

situationist
international

1

s i t u a t i o n i s t i n t e r n a t i o n a l

review of the American section of the S.I.

Number 1 - June 1969

S.I.
P.O. Box 491
Cooper Station
New York, N. Y. 10003

\$1.00 per copy
\$5.00 yearly subscription

Editorial Committee:

Robert Chasse, Bruce Elwell, Jonathan Horelick, Tony Verlaan

Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry
Volume 42, Number 1, June 2003

Anticopyright: texts may be used accordingly

FACES OF RECUPERATION

The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas: the class which is the ruling material force of society is at the same time the *ruling* intellectual force.

If we detach the ideas of the ruling class from the ruling class itself and attribute to them an independent existence, without bothering about the conditions of production and the producers of these ideas, we can say, for instance, that the domination of the aristocracy was really the domination of the concepts honor, loyalty; the domination of the bourgeoisie was really that of the concepts freedom, equality. The ruling class itself on the whole imagines this to be so. This conception of history, which is common to all historians, particularly since the 18th century, necessarily comes up against the phenomenon that the more abstract the ideas (that is, the more universal their form), the more they hold sway.

Once the ruling ideas have been separated from the ruling individuals, and, above all, from the relationships which result from a given stage of the mode of production and in this way the conclusion has been reached that history is always under the sway of ideas, it is very easy to abstract from these various ideas, "the idea," as the dominant force in history, and thus to

understand all these separate ideas and concepts as "forms of self-determination" on the part of the concept developing in history. It follows then naturally, too, that all the relationships of men can be derived from the concept man, man as conceived, the essence of man, *man*. This has been done by the speculative philosophers. Hegel himself confesses at the end of *The Philosophy of History* that he "has considered the progress of the *concept* only" and has represented in history "the true theodicy." Now one can go back again to the "producers of the concept," to the theoreticians, ideologists, and philosophers, and one comes then to the conclusion that the philosophers, the thinkers as such, have at all times been dominant in history. History as dominated by ideas and those who "explain" or "produce" them.

This whole semblance, of the pre-eminence of thinkers, and of the rule of a certain class as only the rule of certain ideas, comes of course to a natural end as soon as society ceases at last to be organized in the form of class-rule, that is to say as soon as it is no longer necessary to represent a particular interest as general or "the general interest" as ruling.

The existence of revolutionary ideas in a particular period presupposes the

existence of a revolutionary class. The function of theory is to always renew the struggle against the perverting influence of bourgeois thought on the thought of the proletariat.

The Comedy of the Re-appearance of Economic Tragedy

Leninist theory explains as always that the negation of capitalist society is of economic necessity. The historical negation amounts to the realization of planned economy, through the coercion of Bolshevik practice. The Leninist theoretical exclusion of the question of who plans in the planned economy (assuming that the true realization of planning represents the adequate condition for the realization of the individual) signals the continuation of the impoverishment of the individual, deflected by the *appearances* of economic equality and rationalized productivity.

Baran and Sweezy emerge years after their writings to provide the theoretical economic base of the contemporary leftish movement in the United States. Throughout their material they implicitly reduce the spectrum of socialist *ideologies* to historical variations on an evolving socialist model, and in which these ideologies will recover their essential unity at a future point in time. Their unification of an appearance becomes thoroughly transparent as the socialist countries continuously reveal themselves as familiar regulators of social control. In this light, socialist theory justifies manipulation and coercion through scientific (quantitative) analysis. It is the illusory theoretical base of the illusory alternative.

In *Monopoly Capital*, Baran and Sweezy argue that the contradictions

of capitalism are with us still, but that they have been modified since their original expression; that is, the capitalist epoch has proven capable of more productivity than anticipated; and yet, profit oriented production creates economic stagnation: limited market outlets cause underconsumption (waste of products) and unemployment (waste of labor) and underutilization of machinery. The essential contradictions of capitalism manifest themselves in imperialist war, racism, domestic and foreign exploitation, bad housing, moral despair, sexual repression, poverty, poor education, and so on and so on. The means of the critique suggest its ends. Baran and Sweezy approach the problem of capitalism by dividing it into separate (separated) problems that are then arbitrarily linked to one another, an approach compatible with the solution they seek, which is a series of reforms. To say that the capitalist system has been kept alive by 'stimuli' is to imply that it can always be kept alive by 'stimuli.' They forget their own active historical role as 'stimuli.'

There is thus no mystery about the performance of the United States economy in the postwar period. With the aftermath boom triggering a great upheaval in the living patterns of tens of millions of people, and with arms spending growing nearly fivefold—from \$11.4 billion in 1947 to \$55.2 billion in 1963—it is probably safe to say that never since the height of the railroad epoch has the American economy been subject in peacetime to such powerful stimuli! What is really remarkable is that despite the strength and persistence of these stimuli, the familiar symptoms of inadequate

surplus absorption—unemployment and underutilization of capacity—began to appear at an early stage, and apart from cyclical fluctuations, have been gradually growing more severe . . .

What needs to be added is that the unemployment situation . . . was considerably worse than the figures indicate . . .

The problem, as they put it, is that in advanced capitalism the forces of production—men, techniques and machines—are blocked from total utilization. They are constantly being unemployed. Baran and Sweezy reduce the problem of the alienation of the practice of reason (which is the self-realization of the individual) to the problem of the alienation of the practice of rationalization (which is the full use or full absorption, of the social product).

Their critique of the quality of life emerges because they can demonstrate only dangerous times for the bourgeoisie on economic grounds. So they tell us that the "sexual excess," like the economic excess, can only be adequately absorbed (sublimated) on a rational basis in socialist society. Nowhere does the individual, or even the worker for that matter, enter the critique, for the very reason that he does not play a central role in their revolutionary model. So-called Marxian science sustains the notion that the negation of capitalism is a given one (the socialist model). By rendering the problem and the solution scientifically (quantitatively) they suggest the necessity and inevitability of expertise, that is, *authority*.

As Leninists, Baran and Sweezy can do nothing more than quantify, that is, mystify things. For they begin and end with the position that the revolutionary project is merely to ac-

celerate the evolving quantitative processes of history. Leninism is the separation of quantity and quality on a permanent basis, in which an endless stream of party specialists redistribute production on behalf of the producers. Qualitative change is exiled to a distant future.

Baran and Sweezy confine the proletariat to a condition of 'moral despair' that permits of clinical (quantifiable) solutions. Beyond what they (and the rest of the social scientists) cannot quantify is that which belongs to the human imagination and a future objective-subjective reality whose material foundations and mere beginnings will be the unmediated, autonomous production of all aspects of life by the producers.

Authentic proletarian autonomy is not simply the adequate negation of hierarchy (though even proletarian autonomy is a possibility which the Leninists refuse to consider essential) but the free play of the individual himself, whose only remaining relation to the necessity of his labor is that he devises the appropriate conditions for its elimination.

(Ernest Mandel, Belgian Marxian economist, soon to be published in three volumes by Sweezy's Monthly Review, argues the impossibility of workers' control, in view of the failure of the Yugoslavian experiment.

In order to absorb class tensions, the Yugoslavian experiment with workers councils was administered by the state bureaucracy and passively established within the local factories. This technique restricts the worker to the factory place and immediately parcellizes the concept of worker autonomy to one aspect of life, when in fact the council form is effectuated at the historic point where it determines all of its aspects. Bolshevik centralization or decentralization are

anodynes for the proletariat playing the central, that is, unmediated role in decision, execution, and production. What the problem is for the proletariat—to become conscious of apparent solutions—is not the problem for Mandel at all.)

Above all, *Monopoly Capital* merely demonstrates the alienation of the industrial capitalist economy from itself. Baran's *Political Economy of Growth* strengthens this minimal argument by taking great pain and length to demonstrate U.S. domination of underdeveloped economies. The purely objective (so-called unbiased) character of this economics becomes explicit when Baran *defends* the oppressiveness of Bolshevik industrialization:

The 'revolution from above' that consolidated the socialist order in Russia and that marked the actual beginning of comprehensive socialist planning led to a sharp deterioration in the immediate economic situation, to a grievous disruption of the normal flow of agricultural (and consumer's goods) production, and caused a painful drop in the standard of living. In this it was very much like most revolutionary breaks in history. Yet while the illness that it provoked was acute and painful, it was manifestly an illness of growth: it reached its crisis with enormous speed and yielded to convalescence within a few years. By the end of the First Five Year Plan the worst 'squeezing' of the consumer was over, by 1935 rationing could be abolished . . .

What the experience of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries clearly demonstrates is that the actual economic surplus need not be maximized in order to

secure tremendously high rates of investments and economic expansion. These are fully compatible with a consistent and sizable rise of people's standard of living. They are possible on the condition of a correct allocation and rational utilization of such economic surplus as is made available for productive investment. While the former has to be governed by the long-term requirements of economic growth rather than by the desire for immediate rapid increases of consumable output, the latter consists of maximal exploitation of all available capital . . .

When consumer trends, capital accumulation, heavy industrial equipment build-up, and size of GNP serve as central criteria, concomitant elements of social coercion can be excluded from the analysis of social progress, becoming in fact a separate problem, if a problem at all. Bourgeois and Marxian social science exclude the 'human variable' from a central position in the analysis at equal rate.

The individual continues to serve his life sentence in the realm of chance, again sacrificed to the realization of historical necessity.

It appears that History allows the individual a single choice: to be strangled to death in the hands of the bourgeoisie or in the hands of the Leninists. The Leninist "negation" of bourgeois society is the instrument of its perpetuation.

Baran and Sweezy in effect merely elaborate the core of Leninist-Stalinist theory: revolutionary change in the advanced capitalist countries is not an immediate possibility; at the stage of monopoly capital, the underdeveloped countries suffer the former agonies and express the former antagonism of

the proletariat in the advanced countries (*this* proletariat now shares in the tendencies of bourgeois consciousness, temporarily); the emergence of socialist competition on the market along with immanent third world revolt eventually closes outlets for profits; so the cataclysmic depression is stimulated through the explosion of the external contradictions; in the meantime, socialist development must be protected at all costs; this means that the Leninist movements in the capitalist countries must not aggravate the contradictions that could stimulate reaction, perhaps even invasion of the Soviet Union. Add Cuba, China, Korea, Vietnam to the list and you have Baran and Sweezy.

In addition, these movements must by necessity, form temporary progressive alliances with progressive elements of the bourgeoisie (united fronts), assuming the temporary postures of reform movements. From beginnings to present, the Leninist movements have sustained their reformist postures. Leninism is the permanent transition; the caustic style of reform.

As it has worked out historically, the restriction of the negation of capitalism to the transformation of a society based on exchange value into one based on use value prolongs the existence of man as commodity. The restricted negation prolongs the alienation of the individual, compelled to develop through the power of others. As cadre of the Welfare State, Baran and Sweezy invert, at all costs, the irreducible essence of critical thought which is to seek the realization of the concrete situation in which the divisions of the old world cease to be.

In the meantime, house servants remain *temporarily* in left-over "state bourgeois" homes in Peking; Russian industry remains *temporarily* moti-

vated by profit and wage incentives; professionals, bourgeois, and so on, *temporarily* consume rare dishes of pork in restaurants well concealed from the pork loving Cuban people.

Capitalist society is sustained by the emergence of the Leninist enterprise. Can we wait till Monthly Review dies its natural death?

A Doctor of Speculation

Who is Marcuse? What is he? that all the opposition adores him?

He tells us in *One Dimensional Man* that the bourgeoisie and the proletariat are still the basic classes in the capitalist world. But the former antagonists are now united in their interest to preserve and improve contemporary society. The proletariat has abdicated its historic role. Class struggle has come to an end in class society. Not only is the proletariat absorbed into bourgeois consciousness, but both classes, now *practically* one, no longer *appear* to be agents of historical transformation. The word *appear* as used by the doctor is curious: we are to assume the analysis of advanced industrial society to be based upon an appearance?

But having disposed of the proletariat, he waxes sad, toward the end of the book, about even the most acute consciousness which is powerless when deprived of the material force for the transformation of life. Since revolutionary consciousness is impossible without a revolutionary class, we take the *acute* consciousness to be something other than revolutionary (bourgeois no doubt).

When he says that "the dialectical concept pronounces its own hopelessness," he crowns his mystifications. He has set from the start the condition for his own hopelessness, which is

then transferred into the hopelessness of the dialectical conception, and, more largely, the hopelessness of the historical project of liberation. After that when he makes statements that tend to clarify the real relationships in 'advanced industrial society,' the statements clarify not the necessity to supersede that society, but *reinforce* the general hopelessness, and as such the statements become reasons for adjusting to the prevailing reality.

