

# Towards a Critique of Spontaneity and Anarchism

**Preface:** Any extremised language is *not* meant to be taken seriously, it's a writing ploy in an attempt to replicate the writing style of these intellectuals

Amongst the left, a growing faction<sup>1</sup> has sprang forth, with immense momentum, it vigorously clashes with capitalist elements at tremendous pace, like no other faction has engaged in for some time (whether it is because of the fall of the Soviet Union, propaganda, or the rise of fascism, is irrelevant) : the individuals I speak of are of course, the anarchists. An invaluable movement to the left, aiding and nourishing its growth, but also the victim of many theoretical failures and errors. It is thus up to us, Marxist-Leninists and Marxist-Leninists-Maoists, to instigate, and catalyse the evolution of this movement, and to bring forth the torch lit up by the anarchists to full victory. In this piece, I will work to take the hand of anarchists, specifically, their approach for prompting revolution, and gently show them their errors, not to feed my own ego, but to magnify the revolutionary potential of the Left as a whole.

Before that, I will quickly describe the opposing attitudes to this question:

**Note:** in the following, the red text is the most critical for the discussion

## The Anarchist Strategy

1. Wait for conditions to get bad enough and fight for reforms within boundaries of the system
2. A resistance movement will manifest
3. Political consciousness disseminates naturally, and becomes the foundation of the movement
4. Socialist revolution without a state (centralized army, institutions, etc...) is achieved, authority (extent depending on specific anarchist) is dismantled, and replaced with voluntary associations
5. Socialist revolution is defended without the aid of a state, and through decentralized, voluntary institutions

## The Marxist-Leninist Strategy

1. Attempt to spread political consciousness within the working class through an organized vanguard party Wait for conditions to be ripe for revolution
2. A movement arises naturally again, but its growth is aided by previous work done by the vanguard party
3. The socialist character of the resistance movement is asserted through the work done by the vanguard party (spreading proletarian consciousness)
4. Socialist revolution with a state is achieved
5. Socialist revolution is defended with the aid of a state

---

<sup>1</sup> r/anarchism reddit community is comprised of 161k members (the great majority of them true anarchists), while r/communism (mostly ML and MLM, but significant, and prevalent non-ML elements) is only 133k members, a difference of 28k (difference of 21%). The largest far left subreddit (r/socialism), is also slightly more marxist-leninist (this position is informed by this poll).

While it may hold true that either this specific aspect of both Marxist-Leninist revolutionary tactics and anarchist revolutionary tactics (raising the political consciousness of the masses) hold greater validity objectively (in the theoretical sense), we must first craft the foundations on which this theoretical advancement (tactics for the heightening of working class consciousness) will be made, for both our tactics rest upon the same foundation, even if only one edifice does not collapse when shaken, this foundation being, the importance of class consciousness in any revolutionary movement.

### The Vital Significance of Political Consciousness

The significance of the synthesis between class recognition/consciousness and any revolutionary movement which aims at the overthrow of an economic mode of production followed by the erection of a new system, cannot, and must not, be understated; we must always stress this fact. As long as any revolutionary movement retains within it the complete absence of political consciousness, so too will it retain its purely reactionary character, for it is only reactionary in nature, and such will be the aims, the tasks, and the impulse of the movement. A resistance movement deprived of political consciousness is the most absolute and extreme embodiment of a reaction, like a reaction, it will be just that, a reaction antithetical to proactive and progressive action, and with that, it is starved of even the possibility of advancing further than the initial starting point. It is the antithesis to evolution, a *reactionary* movement, is not at all *revolutionary*, and cannot be, it is idleness itself. Only through an adoption of class consciousness can a *resistance* movement blossom and mature into a truly *revolutionary (and proletarian)* movement.

Not only this, but as long as a resistance movement is stamped with reactionism, it will only manifest in rare occasions where the detrimentality of material conditions is so great, that the furious spirit of the working class is unleashed. This greatly delays the revolution, extending and magnifying the suffering the proletariat faces.

