

“Life-style” vs. “Social” Anarchism

an historical note on the correct thoughts of Chairman Bookchin

Peter Sabatini

1996

Murray Bookchin must be getting cranky in his old age. Upon reading his latest broadside, *Social Anarchism Or Lifestyle Anarchism: An Unbridgeable Chasm*, I was rudely smacked in the face by déjà vu. Evidently Bookchin is beating a dead horse, trying to breathe life back into an old controversy within the anarchist movement that dates back a century.

It's beyond me why we need to rehash this again. But Bookchin thinks that anarchism is at a “turning point.” In the face of a resurgent right wing, and the death of “communism” in Eastern Europe, the time is ripe for the spread of anarchism. Yet something prevents this from happening. And Bookchin is here to tell us what part of the problem is.

He begins his essay citing the critical tension that has always existed within anarchism, between the individual and the community. The primary emphasis of both these elements within anarchism is a core principle of the doctrine, and something which sets it apart from liberalism and socialism. (In liberalism, the individual is everything and the community nothing [or else “community” is small-town authoritarianism and/or middle class “private” suburban tract enclaves of rampant consumerism where neighbors are total strangers]. For socialism, the individual is relegated to the bourgeois slag heap until after the revolution, and community is the almighty mass-class of proletarian workers too stupid to think for themselves, hence guided by the benevolent “dictatorship” of the advanced class.)

Having read enough anarchism to recognize the presence of this duality (or what one writer has called “communal individuality”), I was immediately engaged by Bookchin's mention of it, and looked forward to his take on the matter, given his formidable skills of theoretical analysis. Instead, what we get is a discussion that quickly degenerates into a diatribe against individualist anarchism. Bookchin sets up a Hobson's choice. Anarchists must choose communist over individualist anarchy (rephrased in current terminology as “social” anarchism v. “lifestyle” [antisocial?] anarchism) or else risk irrelevance.

In Bookchin's view, the individualist anarchism of Max Stirner, Benjamin Tucker, et al., gave rise to all sorts of self-indulgent, apolitical, and pernicious behavior around the turn of the 19th century, such as bohemianism and propaganda by the deed terrorism. And all this amounted to little good for the anarchist movement. But (thankfully) individualist anarchy floundered (compared to the rousing success of communist anarchism), and subsequently fell by the wayside. But now, during the 1990s, given our “reactionary social context,” individualist/ lifestyle anarchism has made a comeback, and today's version encourages a similar sort of do-nothing Yuppie consumerist psychobabble-indulgent banal existence, not to mention New Age mysticism and primitivism, which Bookchin finds highly repellent. This, in turn, only supplants real (social) anarchism, drains off the movement's activism, and reduces anarchism to liberalism. Included on Bookchin's shit list as representative of this individualist regression are writers such as Hakim Bey and John Zerzan, and the periodicals *Anarchy: A Journal of Desire Armed* and *Fifth Estate*.

Individualists & Communists

Given Bookchin's thesis, it would appear we could all benefit from a review of the conflict that arose between individualist and communist anarchy a century ago. So here is that background. Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, the first to use the word "anarchist" to designate a political doctrine, is the fountainhead of both individualist and communist anarchism. (The same might be said of William Godwin, who articulated all the main principles of anarchism a half century before Proudhon. However, when Godwin wrote, there was no organized anarchist movement. Proudhon witnessed the socialist movement in formation, with anarchism as a part. Accordingly, Proudhon's writings reflected this ongoing worker mobilization.)

With Proudhon, anarchism shifted from theory to practice. And this meant the concrete realization of anarchy's main tendencies. On the one hand, from the individualism of Proudhon, one can jump to Stirner and Tucker (as major steps that ignore other contributors). On the other hand, the communist aspect leads to Bakunin and Kropotkin (again ignoring other significant contributors).

Proudhon's mutualist anarchy was geared to the socio-economic realities of mid- to late 19th century France. The French economy was small-scale and decentralized, when compared to England and Germany, and remained that way for a longer period of time (until the early 20th century). [1] Consequently, Proudhon's mutualism was more relevant to French peasants, artisans, farmers, and the fewer numbers of industrial workers. Conversely, mutualism had less of a following in more industrialized England and Germany. But then came Bakunin, who revised certain aspects of Proudhon's mutualist anarchy and derived "collectivism" (what Bakunin sometimes called anarchism). Bakunin took account of the growing worker movement, unionism, and relentless industrialization, and incorporated these widening developments into his anarchism.

