



Univerzita Hradec Králové  
Filozofická fakulta

MASTER THESIS:  
KINOPOLITICS IN  
CONTEMPORARY ANARCHISM

**Author:** Doruk Kaynak

**Study Program:** N0223A100002 - Philosophy

**Field of Study:** Philosophy

**Form of Study:** Full-time

**Supervisor:** Dr. Černý Jan

Hradec Králové 2024

# Declaration

**Declaration:** I declare that I have prepared this Master's thesis (under the supervision of the supervisor of the diploma/bachelor's thesis Dr. Jan Černý) independently and I have listed all sources and literature used.

In Hradec Králové on 04/01/2024

Doruk Kaynak:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Doruk Kaynak', written in a cursive style.

## Abstract:

The thesis explores the schism between traditionalist and post-structuralist anarchism, delving into their historical roots, philosophical distinctions, and potential convergences. It examines the foundational theories of traditional anarchism, influenced by figures like Bakunin, Proudhon, and Kropotkin, and contrasts this with the emergence of post-structuralist anarchism, drawing on thinkers like Foucault and Deleuze. The thesis introduces 'kinopolitics' as a concept integrating movement and spatial dynamics into political discourse, aiming to bridge the gap between these two schools of thought. This synthesis is positioned as a response to modern challenges, especially in high technology and cyberculture contexts. The thesis argues for a nuanced understanding of power dynamics and resistance strategies, positing a viable path forward for anarchist theory and practice.

Kaynak, DORUK. KINOPOLITICS IN CONTEMPORARY ANARCHISM. Hradec Králové: Philosophical Faculty, University of Hradec Králové, 2024, 84 pp. Master Thesis.

Keywords: Anarchism, Politics, Post-structuralism, Kinopolitics, Kyriarchy, Technology

Table of Contents

Abstract:.....	2
1. Introduction: .....	4
2. Understanding the Schism Between Traditionalist and Post-Structuralist Anarchism: A Dive into the Evolution of Anarchist Thought.....	6
<b>Traditional Anarchist Philosophy</b> .....	7
<b>Post-Structuralist Philosophy:</b> .....	7
<b>Melding of Anarchist and Post-Structuralist Philosophies</b> .....	8
3. Traditionalist Anarchism: Foundations and Assumptions .....	10
4. Post-Structuralist Anarchism: Deconstructing Assumptions and Embracing Flexibility.....	15
5. Kinopolitics, Rhizomes .....	18
6. The Overlap of Anarchism, and Post-Structuralism.....	23
7. The Target of Anarchist Critique, and It's Transformative Aims .....	32
8. Deleuze and Guattari in Anarchist Theory and Praxis .....	37
9. Introducing Kyriarchy into The Equation .....	43
10. The Legacy of Foucault and The Frankfurt School.....	46
10. Demonstration Within the Genre of Cyberpunk.....	54
11. Critiques of Post-Anarchism.....	62
12. Interpretation and Synthesis: A Path Forward for Anarchist Thought .....	69
13. Bibliography: .....	81

*“The mission of all governments’ monarchists’ constitutionalists and republicans, is to protect and maintain by force the privileged of the ruling classes, aristocracy, clergy and bourgeoisie.” — Petr Kropotkin.*

*“The fundamental problem of political philosophy is still precisely the one that Spinoza saw so clearly (and that Wilhelm Reich rediscovered): Why do men fight for their servitude as stubbornly as though it were their salvation?”*

— **Gilles Deleuze, Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia**

## 1. Introduction:

One key area of contention between traditional anarchism and post-structural anarchism is the role of the state. While traditional anarchists advocate for the complete abolition of the state, post-structural anarchists argue that this is not enough to address the complex power dynamics at play in contemporary society. Instead, they emphasize the need to challenge and subvert all forms of authority, including those that exist within anarchist communities themselves.