Deprived of a class to end class society, a 'demonstrable agent for historical change,' Marcuse seeks the realization (the emergence of the potential) of bourgeois society not through a suppression of its conditions, but by an intensification of the prevailing process. It is not that the system should be other—but that it should be more what it already is. In this he joins Max Weber, who saw bureaucracy emerge to rationalize (Marcuse's word is: pacify) existence.

He delineates his alternative to bourgeois irrationality in *One Dimensional Man*:

Paradoxically, it seems that it is not the notion of the new societal institutions which presents the greatest difficulty in the attempt to answer this question. The established societies themselves are changing, or have already changed the basic institutions in the direction of increased planning. Since the development and utilization of all available resources for the universal satisfaction of vital needs is the prerequisite of pacification, it is incompatible with the prevalence of particular interests which stand in the way of attaining this goal. Qualitative change is conditional upon planning for the whole against these interests, and a free and

rational society can emerge only on this basis.

The institutions within which pacification can be envisaged thus defy the traditional classification into authoritarian and democratic, centralized and liberal administration. Today the opposition to central planning in the name of a liberal democracy which is denied in reality serves as an ideological prop for repressive interests. The goal of authentic self-determination by the individuals depends on effective social control over the production and distribution of the necessities (in terms of the achieved level of culture, material and intellectual).

Here, technological rationality, stripped of its exploitative features, is the sole standard and guide in planning and developing the available resources for all. Self-determination in the production and distribution of vital goods and services would be wasteful. The job is a technical one, and as a truly technical job, it makes for the reduction of physical and mental toil. In this realm, centralized control is rational if it establishes the preconditions for meaningful self-determination. The latter can then become effective in its own realm—in the decisions which involve the production and distribution of the economic surplus, and in the individual existence.

In any case, the combination of centralized authority and direct democracy is subject to infinite variations . . .

The individuals whose "authentic self-determination depends on effective social control" are the same individuals "whose particular interests are incompatible with qualitative change."

It is the bourgeois order rationalized (pacified), by a centrally controlling technological rationality (why not like Max Weber use the word bureaucracy here?), leaving the individuals to toy "effectively" at the fringes with their individual lives and economic *surplus* . . .

Here then is a program for a social democracy, complete with planners at the top—technocrats or bureaucrats—who are good enough to allow the individual to decide over the secondary: his individual life as surplus.

He warns (elsewhere in his book) about technological fetishism—and then proceeds to advocate it in what he wants somebody to believe is the 'chance of the alternatives.' If he knows, he does not understand that every advance in technological knowledge is an advance in the spectacularization of existence, in slavery: not because knowledge is slavery, but because the ruling strata—bourgeois or bureaucratic, and bureaucratic after bourgeois—can only use knowledge to that end. The liberatory potential of capitalism—removing men from the realm of their total submission to nature—turns into its opposite.

The technocrats are closer than he *seems* to think. "Every hour of every day the Secretary is confronted by a conflict between the national interest and the parochial interest of particular industries, individual services and local areas. He cannot avoid controversy in the whole range of issues which dominate the headlines if he is to place the interests of the many above the interests of the few, and yet it is the national interest, above all, which he has sworn to serve" (*The Essence of Security*, R. S. McNamara). (McNamara's own statement expresses a contradiction. The 'national interest' is the interest of the ruling class (the few, the parochial

interest); but he identifies it here with the interests of the many, as best suits the ideology of a bureaucratically controlled state. This contradiction is the condition of existence of the bureaucracy: it is the foundation of its dilemma, in which it discovers all of its moral, idealistic or whatever, crises. While it carries on the struggle, with state power, for the pacification—rationalization—of existence.)

Beneath the cloak of a doctor of speculation hides a social democrat (one who desires to introduce such *institutional* modifications as will allow capitalism to maintain itself).

Earlier—in *Eros and Civilization*—Marcuse had pointed to the assumption in Freudian theory of the immutability of the struggle against want. The practical possibility of eliminating want obviated the Freudian apparatus as reflection upon an ontological essence of man, and reintroduced it as a moment of thought connected to a moment of history. In the light of this discovery, the critical impact of Freudian theory bore heavily upon the repressive nature of bourgeois society. It was this which founded his attack on the revisionists of Freudian theory, in their need to demolish the critical content of the theory, for the benefit of the bourgeois order.

But Marcuse himself was on thin ice. In speaking of perversions, he noted that they "*seem* to be linked with the general perversion of the human existence in a repressive culture, but the perversions have an instinctual substance distinct from these forms; and this substance *may* well express itself in other forms compatible with normality in high civilization." The conditional hedging is more than the caution of a careful doctor of speculation: it suggests that Freud, after all, *may* have indeed

uncovered something about the ontological essence of man.

It is questionable whether "timelessness is the ideal of pleasure," but he, affirming without the shade of seeming, employs the notion to reintroduce a "primary frustration" so that repression reenters to make "pleasure itself painful."

And he affirms that the elimination of alienated labor is impossible (forgetting for the nonce that alienated labor in bourgeois society reflects the 'struggle against want') so that he then recaptures the content of Freudian theory as ontological speculation. For the problem, really, is to minimize, attenuate, the more noxious traces of bourgeois domination—for a more rational, more pacified organization of survival, until death itself "like other necessities, can be made more rational—painless." So there it is.

On the level of the every day he is less circumlocuted:

"I have never suggested or advocated or supported destroying the established universities and building new anti-institutions instead. I have always said that no matter how radical the demands of the students, and no matter how justified, they should be pressed within the existing universities and attained within the existing universities."

The university is the last bastion of freedom. It is not possible to do without an elite. The working-class needed for the social revolution he has in mind is the working-class needed to set up a new ruling strata. We can understand his desire for selective repressions—for he is not thinking of a revolution. He is thinking of the implementation of a social democratic program of reform within capitalism, and he is thinking of the retrograde opposition to that reform.

At the first skirmish in the streets he rediscovered intact his social democratic past, complete with "non-explosive evolution" and "progressive forces of repression."

The pessimism of his years of isolation permitted him to see that advanced industrial society, as he calls it, is of a piece, a unity founded on the parcellization of existence. But he didn't see it all that well. Rediscovering optimism (through no fault of his own) he rediscovered the fragmentary opposition of his past. Destroy the bourgeois university? Never! You dare, vandall! How can we participate in running it then?

The process of reification has not spared his imagination.

We note (from the same newspaper accounts) that he was impressed by slogans we wrote or inspired in France (May-June 1968)—*All power to the imagination; Be realistic, demand the impossible*. There was, among others, another which he never mentioned: *Humanity will be happy the day the last bureaucrat is hanged with the guts of the last capitalist*. As for doctors of speculation, they will also pass.

Meanwhile, a glib professor, but he be social democrat also, is like a gold ring in a sow's nose.

This text, slightly abbreviated, under the title "The Recuperation of Marcuse," was distributed at an apparition of Marcuse on December 5, 1968, at a benefit performance he gave for the *Guardian* (small melting-pot of ideology).

Con at Work

McLuhan emerged, and with a ba-ality: man's techniques (technology) are extensions of himself.

He says: "*The Gutenberg Galaxy* develops a mosaic or field approach to its problems. Such a mosaic image

of numerous data and quotations in evidence offers the only practical means of revealing causal operations in history." So we know from the start that as a good logician, McLuhan is going to show he has discovered the *cause*, and that the "numerous data and quotations in evidence" will be the effects.

"Technological environments are not merely passive containers of people but are active processes that reshape people and other technologies alike." And so now we also know that the way men make their living penetrates all aspects of life; and that new methods for doing so "reshape" if not eliminate older ways of doing so.

He knows this well enough to say that De Tocqueville knew "typographic literacy had not only produced the Cartesian outlook but also the special traits of American psychology and politics."

He also knows that money is the universal commodity, that all things are reducible to—and that money reduces and is the measure of all things—quantifiable relations. "Money is metaphor in the sense that it stores skill and labor and also translates one skill into another."

That all becomes commodity:

"Typography is not only a technology but is in itself a natural resource or staple, like cotton or timber or radio; and, like any staple, it shapes not only private sense ratios but also patterns of communal interdependence." Or, "Typography tended to alter language from a means of perception and exploration to a portable commodity."

His sloppy use of language aside, he runs into an unexamined difficulty here. In the beginning, he was going to show us the root cause (which the title already indicated was the Guten-

berg galaxy): but now he is speaking of his galaxy (typography) as a raw material among others for the production of one commodity among others. He describes the capitalist mode of production, but locates it in typography, and no where is capitalism directly taken to task. It is only later that one discovers why.

He discovers the power of parcellization as the operational base of the bourgeoisie (parenthetical clarifications added from here on):

"The Machiavellian mind and the merchant mind (both: *bourgeois mind*) are at one in their simple faith in the power of segmental division to rule all—in the dichotomy of power and morals and of money and morals."

He discovers the universal extension of capitalism, which unifies space as *its* space: "If Lowenthal is right, we have spent much energy and fury in recent centuries in destroying oral culture by print technology (*capitalism*) so that the uniformly processed individuals of commercial (*bourgeois*) society can return to oral marginal spots as tourists and consumers, whether geographical or artistic."

He knows the assembly line quality of life: "All experience is segmental and must be processed sequentially."

". . . the twentieth century has worked to free itself from the conditions of passivity, which is to say, from the Gutenberg (*capitalist*) heritage itself. . . . The new electric galaxy of events (*basis for change in mode of production*) has already moved deeply into the Gutenberg (*capitalism*). Even without collision, such co-existence of technologies (*modes of production*) and awareness brings trauma and tension to every living person. Our most ordinary and conventional attitudes seem suddenly twisted into gargoyles and grotesques.

Familiar (*bourgeois*) institutions and associations seem at times menacing and malignant. These multiple transformations, which are the normal consequence of introducing new media (*new productive means*) into any society whatever, need special study and will be the subject of another volume on *Understanding Media* in the world of our time."

There is something in McLuhan for everybody: the vulgar Marxists and the political economists, the formal logicians of the mysteries of quantification and the con men. And the McLuhan con is well underway. After finding his cause in a 'raw material,' not in capitalism itself, what is at issue is to work out how the *new* technology (another 'raw material') can be incorporated in "the world of our time," into this society; that is, how can it be made to fit the bourgeois mold.

We discover how in *Understanding Media*.

The extension of man has become a category which finds its philosophical expression in the phrase: the medium is the message.

Men are displaced. The object is central. Their extensions preempt men. In the bourgeois project of the domination of nature, McLuhan merely discovers for himself that men are dominated by the instruments invented for establishing that domination.

The proletarian project of liberation signifies nothing: men are moved by the unfolding of forces over which they have no control. They are subject to the conditions of existence. To be a man is to perceive the prevailing direction and join it—become one with it.

The global village of McLuhan's dream is universal capitalism, with the new electronic galaxy allowing

for a geographic dispersal which is regrouped in the computer. He carries on at length about decentralization, the *sine qua non* of the new technology. Under the prevailing organization of life, the new technology, at the service of capitalism, dominates centrally, and imparts the illusion of decentralization. The truth of that illusion is dispersal, centrally controlled. Geographic dispersal is the continuation of the parcellization which he had seen as the source of rule by the bourgeois (Machiavellian and merchant) mind.

Each time he reflects upon general content and uses the word "media" or "extensions of man" or "new electronic technology"—all one need do to understand *his* message is substitute the word "capitalism." Each time he reflects upon the specific characteristics of the "new media"—all one need understand is that he shows

The Human Development Corporation (the name is not to be missed) took out a full page ad (January 26, 1969) in the *New York Times* to announce McLuhan's "Dew-Line Newsletter." Billed as an "Early Warning System," the newsletter will use "multi-media to deliver its message," with a "whole new set of sensory equipment." Purpose: "dealing, not only with the significant, but the unpleasant. It means facing today's problems squarely, *and controlling them before they can destroy us.*" The emphasis is theirs; and, they go on with renewed emphasis: "*All we can guarantee is that its purpose is to allow you to exploit change, rather than fall victim to it.*"

them in relation to the universal extension and maintenance of capitalism.

His idea of total passivity—which he calls, in his characteristic manner of inverting truth, ‘involvement in depth’—finds its privileged expression in the reporter who noted about the first manned flight to the moon that it was, through television, “a participatory experience for the individual everywhere—a development that may rank second only to the trip” (*New York Times*, 12/29/68). McLuhan is full of admonitions on the futility of resistance to the established order (which he would call admonitions on the futility of resistance to *change*). He himself joined the Catholic Church to point the way.

The Recuperation of Language

The definition of passivity is involvement in depth. The strike (winter 1968) in New York City by the teachers had something to do with a struggle over decentralization. Marcuse masks the dilemmas of the thought of the ruling strata behind the dialectical conception, itself hopeless. A corporation devoted to the control, exploitation and negation of change is called Human Development . . .