Bakunin was much more the revolutionary than Proudhon ever was. From Bakunin's later vantage point, the concrete indications of spiraling conflict and worker militancy pointed in that direction. Collectivist anarchism thus had greater relevancy for the international industrial proletariat than mutualism did.

Yet at base, collectivist anarchism wasn't that much different from mutualism. The core principles of both remained the same. What differed were some secondary principles regarding tactics and economics, e.g., the gradualist mutualism scheme of family farms and artisan economics shifted to the urban realities of large industrial operations and a revolutionary overthrow. Hence it may be observed that anarchy possesses a unique plasticity, mutability, or protean character, whereby secondary components of the doctrine get modified in accordance with situational demand.

Leery of Unionism

When Bakunin died in 1876, the socialist movement and union activism were stagnant. [2] And it was around this time that anarchists -derived anarcho-communism. Kropotkin, of course, is the best known advocate of communist anarchy, but he didn't originate the revised doctrine (former Bakunin associates Errico Malatesta, Carlo Cafiero, Emilio Covelli, and the Jura Federation in Switzerland were ahead of Kropotkin). Anarcho-communism was no great leap beyond collectivism, only further modification of secondary ideas in response to new circumstances. For example, functioning at a time when unionism was static, anarcho-communists became leery of unionism and resolved to carry on the fight without reliance upon this form of organization.

Likewise, anarcho-communists (again, Malatesta and company) devised "propaganda by the deed" to incite insurrection at the local level, that they believed would, in turn, lead to a wider uprising. Propaganda by the deed did not demand large organization, leadership, or a chain of command. In any case, by the end of the 19th century, anarcho-communism had become the dominant theoretical strain within the anarchist Movement, to the degree that it was made up of proletarian or industrial workers.

With individualist anarchism, there was never the same direct linkage that Bakunin and Kropotkin had vis-a-vis the workers movement. These two anarchists defined anarchism primarily in relation to the working class (as did Marx for that matter). Stirner and Tucker, on the other hand, wrote for different populations. By the same token, Proudhon and Godwin weren't chiefly appealing to industrial workers. And this, as indicated, was on account of

time and place. Bakunin and Kropotkin were exiles from Russia, who lived most of their adult lives in western Europe. Conversely, Godwin had no anarchist movement to reflect on. Proudhon had mainly the French context to contemplate, Stirner remained in Germany, and Tucker lived in the USA.

Proudhon had envisioned societal transformation via smaller social units (mutualism). Individualist anarchism followed along that same track. Just as anarcho-communism had eschewed unionism, individualist anarchism took seriously the tendency of large: scale organizations to become centralized, leadership-dominated, and riddled with authority. Political action was conceived as a personal response guided by reason, as opposed to some sort of materialistic class or group influence that Bakunin and Kropotkin were partial to.

Given what Bookchin says about individualist anarchism, one might think that Stirner never advocated political activism, only that -we should sit around all day and ruminate about change (hence the origin of the lackadaisical bohemian lifestyle). But Stirner never said “do nothing.” The first step towards liberation was the overthrow of the mental hierarchy that exists in your brain. Stirner: “State, emperor, church, God, morality, order, are such thoughts or spirits, that exist only for the mind. A merely living being, an animal, cares as little for them as a child... [H]e succumbs to their power, and is ruled by thoughts. This is the meaning of hierarchy. Hierarchy is dominion of thoughts, dominion of mind!” [3]

It is for the same reason that Stirner criticized Proudhon for assuming that some pithy phrase is going to liberate people. Stirner:

“Because in his mind theft ranks as abominable without any question, Proudhon, for instance, thinks that with the sentence ‘Property is theft’ he has at once put a brand on property.” [4] Stirner wanted people to think for themselves, instead of following the dictates of power. The annihilation of this mental straitjacket would then lead to insurrection, an uprising of (free) thinking individuals. Stirner purposely differentiated insurrection from revolution (a differentiation which was later adopted by Herbert Read). [5]

He viewed revolution as a half-ass measure dominated by leadership that merely replaced one set of state actors with another. Stirner: “To this day the revolutionary principle has gone no farther than to assail only one or another particular establishment, to be reformatory. Much as may be improved, strongly as ‘discreet progress’ may be adhered to, always there is only a new master set in the old one’s place, and the overturning is a building up.” [6] Of course Stirner was absolutely right on this score, as anyone can see from the Russian, Chinese, Cuban, etc., revolutions, where left wing idiots replaced right wing morons.