Another area of disagreement is around the issue of identity politics. Traditional anarchists have often been criticized for neglecting issues of race, gender, sexuality, and other forms of oppression, and for promoting a universalist vision of class struggle. Post-structural anarchists, on the other hand, place a greater emphasis on the importance of recognizing and challenging the intersecting systems of power that shape our identities and experiences.

Despite these differences, there is also considerable overlap between traditional anarchism and post-structural anarchism, particularly in their shared commitment to anti-authoritarianism and direct action. Many contemporary anarchists draw on both traditions in their activism and theorizing, and there is ongoing debate and dialogue between the two camps.

Anarchist thought, characterized by its enduring diversity and dynamism, stands at a crossroads marked by the schism between traditionalist and post-structuralist paradigms. This thesis ventures into the heart of this divide, exploring the historical foundations, philosophical distinctions, and potential convergences of these two predominant strands of anarchism. The opening segment delves into the origins and core tenets of traditionalist anarchism, rooted in the works of seminal figures like Bakunin, Proudhon, and Kropotkin, highlighting its commitment to principles of liberty, mutual aid, and a vision for a society devoid of coercive hierarchies.

The discourse then shifts to the emergence of post-structuralist anarchism, emerging from the intellectual currents of the mid-20th century, which introduced a critical re-evaluation of established narratives and structures. This strand, influenced by thinkers such as Foucault and Deleuze, brings a nuanced critique of power, identity, and resistance, advocating for a more fluid, decentralized approach to societal organization and political activism. The examination of post-structuralist anarchism provides insight into its critique of foundationalist ideologies and its emphasis on the pervasive and multifaceted nature of power.

In the final part, the thesis proposes a synthesis that integrates the kinopolitical perspective, a concept that emphasizes movement, space, and the bodily experience in political discourse. This integration aims to bridge the gap between the two schools, leveraging the strengths of each to address modern sociopolitical challenges, especially in the context of high technology and cyberculture. The concluding argument posits that this synthesis, enriched by a comprehensive understanding of power dynamics and a nuanced approach to resistance, offers a viable and robust path forward for anarchist theory and practice in the contemporary era.

## 2. Understanding the Schism Between Traditionalist and Post-Structuralist Anarchism: A Dive into the Evolution of Anarchist Thought

Anarchist philosophy represents a multifaceted and often misunderstood ideology that challenges prevailing notions of governance, authority, and social order. Rooted in principles of individual liberty, direct democracy, and the rejection of coercive hierarchies, anarchism offers a unique perspective on how societies can organize themselves without centralized authority. Although often associated with disorder and chaos, this philosophy advocates for a highly organized and harmonious social framework grounded in voluntary cooperation and mutual aid. The common reason of the negative perception of anarchist philosophy is the misapplication of Durkheim's concept of Anomie<sup>1</sup> on to anarchist philosophy. Anomie refers to a normless state of society in which the fabric of society is completely broken down. The anarchist deconstruction of concepts such as hierarchical organisations does not necessitate anomie.<sup>2</sup>

In the evolving discourse of anarchist philosophy, a schism has emerged, delineating two distinct trajectories: traditionalist anarchism and post-structuralist anarchism. Traditionalist anarchism, rooted in the classical canon of anarchist thought, steadfastly upholds the principles of individual liberty, direct democracy, and the dismantling of coercive hierarchies. It envisions a society where self-governance and mutual aid are the cornerstones of social organization, free from the constraints of the state, capitalism, and patriarchal structures. A brief timeline of this development is as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup> Anomie is a term first introduced by Guyaou, but the modern connotation of the term was developed by Durkheim.

<sup>2</sup> The distinction is explored in "Anarchy Without Disorder" by Proudhon. It will thus not be further elaborated on in this work.

## **Traditional Anarchist Philosophy**

### **Late 18th to Early 19th Century:**

Precursors to anarchist thought began to emerge, with thinkers like William Godwin (1756-1836) advocating for a society without government.