The energy for emancipation must be shackled to its prevention. *Participation* is recuperated from the description of the relation among equals in an activity to become what describes the running of *things as they are*—schools, factories, life. The function of such participation of course is to channel energies toward changing existing institutions into more viable forms. These changed forms become powerful tools for the

prevention of any real emancipation. What is important to note in the process is the disappearance of any other *significant* sense to participation.

Before decentralization can be recuperated, it must be weakened in its implications of autonomous power, and of the absence of central authority. Before revolution can be recuperated, it has to mean first simply change; change in fare, small change. After that, the words—having inverted truth, and *their* truth—mean little else.

To recuperate words is really to recuperate what they represent; so that the only activity the words describe is the activity the *recuperated* words describe. It follows that the true meanings of the words merely become *aspects* of their false meanings, the true activity they describe merely aspects of their *false* activity.

The S.I. offers a few definitions. Society: protection racket. The State: the Enforcer. Politicians: gangsters. The sense of the first terms emerge clearly in the second, which is, in fact, the function of *definition*.

*

We have used the word *recuperate*, which means recover: the activity of society as it attempts to obtain possession of that which negates it. The word that *seems* to mean the same thing on the “New Left” is *coopt*. The word means “to elect into a body by the votes of its existing members”: by extension, it would be the act, for example, of Hayden or Carmichael going to work for the Nixon administration. They would, in reverse, be “lost” to their “New Left” organizations (though hopefully they would bring their constituencies with them).

The different word also separates us from the redundant confusion of that luckless state, the “New Left.”

CERTAIN EXTRAORDINARY CONSIDERATIONS CONTRIBUTING TO THE UNDERSTANDING OF THE DEVOLUTION OF CAPITALISM AND BUREAUCRATIZATION OF EXISTENCE

1.

Capitalism impoverishes. Profit and competition drive to monopoly and monopoly impoverishes individual members of the bourgeoisie, in open conflict with one another. It eliminates previous means of production, though holdovers from these may continue within capitalism so long as they remain marginal (small business, artisans, individual farmers). It impoverishes the proletariat which, having created the wealth and the conditions for the emergence of higher relations of production, is totally expropriated.

2.

“The estimated gross estate size for the total adult population in 1953” says Lundberg in *The Rich and the Super-Rich*, “was as follows (see table below):

“This table . . . shows that 50 per cent of the people, owning 8.3 per cent of the wealth, had an average estate of \$1,800—enough to cover furniture, clothes, a television set and perhaps a run-down car. Most of these had less; many had nothing at all. Another group of 18.4 per cent, adding up to 68.4 per cent of the population, was worth \$6,000 on the average, which would probably largely represent participation in life insurance or emergency money in the bank. Perhaps this percentage included some of the select company of ‘people’s capitalists’ who owned two or three shares in AT&T.

“Another 21.80 per cent of adults, bringing into view 92.59 per cent of the population, had \$15,000 average gross estates—just enough to cover a serious personal illness. This same 92-plus per cent of the population all together owned only 47.8 per cent of all assets.” . . .

Gross Estate Size (dollars)	Number of Persons Aged 20 and Over		Average Estate Size (dollars)	Total Gross Estate	
	(millions)	Percentage		(billion dollars)	Percentage
0 to 3,500	51.70	50.0	1,800	93.1	8.3
3,500-10,000	19.00	18.4	6,000	114.0	10.2
10,000-20,000	21.89	21.2	15,000	328.4	29.3
20,000-30,000	6.00	5.8	25,000	150.0	13.4
30,000-40,000	2.00	1.9	35,000	70.0	6.3
40,000-50,000	0.80	0.8	45,000	36.0	3.2
50,000-60,000	0.35	0.3	55,000	19.3	1.7
All under 60,000	101.74	98.4	7,900	810.8	72.4
60,000-70,000	0.18	0.1	61,000	10.5	0.9
60,000 and over	1.66	1.6	186,265	309.2	27.6
All estate sizes	103.40	100.0	10,800	1,120.0	100.0
Median estate size			3,500		

It is concluded that "top wealth-holders owned 27.4 per cent of gross and 28.3 per cent of net prime wealth in 1953, but increased their share to 30.2 and 32.0 per cent respectively by 1958. These data support Lampman's conclusion that the share of top wealth-holders has been increasing since 1949."

"... The top 11 per cent of persons in the magic 1 per cent (or 0.11 per cent) held about 45 per cent of the wealth of this particular group while the lower half (or 0.50 per cent) held only 23 per cent." . . .

"This is where the question rests on the basis of the most recent data supplied by leading authorities in the field: Concentration of wealth in a few hands is intensifying."

"By 1975, according to Willard Mueller, chief economist of the Federal Trade Commission, 200 corporations will own two-thirds of all American manufacturing assets compared with the same proportion owned by 500 corporations in 1962."

"Experts concede that a 5 per cent ownership stake in a large corporation is sufficient in most cases to give corporate control."

3.

Impoverishing internally, capitalism is driven to expand, to bring new areas under concentration, to open more and more of the world to its trade.

The imperial phase of western capitalism creates one crop economies. Colonial countries are totally dependent upon the world market, which is the market of capitalism. Imperialism appropriates the wealth of a country; the country is deprived of the fruits of its labor. The so-called poor countries become poorer; the imperial center more wealthy.

Capitalism's presence destroys tribalism, feudalism, slavery, religion,

culture—transforming residues of these into commodities, for tourism or the art market.

Creating conditions for the rise of capitalism, western imperialism impedes further development in industrially underdeveloped countries. The so-called rule of the generals creates the local conflictual elements against which socialism appears.

4.

Bureaucratic state capitalism with socialism as ideology—as weapon against the imperial phase of western capitalism—emerges to continue and finish capitalist development in underdeveloped countries.

'Socialism' is not a transformation of capitalism but a submission to its development, in the absence of a bourgeoisie, as independent class, whose laissez-faire stage of capitalist development could not—cannot—compete with the imperial formation. 'Socialism' continues the bourgeois project, minus a bourgeoisie.

The disappearance of the bourgeoisie in underdeveloped countries begins with the Bolshevik coup. This social upheaval established a centralized state, operated by a bureaucracy, over a proletariat it is helping to create, and in whose name it finds its legitimation. The 'socialist' countries maintain world trade, competition, profit, money, commodity relations (and first of all the sale of labor): they enter into relations with them: they extend the universal (global) domination of capitalism. The emphasis of 'socialism' upon economic growth is not a revolutionary aberration but the expression of its content.

This solution advocated by a myriad of latter day 'socialists' is to demand for western capitalist countries the creation of a central bureaucracy—prefigured in the elitist party—already emerging in control of the state, that is: to advocate that the qualitative transformation of capitalism is simply the direction capitalism takes in *preventing* such transformation.

5.

The real wealth of society consists of the useful things that can be produced and not of money which is only a medium of circulation and has become superfluous.

Capitalism, impelled by profit, produces socially useless things, commodities. As these commodities recede from any real use value (use value out of which they emerge and which they must continue to be the expression of), every effort is made to reassimilate them to the desirable, the needed, the necessary, until commodity production *is* production for use.

6.

Marketing draws on the sexual energy of the individual in order to impart it to the objects. The accident of desexualization reveals the necessity of the commodity spectacle. The objects are not only shown by men and women who look or act horny, the objects are *in themselves* appealing, attractive, desirable, necessary for one's fulfillment, exactly as a sexual object is. Man, to be, has to be recognized by other: but with commodities—whose essence disintegrates with possession, only to reappear in commodities not yet possessed—there is no recognition, only pursuit. The labor of men returns to them in the commodities produced, commodities invested with the real life of the producers: men consume their alienated existence. The end is the Nothing Box—the commodity that serves no function other than to be purchased, until you possess it, then it disintegrates. In the passage from 'things to goods' capitalism achieves its huge slight o' hand: life disappears into objects. Life is object: spectacle, show.

7.

Capitalism has uprooted the whole past of social evolution: it has experienced, of itself, its every impulse, and has unleashed in itself forces greater than those of all former developmental stages.

It has been ripe for some time now for the realization of its liberatory potential. The retard in the historical consciousness of the necessity for a total transformation of life finds capitalism masking its decay behind the bureaucratization of existence. The formal rationalization of an irrational world, the perpetuation of the struggle for survival, surpassed by the practical movement of capitalism, is the 'rational' project of bureaucracy.

8.

Having succeeded in socially concentrating the means of production, and having dominated nature, capitalism strives for a permanent lease on life. Whereas it rose to domination by transforming the world, it now attempts to dominate the world by stabilizing its hold over it.

But this corresponds also to the end of capitalism: as the repetitive pursuit of a surpassed goal, as gradual devolution; the institutionalization of total passivity consuming itself as activity, life as show which is only the show of life, survival for life becoming survival as life. Stabilization—effective devolution—is the privileged task of bureaucracy.

The rise of the occult these days not only means traditional religions have ceased to function, it prefigures the relationship men will have to capitalism as established order, impersonal force, permanent, perma-

nently irrational and untouchable. The ptlomaic cosmology revisited: a fascination with the occult is a fascination with the image of a new enslavement, to change the world in the head, by default of simply changing it.

9.

The productive forces in a social order must find their development before that social order can disappear. New and higher relations of production do not emerge before the material conditions of their existence have gestated in the old society. The old social order resists the emergence of new higher relations by partially appropriating them in order to control them.

The introduction of cybernation into the mode of production is to make machines rather than men the principal agents in the process of production. It is to put an end to wage-labor.

But if technological development under the bourgeois impetus to profit ceases when it ceases to make a profit, under bureaucracy it ceases where it no longer offers the possibility of control (rationalization). Development then ceases to be bureaucratically rational. For bureaucracy, the project is to extend the rational organization of a world which is irrational and *remains* irrational. It follows that as the rationalization of existence intensifies, the *whole* of reality becomes more and more incomprehensible: the road is open for the "meaningful" reintroduction of theology in daily life. Religion reappears, barring life.

10.

The adjusted social relations emerging are an attempt to freeze class relations, create socially unproductive jobs, guarantee income (in order to guarantee a commodity economy) and extend commodity production (in order to perpetuate the spectacle of existence); presided over by a centralized bureaucracy in control of political power and of the means of production by virtue of its privileged exercise of the power of the state.

It is immaterial to note that class relations cannot be frozen, what matters is that the *attempt* to freeze them impedes the project of liberation.

11.

Three principle characteristics of bureaucracy are: it controls political power, it controls the means of production, it requires for the legitimation of its rule that it rule in the name of a given, established, class. In

the west it is in the name of the bourgeoisie; in the east, ushered in by the Bolshevik coup, it already rules in the name of the proletariat.

12.

The bourgeoisie assures the loyalty of top bureaucrats—presidents, vice presidents, and executive vice presidents, when these are not themselves members of the owning bourgeoisie—by making them independently wealthy: by incorporating them into the ruling class.

The bourgeoisie cannot run the economy without an army of specialists: a bureaucracy. The bourgeoisie, as a rule, is not equipped to deal with the day to day business of conducting business which involves a multiplicity of independent specializations (i.e., it is not equipped to *control* the economy). The bourgeoisie generally lets the bureaucrats run the show.

As the bureaucracy begins to exercise control—especially over the state—it begins to conceive of itself as the representative of the ‘general interest’ and as such finds itself opposed to the special interest of the class in whose name it rules (in the socialist countries of course the bureaucracy already rules in the ‘general interest’ so that special interests—including the proletarian project of liberation—take on the mien of retrograde action to the development of ‘socialism’). Aside from what the state actually owns, its enormous power—dwarfing any corporation—lies in the budget and deficit spending.

13.

Specialists of all kinds are the mainstay of bureaucratic organization. Wherever student opposition does not become aware of itself as total opposition to the present organization of survival, it merely reflects the conflictual aspects of transforming the bourgeois university into a university for the formation of future bureaucrats. Any opposition which does not aim at the dissolution of the university—bourgeois or bureaucratic—functions to this end.

Separate power and separation of power; separation plays the game of bureaucracy which is the effective unification of the parcellized world.

14.

The bureaucratization of existence is so at the surface that—having devoted so much space to showing how the owners really run the show—Lundberg’s vision of the future, with a little reservation about the military, is simply lifted from Robert L. Heilbroner’s view of how the show will end. “Heilbroner sees something very akin to socialism, or

production-for-use in a rationally aspiring society, ushered in by a new class consisting of intellectual elites. The revolutionary potential, in sum, resides in the intellectual middle classes, not in the passive, dependent proletariat, who have no 'historical task.'

"These new elites in Heilbroner's view consist of the new military policy-makers, the professional expert from the academic world in the form particularly of specialists in the social and natural sciences, the highly trained new type of government administrator and possibly the administrators that have come into view with the emergence of the big labor unions. These labor administrators are of a type quite different from the old-time ward-boss variety of labor leader.