Blaming Stirner or individualist anarchism for turn of the century propaganda by deed is also off the mark. The 1890s in general were a violent decade that saw an escalation of strikes and worker mobilization, plus bombings and assassination of all sorts. [7] Anarchist propaganda by deed made up only a tiny fraction of this whole. While a few specifically anarchist bombings were indeed reckless, most of the terrorism of this period was hardly anarchist inspired (some of it was the usual handiwork of government agents provocateurs). [8]

Still further, whether such acts were carried out more by individualist than communist anarchists is a matter of conjecture. Finally, the argument that propaganda by deed helped to give anarchism a bad public image is true enough, but hardly surprising given that turn of the century “public opinion” was largely informed by state-run or private capitalist media that was hardly friendly towards anarchism (just as it is today). If middle class respectability is what you’re after with anarchism (e.g., get the middle class to like anarchists and maybe they’ll vote them into office, a la social democracy), then you might as well pack it up and go home.

Stirner makes the perfect whipping boy. Like Marx or Sade, he can be condemned and summarily dismissed without having to know what he actually said. Stirner gets labeled (by those who don’t like his ideas) as a demented anti-social misfit, a pre-Nietzschean fascist. Liberals attack Stirner for his “egoism” (i.e., egalitarian individualism) because their own stark individualism is little more than a justification for economic inequality and exploitation, hence elitism and a defining of the individual as a function of power. The socialist dislike of Stirner (e.g., Marx’s extended attack in *The German Ideology*) stems from socialism’s own meager definition of the individual and its antipathy to idealism. Likewise, Bookchin’s dismissal of Stirner has the intentional effect of exalting his own position vis-a-vis individualist anarchism as the more “social” of the two.

Yet if Stirner really was the anti-social paragon he is made out to be, one has to wonder why other communist anarchists embraced him. For example, the anarchist historian Max Nettlau: “I have offered extracts [from a previous work] in order to back up my opinion that Max Stirner was at heart eminently social, socialist, desirous of social

revolution; but being openly anarchist, his so-called ‘egoism’ was a form of protection, the defense that he believed necessary to adopt against authoritarian socialism, against all statism that the authoritarians might insinuate into socialism.” [9]

Emma Goldman: “It is the same narrow attitude which sees in Max Stirner naught but the apostle of the theory ‘each for himself, the devil take the hindmost.’ That. Stirner’s individualism—contains the greatest social possibilities is utterly ignored. Yet, it is nevertheless true that if ‘society is ever to become free, it will be so through liberated individuals, whose free efforts make society.” [10] It may also be noted here that the revolutionary communist Alexander Berkman sold Stirner’s book through his magazine, *The Blast*. [11]

Perhaps more to the heart of the matter is that with Stirner, anarchism truly became a doctrine of individual and communal liberation. The communal individuality component was fully realized and that essential tension between the individual and the community came to the forefront as a core anarchist principle. (Coming at the time that Stirner did, taking his anarchism in part from Proudhon, the individuality and liberty components had not yet been fully articulated, e.g., for all that Proudhon may be lauded, he was also sexist and anti-Semitic, which was hardly anarchist.) Furthermore, because of Stirner, anarchism could never again be confused with socialism or subsumed within it as a “deviant” variant (though some still try). After Stirner, when compared to anarchism, all liberalism and socialism is authoritarian drivel.