### The Terminal Illness of Anarchist Tactics and the Cure: the Vanguard Party

We have described the importance of political consciousness amongst a political revolutionary movement, having laid the sheer vitality of that down we can now proceed to explain why and how this terminal illness of inefficiency seems to infest a significant portion of the left (anarchist left).

The split between anarchism and Marxism-Leninism (the relevant one) evolves and manifests out of 1 specific theoretical position, a theoretical position which is then extended by both camps, and used to support and serve as the infrastructure for the further theoretical development (tactics), this question is: "does political consciousness arise naturally?". If we wish to critique, and explain away the deficiency of anarchist revolutionary tactics, this is the base we must attack. Our analysis must be, just as a dialectic, twofold, we must separate our analysis into a historical and empirical dimension, and a logical dimension, where we utilize only strict logistics. These two dimensions will then no longer be meer aggregates, but synthesise into our complete analysis.

I shall apply the same method employed in mathematics, initially do a logical construction, and then use data to review the validity and rigour of the perpetrated logic, that is to say, I will venture the logical constituent of the analysis in this paragraph. To expect political consciousness to be meaningfully allocated throughout the working class without the aid of prior and active work carried out by a properly educated and effectively organized body, is ridiculous. To expect such a great thing is to task proletarians whose minds are absolutely and fully geared towards how they will pay the rent, whose thoughts are almost wholly surrounding the stress of wage-labour<sup>2</sup>/reproductive-labour<sup>3</sup>, to engage in tedious, and extended, theoretical exercise without a resource which can help with their specific questions. It is like depriving a student of a teacher, and providing only the books, and expecting the student to invent all of physics again, possible, but minimal likelihood. Both elements are necessary for consistent success, retaining only one, will not consistently suffice.

Anarchists which champion the outdated notion of the spontaneous character of revolution remain to this day, but are in a state of decline (in numbers), however, another faction has arisen, anarchists who have abandoned this notion of absolute spontaneity, and replaced it through the annexation of the Leninist conception. These anarchists have a different disagreement with us Marxist-Leninists, a disagreement aimed at the structure of this class consciousness disseminating organ. Centralization vs Decentralization.

Centralized Vanguard Party: Large single unit accumulation of many individual parties with body which expresses authority of collective (through democratic centralism) over individual sect

Decentralized Political Parties: Small individual parties

Proponents of this sub-tendency uphold the view that through an amalgamation of different logical strings, decentralized political organizations and work are not only preferable to a centralized vanguard party, but sufficient, and reliable. They deem the vanguard party to be inherently flawed for the same reason they place no trust in a state (covered in next section of text), so here I will only discuss the last 2 issues: the reliability and performance of a decentralized organ aiming for the spread of class consciousness.

For the widespread awakening of the working class, monumental and extended work is necessary, a task which requires many resources and manpower. The amassing of resources required can only be fulfilled through the combination of each individual unit's powers. This cannot be consistently relied upon without a body which can express authority (of the collective), what interest does an ideologically opposed faction who diverges also in their idea of the ideal handling of the situation, have in aiding the rest of the party in

---

<sup>2</sup> Living paycheck to paycheck

<sup>3</sup> Adequately maintaining a family, and house-work

something they do not believe is an adequate action? (This is confirmed by past experiences<sup>4</sup>)

Having illustrated the impossibility of decentralizations' **consistency**, the next inquiry becomes one focused on the possibility, and eventually preferability, of divergent system. To the first question, yes, another system is possible: a united front directed through democratic centralism<sup>5</sup>. While it is possible that the wrong course of action taken, this action is at least one whose effects are significant, having an actual effect in the society, while decentralization cannot produce even a significant incorrect action. This is without mentioning that rigorous extended debate between a large swarm of intellectuals is more likely to produce a majority with the correct understanding of the situation, something much less likely to happen when ideologically different individuals are free to leave (something very probable when they are free to cave to their frustration) and not forced to engage. This is the same issue that appears with decentralized planning as opposed to centralized planning<sup>6</sup>.

