

A W O R D T H E

When attempting to define Anarchism, it's easy to come up against a brick wall. Many people take Anarchism to be another political ideology, although politics is the study of government and Anarchy is the complete absence of government. Therefore politics would be an analysis of the systems of government, while Anarchy would be whatever it is we would naturally be doing without government. While most political ideologies have rigid, static definitions, Anarchism is the recognition that nothing we experience is static, and our interactions are as elastic and unownable as the tide. Comparing Anarchism to other political ideologies is like comparing a cherry blossom to a riding lawnmower.

Anarchists believe that human beings are dynamic, complex creatures, and that the state is an unnatural and patronizing institution that attempts to replace authentic experience with efficiency, autonomy with homogeneity. The ideal state is made up of simple machines, instead of individuals and communities. The state provides mass culture and employment, and the people become interchangeable cogs. The state takes a foaming mass of colors and attempts to force it into a small, square hole. Soon the simple act of existence becomes meaningless, and feelings of alienation and depression become almost universal. The only way to derive satisfaction from a system such as this is through total nihilism, which leads to a whole spectrum of other social problems, which you need only to look out your window to witness.

Anarchists under the current system are the ultimate romantics, because obviously the state is alive and well, and claiming to be an "Anarchist" in a fascist system is like being a religious fanatic who, due to severe repression, is completely unable to practice their religion. From this we see that without freedom to self-govern, claiming to be an Anarchist means, well, absolutely nothing. For this reason identifying as an Anarchist in our current political state is the ultimate hypocrisy. Anarchists must constantly prove to one another and themselves that they are fighting for something attainable, that they are not just "eating the meat and ignoring the factory farm, because the factory farm might burn down someday..."

Identifying as an Anarchist and working with other Anarchists can often be just as alienating as passive existence

in mainstream culture. All that separates "the Anarchist" from the masses is a beautiful and nonexistent ideal, and a word that most people equate with violence and insecurity, or an exclusive subculture of you-know-what. (The white, middle class, blah blah blah has absolutely been played to death.) Therefore there is no end of conflict and confusion among communities of Anarchists, and Anarchists are never any closer to attaining the ideal that they hold so close to their hearts.

What is needed is a unified move towards Revolution, Revolution being the overthrow and complete destruction worldwide of all systems of government, leaving a vacuum for something new. Anarchists must move together toward this goal, and abandon the subculture that is made possible by the very existence of the capitalist state that they claim to despise. We must realize that all sorts of peoples worldwide face different versions of the same oppression. The desire to be free of fascism is a basic human desire, a nameless desire that cannot be translated into our meager language. The word "Anarchy" itself is flawed and attempts to squeeze something human into something mechanical like a language that itself perpetuates the system we live under. In order to work towards Revolution Anarchists must realize that Revolution is the inevitable first step toward freedom and autonomy for all peoples. In an Anarchist's ideal society (you know, anarchy) it is not necessary for everyone, or anyone, to agree on the way they want to live. So why now, when that ideal is as far away as it could possibly be, are we unable to work with those who do not live the way we do? Why are we unable to communicate with people who do not fit the mold we have set for ourselves? We do not need Revolution because it is necessary for everyone on the way that we want to live. We need Revolution because systems of government are sick. We need revolution because we have nothing to lose by trying, except a subculture of masturbation that makes our current existence a little more bearable.

This leaflet attempts to communicate an understanding of Anarchism, Anarchists and Anarchy, as undefinable and inadequate as those words are, in a language that is repressive in of itself. to you, in hopes of clarifying ideas you may already have been exposed to and instigating dialogue among people new to revolutionary ideas. This explanation is not at all complete. And nothing is static. Whew.