Individualists & Utopians

The shift within European anarchism, from mutualism to collectivism to communism (which was more an accumulation, one variant didn’t eliminate the others) also occurred within the United States, especially among the industrial working class. However, in the USA there was another factor not part of the European equation, namely, the individualist anarchism of Benjamin Tucker. Individualist anarchism in the USA extended from the communal-utopian movements of the mid-19th century (influenced by the writings of Godwin, Robert Owen and Charles Fourier). Josiah Warren (a former member of Owen’s commune in Indiana) is considered to be the first individualist anarchist. Other better-known individualist anarchists were Ezra Heywood, William B. Greene and Lysander Spooner. Tucker knew some of these anarchists and eventually he became the leading spokesperson for this variant on account of his long running periodical *Liberty*.

Benjamin Tucker was significantly influenced by Proudhon (he adopted Proudhon’s mutualism), as well as Stirner (the English translation of Stirner’s book, which is still in print, was by Tucker associate Steven T. Byington). Just as mutualism had resonated with segments of the French populace, so mutualist-type American individualist anarchism appealed to certain socio-economic subgroups—within the United States (those—that anarcho-communism would never reach). That is, the tens of thousands of people who had participated in American communal utopianism, lived a daily existence that was largely self-sufficient, based in farming and/or craftwork and trades. Individualist anarchism appealed to some of this diminishing socio-economic stratum, and others.

But then after the Civil War, the United States rapidly became industrialized. Consequently, there were swelling numbers of people working in factories (blue and white collar), employed by capitalist concerns, and less of those who had an independent livelihood. Hence, the gross trend was from the rural farm to the urban factory, from independence to dependency.

In regards to social transformation, Tucker followed Proudhon in favoring tactics that were more gradual than revolutionary (which is, I guess, the reason why „; Tucker is sometimes made out to be no more than an armchair intellectual). He advocated a modified mutualism, plus the use of boycotts (non-payment of taxes and no military service), and sometimes more drastic measures. Tucker: “Neither the ballot nor the bayonet is to play any great part in the coming struggle; passive resistance and, in emergencies the dynamite bomb in the hands-of isolated individuals are the instruments by which the revolutionary force is destined to secure in the last great conflict the people’s rights forever.” [12]

Trading Insults

Like Stirner, Tucker also gets accused of being anti-social. And also like Stirner, this charge has little relation to what Tucker actually said, e.g., —the community' is a nonentity, that it has no existence, and that what is called the community is simply a combination of individuals having no prerogatives beyond those of the individuals themselves." Also, "Today...society is fundamentally anti-social. The whole so-called social fabric rests on privilege and power, and is disordered and strained in every direction by the inequalities that necessarily result therefrom." [13]

At any rate, what eventually happened is that anarcho-communists and individualist anarchists finally noticed each other. Even though individualist and communist anarchy are fundamentally one in the same doctrine, their respective supporters still ended up at loggerheads over secondary issues of tactics and economics (*viz.*, what allows the variants of anarchy to "fit" differing circumstances). A verbal dispute broke out. Both groups had their own periodicals, and each side began to disparage the other, which reached its nadir when Tucker and Kropotkin traded insults.

Tucker: "In view of these things, I submit that General Walker [president of MIT in 1887, when Tucker wrote this] has no warrant whatever for referring to such men as Kropotkine [*sic*] as true Anarchists and 'among the best men in the world,' while in the same breath he declares...that 'the mobs at the Haymarket were composed of pick-pockets, housebreakers, and hoodlums,' and that 'the ruffians who are called Anarchists who formed the mob in the Haymarket in Chicago were not Anarchists.' If Kropotkine is an Anarchist, then the Chicago men are Anarchists; if the Chicago men are not Anarchists, then Kropotkine is not an Anarchist...And as to their Anarchism, neither of them are Anarchists. For Anarchism means absolute liberty, nothing more, nothing less. Both Kropotkine and the Chicago men deny liberty in production and exchange, the most important of all liberties, without which, in fact, all other liberties are of no value or next to none. Both should be called, instead of Anarchists, Revolutionary Communists." [14]

"The reason why Most and Parsons are not Anarchists, while I am one, is because their Communism is another State, while my voluntary co-operation is not a State at all. It is a very easy matter to tell who is an Anarchist and who is not. One question will always readily decide it. Do you believe in any form of imposition upon the human will by force? If you do, you are not an Anarchist. If you do not, you are an Anarchist. What can any one ask more reliable, more scientific, than this?" [15]