It is important to note that hitherto we have examined the vanguard as a *political* organ, it is however, also an organ *for the revolution*. The same logic depicted above, applies, and can be extended to also the issue of directing the revolution (eg. a coordinated struggle is needed, something not achievable without a central authoritative body). As Stalin said,

“These conditions are no less complicated, if not more so, than the conditions of war. Who can see clearly in these conditions, who can give correct guidance to the proletarian millions? No army at war can dispense with an experienced General Staff if it does not want to be doomed to defeat. Is it not clear that the proletariat can still less dispense with such a General Staff if it does not want to allow itself to be devoured by its mortal enemies? But where is this General Staff? Only the revolutionary party of the proletariat can serve as this General Staff. The working class without a revolutionary party is an army without a General Staff.”

### The Anarchist Distaste: The State

For differing reasons that shall be highlighted further in the text, ideologically differing anarchists (mainly anarchist philosophers, and liberal socialists) are held together through their mutual opposition to the state (even if for differing reasons), a view that is then utilized to justify their hostility to both a socialist (worker's) state, and an epoch of dictatorship of the proletariat (to deny the essentiality of the state in guarding the proletariat from Bourgeois counter-revolution). This position must be rejected.

---

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.youthkiawaaz.com/2017/12/the-communist-parties-in-india-and-splits/>  
<https://www.marxists.org/history/erol/periodicals/forward-kc/split.htm>  
<https://www.marxists.org/history/erol/ncm-5/index.htm>

<sup>5</sup> The principle of “Freedom of discussion, unity of action” (Lenin)

<sup>6</sup> Both points are masterfully demonstrated in the downfall of Sears covered in pages 26-28 of The People's Republic of Walmart (<https://www.docdroid.net/HmlfK7Q/jacobin-leigh-phillips-michal-rozworski-the-peoples-republic-of-walmart-how-the-worlds-biggest-corporations-are-laying-the-foundation-for-socialism-verso-2019-pdf#page=26>)

In its most blunt form: to protect the achievements of a socialist revolution, a state is history's prescription, it is obligatory for efficient security, for a state is the chosen tool of the Bourgeoisie<sup>7</sup> and surrounding nations (surrounding imperialist powers are the main reserves of the domestic bourgeoisie<sup>8</sup>), and no decentralized army can defeat a centralized one. To decentralize our forces is to shoot ourselves in the foot, for their motto is "divide and conquer".

### History's Lesson

To strengthen our above laid out logical path, we will test it against reality. We shall begin with an experiment indispensable to both the development of all of socialist theory (including Marxism-Leninism), and an anarchist trophy: the Paris Commune. An experiment which was swiftly destroyed, lasting only 2 months<sup>9</sup>, this only being the product of the French state's weakness at the time, and only spanned across the area of a single city (even if a capital). To see this as an anarchist success, is ridiculous, as the International concluded at the time, the Commune's state not only vitally needed strong reinforcements (the civilian delegate of the War Committee had no previous experience<sup>10</sup>), but it had also been too kind to the Bourgeoisie and French government when it had the chance<sup>11</sup>. Concluding this paragraph, I know that many anarchists do not wish to emulate the Paris Commune to such absoluteness, many however cite it as a sufficient model.

Another attempt commonly indicated is Catalonia, an example which fully highlights the grave problems with anarchist revolutionary tactics, and anarchist hypocrisy once it is time to act. A commonly espoused anarchist myth (I am sure it is not in bad faith) is that of the incredible contrast between Catalonia and their Bolshevik brethren, this is however, not representative of reality. For Catalonia did in fact maintain a state, a state responsible for the erecting of labour camps housing fascist sympathisers<sup>12</sup>, and for administrative tasks<sup>13</sup>. Even if the concession is made to classify it as an anarchist experiment, it still remains a failed one (it was crushed)<sup>14</sup>.