"While few if any of these men are hostile to the existing system of monopoly capitalism, Heilbroner believes (in which belief I concur) that in the long run, over a span of 50 to 150 years, the differences in background, method and objectives of these elites from those of the business elite will generate frictions between them . . .

"The inherent social irrationality of the system of production chiefly for private profit, utilizing for the short run the increasingly powerful tools of science and technology, practically guarantees the long-run end of such dominance." The rise of a pacifying bureaucracy is on the order of a fatality.

The Bureaucrats Themselves Are Jubilant

In these conditions, power will gravitate increasingly into the hands of those who control the information and can correlate it most rapidly. Our existing postcrisis management institutions will probably be increasingly supplanted by precrisis management institutions, the task of which will be to identify in advance likely social crises and to develop programs to cope with them. In that setting, the key to successful adaptation to the new conditions will be found in the effective selection, distribution and utilization of social talent. By 1980, not only will approximately two-thirds of United States urban dwellers be college-trained, but it is most certain that systematic elite retraining will be standard in the political system. . . .

Accordingly, the emerging technetronic society will differ from the industrial one in a variety of economic, political and social aspects. The following examples may be briefly cited to summarize some of the contrasts:

In an industrial society, the mode of production shifts from agriculture to industry, with the use of muscle and animals supplanted by machine-operation. In the technetronic society, industrial employment yields to services, with automation and cybernetics replacing individual operation of machines.

Problems of employment and unemployment yield to questions relating to skill-obsolescence, security, vacations, leisure, and psychic well-being of relatively secure but potentially aimless lower-middle class blue-collar workers.

Education, no longer merely concerned with overcoming illiteracy or with technical training, becomes universal, highly advanced and relies more on visual and audial devices. It becomes extended in time and it is to be expected that in our lifetime refresher courses throughout the span of one's life will replace the present reliance on a self-contained decade and a half of formal education.

Traditional urban political elites are increasingly replaced by professional political leadership possessing special technical skills, relying on intellectual talents and exploiting mass media to mobilize individual support directly, no longer by the intermediary of organized parties.

In the technetronic society the university becomes an intensely involved thinktank, the source of much sustained political planning and social innovation and no longer a withdrawn ivory tower.

The search for broad ideological answers, typical of the early stage of industrialization, gives way to a more pragmatic problem-solving approach to social issues, though that approach is not devoid of idealistic concern with human values.

*Dr. Z. Brzezinski—professor of government and director
of the Research Institute of Communist Affairs
at Columbia University*

To begin with, I think man has already matured past the point where he will put to use everything he can invent. He did this primarily at a time in our industrial development when he did not have the ability to foresee the larger outcome of his actions. In spite of the many foolish things we may still do today, I think we are now much more analytical, farsighted and wiser than we have ever been, particularly concerning our own survival. Also, we can already see the breakdown of the "cog in the well-oiled machine" theory in much of the rebellion in the world today and a new emphasis on the dignity and growth of the individual.

There is much that is illogical in the theories of our modern pessimists. For example, would a truly efficient machine be self-destructive?

It seems to me it would be self-adjusting to stresses and strains on its parts since they are vital to its very life, not to mention its efficiency. I think the extreme of these pessimists overlook man's higher instinct for survival as well as his ever-growing awareness of his problems and his ever-increasing ability to deal with them. They themselves are helping us in dealing with our problems, in meeting the challenges of our age, by their "feedback," their warnings and the extent of their alarm over certain mistakes we have made.

G. T. Seaborg, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission

15.

The pacification of existence finds its expression in the increasing state interventions in the movement of the economy, in order to stabilize its growth patterns, against crisis. This function displaces the real basis for the existence of the bourgeoisie as independent class and pressages the real end of bourgeois (representative) democracy.

16.

Bourgeois (representative) democracy is the appropriation of the political power of individuals, renamed constituencies, by representatives. These, in the name of their constituencies, employ that power for the benefit of the ruling class. The vote is the formal legitimation of the masters, and through that the assurance of the permanence of the separation from themselves as individuals of their political power. Representative democracy follows the course of bourgeois development—it passes from compromiser and arbiter among bourgeois in open conflict with one another, to being the vessel for a centralized state in the hands of bureaucracy exercising power within the formal husk of representative democracy.

17.

Bureaucracy, aside from the work of stabilizing, establishing the permanence of the economy as separate force, *politically* levels social classes in order to guarantee their permanence. It rationalizes the reduction of everyone within the economy to variations in the role of consumer.

18.

As bureaucracy masks this degraded life by removing the most blatant signs of a poverty which is no longer necessary, the poverty of existence comes into view; private life is life deprived of everything. Bureaucracy strives to remove particular wrongs in order to mask the wrong in general, which is that several centuries of bourgeois development of the economy has a potential for liberation which the bureaucracy is the specific denial of.

19.

The effective negation of this development is the proletarian project: the project of the class that must become visibly what it already is essentially; the project of consciously abolishing capitalism; the project of taking over the whole of existing productive forces; the project of the uninterrupted transformation of life.

20.

Whether bourgeois or bureaucratic, the ruling strata experiences the parcellization of life as the confirmation of its existence: parcellization is its power, and it is that power which accords the ruling strata the appearance of a human existence. The proletariat experiences parcellization as the reality of an inhuman existence and the confirmation of its powerlessness.

Is a proletarian who has no power over his own life and *knows* it. It takes one to know one.

21.

The power of the proletariat finds expression in direct democracy.

The delegate of direct democracy emerges when the political power of the individual is no longer separated from his social power. The delegate, subject to immediate recall, is the voice or the vote of the base (those who keep their power and send out a number from among them, strictly mandated, to express the voice or the vote). No man possesses the social or political power of another.

22.

The workers council was the highest organizational form of direct democracy reached by the proletariat for the expression of its own power, at the moment of its setback around the time of the Bolshevik coup, and again, in Spain. Where the setback has been assimilated by leftish theoreticians to the end (the permanent defeat) of the proletariat, the councils have been abandoned. But the reaffirmation of capitalism and class society is the reaffirmation of their negation—the proletariat—and the expression of the proletariat's own power, the councils. The renewed motion toward emancipation will begin where the old had left off.

23.

What defines the power of the councils? The dissolution of all external (separate) power; direct and total democracy; the practical unification of decision and execution; the delegate, strictly mandated, subject to immediate recall; the abolition of all hierarchies and independent specializations; the management and conscious transformation of all aspects of liberated life; the creative, permanent participation of individuals; international extension and coordination.

Robert Chasse

TERRITORIAL MANAGEMENT

Capitalist production has unified space, a space which is no longer limited by external societies. The unification is both an extensive and intensive process of banalization. The accumulation of mass-produced commodities for the abstract space of the marketplace had to dissolve the autonomy and quality of places, as it had previously broken down legal and regional barriers and medieval corporative restrictions, with their artisan quality. This power of homogenization is the heavy artillery under which all Chinese walls crumble.

*

The *living room of commodity* is forever being modified and rebuilt in order to become ever more identical to itself, to get as close as possible to motionless monotony.

*

Society suppresses geographical distance but gathers distance inwardly in the form of spectacular separation.

*

As a by-product of the traffic of commodities, tourism—human traffic as consumption—is at base the possibility of going to see what has become commonplace. The economic planification of different sites is already the guarantee of their equivalence. The modernization that removed time from travel also removed the reality of space from it.

*

Society, which molds its surroundings, has developed a special technique to mold the territory itself, which is the concrete base for all its tasks. Urbanism is the monopolization of the natural and human environment by capitalism which can—and now has to—remake the whole of space as its own decor, as its logical development into absolute domination.

*

The capitalist necessity which is fulfilled in urbanism (as a means for the visible suspension of life) finds expression in Hegelian terminology

as, for example, the absolute predominance of "the peaceful coexistence of space" as against "the anxious becoming in the succession of time."

*

If we understand the technical forces of capitalist economy as resulting in separation, what we have in the case of urbanism is the overall equipment for treating the terrain in the way that best fits the deployment of these forces; the very technique of *separation*.

*

Urbanism is the modern achievement in the uninterrupted task of preserving class power: it maintains the atomization of workers dangerously *brought together* by urban conditions of production. The constant struggle against the possibilities of their coming together finds its ideal battleground in urbanism. Since the experiences of the French Revolution, the effort of established powers to multiply the means of keeping law and order in the street finally results in the suppression of the street. "With mass-transit systems cutting across long distances, the isolation of the population has proven to be a more effective means of control," says L. Mumford in *The City in History*, while describing a "one-way world hereafter." But the general movement to isolation, which is the reality of urbanism, also contains a controlled reintegration of workers, based on the planned necessities of production and consumption. Integration to the system recaptures the isolated individuals as individuals isolated together: factories, culture halls, tourist resorts and housing developments are expressly organized in the light of this pseudo-community that follow the isolated individual right into the *familial cell*: the generalized use of mass-media with its spectacular message fills the isolation with the images of the ruling world: it is only through this isolation that these images acquire their full power.

*

New architecture, traditionally developed to satisfy ruling classes, is for the first time destined to the *poor*. The mass character of housing—character prefigured in its destination and modern conditions of construction—is the source of the formal misery and huge extension of this new architectural experiment. At the core of modern construction is the *authoritarian decision* to abstractly manage the territory into territory of abstraction. Whenever the industrialization of industrially backwards countries begins, the same architecture appears, as the fitting terrain for the new kind of social existence being implanted. Both the increasing material power of society and the delay in the conscious domination of this power are displayed in urbanism, as clearly as they are in matters of thermonuclear weaponry or birth control (where the possibility of manipulating heredity is already in view).

*

The present is already the time of self-destruction for the urban

milieu. The explosion of cities over the countryside—countryside increasingly covered with the “shapeless masses of urban residue” (L. Mumford)—is directly ruled by the imperatives of consumption. The dictatorship of the automobile as prototype of the first phase of mercantile affluence—impressed the terrain with the domination of the highway, a highway which dislocated old urban centers and made for an ever-widening dispersal. At the same time, unfinished reorganizations of the urban fabric polarize themselves temporarily around the “distribution factories” that are supermarkets. These temples of precipitated consumption, having brought about a partial recomposition of the agglomeration, are themselves caught in the centrifugal movement that discards them as soon as they in turn become overloaded secondary centers. But the technical organization of consumption only stands in the foreground of the general dissolution that has led the city to *consume itself*.

*

Economic history, developed entirely around the antagonism between town and country, has achieved the kind of success that cancels out both terms. The actual *paralysis* of the total historical development for the benefit of the independent movement of the economy is such that as city and country begin to disappear, we witness not the supersession of their separation but their simultaneous collapse. The reciprocal exhaustion of city and country—product of the failure of the historical movement through which the existing urban reality should be surpassed—appears in the eclectic mixture of their decayed elements covering the most industrially advanced areas.

*

Universal history, born in the city, reached maturity when the city became victorious over the country. Marx considers one of the greatest revolutionary merits of the bourgeoisie to be the “subjection of the country to the city,” whose very *air emancipates*. But if the history of the city is the history of freedom, it is also the history of tyranny, and of state power which rules over both city and country. The city has only been able to be, so far, the battleground for historical freedom, not its possession. The city is the *center of history* because it is at once concentration of social power, which makes possible the historical task, and consciousness of the past. The actual trend towards the destruction of the city is only another expression of the delay in subordinating the economy to historical consciousness, to bring about a unification of society as it re-assumes the powers that have become detached from it.

*

“The countryside shows the exact opposite, isolation and separation” (*German Ideology*). As it destroys the city, urbanism recreates a pseudo-countryside in which are lost both the natural relationships of the old countryside and the direct and directly questioned social relationships of the historical city. A pseudo-peasantry is being created by the housing

conditions and the spectacular control of space through territorial management. Two elements—dispersal in space and stubbornness—that kept the peasantry from undertaking independent action and affirm itself as a creative historical force, have now become the characterization of the producers—the movement of a world they create themselves remains as much beyond their reach as the natural rhythm of work was in the agrarian society. But when the peasantry—which was the unshakable foundation of “oriental despotism,” and whose disintegration summoned bureaucratic centralization—re-emerges as a product of the conditions of the increasing bureaucratization of the modern state, its *apathy* has to be *historically fabricated* and maintained; natural ignorance has been replaced by the organized spectacle of error. The “new cities” of the technological pseudo-peasantry show clearly their break with the historical time on which they are built. Their motto could be: “Nothing will ever happen here, and nothing *ever has*.” Because history, which has to be delivered in the cities has not—up to now—been delivered, the force of *historical absence* begins to compose its own exclusive landscape.