A Sort of Epicurean Amoralism

Kropotkin: "Tucker thus follows [Herbert] Spencer, and, like him, opens (in the present writer's opinion) the way for reconstituting under the heading of 'defence' all the functions of the State...The Individualist Anarchism of the American Proudhonians finds, however, but little sympathy amongst the working Masses. Those who profess it—they are chiefly intellectuals—soon realise that the individualisation they so highly praise is not attainable by individual efforts, and either abandon the ranks of the Anarchists, and are driven into the Liberal individualism of the classical economists, or they retire into a sort of Epicurean amoralism, or super-man theory, similar to that of Stirner and Nietzsche. The great bulk of the Anarchist working men prefer the Anarchist-Communist ideas which have gradually evolved out of the Anarchist Collectivism of the International Working Men's Association." [16]

This dispute did not go unnoticed by other anarchists, and it was eventually called to a halt (or at least critiqued) by cooler heads who recognized it for what it was, a ridiculous squabble over secondary issues. Note the pronouncements of these anarchists.

Max Nettlau: "It [Liberty] was a very combative organ edited by Tucker that began to deny the right of the collectivist libertarian communists, and even Kropotkin, to call themselves anarchists, and it was argued in reply that those individualists could not be considered anarchists due to the fact that they sometimes accepted private property, etc. In my opinion, they understood each other very poorly, nothing was known then in Europe of the fifty-year past American anarchist history, and very little in America as well of the same European history of the previous fifty years. There was enough room for both currents, that up to then had taken very little interest in each other, that hadn't even been aware of each other's existence." [17]

Errico Malatesta: “There are those among the anarchists who like to call themselves communists, or collectivists, or individualists or what have you. Often it is a question of different interpretations of words which obscure and hide a fundamental identity of objectives; sometimes it is only a question of theories, hypotheses with which each person explains and justifies in different ways identical practical conclusions...In the anarchist milieu, communism, individualism, collectivism, mutualism and all the intermediate and eclectic programmes are simply the ways considered best for achieving freedom and solidarity in economic life; the ways believed to correspond most closely with justice and freedom for the distribution of the means of production and the products of labour among men...But in the long run it is always the searching for a more secure guarantee of freedom which is the common factor among anarchists, and which divides them into different schools. The individualists assume, or speak as if they assumed, that (anarchist) communists want to impose communism, which of course would put them right outside the ranks of anarchism. The communists assume, or speak as if they assumed, that the (anarchist) individualists reject every idea of association, want the struggle between men, the domination of the strongest—and this would put them not only outside the anarchist movement but outside humanity...Thus it has happened for anarchists of the different tendencies, in spite of the fact that fundamentally they wanted the same thing, to find themselves in fierce opposition on the practical questions of life and propaganda.” [18]

Voltaire de Cleyre: “Now it is perfectly apparent that Anarchy, having to do almost entirely with the relations of men [sic] in their thoughts and feelings, and not with the positive organization of production and distribution, an Anarchist needs to supplement his Anarchism, by some economic propositions, which may enable him to put in practical shape to himself and others this possibility of independent manhood. That will be his test in choosing any such proposition, the measure in which individuality is secured...Every Anarchist has this in common with every other Anarchist, that the economic system must be subservient to this end; no system recommends itself to him by the Mere beauty and smoothness of its working...There are, accordingly, several economic schools among Anarchists; there are Anarchist Individualists, Anarchist Mutualists, Anarchist Communists and Anarchist Socialists. In times past these several schools have bitterly denounced each other and mutually refused to recognize each other as Anarchists at all. The more narrow-minded on both sides still do so; true, they do not consider it is narrow-mindedness, but simply a firm and solid grasp of the truth, which does not permit of tolerance towards error. This has been the attitude of the bigot in all ages, and Anarchism no more than any other new doctrine has escaped its bigots. Each of these fanatical adherents of either collectivism or individualism believes that no Anarchism is possible without that particular economic system as its guarantee, and is of course thoroughly justified from his own standpoint...Therefore I say that each group of persons acting socially in freedom may choose any of the proposed systems, and be just as thorough-going Anarchists as those who select another. If this standpoint be accepted, we are rid of those outrageous excommunications which belong properly to the Church of Rome, and which serve no purpose but to bring us into deserved contempt with outsiders.” [19]