Makhnovist Ukraine is among the secondary most infamous anarchist talking points, a hope severely displaced. Before delving into questions of the anarchist or not nature of Makhnovist Ukraine, it must be pointed out that it was crushed, so even if we arrive at a concession, and the anarchist nature of Black Ukraine has been asserted, that is irrelevant, for it was destroyed by the Red Army (this was not some machiavellian plot by the Bolsheviks to crush anarchism as some may suggest, it was a reaction to constant pestering and sabotage by Makhnov, whether it was ineffectual dealing with rampant banditism, attack

---

<sup>7</sup> The White army in Russia, the Nationalists in China, etc..

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.britannica.com/event/Russian-Civil-War/Foreign-intervention>  
<https://www.archives.gov/education/lessons/korean-conflict>

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.history.com/news/vietnam-war-combatants>

<sup>10</sup> <https://www.britannica.com/event/Commune-of-Paris-1871>

<sup>11</sup> [https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Louis\\_Charles\\_Delescluze](https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Louis_Charles_Delescluze)

<sup>12</sup> <https://www.marxists.org/history/france/paris-commune/timeline.htm>

<sup>13</sup> <http://econfaculty.gmu.edu/bcaplan/spain.htm>

<sup>14</sup> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3ufTFRGPrCM&t=76s> has sources

<sup>14</sup> <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-20345073>

on Cheka officers by these bandits, or stealing supplies from the Red Army and Bolsheviks<sup>15</sup> ). On the supposed “anarchist” quality of black Ukraine, it had many characteristics, but statelessness was not one. A state did persist to exist after the revolution, an intelligentsia was constructed, the Kontrrazvedka, which killed and tortured members of the political and ideological opposition<sup>16</sup>. The black army also imposed mandatory military enrollment with the guise of “volonarianism”, while the composition and actions of the army were under Makhno’s direct control, and as previously mentioned, parts of the Black Army would plunder and steal from both the peasants and workers<sup>17</sup>, harassing their well-being. Some anarchists may now point to the communes as an embodiment of Makhno’s success, however, these were few, comprising less than 0.1% of the populations of the “captured” territories<sup>18</sup>, a thing symptomatic of the inability to effectively spread political consciousness without the Leninist vanguard party. The conclusive attitude we bring forth after being armed with historical analysis, is that the Black Army supplied its forces in great part from the petty-bourgeois reserve of the peasantry (peasants who opposed the dictatorship of the proletariat, but supported the overthrow of Tsarism, both expressions of their peculiar class character), and that Makhno did not establish an anarchist utopia.

On the Zapatistas, anarchists often claim this movement to be representative of anarchism, and be adherent to anarchist ideals, they have however denied this, and do not comply to any specific ideology<sup>19</sup>, it is more the symptom of a general anti-colonial struggle by the Mexican people. It still remains however that the zapatista insurrection was not organized fully to the extent leninism demands, but was able to escape this flaw, the zapatista’s advancing tempo staying strong, due to their enemies (the Mexican state) weakness at the time. It is also clear that the zapatistas survival rests upon the smothering of their advance, the Mexican state ignoring them for they are not perceived as a threat, an attack could not be survived by the zapatistas, partially due to their disorganization.

Rojava is another common subject of anarchist praise, and proclaimed a successful example of anarchist revolutionary methods, something very unifying. The Kurdish forces have brought the flag of progressivism far forward, but have also been the perpetrators of heinous war crimes, and have indirectly brought forward the advance of US imperialism (for its support, America can now extract oil from the Kurdish regions (around 30% of Syria), effectively controlling 95% of Syria’s oil and gas potential reserves. It has exercised its control over the oil reserves with the aid of Kurdish forces, and allegedly, ex-ISIS members

---

<sup>15</sup>

[https://www.reddit.com/r/communism/comments/64wkqf/polemic\\_the\\_anarchokulak\\_bandits\\_of\\_russia\\_and/](https://www.reddit.com/r/communism/comments/64wkqf/polemic_the_anarchokulak_bandits_of_russia_and/)  
<https://isreview.org/issues/53/makhno.shtml>

<sup>16</sup> <https://marxistleftreview.org/articles/nelson-makhno-the-failure-of-anarchism/>