*

As it threatens this twilight world, history is also the force that can subject space to living experience. The proletarian revolution is the *very critique of human geography* through which individuals and communities are forced to build places and events directly related to the appropriation, not just of their work, but of their total history. In this moving space of play and freely chosen variations in the rules of the game, the autonomy of places can be rediscovered without reintroducing an exclusive attachment to the soil, and through that discovery can be recaptured the reality of journeying, as well as the reality of life seen as a journey which contains in itself its whole meaning.

*

The greatest revolutionary idea concerning urbanism is neither urbanistic, technological, nor esthetic. It is the decision to rebuild the entire territory according to the needs of the power of the workers councils, of the *anti-state dictatorship* of the proletariat, of executory dialogue. And the councils' power, which can only be effective if it transforms existing conditions in their entirety, cannot settle for less a task if it wants to be recognized and recognize itself in its world.

Guy Debord

From paragraphs 165 through 179 of our comrade's book, *La Société du Spectacle*, published by Buchet-Chastel, 1967.

AND POPULATION CONTROL

If you are under 35 . . . chances are good that before you die humans will be:

Preselecting the sex of their children as easily as they pick the color of a new car.

Regenerating defective or damaged organs.

Implanting preselected embryos into wombs, or using preserved sperm and egg cells from superior individuals, long after death, to create life.

Living 90 or 100 years with the vigor and alertness that most of us now lose by age 60.

Reprogramming cells with biochemical bits or new genetic information to combat inherited diseases like hemophilia and even to acquire new traits, such as improved intelligence.

Or lose old traits, judged undesirable by the established powers:

Injecting, erasing and changing memory, like editing a tape recording; controlling behavior, either through genetic manipulation or through electrodes implanted painlessly in the brain.

Changing sex at will.

Shall we continue?

Your children will probably face

even more awesome possibilities. They may reproduce exact likenesses of themselves, multiplying asexually, like plants. They may postpone death indefinitely, and live with hearts, lungs, kidneys—even brains—made of plastic or metal or taken from animals. Further, they may see life itself created in the laboratory. . . .

By tinkering with the fundamental molecular events associated with heredity and development, geneticists hold out the prospect of correcting almost any unwanted human condition—cancer, birth defects, diabetes, hemophilia, aging.

This is also work in the extension of control by way of chemical (and electrical) means that can be administered at any sign of the absence of *adjustment* to the established conditions of survival.

They speak of imparting superior intelligence to all, of preserving desirable traits perpetually, of turning the chemical units of heredity, called genes, on and off at will.

The author goes on to cite the possible use of virus infections, surgical implantations, and “untangling the mystery of the central nervous system:”

Vernon H. Mark and William H. Sweet of Harvard and Jose Delgado of Yale have been experimenting with the control of behavior, pain and other phenomena by implanting electrodes in the brain and delivering electrical messages to the appropriate area.

Having sketched out this biochemical utopia, the author goes on to say:

Who is to take the responsibility? Can governments, so sluggish in reacting to the social problems of hunger and poverty, be expected to take the necessary steps to avert biological disaster 30 years hence? . . . The nagging concern of many geneticists is reflected by Rollin Hotchkiss: "The total genetic composition of the human race is a public property in which we all share. The simple rules of the baseball field and the market place are not quite enough to judge these complex issues." (From an article by Robert Reinhold, *New York Times*, 1/6/69).

The last comments have a quieting effect, coming after a description of a humanity controlled from the biochemical laboratory, because it shows that Reinhold (and Hotchkiss and other geneticists who are *nagged*) is aware and concerned about these "complex issues." The matter is really not of deciding who is to take responsibility since all responsibility has already been appropriated by the ruling strata whose *right* to that responsibility is not put in question.

An inhuman science is a contradiction in terms. But the development of this inhuman science is an excres-

cence of the established order which is subject to the "simple" rules of the market place.

Manipulation of heredity is not for improvement of the species but for control over it. In this context the concern of the biologist over *improvement* is of no importance, except as it creates privileged moral dilemmas for him and others of his specialization, while effectively pursuing their research.

Population control is important to the ruling strata—bourgeois or bureaucratic—which has no need for an expanding labor force. Note that if the absolute numbers in the labor force expand each year, its relative numbers decrease. Aside from work speed-up, under which workers belabor, the increasing division of labor has already lent itself to the mechanical *regrouping of tasks* in a machine. Few of the "experts" deny the world can hold two, three times its present population. The fear is not over feeding—although the malthusian syndrome manifests itself—but over the *disintegrating effects of a population increase on the established way of life, which excludes from life a majority of the population already in existence.*

"India has launched a powerful consumer marketing campaign to sell 600 million contraceptives for men each year at less than one cent" (10/10/68). "I think the time has come when as a nation we must adopt a firm population policy and goal. I would like to hope that zero population growth would be the ultimate policy and a limit of 250 million people the goal (for the United States)" (11/15/68). "The Ford

Foundation announced yesterday grants totaling \$10-million for family planning programs in slum areas and for research in reproduction and contraception" (12/30/68). And, a few days later, "The contraceptives of the next generation may include a mini-dose pill taken once a day every day, a 'time capsule' that can provide contraceptive protection for perhaps as long as 20 years, a pill or injection that will last one to six months, a 'morning after'—or retroactive—pill, and a vaccine to immunize men or women against sperm or to block sperm or egg production."

"For the first time in its 52 years as a national voluntary birth-control agency, Planned Parenthood-World Population yesterday approved unan- imously a policy recognizing abortion and sterilization as proper medical procedures. . . . It called voluntary sterilization of either man or woman a medically accepted means of per- manent conception control" (11/14/- 68). Source: *New York Times*.

The chemical (and mechanical) contraceptives variously produce can- cer, blood clots, blindness, heart dis- ease, insanity, reduced sex-drive, kidney and pelvic infections, and fat, leading to various ways of dying. They have—as a weakening of the organism will have—immediate de- bilitating effects on desire, aside from the long range genetic effects *which are expected*, and expected to be *devolutive*.

It is perhaps not necessary to in- quire at this point why natural contra- ceptives are not under consideration. That this situation exists is not the result of a "plan" or "conspiracy" but simply that in the present context what is sought is the destruction of excess population (where excess, be-

fore being a specific quantity, is a quality: all those who are not neces- sary to produce wealth for the ruling strata). Most generals do not plan or conspire to kill men; they kill as a consequence of the practice of their existence.

The "reproductive capacity" is also attacked by other means. The en- forced passivity of television (over three hours per person per day) effectively, to now, checks the aggres- sion which must be at least as great as the passivity which contains it. Central here is that excessive tension locks out pleasure: it functions effec- tively as an impediment to sexual expression. "Dr. Ott . . . performed experiments which led him to believe that radiation (from television) in amounts far smaller than what is considered dangerous by present standards, can affect glandular de- velopment, is dangerous to children and adults and disastrous to infants. . . . Ott's experiments indicate that radiation from TV screens may be entering the pituitary gland at the base of the brain, through the eyes, caus- ing an excessive secretion into the endocrine glandular system which controls hormones, the chemistry of the body, and generally, the future of the race" (*Prevention—the maga- zine for better health*, Feb., 1968). "The problem of excessive radiation is not limited to the sets of one manu- facturer" (Public Health Service, February 1, 1968).

The sexual revolution tends to de- sexualize. A reaction to the TV screen, the show of life, it in no way escapes it. The excessive *agitation* which in- forms this "revolution" passes for looseness, ground for pleasure. But we really witness the triumphant col- onization of erogenous zones. Orgasms

may be produced at an increasing rate but only to be consumed immediately in the tension which passes into pathological rigidity, a *general desensitization*. Accordingly, the side-show moves center stage, and the freaks necessarily point the way: penis plaster-casters, amyl nitrate snorted as you come, screw at the drop of a name, for any reason, and the first is

to have no reason. Copulation is diversion, a mobile passivity. All but pleasure is here, and the participants grow jaded.

*

All exits are closed but one; passions find the possibility of unfettered development only in the proletarian project. Don't change your verbiage, change life.

THE PRACTICE OF THEORY

The Situationist International

The universally dominant social system, which tends toward totalitarian self-regulation, is far from having found the definitive answer to the incessant revolutionary crises of the historical epoch which began two centuries ago. A new critical phase has opened. But the system is also being resisted by false forms of opposition which remain trapped on the territory of the system itself—a system which these illusions can thus only serve to reinforce.

The situationists consider that the indivisible perspective of the *opposition* is the effective abolition of class society, commodity production, and wage-labor; the direct fusion of theory and practice in activity which excludes the possibility of all petrification into ideologies (mystifications).

The factors put in question by this historical problem are the rapid extension and modernization of the fundamental contradictions within the existing system; between the system and human desires. The social force which has an interest in—and is alone capable of—resolving these, is made of those who are powerless over the employment of their own lives and know it, helpless to control the fan-

tastic accumulation of material possibilities which they produce. Such a possible resolution has already been sketched out in the model of the democratic workers council. The movement required from the proletariat for it to form itself into a class, unmediated by any leadership, is the sum of the intelligence of a world without intelligence. The situationists declare that outside the whole of this movement they have no interest. Faced with the struggles which are beginning in various countries and over various elements, the situationists see their task as that of putting forward the whole of the problem, its coherence, its theoretical and therefore practical unity.

*

The S.I., being aware of the crisis of both mass parties and of “elites,” must embody the supersession of both the Bolshevik C.C. (supersession of the mass party) and of the Nietzschean project (supersession of the intelligentsia).

Whenever any power has set itself up to direct revolutionary will, it has a priori undermined the power of the revolution. The Bolshevik Central Committee was defined as at once concentration and representation. Concentration of a power antago-

nistic to bourgeois power and representation of the will of the masses. This double characteristic determined that it rapidly became no more than an empty power, a power of empty representation, and that it soon rejoined in a common form (bureaucracy) bourgeois power, forced to follow a similar evolution.

The intelligentsia is power's hall of mirrors. Opposing power, it never offers more than cathartic identifications playing on the passivity of those whose every act reveals real dissidence. We are capable of precipitating its crisis, but only by entering the intelligentsia as a power (against the intelligentsia).

Since the only purpose of a revolutionary organization* is the abolition of all existing classes in a way that does not bring about a new division of society, we consider an organization revolutionary which purposefully pursues the international realization of the absolute power of the workers councils. That power has been outlined in the experience of the proletarian revolutions of this century—Russia 1905, Kronstadt 1921, Asturias 1934, Spanish revolution 1936. It is power without mediators.

Such an organization makes a unitary critique of the world, or is nothing. By unitary critique is understood a total critique of all geographic areas where various forms of separate socio-economic powers exist, as well as a critique of all aspects of life.

* Minimum Definition of Revolutionary Organizations, adopted at the 7th Conference of the S.I. in July 1966 and reissued by the Comité Enragés-Internationale Situationniste during May 1968. In June, it was translated and distributed here by the S.I. and the Council for the Liberation of Daily Life.

Such an organization sees the beginning and end of its own program in the complete decolonization, the complete liberation of daily life. It aims not at the self-management by the masses of the *existing world* but at its uninterrupted transformation.

Such an organization embodies the radical critique of political economy, the transcendence of commodity and wage-labor. It refuses to reproduce within itself any of the hierarchical conditions prevailing in the world that dominates us. The only limit to participating in its total democracy is that each member recognize and appropriate for himself the *coherence of its critique*. The coherence has to be both in the critical theory and in the relationship between the theory and practical activity. The aim is theoretico-practice. A revolutionary organization radically criticizes every ideology as *separate power* of ideas and as *ideas of separate power*. It is at the same time the negation of any leftovers from religion and of the prevailing social spectacle which, from news-media to mass culture, monopolizes communication between men around their unilateral reception of the images of their alienated activity. The organization dissolves any "revolutionary ideology" by revealing it to be the sign of the failure of the revolutionary project, as the private property of new specialists of power, as the imposture of a new *representation* which erects itself above the real proletarianized life.

The category of totality, of the global critique, is the last judgement of the revolutionary organization, so the organization is, in the end, a critique of politics: it must aim explicitly through its victory at the dissolution of itself as a separate organization.

S.I. ADDRESSES

U.S.A.

Situationist International
P. O. Box 491
Cooper Station
New York, N. Y. 10003

DENMARK

Situationistisk Internationale
Postboks 106, 8900
Randers

FRANCE

Internationale Situationniste
B. P. 307-03
Paris

ITALY

Internazionale Situazionista
C. P. 1532
Milan

Situationist Distribution

An S.I. post office box was opened in New York in April 1967. Several situationist texts have since been distributed extensively.

Well over 10,000 copies of the translation of *De La Misère En Milieu Etudiant* (booklet from the scandal at the University of Strasbourg, 1966) have been distributed in the United States and Canada. Known under the title of *Ten Days That Shook the University* up to now, it has been republished by the S.I. as *On the Poverty of Student Life*.