Anarchism Without Adjectives

Although this feud between communist and individualist anarchy (over who is or isn't a “real” anarchist) eventually faded, it still resurfaced on occasion. For example, a couple decades ago George Woodcock made this assertion: “I am doing neither [Noam] Chomsky nor [Daniel] Guerin an injustice in stating that neither is an anarchist by any known criterion; they are both left-wing Marxists.” [20] Here it wasn't communist v. individualist anarchy, but communist v. syndicalist; Woodcock was booting Chomsky and Guerin out of the anarchist camp on account of their partiality to anarcho-syndicalism.

This then brings us back to the present, and Mr. Bookchin's attempt to rid anarchy of its individualist component. One statement that he makes in particular eerily resounds the old controversy. At the end of his essay, Bookchin says the following: “Certainly, it is already no longer possible, in my view, to call oneself an anarchist without adding a qualifying adjective to distinguish oneself from lifestyle anarchists” (p. 61). Meaning, I guess, that from now on Bookchin is going to call himself a “social anarchist” instead of simply “anarchist,” while all the rest of us can label ourselves “lifestyle anarchists.”

Anarquismo sin adjetivos

In George Esenwein's book, *Anarchist Ideology and the Working-Class Movement in Spain, 1868–1898*, we read this interesting statement: "Beginning in 1886, the anarchists grouped around the Barcelona printers' association La Academia made a serious attempt to exorcise the Spanish anarchist movement of doctrinal disputes by espousing a nondenominational form of anarchism in the periodical *Acracia*. After *Acracia* ceased publication in 1888, the campaign to eradicate sectarianism from the anarchist movement was taken up by several of the intellectuals associated with Antonio Pellicer's circle. Their collective efforts led to the formal articulation of a viewpoint that came to be known as anarquismo sin adjetivos (anarchism without adjectives). Considered by some historians to be Spain's only real contribution to anarchist theory, anarchism without adjectives was actually more of a perspective or an attitude than a set of specific ideas. In its broadest sense, the phrase referred to an unhyphenated form of anarchism, that is, a doctrine without any qualifying label such as communist, collectivist, mutualist, or individualist. For others anarquismo sin adjetivos was simply understood as an attitude that tolerated the coexistence of different anarchist schools." [21]

So perhaps that is what we need to stress here: anarquismo sin adjetivos.

To close, I would like to note the obvious. I have said practically nothing to rebut Bookchin's specific charges against Bey, Zerzan, etc., as they can well enough speak for themselves. My intention here was to show that Bookchin's assault on individualist anarchy is nothing new, and mostly wasted effort. What I really don't understand though, if I may be permitted here a momentary spasm of digression, is why Bookchin spends so much time getting hot under the collar about primitivism, bohemianism, or whatever, and all the while he totally ignores the real lifestyle "anarchists." Barely a word, if that, about the walking brain-dead who call themselves "anarchists" and are members of the Libertarian or Republican party, devotees of the capitalist-worshipping Murray Rothbard and Ayn Rand, or the other assorted right wing authoritarians and oddball reactionaries who wouldn't know anarchism from a hole in the ground (who lament about government "interference" in their "private" lives and then clamor for more police and military, or else retreat to the backwoods with Bibles and testosterone). Their "anarchism" is pure escapist fantasy as they wax enthusiastic about metaphysical entities such as the "free market." What about it, Bookchin?

Why the silence on these half-wits?