<sup>17</sup> <https://isreview.org/issues/53/makhno.shtml>  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZiSM8SkE4mo>

<sup>18</sup> Source has already appeared in footnotes

<sup>19</sup><https://iaf-fai.org/2019/05/05/a-zapatista-response-to-the-ezln-is-not-anarchist/>

<sup>20</sup>). The rojavan movement bases itself in great part on Kurdish ultra nationalism, a tendency greatly akin to zionism, advocating the formation of Kurdistan (something not to be opposed), but which has been carried out through the forceful displacement of native populations, and ethnic cleansing<sup>21</sup>. It is also fallacious to claim that rojava has successfully managed to defend itself, for it relied previously on American protection, something it recently lost. Our finalised stance must be one of opposition, while it is righteous to fight for national independence (the Kurds constitute a nation) ,and against the mistreatment of the Kurds, the way this task has been assumed, endangers the whole of the syrian people's sovereignty (from imperialist tyranny).

As history has now clearly and repeatedly shown us, we must take away 2 facts: a state is a necessary requirement for the protection and extension of the proletarian revolution, and a vanguard party is the sole most effective and consistent organ through which political consciousness is transmitted amongst the working class.

### Further on The Modern Major Anarchist Tendency

Preface: Liberalism= Philosophy used to justify capitalism/ anti-communism (not American definition). All capitalists are liberals, with the exception of fascists<sup>22</sup>.

Now that we have have accurately illustrated this failure of anarchism, the other one (absence of a state) might be subject to scrutiny in a different piece, it is important also to dedicate analysis and ponder the reason why these attitudes have and continue to advance in harassing the left, how the once overwhelmingly Leninist left<sup>23</sup> which terrified the international Bourgeois so deeply, on the edge of ushering in the complete eradication of capitalism, has been replaced with such a dull blade<sup>24</sup>. While I did mention it in an earlier paragraph, further inquisition is necessary.

It is clear that these ideas of sudden spontaneity and the unimportance of the state in successful deflection of attacks, are not very intuitive, nor have always been so widespread, so how have they come to annex themselves with the left so closely<sup>25</sup>? The situation we experience today is not natural, nor common<sup>26</sup>. It appears clear to me then, that this

---

<sup>20</sup>

<https://mronline.org/2018/04/18/how-the-u-s-occupied-the-30-of-syria-containing-most-of-its-oil-water-and-gas/>

<sup>21</sup> [https://www.reddit.com/r/communism/comments/cg833q/rojava\\_sourced\\_minipost/](https://www.reddit.com/r/communism/comments/cg833q/rojava_sourced_minipost/)

<sup>22</sup> Fascist directly advocate for no competition, while liberal thought only indirectly justifies limited economic competition (market always leads to monopolies)

<sup>23</sup> According to Wikipedia ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Russian\\_Civil\\_War](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Russian_Civil_War)) "Red Army (peak): 5,427,273 while Black Army (peak): 103,000 "

[https://www.reddit.com/r/socialism/comments/ftoal2/popular\\_support\\_for\\_anarchism\\_and\\_marxismleninism/?utm\\_source=share&utm\\_medium=web2x](https://www.reddit.com/r/socialism/comments/ftoal2/popular_support_for_anarchism_and_marxismleninism/?utm_source=share&utm_medium=web2x)

[https://www.reddit.com/r/DebateAnarchism/comments/ftoaxq/popular\\_support\\_for\\_anarchism\\_and\\_marxismlenini sm/?utm\\_source=share&utm\\_medium=web2x](https://www.reddit.com/r/DebateAnarchism/comments/ftoaxq/popular_support_for_anarchism_and_marxismlenini sm/?utm_source=share&utm_medium=web2x)

<sup>24</sup> I know of the praxis carried out by anarchist movements, and while it may be a real victory for local proletarians, it has not brought forward the revolution, or socialism. The sad truth is, the modern left does not, and cannot strike with such vigour it once could.