The entire text was reprinted in several issues of the *Berkeley Barb* which at another time published certain situationist comics on its cover. (While publishing *Ten Days*, the *Barb* serialized an article by that subleninist star, Régis Debray. This world tries to bring the most radical gestures under its wing: the avant-

garde of its subculture serves to make it appear that the S.I. competes with, and is thereby equal to, Régis Debray who equals the Panthers who equal the Peace and Freedom Party which equals the Yippies who equal the Sexual Freedom League which equals the ads in the back which equal the price on the cover. The *Barb*, the *Rat*, *Good Times*, and so on—it makes no difference. Same old show, new markets.) The March 28, 1968 issue of the *Helix*, a Seattle underground paper, reprinted *Ten Days* with comics and an original situationist text on the student revolts in Italy, Germany and Poland.

Extracts from the Strasbourg text appeared during the student disturbances at Roosevelt University in Chicago during the spring of 1968. The new monthly, *Black and Red*, from Kalamazoo, Michigan, has reprinted the text in serial. The Radical Action Cooperative printed an edition of a thousand *Ten Days* for distribution during this spring's show at Harvard. Recently, the "eye makers" (in New York) have issued an attractive edition of the text under the title, *Once upon a time the universities were respected*; in their introduction they capture the spirit many have missed: "The purple Left in America has called the pamphlet 'a belly laugh.' We agree. But we think that's what's needed. And more . . . a belly dance. In Marx's words, 'hic Rhodus, hic Salta.'" In the text, they have substituted the word *coopt* for the word *recuperate*; and on the last page—in what is perhaps a proofreader's error—they have used the word *centrism* in the phrase which in the original reads: "The enemy is entrism, cultural or political."

Following its initial publication in France, the Strasbourg text has been published in at least nine other countries.

In 1966, Raoul Vaneigem's text "Banalités de Base," which originally appeared in *Internationale Situationniste* numbers 7 and 8, was translated and published in England as *The Totality for Kids*. In late 1967 an edition of one thousand was printed in New York. By late 1968 that edition was out of print; the booklet was reprinted in February 1969.

Limited editions—which are no longer available—of the following S.I. translations have also been published in the United States: "Root Structures of Reification," "Geopolitics of Hybernation," "The Decline and Fall of the Spectacular Commodity Economy," and "Perspectives for the Conscious Modification of Daily Life."

In November 1968 we issued two thousand copies of the "Pogo" comics, "Address to New York City Public School Students." Liberation News Service reprinted this in one of its packets, calling it the first decent work on the New York teachers' strike; however, they failed to include the S.I. mailing address. The *Rat* reprinted it, and there, true to form, all mention of the situationist origins of the comics disappeared.

As a contribution to an understanding of the spectacle of electoral politics, the wall poster, "Post Mortem Ante Facto," was issued at the time of the pseudo-event of Nixon's inauguration.

5,000 copies have been printed of *Situationist International* #1.

The American Adventures of Two Books

Two books of situationist theory were published in France in late 1967: Guy Debord's *La Société du Spectacle* (Buchet/Chastel) and

Raoul Vaneigem's *Traité de Savoir Vivre à l'Usage des Jeunes Générations* (Gallimard). A translation of a chapter of Vaneigem's book appeared over a year ago in *King Mob Echo*, a British publication, and we have translated the chapter of Debord's book which appears earlier on these pages. So far this is all that is available in English except for a few quotations from Debord in the Cohn-Bendit brothers' *Obsolete Communism: the Leftwing Alternative*.

There was, however, a review of these books that appeared in the April 21, 1968 *New York Times* Book Review section. The *Times* has a reputation for appearing to cover the events that shape history while other dailies content themselves with comics, syndicated columns and open censorship. When one happens to know a given event directly, it becomes obvious that the *Times*, too, is sucking its "information" out of its thumb, and that the distinction between it and the others is purely one of image and role.

Marc Slonim's review has a singular beginning:

Those who want to understand the ideas lying behind the student revolts in the Old World ought to pay serious attention not only to the writings of Adorno and of the three M's—Marx, Mao and Marcuse—but above all to the literature of the Situationists. This is the name assumed by one of the leading groups in the European youth movement. They claim to have a clear vision of present-day conditions or, in existentialist terms, of the "situation," and are determined to react against it.

So it is *ideas* that are behind student revolts, at least those in the Old

World. And there, in the Old World and more particularly "in the European youth movement," one will find the situationists. Also, it helps to understand something "in existentialist terms."

Debord's book, divided into 221 aphoristic paragraphs, uses Marxian terminology and economic analysis, but rejects the idea of a proletarian revolution in the same way as it repudiates Socialist democracy, Russian or Chinese Communism, and traditional "incoherent anarchism."

Apparently paraphrasing Debord: The true aim of man is "to be," but society has replaced it by "to produce," "to have," and "to possess." And further: Actually men should have equal rights to all earthly blessings and pleasures, to exist in joy and freely express all their potentialities. But to reach such a situation, one has to destroy all authority, especially that of the state, to negate all moral restrictions, to expose fossilized knowledge and all "establishments," to bring truth into the world of semblance, and to achieve what Debord calls "the fulfillment of democracy in self-control and action." Which sets us up nicely for the finale: He fails to say how to achieve this program, but when Piergiorgio Bellocchio and Grazia Cerchi, editors of the Situationist Piacenza periodical, shouted in the main auditorium of Rome University, "No to war, yes to guerrillas," the students rose and applauded for a quarter of an hour.

One wonders if Bellocchio and Cerchi misspell in their shouting . . . but it does not matter. As it does not matter that in the real world Bel-

locchio and Cerchi were not and are not situationists, nor that the "Piacenza periodical" was not and is not a publication of situationists—here we are getting close to the truth of the *Times* which is the truth of the spectacle. Slonim's piece refers throughout to one "Raouï Veinegem," and accidental as this mistake may be it gives away the heart of the matter: this is not the story of real situationists in the real world, rather it is the *fiction* of the parallel world of the spectacle where characters and situations approximate their real counterparts and masquerade as them in order to rob them of their essence. So the *Times* gives an unwitting affirmation of Debord's description (which naturally bears no *resemblance* to Slonim's description of it). And we have turned around and robbed the thieves.

Vaneigem, in particular seems to rattle the literary agents of capital: when he is quoted in the translation of the Cohn-Bendit book, it is one "Raoul Vaneigheim" who receives the credit.

Publishing houses, as a lot, are another active agent of the shadow world, and to date they have shown no eagerness to furnish English-speaking readers with copies of these books.

Council for the Liberation of Daily Life

The Council came into existence in the fall of 1967. At that time it published *Hall of Mirrors*, a collection of three texts on the poverty of daily life and the urban insurrections of the previous summer, which was distributed with the situationist text, "The Decline and Fall of the Spectacular Commodity Economy."

The winter was spent in the preparation of Robert Chasse's booklet, *The Power of Negative Thinking—or—Robin Hood Rides Again*, which was published in April 1968 (the S.I. will continue its distribution). During May and June the Council worked closely with the S.I. in relation to the events in France. In September the Council published the leaflet, "The Newest School Buildings are Indistinguishable from the Newest Prisons or the Newest Industrial Complexes" (abbreviated versions were published in the British publications, *Anarchy* and *Solidarity*); a "Reply to Murray Bookchin Concerning His Theories on the Recent French 'Revolution'" (in a section devoted to the S.I., the British publication, *Hapt* reprinted this and panels from the situationist comics referred to below); and "An Open Letter to Radical Action Co-operative, Students for a Democratic Society, Students, Faculty, Others Engaged by University Life." These, eventually, were also mailed out with the comics, "The Great Late Show of Opposition," and a cover letter (December 1968) announcing that after a year's existence as a separate organization, the Council considered its practice and theory corresponding to those of the Situationist International, and accordingly dissolved.

Our Game in May

Those who are acquainted with situationist thought found many of the aphorisms that covered Parisian walls last May familiar, even though the press, large and small, was not about to talk of the origin (or the source of inspiration), reception or spread of these graffiti. And so it has been that during the past year many of the inquiries coming to us have

concerned the nature of the participation of the S.I. in the May celebrations and the availability of an analysis of those events. In early June 1968 situationists in New York (with the Council for the Liberation of Daily Life) released "The Enraged in France," a skeletal account of the events leading to the occupation of the Sorbonne, with commentary on the general movement following. This was issued along with the "Minimum Definition," and a translation of the "Address to All Workers," signed by the Comité Enragés-I.S. and the Conseil pour le Maintien des Occupations.

Despite the glut of verbiage hawked thusfar, the true history of those days has yet to appear in English; however, that will soon be remedied if Grove Press publishes a translation of our comrade René Viénet's *Enragés et situationnistes dans le mouvement des occupations*. This profusely illustrated book, published last October by Gallimard, has been described (in *Bulletin* #17 of the Centre internationale de recherches sur l'anarchisme) as "the most wicked and the most beautiful" of all the books to appear on the May events. (Several of the 'documents' that comprise the final hundred pages of Viénet's book have been published in Italian and Portuguese in a book of situationist texts, *l'estremismo coerente dei situazionisti—o extremismo coerente dos situacionistas* (Ed. 912, Milan, Italy). Other texts and photographs from the book were published this March as a special supplement to *Situationistisk Revolution* #2, in Denmark.) Its translation and publication here will counter the thousands of pages of ideological "analysis" spewing out of the "left" and will also give the lie to the passing slanders in a piece of purely

commercial shit like *Red Flag*, *Black Flag*.

May-June

The scandal at the University of Strasbourg in late 1966 (out of which came the booklet *Ten Days*) can be seen as the prelude on the road to the barricades of May. The significance of that little event was the proof in practice of the fragility of the established system in the hands of those conscious of exactly what they wanted and of what stood in their way.

At Nantes, the assault on UNEF—the student union—à la Strasbourg was repeated in November 1967; in February the university was occupied (in the end 1500 students occupied the city court house).

At Nanterre, a campus closely resembling—in its lifeless bureaucratic modernity—the large state universities in America, a small group of enragés emerged to combat the police presence on the campus. The liberal university reacted there as it does here: more police. The enragés, in theoretical accord with the S.I., proceeded with class disruptions. The whole “left” scene was active, and the university buildings were occupied in February. Following the arrest of six “anti-imperialist militants” in Paris, an assembly was called at Nanterre. In the name of the enragés, René Riesel demanded that two observers for the administration and all

The agitation at Nanterre con-Refused this *minimum*, the enragés walked out. Thus the March 22nd Movement was born, a collection of anarchists of all shades, Trots, Maoists, and so on and so on—without the enragés, and *in opposition to them*. The Stalinists present be turned out.

tinued from all corners, as did the repression. An enragé was expelled from all French universities for five years without so much as a grunt from March 22nd; but when six of the “leading militants”—including Riesel and Cohn-Bendit—faced expulsion, March 22nd and UNEF called the protest rally in the Sorbonne courtyard for May 3rd.

Then, between May 3rd and 9th, a lock-out of the Sorbonne is decided by Roche (administrator); four students are condemned to 2 months prison; a strike is called to protest both the arrests and the closing of the Sorbonne; on the 6th, violent demonstrations extend into the night, 422 are arrested; the following day demonstrations spread to the provinces; the Sorbonne is declared opened and then closed again; Nanterre is open. May 10th is the night of the barricades. Paving-stones and Molotov cocktails against gas, clubs and concussion grenades. 367 wounded; 460 detained. 188 cars damaged. On the 11th, the trade unions, under pressure from the workers, call for a one day general strike, to protest police violence and support the students. By the 13th, the Sorbonne is occupied by the students. By the 15th, the workers have occupied Renault and the occupation movement spreads, as they say, like wild fire . . .

In the first general assembly of the occupied Sorbonne, Riesel put forward the demands that were implicit in the direct democracy practiced there, and he was elected to the Occupation Committee. This body of fifteen revocable delegates was charged with the organization and maintenance of the occupation, but almost from its formation, it found its work hamstrung by the likes of UNEF bureaucrats and their darling special-

ists. On the 16th, in view of the accelerating movement of factory occupations, the Occupation Committee of the Sorbonne called for "the immediate occupation of all factories in France and for the formation of workers councils." This scandalized—and united—all the petty bureaucrats and leftish mini-chiefs and, through their manipulations, led to the recall of the Occupation Committee on the 17th. The ex-committee announced that as democracy had been manacled once more by specialists of power and as the Sorbonne had effectively separated itself from the workers, the interests of the ex-committee members were no longer there—and they left.