In conclusion, a quotation from Max Nettlau's essay, "Anarchism: Communist or Individualist?—Both," which appeared in the July 1914 issue of Emma Goldman's magazine *Mother Earth*. "Neither Communism nor Individualism will ever disappear; and if by some mass action the foundations of some rough form of Communism were laid, Individualism would grow stronger than ever in opposition to this. Whenever a uniform system prevails, Anarchists, if they have their ideas at heart, will go ahead of it and never permit themselves to become fossilized upholders of a given system, be it that of the purest communism...This desirable state of things could be prepared from now, if it were once for all frankly understood among Anarchists that both Communism and Individualism are equally important, equally permanent; and that the exclusive predominance-of either of them would be the greatest misfortune that could befall mankind. From isolation we take refuge in solidarity, from too much society we seek relief in isolation: both solidarity and isolation are, each at the right moment, freedom and help to us. All human life vibrates between these two poles in endless varieties of oscillations." [22]

Endnotes

1. See Francis Feeley, *The French Anarchist Labor Movement and "La Vie Ouvriere," 1909–1914* (New York: Peter Lang, 1991), p. 2; James Joll, *Europe Since 1870: An International History*, Second Edition (Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1976), pp. 53, 63; Sima Lieberman, *Labor Movements And Labor Thought: Spain, France, Germany, and the United States* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1986), p. 204.

2. G.D.H. Cole, *Socialist Thought: Marxism and Anarchism 1850–1890*, Volume II of *A History of Socialist Thought* (London: Macmillan, 1954), pp. 163, 199, 211.
3. Max Stirner, *The Ego And His Own*, James J. Martin, ed. (New York: Libertarian Book Club, 1963), p. 74.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 78.
5. Herbert Read, *Anarchy And Order: Essays in Politics* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1971), p. 51.
6. Stirner, pp. 110–11.
7. Leopold H. Haimson and Charles Tilly, eds., *Strikes, Wars, And Revolutions In An International Perspective: Strike Waves in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1989); Charles Tilly, Louise Tilly, and Richard Tilly, *The Rebellious Century 1830–1930* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1975), pp. 55, 5759, 156, 213, 215, 226, 230; Jaap van Ginneken, *Crowds, Psychology, And Politics 1871–1899*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1992), p. 169.
8. Robert J. Goldstein, *Political Repression In 19th Century Europe* (London: Croom Helm, 1983), pp. 72–3, 292, 295, 314; Bernard Porter, *Plots And Paranoia: A History of Political Espionage in Britain 1790–1988* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1989), pp. 113–14, 117.
9. Max Nettlau, *Anarchy Through The Times* (New York: Gordon Press, 1979), p. 83.
10. Emma Goldman, *Anarchism And Other Essays* (New York: Dover Publications, 1969), p.44.
11. Alexander Berkman, ed., *The Blast* 1(2) 22 January 1916.
12. Benjamin R. Tucker, *Instead Of A Book, By A Man Too Busy To Write One* (New York: Haskell House, 1969), p. 413.
13. *Ibid.*, pp. 330, 361.
14. *Ibid.*, pp. 389–90.
15. Benjamin R. Tucker, *Individual Liberty: Selections From the Writings of Benjamin R. Tucker*, Clarence L Swartz, ed. (New York: Revisionist Press, 1972), p. 33.
16. Peter Kropotkin, *Two Essays: Anarchism and Anarchist Communism*, Nicolas Walter, ed. (London: Freedom Press, 1987), pp. 18–19.
17. Nettlau, p. 59.
18. Errico Malatesta, *Errico Malatesta: His Life & Ideas*, Vernon Richards, ed. (London: Freedom Press, 1984), pp. 29, 30, 31, 33.
19. Voltairine de Cleyre, *Anarchist Essays* (San Francisco: Cobden Press, n.d.), pp. 23–25.
20. George Woodcock, “Noam Chomsky’s Anarchism”, in George Woodcock, *Anarchism And Anarchists* (Kingston, Ontario: Quarry Press, 1992), p. 225.
21. George Richard Esenwein, *Anarchist Ideology And The Working-Class Movement In Spain 1868–1898* (Berkeley: University of California, 1989), pp. 134–5.
22. Max Nettlau, “Anarchism; Communist Or Individualist?—Both”, *Mother Earth* 9(5), July 1914, 172.

fifth Estate

Peter Sabatini
“Life-style” vs. “Social” Anarchism
an historical note on the correct thoughts of Chairman Bookchin
1996

<https://www.fiftheestate.org/archive/348-fall-1996/life-style-vs-social-anarchism>
Fifth Estate #348, Fall, 1996

[fiftheestate.anarchistlibraries.net](https://www.fiftheestate.org)