<sup>25</sup> This is exaggerative, and a writing-ploy

<sup>26</sup> Demonstrated previously through the completely opposite scenario we were in for the majority of the 20th Century

extensive anarchist phenomenon is not “the natural ideology of the working class”, but the synthesis between a socialist spectre<sup>27</sup> which still, and always will, haunt the globe, and an ultra-liberalism. A liberalism birthed by anti-communist rhetoric and propaganda, a liberalism which now has no restraints, expanding its grasp ever further on the mind of the proletarian, and a society, a liberalism now hegemonic with no counter-acting force ever since the collapse of the Soviet Union. Liberalism has demonized Marxist-Leninist practice to such an extent, that it has become absolutely inter-connected with, and inseparable from, theory. “Even if its doctrines much superior, and historically preferable revolutionary tactics, they cannot, and must not be pre-empted for they are inherently evil”: is the seed which liberalism has buried so deep within the anarchist mind, corrupting their thought process, and impairing their theoretical growth. This too is where the idea of the innate vileness of the state is born, Marxism-Leninism stresses the importance, and sheer power the communist struggle can harness if utilizing the state, so that too must be evil. The common anarchist is not stupid, they are a genuine socialist infected with the disease of liberalism.

On a concluding note for this section: I know that this is not where anarchist philosophy is originally *developed*, but this is the method through which so many have *adopted* anarchist attitudes.

### Further on The Philosophical Anarchist Tendency

I have seen expressed within anarchist circles the idea that managerial authority is not necessary, an extremely preposterous idea, for the following reasons

1. While it is a more general point, it is still relevant for this concrete form of authority: As Joseph Stalin pointed out, “Authority over the individual is necessary to preserve, and further, the interest of the collective, the aggregate of many individuals. To let the individual express power over the collective, is to enable for the victimisation of man over man tenfold. While authority initially presents itself as the antithesis to liberty, its absence is the catalyst for the degeneration of this liberty, authority is innately necessary for the preservation of liberty, and it is here where the anarchists conflate the authority of the many over the few, with the authority of the few over the many (this misunderstanding amalgamated with rampant consumption of anti communist (liberal) propaganda, is the moment when the *philosopher* anarchist rejects authority and the state entirely<sup>28</sup>). Force expressed by the collective over the individual attempting to coerce the collective, is much different than a few oligarchs enslaving the toiling masses.
2. Now that the immeasurable (use) value of authority has been asserted (a point some anarchists will concede to, proclaiming that it is “*justified*” hierarchy), the point of contention becomes the method by which the interest of the collective should be

---

<sup>27</sup> Reference to famous Karl Marx quote “A spectre is haunting Europe — the spectre of communism”

<sup>28</sup> The anarchist will refute, “only *unjustified* hierarchy is to be opposed”, this is the card every anarchist has metamorphosed into their sleeve, we all know that in reality, historically, the greatest section of anarchists pride themselves upon the almost full opposition towards authority (slogans such as, “fuck authority, or “against authority” are solid examples of this position), therefore, criequeing this logi is a valid choice, for it is often the weapon of choice for anarchists



asserted. Many advocate for solely, and absolutely, direct worker control<sup>29</sup>, while the ideas that lead to this are genuine and admirable, this efficiency of this method of organization is severely hindered by 2 reasons (first one in this paragraph, and second one elaborated on in point 3). The brutal truth is that it is not always possible, for the common person (naturally so) cannot comprehend the complexions of the incredibly specific matter at hand, and cannot afford to become acquainted with them, for it is an extremely tedious, prolonged, and tiring task.

3. To call a reunion of all of your members wastes a significant magnitude of time, time that is a limited resource used for labour, significantly reducing the possible productivity of this firm. Not only is this system innately wasteful, it is wasteful unnecessarily. Mass line is the concrete solution Mao developed for both these problems.