Salaried work stopped, and on the initiative of the workers themselves. By the 20th, the movement encompassed 6 million workers; in the days to follow the figure rose to 10 million. The unions, the bureaucratic mentality of which recognizes quantity alone, finally saw the fragility of their own possession of the "labor movement" and mobilized to meet the challenge. By their announcements, the occupations were made 'official' but *separated*. The bureaucratic representatives of each factory or segment of industry raised specific demands (wage increases, and so on) and cited these demands as the bases for the different occupations. Only the unions (and particularly the Stalinist CGT) could put over such a con, because—unlike the State and the bourgeoisie—their handymen and louts were already among the workers. Above all it was necessary to keep the workers separated from one another and from others who found themselves proletarians in the situation. Hence the locking of the factory gates and the use of union functionaries as pickets (guards).

Then the reeducation—the reduction—of the workers could begin.

On May 17th a Council for the Maintenance of Occupations (CMDO) was formed by the ex-Occupation Committee of the Sorbonne and others, calling for the extension of the occupations into the direct democracy of the councils. By May 30th, it issued an "Address to All Workers," saying, in part: "The present movement was not 'politicized' by going beyond the miserable trade-union demands about salaries and retirement, abusively presented as 'social questions.' The movement is already beyond *politics*: it poses the *social question* in all its simplicity . . . As of now, with the power they hold, and with the parties and trade-unions we all know already, the workers have no other way than the direct take-over of the economy and of all aspects of the reconstruction of social life by basic unitary committees, affirming their autonomy vis-a-vis every politico-syndical leadership, and assuring their self-defense by federating regionally and nationally. Following this pattern they will become the only real power in the country, the power of the councils of workers . . ."

The CMDO put into practice the quality of this direct democracy with a guarantee of equal participation to all in debate, decision and execution. Encompassing about forty workers, students, lycéens (high school students), enraged and situationists, it functioned as an uninterrupted general assembly. Cohesion, born in the situation, was reinforced by general accord on the principle theses of the S.I. During its existence of less than a month, the CMDO published a number of texts, always articulating what was actually transpiring and what were the minimum steps neces-

sary for advancing the situation into the realm of daily life transformed. CMDO, not a council, but functioning to foster the development of councils, dissolved with the effective end of the occupations.

Viénet's book, which documents and illustrates what has only been summarily sketched here, is historically "objective" and theoretically incisive, without being "detached"—that schizoid state engendered by the spectacular commodity that Cohn-Bendit, for one, mistakes for a natural. Football players, young doctors, ex-mercenaries, elementary school children—all were in some way aware of the antagonism between their roles and their lives, and all moved to resolve it.

But if the events revealed the abandonment of the two organizations (trade-unions and mass party) that appropriated the struggle of the proletariat in the preceding century, they also revealed the left-overs of the idea that "leaders" such as they had are somehow necessary to advance the movement into the proletarian project. There was talk, suggestions, incipient movements toward self-management, sketches of things to come. The councils did not emerge. What occurred was the anticlimactic and reticent movement back to work, the elections, and the selected repressions.

The possibilities announced in France, naturally, will emerge again—and not only in France.

Some of the Graffiti

In the decor of the show, the eye meets only things and their prices.

And meanwhile, everybody wants to breathe and nobody can and many say, "we will breathe later." And

most of them don't die because they are already dead.

Man is neither the good savage according to Rousseau, nor the pervert according to the Church. He is violent when he oppressed, he is gentle when he is free.

It's not man, it's the world which is abnormal (Artaud).

No replastering, the structure is rotten.

Masochism today takes the form of reformism.

Reform my ass.

Reservations imposed on pleasure excite the pleasure of living without reservations.

When the last sociologist is hanged with the guts of the last bureaucrat, will we still have problems?

Be cruel.

Rape your Alma Mater.

Forget everything you've been taught. Start by dream.

Down with the toad of Nazareth.

The most beautiful sculpture is a paving-stone thrown at a cop's head.

Under the paving-stones, it's the beach.

Art is an academic headache.

The trade unions are whorehouses.

It is painful to submit to our bosses, it is even more stupid to choose them.

Let's not change bosses. Let's change life.

Don't liberate me, I'll take care of that.

We'll ask nothing; we'll take, occupy.

Millionaires of all countries unite, the wind is turning.

No freedom for the enemies of freedom.

Put a cop in your tank.

I love you!! Oh, say it with paving-stones!!!

Chance must be systematically explored.

Action must not be a reaction, but a creation.

We will have a good master as soon as everybody is his own.

Revolution ceases to be as soon as it is necessary to be sacrificed to it.

Embrace your love without dropping your guard.

Freedom is the crime that contains all crimes. It is our absolute weapon.

All power to the workers councils (an *enragé*).

All power to the councils of the enraged (a worker).

Cohn-Bendit as Representation

Daniel Cohn-Bendit, an *Internationale Situationniste* reader, famous for being undesirable to the Gaullist regime, has written a book in collaboration with his brother, entitled: *Obsolete Communism: the Leftwing Alternative*. It has been widely hailed as the best piece dealing with the May-June events yet published in English. It is true that brother Daniel has his moments of intelligence, but this is necessarily in contrast to the bureaucratic pigs in whose company he always appears. It is a good showman who always appears livelier, wittier, smarter and more daring than his competitor-associates. But the intelligence of the showman is the stupidity of the revolutionary.

Dany Cohn-Bendit set in motion the mechanism whereby he is a spectacular "youth culture" hero, and he maintains it. Whether this is conscious or unconscious on his part only renders it either sinister or tragicomic. In the June 1969 *eye* magazine (the Hearst hip culture rag, format à la *Paris Match*, and aimed exclusively at the prepubescent), our Dany the "Red," "Europe's Rebel King," and

"a red-haired hero of last spring's Paris Revolution, tells about an international organization of rebel students, how the universities ought to be restructured (S.I. note: their word), why Communism is dead, and what students will be up to next fall."

It is in light of this—and the hundreds of photos in the color weeklies, and Geismar, and Sauvageot and the JCR creeps—that Cohn-Bendit's "serious" work must be understood. His presentation of the story of the Makhnovitchina and the Kronstadt Soviet, his oddly chosen quotes from Vaneigem and Debord—these are hardly in the service of social change, when everything he touches turns technicolor.

In the introduction to his book, he finds his spectacular role "strange." It is the comment which is strange. He then tells us that his book is not a historical treatise "because the events are too recent for anyone to reconstruct them objectively." Further: "Nor does this book pretend to give a simplified theoretical account of the events. Having participated in them and observed them at close quarters, I am unable to stand aside and take a detached view of the overall situation." He still believes that the knowledge of history must be separated in time for its making and that theory is necessarily "detached" from its adequate practice. He reassembles himself to the sociologists he also criticizes.

If, as he says, the March 22nd Movement was "the result of arduous research into revolutionary theory and practice," then the "researchers" (himself among them) must be judged incompetent. He spends the last half of his book amassing the proofs against the Leninists, demonstrating their continued attempt to appropriate the power of the prole-

tariat; but he defends his own practice—which was to be open to the would be heirs of Lenin and Trotsky as well as to all those who would have nothing more (or less) than the power over their own lives. He refinds the core—and failure—of anarchism's historical practice and embraces it: in the apparent openness of March 22nd and of the action committees which Dany considers models for the future, could be found the self-proclaimed non-leaders, those invisible pilots at least hypothetically all the more powerful for lacking the appearance of power.

In contrast to the CMDO, many action committees maintained their existence beyond the passing of the situation which spawned them. Then, as in their effective existence, they were subject not only to the vanities of these invisible pilots, but also to recuperation by the "openly organized" specialists of power, more experienced and better equipped for sustained manipulation. The most recent conference of UNEF marked the integration of most surviving AC's into its structure.

The separations enforced by the spectacle, in that they are admitted at all, enter everything. Cohn-Bendit, another of those ideologists who 'only wants to make a revolution,' has a mass of correct perceptions (partial truths) which, by way of his ideology, are reintegrated into the show of confusion, where his material interests now lie. As long as the separation exists, the show rules.

Faithful Dissimulations

A general malaise grew around the May-June events even as they occurred. The inability of the comment to see what was clearly unfolding

before (and against them) is only countered by their hard work in masking it for everyone else. "Hard news" on the events was to be found in the United States only in the likes of the *New York Times* (with the "objectivity" we know), and those who were not reached by that fell prey to the lesser ideologists who spewed forth in a completely predictable manner:

The little parties of the left faithfully supported their French equivalents and when they had none, worked overtime in heaping shit on their favorite enemies: The Communist Party USA, as ever, followed the dictum about the biggest lie as it discovered and denounced the Gaullist agents led by Cohn-Bendit (who to the French CP—predictably—was a Trotskyist) and reported the glorious CGT bureaucrats leading the workers to victory under the Red Flag and the Tricolor; the Young Socialist Alliance/Socialist Workers' Party in support of the Jeunesse Communiste Revolutionnaire brand of Trotskyists against the Stalinist CGT bureaucracy (but *for* the union itself) and against the Federation Etudiante Revolutionnaire/Voix Ouvriere brand; the Workers League in support of FER/VO Trotskyists against . . . etc; the Marxist-Leninists of the Workers World/Youth Against War and Fascism family against the YSA/SWP/Workers League. And on to the maoists and every other cretin calling for this or that vanguard party.

The "underground press," with its low budget imitation of the movie magazines, provided "star" commentary from Jean-Jacques Lebel and Edgar Morin (the former an aging ex-surrealist media freak, the latter a pataphilosophic sociologist). And the *Village Voice* expressed the mentality of the "left liberal" as it attributed

the "revolution" in turn to Marcuse, Lefevre, and the ghost of L. D. Trotsky.

New Left Notes printed part of M. Bookchin's series, and *CAW!* #3 (the SDS literary magazine) buried the decent reportage of the *Solidarity* (England) pamphlet among the fragmented "analysis" of March 22nd members, the pleadings of the bureaucrat Barjonet, and the guest star appearance of Sartre and de Beauvoir. One gingerly but self-important step outside SDS, the Radical Action Cooperative performed its expected service in publishing an account of the "revolutionary" bureaucratic management of the city of Nantes in Brittany, complete with the insights of the Trotskyist trade unionist, Lambert.

Everyone got their licks in beating the French CP and its henchmen; it is cathartic, you know, as it helps conceal the effective stalinism practiced in the daily lives of the whole bunch.

Bad enough that we should be plagued with an American equivalent for every half-baked ideologist in France, the stars of the Columbia debacle engineered an International Conference in New York in late September 1968. Foreign ideologists (*the real thing*) were imported for the show; for the planners and invited participants, revolutionary internationalism was practically understood as a variation on the international commodity spectacle and not as its negation. In this soup, an incoherent anarchist and a JCR Trot were representative of the crumbs 'representing' the revolutionaries in France. Our comrade Tony Verlaan intervened in this ideological sideshow, exposing it for what it was. The comics, "The Great Late Show of Opposition," issued immediately thereafter, is the

adequate chronicle of this pseudo-event and its disruption.

The only piece on the May-June events that is worth reading is *Worker-Student Action Committees, France May '68* by Fredy Perlman and Roger Gregoire (published by *Black and Red*, P. O. Box 973, Kalamazoo, Michigan, 49005). This small book deals directly with the experience of the authors in the occupation of Censier and in the Citroën Action Committee, and their critical analysis of this experience. They meticulously describe the mechanism of spectacular fragmentation in the destruction of possibility in a real historical situation, and they apprehend very well the terrain of daily life as the base of independent class activity. But the spectacular mechanism catches them still: throughout, they use the March 22nd Movement as a model of comparison and thus contribute to myth. They transpose Cohn-Bendit's intuitive radicalism onto March 22nd (the leftist amalgam he has come to spectacularly personify) when that organization was the *containment* of that radical spirit. The translations from March 22nd's *Ce n'est qu'un début, continuons le combat* published in *CAW!* (as mentioned above) are sufficient illustration of that "Movement's" confident confusion.

The surrealists (hardly a factor here, but still a residue living off past glories in France), in their absolute separation from the events, saw, through some intellectual exercise, the realization of Fourier's cabalist principle in the competing ideologies in that parliamentary decomposition which was the March 22nd movement! Poor Fourier. Here again the nonsense of ideology passes into the ideology of nonsense in the hands of those who are *not serious*, and who are content to perfect play as a profit-

able specialization within the surface world of culture.

And even some who have advocated workers councils show, in response to real possibilities, that they missed the point altogether; that when they talked of councils they saw a crypto-bureaucratic form: a philosophical leninist like C. L. R. Jones, of "Facing Reality," described it over a decade ago: *Workers councils in every branch of national activity.*

Both Viénet's book and *Internationale Situationniste* #12 (this last soon to be published; copies available from us for one dollar each) expose in detail the role of the political and cultural recuperators during the actual struggle in France.