### **19th Century:**

Pierre-Joseph Proudhon (1809-1865) publishes "What is Property?" in 1840, often considered the first explicit expression of anarchist philosophy. He famously declared, "Property is theft!"

### **Late 19th Century:**

Key figures like Mikhail Bakunin (1814-1876) and Peter Kropotkin (1842-1921) further developed anarchist theory, emphasizing anti-state and communalist ideas.

Anarchism became a significant political force, particularly in Europe and the Americas.

## **Post-Structuralist Philosophy:**

### **Mid-20th Century:**

Post-structuralism emerged in the 1960s in France as a reaction against structuralism, a philosophical and linguistic movement that sought to understand the underlying structures in cultural phenomena.

Key figures include Michel Foucault (1926-1984), Jacques Derrida (1930-2004), Gilles Deleuze (1925-1995), and later, Félix Guattari (1930-1992).



### **1970s and 1980s:**

These thinkers challenged established structures in philosophy, literature, and social sciences, questioning the fixedness of meaning, and emphasizing the fluidity and contingency of language, power structures, and human identity.

### **Melding of Anarchist and Post-Structuralist Philosophies**

#### **Late 20th Century:**

The melding of anarchist and post-structuralist philosophies is most notably represented in the work of Deleuze and Guattari, particularly in their collaborative works like "Anti-Oedipus" (1972) and "A Thousand Plateaus" (1980).

Their ideas resonated with the anarchist emphasis on anti-authoritarianism, decentralization, and the critique of rigid structures.

### **1980s and 1990s:**

This period saw the growth of "post-anarchism," a term used to describe a synthesis of traditional anarchist philosophy and post-structuralist thought.

Thinkers like Todd May and Saul Newman explored how post-structuralist critiques of essentialism and universalism could enrich and revitalize anarchist theory.

#### **21st Century:**

Post-anarchism continues to evolve, incorporating insights from both traditions, influencing various social movements and academic discourses.

It emphasizes anti-essentialist politics, a critique of traditional power structures, and a focus on local, decentralized forms of resistance and organization.

The advent of post-structuralist thought, with its Deleuzian and kinopolitical inflections, has introduced a compelling critique of traditionalist assumptions, advocating for a more nuanced and fluid approach to the anarchist project. This post-structuralist turn, drawing on the works of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, emphasizes the significance of movement—both literal and metaphorical—as a transformative force in political and social realms. Kinopolitics, in particular, foregrounds the role of migration, nomadism, and other forms of movement in challenging and reshaping power dynamics.

### 3. Traditionalist Anarchism: Foundations and Assumptions

Traditionalist anarchism, advocates for self-governance, mutual aid, and the dissolution of all forms of hierarchy, including the state, capitalism, and any and all kyriarchic<sup>3</sup> forces. This school of thought values communal living and cooperation, fostering a sense of solidarity among individuals.

Traditional anarchism, as a term, encompasses the foundational thinkers and philosophies of anarchist thought, prominently featuring the works and ideas of Proudhon, Cafiero, Bakunin, and Kropotkin. These thinkers laid the groundwork for what is commonly understood as anarchist philosophy, each contributing unique perspectives and ideas that collectively shaped the anarchist movement.

#### **Pierre-Joseph Proudhon (1809-1865)**

- Often regarded as the father of modern anarchism, Proudhon was the first to declare himself an anarchist. His famous assertion, "Property is theft," reflects his critique of the prevailing economic and social order.
- Proudhon advocated for a society without authority or imposed government, favouring mutualism - a form of economic exchange based on cooperative associations of producers.

#### **Mikhail Bakunin (1814-1876)**

- Bakunin, a Russian revolutionary, is best known for his vehement opposition to the ideas of state socialism and Marxism. He emphasized the importance of direct action and mass revolt as means to overthrow oppressive structures.
- He believed in collectivist anarchism, which argued for the collective ownership of the means of production and the abolition of the state and private property.