Through this deconstruction of this specific issue, a new truth is unearthed and thrust into our view: it now becomes perfectly clear that it is petit-bourgeois, and inherently liberal (in the sense of classical liberalism), individualism that spawns anarchist philosophy. Liberalism is the substructure for the *philosopher* anarchist's contempt for both authority and the state, this is further highlighted by the **absolute** nature of their opposition against the state, the resentment that extends, historically<sup>30</sup>, even to the worker's state<sup>31</sup>. The anarchist (philosophical) misstep is a combination of

1. Too succumb to emotionalism, to fail to see the state as it truly is, only a tool, a tool incapable of doing. The relative-to-class character of the state is rendered obsolete in anarchist analysis, it is viewed as a thing imbued with class interest, collaborating with the ruling class to dominate the oppressed classes. Even if we do not contest the liberal view of historic attempts at socialism, the reasoning still remains:  
the oppressors used it for bad purposes → it is innately oppressive  
, a line of reasoning akin to "criminals use guns → guns are bad".
2. Falling into the grasp of the Bourgeoisie, and be blinded to the emancipation experienced by the masses in these dictatorships of the proletariat<sup>32</sup>

The first point is a misstep because while the state can under certain conditions develop into a whole separate class, this can be avoided through soviet democracy, which ensures that the composition of the party is minimally opportunist in character, strong discipline, and continuous examination of party members. State officials must also not receive preposterous benefits, this is to prevent the formation of a distinctly separate class (a class which receives the majority of the spoils of surplus value), and restrict the demographic of opportunists within the party (the same approach must be taken, and expanded to further extremity with the vanguard, it is of even greater primary importance to remove opportunists from the party in the revolutionary, and pre-revolutionary era). The second I call a misstep due to its empirically fallacious nature.

---

<sup>29</sup> In the sense of worker encounters responsible for *all* decision-making

<sup>30</sup> Eg. Soviet Union, Mao's China, DPRk, etc.

<sup>31</sup> Anarchists believe that the worker's state cannot, and never has, existed. To refute this point, see the following link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kQoEqBx70ts&t=350s>

<sup>32</sup> <https://gowans.blog/2012/12/21/do-publicly-owned-planned-economies-work/>  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TMKEhewbaZg>  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Okz2YMW1AwY&t=482s>

Bakunin once said:

“When the people are being beaten with a stick, they are not much happier if it is called the People's Stick.”

What this quote however does not convey, is that the stick must not always beat the people, that is not its nature, it is merely a stick. The people however, can wield the stick to fend off a ravaging dog.

As a side note, some anarchists hold up the line that the state must be opposed for its minority quality, this too is however an erroneous point. While a common line of thought, what matters is not *who* resides within positions of power, but which *interest* is pursued through the operation of that power. A quarrel should not be made over a dictator if they act wholeheartedly for the proletariat. It is true however that the probability for the representation of the masses's will grows generally along the line of the number of people participant within expressions of power.

## Conclusion

Anarchism must be opposed for the incompetence of its revolutionary tactics, and its historical hostility towards worker's states, aids the Bourgeoisie in their struggle against proletarian liberation. We must also note how anarchists commonly further imperialism in the current epoch by mindlessly consuming propaganda and opposing the imperialised nations<sup>33</sup>

This said, anarchists are not opportunists, and must not be treated as such. They are comrades, misled at that, but remain comrades. Red and black must unite their forces when combating the common enemy!

## Anarchist (Philosopher) Quotes Which Illustrate Mentioned Principles

“Such free display of human energy being possible only under complete individual and social freedom, **Anarchism directs its forces against the third and greatest foe of all social equality; namely, the State**, organized authority, or statutory law,—the dominion of human conduct. Just as religion has fettered the human mind, and as property, or the monopoly of things, has subdued and stifled man's needs, so has the State enslaved his spirit, dictating every phase of conduct. **"All government in essence," says Emerson, "is tyranny." It matters not whether it is government by divine right or majority rule. In every instance its aim is the absolute subordination of the individual.**”—Emma Goldman

