's novel, *News from nowhere*, among the libertarian utopias (see *Bibliography of Anarchy*, Brussels, 1897, p. 212). [7]

R. Trousson, *Travels to the lands of nowhere*, Brussels, Ed. of the University of Brussels, 1979, 298 p. [8]

Karl Mannheim, *Ideology and Utopia*, Paris, M. Rivière, 1956, p. 124. [9]

"The great utopians of the nineteenth century all had as successors men who abandoned the primitive ambitions of the founders for reforms, that is to say, to adopt a conservative attitude", G. Sorel, *La decomposition du marxisme*, Paris, M River, 1908, p. 15.[10]



G. Sorel, *Reflections on violence*, [1908], Paris, M. Rivière, 1972, p. 152 and p. 155. [11]

Cf. on this point, Marc Angenot, *L'Utopia collectiviste: le grand histoire sociale sous la Second Internationale*, Paris, P.U.F., 1993, 397 p. [12]

Cf. Pierre Cours-Salies and René Mouriaux, in *How we will do...*, op. cit., p. v. See also the remarks of Robert Brécy, *The General Strike in France*, Paris, EDI, 1969, p. 78. [13]

It should be noted, however, that Pouget had previously serialized two other "social anticipation" novels in *Le Père Peinard*: "Le Musée des Horrors" (1889) and "Le Père Peinard en 1900" (1890-1891) in which he described what an anarchist society could have been (see the chapter "Pouget novelcier" by Christian de Goustine in *Pouget: Les matins noirs du syndicalisme*, Paris, Éd. de la Tête de Feuille, 1972, p. 155-181. [14]

A very special mention deserves the study that F. Armand and R. Maublanc devoted in 1937 to Fourier. These authors strive to prove against all evidence the deep identity existing between the Soviet regime and phalansterian ideas, not hesitating to write that Fourier would have found in the sovkhos and kolkhos "the modern image of his phalanstery". Stalin himself is also called upon to show the close relationship between "socialist emulation" and the "cabalist". "What are the Stakhanovist teams, they write, if not the composite and the cabalist in action, groups of enthusiastic workers who, by emulation, achieve a better division of labor and strive to break industrial records? (cf. Fourier, Paris, International Social Editions, 1937, vol. 1, p. 187 and p. 190-191). [15]

B. Baczko, *Lights of Utopia*, Paris, Payot, 1978, p. 31. [16]

B. Baczko, *Social Imaginaries: Collective Memories and Hopes*, Paris, Payot, 1984, p. 32. [17]

G. Sorel, *Reflections on Violence*, op. cit., p. 153. [18]

E. Coeurderoy, *Hurrah! ! or the revolution by the Cossacks*, Paris, Plasma, 1977, p. 434. [19]

None of the foundations of the "selfish and bourgeois" society of his century found favor in his eyes:

"Your property! it is theft; it breeds theft – to be destroyed.

Your marriage ! it is prostitution; it perpetuates prostitution – to be destroyed.

Your family: it is tyranny; it motivates tyranny – to destroy.

Your morals! it is mutilation; it reproduces mutilation – to be destroyed.

Your duty! it is suffering; it echoes suffering – to be destroyed.

Your religion ! it is atheism; it gives birth to atheism – to be destroyed.

Your righteousness! it is injustice; it justifies injustice – to be destroyed.

Your order! it is disorder; it reproduces disorder – to be destroyed. »

The Barrier of combat, [1852] in E. Coeurderoy, *For the revolution*, Paris, Champ Libre, 1972, p. 70. [20]

The Barrier of Combat, op. cit., p. 78. [21]

Hurrah! ! !..., op. cit., p. 79. [22]

Ibid. p. 76 [23]

Ibid. p. 436. [24]

R. Vaneigem in For the Revolution, op. cit., p. 9. [25]

Hurrah! ! !..., op. cit., p. 73 and p. 75. [26]

Ideology and Utopia, op. cit., p. 162-163. [27]

Quoted in Hurrah! ! !..., op. cit., p. 469. [28]

Ibid., p. 339-340. [29]

The historian Max Nettlau will be one of the first to introduce this author to the libertarian public. See in particular the biographical notice he wrote on the occasion of the publication in 1910 by Stock of the first volume of the Works of Cœurderoy. [30]

New voice, s.l., s.d. [1893?]. [31]

“The Next Day”, La Lutte sociale, Lyon, n° 6, October 2, 1886. [32]

P. Paillette, “Happy times” in Tablets of a lizard, Paris, 1892. [33]