---

<sup>3</sup> Please refer to the section on Kyriarchy.

### **Carlo Cafiero (1846-1892)**

- Carlo Cafiero was an influential figure in the development of anarchist thought, particularly known for his role in the spread of anarchism in Italy. Born into a wealthy Neapolitan family, Cafiero's trajectory into anarchism was marked by his engagement with radical political ideas and his eventual disillusionment with Marxism.
- Cafiero's legacy in the anarchist movement is significant for his efforts to synthesize Marxist economic theory with anarchist principles.

### **Peter Kropotkin (1842-1921)**

- Kropotkin, a Russian activist, and scientist is noted for his advocacy of anarchist communism. He argued that the abolition of private property and the state would lead to a society where individuals would voluntarily cooperate and share resources.
- His concept of mutual aid as a factor in evolution underpinned his arguments for cooperation over competition in human societies.

The foundational praxis of traditional anarchism has also found stewardship in recent intellectual history:

- **Noam Chomsky:** An American linguist, philosopher, and political activist, Chomsky is perhaps one of the most well-known contemporary figures associated with anarchism. His critiques of capitalism, state power, and media manipulation align with traditional anarchist thought. Chomsky's advocacy for direct action, decentralization, and a libertarian socialist form of governance continues to influence modern anarchist theory and practice.
- **Murray Bookchin:** Bookchin was an American social theorist, often associated with the development of the theory of social ecology and libertarian municipalism. He proposed a form of ecological anarchism and argued for decentralized, community-based forms of governance, reflecting key principles of traditional anarchism.

- **David Graeber:** The late anthropologist and activist David Graeber was known for his influential role in the Occupy Wall Street movement and his scholarly work, which often delved into anarchist theory. His writings on debt, bureaucracy, and economic systems have been pivotal in contemporary anarchist discourse.
- **Cindy Milstein:** Milstein is an anarchist author, educator, and organizer who writes extensively on contemporary anarchist theory. Her work encompasses a range of topics including democracy, anarchism, and social change, reflecting a modern interpretation of traditional anarchist values.

Traditional anarchism is anchored in a body of quintessential literature that has shaped its principles and ideologies. Key texts in this canon include Pierre-Joseph Proudhon's "What is Property?" where he famously declares "property is theft," signalling a critique of capitalist property relations. Mikhail Bakunin's "God and the State" offers a foundational anarchist critique of religion and authority. Peter Kropotkin's "The Conquest of Bread" and "Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution" emphasize the importance of cooperative social organization and mutual aid as inherent to human societies. These works collectively form the bedrock of traditional anarchist thought, advocating for a society free from coercive hierarchies, emphasizing direct action, and promoting mutual cooperation and aid as the basis for social organization.

Pierre-Joseph Proudhon's "What is Property?" is seminal in anarchist literature, where he famously posits "property is theft," challenging the traditional notions of ownership and capitalist property relations. This work critically examines the concept of property, arguing that it leads to inequality and exploitation.

Mikhail Bakunin's "God and the State" is another cornerstone text, offering a radical critique of religion and authority. Bakunin argues against the interplay of religious and state power, seeing both as oppressive structures that stifle individual freedom and social progress.

Peter Kropotkin's "The Conquest of Bread" outlines a vision of a decentralized, stateless society, advocating for the collective ownership of means of production. He emphasizes the need for direct action to achieve a society based on mutual aid and voluntary cooperation.

In "Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution," Kropotkin counters social Darwinist arguments, proposing that cooperation and mutual aid are significant factors in the evolution of species, including humans. This work underlines the importance of solidarity and cooperation in the development of societies.