---

<sup>33</sup> [https://www.reddit.com/r/Anarchism/comments/cfza8y/what\\_are\\_your\\_thoughts\\_on\\_rojava/](https://www.reddit.com/r/Anarchism/comments/cfza8y/what_are_your_thoughts_on_rojava/)  
[https://www.reddit.com/r/Anarchism/comments/ccgww9/what\\_are\\_your\\_thoughts\\_on\\_the\\_dprk\\_megathread/](https://www.reddit.com/r/Anarchism/comments/ccgww9/what_are_your_thoughts_on_the_dprk_megathread/)

“There are those, on the one hand, who hope to achieve the social revolution through the State by preserving and even extending most of its powers to be used for the revolution. **And there are those like ourselves who see the State, both in its present form, in its very essence, and in whatever guise it might appear, an obstacle to the social revolution, the greatest hindrance to the birth of a society based on equality and liberty, as well as the historic means designed to prevent this blossoming.**”-Peter Kropotkin

“**Where there is authority, there is no freedom**”-Peter Kropotkin

“**Representative government corresponds to capital. rule. Both, however, are class-rule.** But in a society where the distinction between capitalist and laborer has disappeared, there is no need of such a government; it would be an anachronism, a nuisance. **Free workers would require a free organization, and this cannot have any other basis than free agreement and free cooperation, without sacrificing the autonomy of the individual to the all-pervading interference of the State.**” -Peter Kropotkin

“Humanity is trying now to free itself from the bonds of any government whatever, and to respond to its needs of organization by the free understanding between individuals pursuing the same common aims. ... **Free agreement is becoming a substitute for law. And free cooperation a substitute for governmental guardianship. ... We already foresee a state of society where the liberty of the individual will be limited by no laws, no bonds—by nothing else** but his own social habits and the necessity, which everyone feels, of finding cooperation, support, and sympathy among his neighbors.” -Peter Kropotkin

(It is essential to recognise here how this is no consistent or sustainable attitude, people commit atrocities, so is the tale told by imperialists<sup>34</sup>, capitalists<sup>35</sup>, and landlords<sup>36</sup> which care not for people, only for profit, and sympathise, we cannot rely on either.)

“**The Boston Anarchists are opposed to mob rule.**

**For this reason they are opposed to the State, whose rule is nothing less than mob rule, since all arbitrary rule which is enforced by brutal agencies is mob rule. The State, then, is the chief of mobbists.**”-Henry Appleton

“**As the word "anarchy" etymologically signifies the negation of governmental authority, the absence of government, it follows that one indissoluble bond unites the anarchists. This is antagonism to all situations regulated by imposition, constraint, violence, governmental oppression, whether these are a product of all, a group, or of one person.**”-Emil Armand

---

<sup>34</sup>

<https://www.counterpunch.org/2017/12/08/state-of-fear-how-historys-deadliest-bombing-campaign-created-todays-crisis-in-korea/>

<sup>35</sup>

<https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2014325/Nike-workers-kicked-slapped-verbally-abused-factories-making-Converse-line-Indonesia.html>

<sup>36</sup> <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/27/us/coronavirus-philadelphia-hahnemann-hospital.html>

**“Almost anyone, I suppose, can call himself or herself an anarchist, if he or she believed that the society could be managed without the state. And by the state—I don’t mean the absence of any institutions, the absence of any form of social organisation—the state really refers to a professional apparatus of people who are set aside to manage society, to preëempt the control of society from the people. So that would include the military, judges, politicians, representatives who are paid for the express purpose of legislating, and then an executive body that is also set aside from society. So anarchists generally believe that, whether as groups or individuals, people should directly run society.”-Murray Bookchin**

**“I, as an Anarchist, have no right to advise another to do anything involving a risk to himself; nor would I give a fillip for an action done by the advice of someone else, unless it is accompanied by a well-argued, well settled conviction on the part of the person acting, that it really is the best thing to do. Anarchism, to me, means not only the denial of authority, not only a new economy, but a revision of the principles of morality. It means the development of the individual, as well as the assertion of the individual. It means self-responsibility, and not leader-worship.”-Emma Goldman**

**“Socialism greatly needs Anarchism as a critic and to keep it from sacrificing the individual and his originality to the domination of the mass.”-John William Lloyd**