Epitaph to Bookchinism

The Council wrote its "Reply to Murray Bookchin Concerning his Theories of the Recent French 'Revolution'" in response to the last of Bookchin's series of articles appearing in the *Rat*. The editor of that New York paper rejected the reply on the grounds that it was over the heads of the readership, and that it lacked entertainment value. We were also told that some of the editor's old friends did not understand that the *Rat* just really wanted to make a buck.

The "Reply" was mimeographed (with a comment on its fate with the *Rat*), distributed by hand, and eventually sent out in the general mailing announcing the Council's dissolution and the plans for this magazine. Before the mailing, a copy was sent to Bookchin (and his ever loyal followers, Herber and Keller). He immediately contacted us, asking if we would either print an answer that he would write to the reply or consent

to his sending it out to the mailing list which would be receiving the "Reply." The answer, naturally, was no.

It was, according to him, our "democratic" responsibility to allow him to answer directly to those who had received the "Reply," but not apparently his democratic responsibility to see that our "Reply" find its way to those who had received his commentary. Failure to do so naturally signified that we were neither open nor democratic, thus attempting to place us in a position of helping him disseminate his ideology. The obvious duplicity—and attempted manipulation—behind this little charlatanism has found echo in subsequent developments.

It does not seem to have occurred at all to Bookchin that he could have printed the "Reply" and his answer in his own magazine *Anarchos*, which has since appeared; that nothing of any of this has been made *public by him*; that rather he has gone about spreading rumors from ear to ear about undemocratic practices which *we engage in*.

Bookchinism, peculiar American variety of anarcho-bolshevism, is comprised of three main theoretical fetishes: ecology, technology and false historicism (as Bookchin's Greek ecclesia of the future). Its effective practice is manipulative, in memory of Leninist humanism.

Having broken with Bookchin already in December 1967 over his spirited defense of sacrificial militants and mystics, we will only add that our concern is with individuals consciously engaged in the qualitative negation of class society (which, for Bookchin, does not exist, or if it exists, does not matter). From this base, real dialogue only takes place in the active process of demystification. To step

aside to banter with an ideologist who publicizes the fact (*Anarchos*, books, speeches, lectures, etc.) would be to give up all and re-enter the old world on its rules.

The Who's Who of the Ministars of the Minispectacle (selected listing)

Nothing would be more erroneous than the belief that those who become *something* instead of remaining *someone* have not fully merited this transformation (J. Weber).

Albert, Sue, see: *Reuben, Jerry*
Bookchin, Murray: Theoretical Smoke the Bear; laughs when tickled.

See also: *Epitaph to Bookchinism*.

Brown, H. Rap, see: *Carmichael, Stokely* plus more shouting.

Calvert, Greig: Ditch him as irrelevant.

Carmichael, Stokely: Originator of 'black power' confusion. Ministar press seeker, black parliamentary constituency builder. Presently residing with either (1) wife in house of mother-in-law, or (2) residing in \$75,000 house that he paid cash for (to survive). Cadre of tourism. Could be found organizing a black (Democratic?) voting bloc somewhere in D.C. vicinity. Recently switched preference from SNCC reformist decentralism to Panther centralist reformism; thereafter to slip from public eye and petty separatist squabbles to the relief of all but the ideologists.

Cleaver, Eldridge: Following Rob Williams, hopefully to Maoland. Refer also to *Reuben, Jerry* as his favorite son for vice-president.

Davidson, Carl: Minimal point theoretician. Swallows Baran-Sweezy. Moralizes on the *Guardian* toilet

paper and *New Left* rag on the psychological attitudes to take toward white workers. Is in limbo on the working class. Still argues the necessity of the vanguard party. Does not know content from cloak. Castro and Mandel got him evenly by the tail. Habitual loser.

Dellinger, Dave, see: *Reuben, Jerry* plus less shouting. Anarchist friend of Castro.

Garson, Marvin: Pacified along with the pacification of the Haight-Ashbury crowd.

Gordon, Jeff: Cop posing as a maoist priest or priest posing as a maoist cop.

Gottlieb, Bob: Grub in outmoded avant-garde costume; dirty collar intellectual, professional parasite and local minichief of manipulation. New theory: class society has disappeared, except for a surplus of alienation. His problem: write a new *Capital* without classes, labor, production, revolutionary agent and so on and so on. Technology fetishist.

Hayden, Tom: Ex-reform Democrat, now social democrat and boy scout. Professional manipulator of the little meetings of little student revolts of which he also likes to be the Chairman. Impudent name dropping pacifist in the war zone. Incapable constituency snatcher and co-director in the lamentable body count in the Chicago anti-war insane asylum. Parliamentarist, still voting, be it with his feet.

Hoffman, Abbey: Shrewdly left behind by his cabalist contemporaries Ginsberg and Leary, he still roams hippy hill turning over the garbage. An artistico-politico counselor of sorts, the Billy Graham of youthful zombies. He pragmatically tinkers with any political garbage available—Castro, Vietnam, McLuhan—

which an average intelligence would recognize to be the antithesis to the fun without work and money he says he dreams of. Has view of the transformation of life that equals the short change of the electric circus (which bills itself as "the ultimate legal entertainment experience"). With the decline of Julius Lester, activism, and pacifism, this *pacification agent* is up for sale to any chemistry lab. Gas mask required.

J.J.: Historically ridiculous; has no last name.

Klonsky, Mike: Pacifist highpriest and mini-inquisitor of monkey-business.

Marcus, Lynn: state and revolution fetishist.

Morea, Ben: Circular artist and Bakuninist Howdy Doody. Beyond his abuse of Reich, enjoys as a revolutionary feast the cyclic digestion of peanut butter sandwiches, hard-boiled eggs with an occasional carrot. Presently patriarch of the loose affinity group, the UAW/MF who, having shaped their proletarian conditions, will tribally redeem the proletariat. Spectacularly and vainly claiming the miserable streets for the people; beating the mafia to the monopoly on the light-shows and the acid supermarket. Main neuromaniacal stand: "Bourgeois art is dead but I love Pollock."

Ogelsby, Carl: Chief ideologist, creep defender of stalinism. Speech monopolist, pep talker and politico-geographical freak. Uncalled mediator between SDS regions of his creation, maintains a shabby shuttle service between anti-war corporate liberals and their student constituents. Issue strategist. Notably engineer of the great return to the so-called anti-racist struggle. Self-acclaimed poet of incoherence and confusion, seeks to contain the

possible proletarian feast to a Harvardish rock and roll party.

Reuben, Jerry: Obnoxious little guru to be. Originally a mindless faithful Castro freak. Pretends to lead the confused hoards beyond political alienation into the realm of religion. Poses as heroic camera guerrilla, eats off and is swallowed by the prevailing spectacle. Mystic mystifier and mythomaniac, struggles only on the level of appearances. Expedient maoist, is compatible with the ideology of tolerant confusion; can be found together with Abbey Hoffman, Sue Alpert, Dave Dellinger, SDS and Peace and Freedom Party.

Rudd, Mark: Historically ridiculous; see also: *J.J.*

Seale, Bobby: Administers breakfast in exchange for the Panther salute.

SDS telephone: Instrument to satisfy the narcissism of inflated junior executives.

Sinclair, John: Lysergic acid derivative; poetry racketeer; petty publisher; profiteer on diluted decibels; Founder of White Panther Party, dopey.

Selected Abbreviations:

BPL: Black Power Leeches

BPPSD: Breakfast Party Poopers for Self Defense (or Self-digestion)

CP: Capitalist Pimps; see also *derivatives*: PL, SS, YAWF, etc. . . .

FPP: Outright (see SS)

LID: Lid

MF or mfr: Media freak

PF: Poor Fools Party

PL: Political Leech

SDS: Sons of Democratic Satraps or Social Democratic Spit

SG or sgdd: Socialist granddaddy

SR: Socialist rabies (or rabbis)

SS: Stalinist Scum

TF or tfr: Technology freak

UAW/MF: Unsightly Atavistic Worms/see MF

Wlg: Women's Liberation grunts
YAWF: yawf or yuk

M A N

*If you smash the educational system
that bores you, that's what they'll
call you the rest of your life.*

Opposition Falsified

The opposition that confronts American universities at this point must be seen as a reply to the general social dissolution *and* as a reflection of adjustment to changes forced by the bureaucratization process. On the elemental level students revolt against the intellectual sterility of the university, against its bureaucratic pettiness, against its existence as a corporation of lies. The student is powerless over the employment of his life (which in his particular case is the odious job of producing and maintaining the technology and ideology so necessary to the continuation of capitalism), and his revolt against this condition is the expression of his proletarianization.

What we have witnessed in the last year and a half is the spectacular presentation of this revolt manacled to "issue politics" and underdeveloped ideologies—in short, manacled to the amelioration of the apparent defects of capitalism. The Columbia occupation appeared to grow out of this framework, but the immediacy of life in the 'communes' created gave expression to the real root of the revolt. This immediacy however was quickly eroded because no one there realized that the recuperators were still among them. The silly 'heroic' defeat, the factional quibbling—all followed, and Columbia (that is, this series of bureaucratic maneuvers mythologized) became a model for much of what has passed since.

Out of the Columbia strike came

a bizarre communitarian grouping called the Radical Action Cooperative (RAC). They opposed themselves to the subleninists all around them, claimed to start from a critique of daily life and declared affinities with the thought of the S.I. But they quickly exposed themselves as inflictions of their own boredom and confusion, as ideologists of daily life. RAC migrated to Harvard where they provoked the unimaginative 'confrontations' from which the well-disciplined zombies of PL tried to profit.

Whenever necessary there is the *show* of violence (Cornell), but more often only the talk of the show. There is always the central strike committees with the bickering over the representation of blocs (not even people—blocs), always the tactical alliances and uncritical support—even to the trade unions: the San Francisco State strike collapsed from its sheer boorishness. The student ideologist still senses his underdevelopment, but finds his model in the spectacular presentations of black ideologists and bureaucrats. Northwestern was a *charming* beginning, and more recently, City College. The Panther heroes with their auxiliary, the Black Student Unions, present the basic reformist demands, and though they do not know it, they will be rendered superfluous by those demands that will be accepted. The apparent victory is only the appearance of victory.

Bureaucratic capitalism does not see the reforms necessary to its survival: these are first presented by oppositional bureaucrats and ideologists. This presentation is necessary. The prevailing system *needs* functionaries trained in Black Studies Programs, its welfare breakfast administrators, and the universities *need* to incorporate students into their administrations—but the presentation

is 'unofficial,' spectacularly oppositional and therefore excessive. Once the official programs are created (minus ideological exaggerations) to meet the needs, there follows the spectacular destruction of the agents of exaggeration. It was true of the old Bolsheviks and more recently in our particular history, the 'leftists' in the formation of the CIO—and it will come true for the Panthers and their white collegiate counterparts. This spectacular destruction, serving to create the myths of martyrs that will colonize and falsify future opposition, only covers the real tightening up on those "masses" whose violent excesses find no possible bureaucratic integration.

And Opposition Rediscovered

The crime of the oppositional ideologist's suicide is that it has so far accompanied the dismemberment of authentic revolt *which does not recognize itself for what it is*. In that this revolt—manifestation of the class struggle—is not conscious or at least imperfectly conscious of itself, it does not continue; it is constantly reborn with the people who refuse to be represented, whose gut reactions negate those who move to take them over.

Important in social situations of opposition is the violence that transcends the ideologies that seek to contain the opposition. Wildcat strikes and accompanying sabotage are a part of the industrial situation that the bureaucrats can no longer ignore; SDS and the black ideologists are working overtime to integrate all this into a spectacular "New Left" framework.

On the campuses too, class violence

escapes its manipulators when it discovers the possibility of life as a festival. Many incidents, drab in their spectacular repetition, have contained this realization for certain individuals. What is known of the events this past spring in Madison, Wisconsin points to the social realization of this possibility: a street party, enjoyment in its proper allocation in bourgeois times, exceeds its proper bounds and is immediately met with police repression. It took three days of tear gas and riot clubs to return the scene to domestic tranquility. The testimonies of the fire chief and a mayoral candidate express the disappearance of the festive possibility.

The destruction of Zap, North Dakota follows in a line that begins with the incident in Hollister, California, spectacularized in *The Wild Ones*. With capitalism, travel emerges as tourism, the devastation of places by the commodity. The destruction of the business district of Zap was the beginning of the rediscovery of Zap as a *place*. The devastation of the place as a commodity and a commodity palace—purely for the fun of it—points to the proletarian reconstruction of space.

We do not maintain that the individuals participating in a wildcat strike, or a university insurrection or an antitourist potlatch, come out of their experience recognizing it for what it really is. The real opposition which is not aware of itself as such is recuperated and reintegrated. The routine of daily life, not to mention the teachings of the leftish marionettes, erodes a memory and turns it into show. The realization of all past moments of proletarian insurrection will not exist outside the appropriation of all power by the councils of workers.

situationist
international

1