Central to traditional anarchist thought is the belief that the state and all forms of imposed authority are inherently oppressive and unnecessary for the organization of society. Anarchists believe that cooperation and mutual aid are fundamental aspects of human nature and should be the basis for social organization. A key principle in traditional anarchist thought is the use of direct action as a means to effect social and political change, bypassing established political structures. Traditional anarchists critique capitalism for its inherent inequalities and exploitation. They advocate for the abolition of private property (in the capitalist sense) and the establishment of communal or cooperative ownership of production. Anarchists favour decentralized, federated structures as opposed to centralized power, allowing for greater autonomy and freedom at local levels. The freedom of the individual is a paramount value in anarchist thought, always balanced with the idea of communal responsibility and cooperation.

Traditional anarchism, thus, represents a radical critique of existing political and economic structures, proposing a society based on voluntary cooperation, mutual aid, and the absence of coercive authority. The foundational thinkers of anarchism provide diverse yet interconnected perspectives on how such a society might be structured and achieved. Many traditionalist anarchists recognize the importance of living in harmony with the natural world and strive to minimize their ecological footprint. They often advocate for sustainable practices, such as permaculture, in order to create a society that respects and protects the environment for future generations.

By understanding the foundations and assumptions of traditionalist anarchism, we can better appreciate its contributions to political thought and its argument for being the predominant approach for anarchist projects.

## 4. Post-Structuralist Anarchism: Deconstructing Assumptions and Embracing Flexibility

The advent and development of post-structuralist anarchistic thought represent a significant evolution in the realm of anarchist philosophy, intertwining with contemporary concerns and critiques offered by post-structuralism. This synthesis offers a nuanced approach to understanding and critiquing power structures, subjectivity, and resistance in modern societies.

Post-structuralist anarchism, sometimes referred to as postanarchism, emerged as a response to both classical anarchism and the theoretical developments within post-structuralism. It can be viewed as a continuation and deepening of the anti-authoritarian impulse within traditional anarchism, with a renewed focus on discursive and epistemological authority and fluid identities.

Post-anarchism, a modern development within anarchist thought, synthesizes classical anarchist principles with post-structuralist and postmodernist theories. Key figures in post-anarchism include Todd May, Saul Newman, and Lewis Call. May's "The Political Philosophy of Post-Structuralist Anarchism"(1994) is foundational, incorporating post-structuralist ideas into anarchist theory. Newman, in "From Bakunin to Lacan," (2001) critiques classical anarchism and suggests a new anarchist framework influenced by post-structuralism. Lewis Call's "Postmodern Anarchism" explores the relevance of postmodernist ideas to anarchism. These works and thinkers collectively contribute to post-anarchism's critique of essentialist foundations in traditional anarchism and its emphasis on a more fluid understanding of power and identity.

Todd May (1994) integrates post-structuralist ideas into anarchist theory, challenging the notion of an inherent, universal structure of power and authority. He argues for a flexible, tactical approach to political engagement, diverging from traditional anarchism's focus on a universal struggle against the state.



Saul Newman (2001) critiques the essentialist underpinnings of classical anarchism and proposes a new framework influenced by post-structuralist thought. Newman examines how concepts like power, identity, and resistance can be reinterpreted through a post-structuralist lens to revitalize anarchist theory.

Lewis Call's "Postmodern Anarchism" (2003) explores the intersections between postmodernist theories and anarchism. Call argues that postmodernism's scepticism of meta-narratives and its emphasis on individual subjectivity and decentralization align with anarchist principles, offering new pathways for anarchist thought and practice.

Classical anarchism, with figures like Bakunin, Kropotkin, and Proudhon, focused on the critique and eventual dismantling of centralized state power and institutionalized political power. However, post-structuralist anarchism casts doubt on some of the epistemological assumptions underpinning classical anarchism, particularly its reliance on naturalistic and humanistic metanarratives.

- Post-structuralist anarchism aligns with post-structuralist thought in rejecting essentialism. It challenges the notion of fixed, predetermined identities and structures, whether in terms of power, human nature, or social organization.
- Echoing Foucault's analysis, post-structuralist anarchism views power as dispersed and pervasive throughout social relations and institutions, rather than centralized in the state. This view necessitates a more complex approach to resistance and liberation.
- Influenced by thinkers like Lyotard, post-structuralist anarchism is sceptical of overarching narratives and universal truths, advocating instead for a recognition of the plurality and contingency of social and political life.
- Post-structuralist anarchism is characterized by a tactical rather than strategic approach to political action. It emphasizes localized, pluralistic interventions rather than unified, large-scale revolutions.

- Building on the work of thinkers like Foucault and Derrida, post-structuralist anarchism interrogates the nature of the subject, recognizing that individuals are constituted by and within power relations and discourses.
- It advocates ongoing, localized forms of resistance and practices of freedom, rather than seeking a final, utopian liberation from power structures.
- It encourages an ethics and politics of becoming and singularity, moving away from identity politics and towards an understanding of subjectivity as dynamic and evolving.
- Post-structuralists challenge the traditional anarchist fixation on individual autonomy and suggest a more fluid understanding of selfhood.
- Post-structuralist anarchism rejects the simplistic view of power as solely residing in institutions like the state. Instead, it emphasizes the dispersed and multifaceted nature of power, acknowledging its presence in language, social norms, and everyday interactions.
- Post-structuralists advocate for a pragmatic and flexible approach to anarchism, recognizing the need to adapt strategies and tactics to specific contexts and circumstances. They reject rigid dogma and emphasize the importance of experimentation and improvisation.

## 5. Kinopolitics, Rhizomes

Kinopolitics, an emergent field within political theory, explores the intricate relationships between movement, space, and power. This interdisciplinary approach draws from phenomenology, examining the embodied experience, and extends into critical theory, analyzing how spatial dynamics reflect and influence power relations. The concept is further enriched by post-structuralist perspectives, particularly those of Deleuze and Guattari, who advocate for a non-linear, networked understanding of knowledge and social structures. Kinopolitics challenges traditional notions of sovereignty and territoriality, offering insights into contemporary issues like globalization, migration, and the impact of digital technologies on social dynamics. This framework highlights the importance of physical and informational mobility in shaping political and social landscapes, advocating for a deeper understanding of the ways movement and space intersect with and define political and social realities.

Kinopolitics, as an explicit field, does not have a long-established historical lineage but rather represents a contemporary convergence of ideas from various intellectual traditions. Key figures in the development of kinopolitical thought include Henri Lefebvre, Michel Foucault, and Gilles Deleuze. Lefebvre, in "The Production of Space," explores how space is socially produced, influencing, and reflecting social dynamics. Foucault's concept of biopower and his analysis of panopticism in "Discipline and Punish" highlight how control and power extend into spatial and bodily realms. Deleuze, along with Félix Guattari in "A Thousand Plateaus," introduces the idea of the rhizome, emphasizing non-hierarchical, interconnected ways of understanding space and movement. These thinkers, although not explicitly kinopolitical, have significantly influenced the field's perspective on movement, space, and power.

Henri Lefebvre's "The Production of Space" delves into how space is not merely a physical backdrop but actively shaped by and shaping social dynamics. He argues

that space is a product of complex social processes and is instrumental in societal structures.

Michel Foucault's "Discipline and Punish" introduces the concept of panopticism, illustrating how modern societies implement disciplinary methods that extend into the spatial and bodily realms. His analysis emphasizes how power operates through the organization and control of space.

Especially important for this work, Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, in "A Thousand Plateaus," present the concept of the rhizome, a metaphor for knowledge and cultural dissemination that is non-linear and non-hierarchical. This idea disrupts traditional, tree-like structures of knowledge, suggesting a more interconnected and multiplicitous understanding of space and movement.

Rhizomes are non-hierarchical, non-linear structures that defy traditional notions of order and control. They embody the fluidity and openness that anarchists seek to foster in society. In contrast to the rigid, top-down structure of the state, rhizomes represent a more flexible and adaptable mode of organization. They suggest a society that is open to change, experimentation, and the emergence of new forms of community and governance. Assemblages, a concept developed by Deleuze and Guattari in their collaborative works, refer to heterogeneous networks or configurations of interrelated elements.

These elements can be of any nature – material, social, linguistic, or conceptual. Assemblages are characterized by their ability to link disparate entities in a manner that both preserves the individuality of each component and creates a new collective entity. This approach emphasizes fluidity, openness, and multiplicity. The strength of an assemblage lies in its capacity for adaptation and reconfiguration in response to changing circumstances, thus challenging fixed and rigid structures.

Rhizomes, on the other hand, represent a metaphor and model for knowledge and cultural dissemination that is non-hierarchical and non-linear. Drawing from botanical imagery, a rhizome is an underground stem that sends out roots and shoots

from its nodes. In Deleuzian philosophy, this translates to a way of thinking and organizing knowledge that is characterized by connectivity, heterogeneity, and multiplicity. Unlike traditional tree-like (arborescent) structures that operate through binary and hierarchical logic, rhizomatic structures enable multiple, non-hierarchical entry and exit points in data representation and interpretation.

An example of a rhizomatic social structure in practice can be seen in decentralized, peer-to-peer networks like those used in open-source software development communities. In these communities, there is no central authority dictating how projects progress. Instead, individuals contribute autonomously, with ideas and modifications branching out in various directions, much like a rhizome. This approach allows for a diverse range of contributions and rapid adaptation, embodying the principles of non-hierarchical organization and collaborative development inherent in a rhizomatic structure. While an example of an assemblage in practice is a grassroots community organization. Such an organization is formed by diverse individuals coming together for a common cause, bringing their unique skills, backgrounds, and perspectives. This group is not defined by a rigid structure; rather, it's characterized by the dynamic interplay of its members' contributions. Each member retains their individuality while collectively contributing to the organization's goals, adapting and reorganizing as needs and circumstances change. This fluidity and multiplicity of connections embody the concept of an assemblage.

While both assemblages and rhizomes are concerned with connections and relationships, assemblages focus more on the pragmatic linking of diverse elements to form a functional unit, whereas rhizomes emphasize a theoretical model for understanding knowledge and social structures in a non-linear and non-hierarchical manner.

In sum, while assemblages and rhizomes in Deleuzian philosophy share a resistance to traditional, rigid structures, they do so from different vantage points: assemblages highlight the pragmatic and operational aspect of interconnected, heterogeneous

systems, whereas rhizomes offer a theoretical framework for understanding knowledge and culture as inherently decentralized, interconnected, and dynamic.

Analysing social movements through a kinopolitical lens enables a critique of rigid power structures. Kinopolitics, focusing on movement and space, illuminates how social movements physically and symbolically challenge and navigate these structures. It reveals the dynamics of protest movements, like occupying spaces or marching, as forms of resistance against established power. This perspective underscores the significance of spatial strategies in social movements, showing how the reclamation or transformation of spaces can symbolically and practically undermine entrenched power dynamics. Thus, kinopolitics provides a valuable framework for understanding and strategizing within social movements, emphasizing the importance of spatial tactics in the broader struggle against oppressive systems.

The rhizomatic analysis of power structures, as conceptualized in kinopolitical thought, directly challenges traditional hierarchical models. In a rhizomatic system, power is decentralized, spreading out like roots or networks rather than flowing from a single top-down source. This means that influence and control are not confined to a specific locus but are distributed across various nodes, each capable of growth and change. Such a framework allows for a more dynamic understanding of power relations in society, highlighting the fluidity and multiplicity of influence and control. By recognizing the diverse and interconnected nature of power, rhizomatic analysis undermines the rigidity of hierarchical power structures, suggesting that change can originate from multiple points rather than a singular authority. This perspective is particularly relevant for analysing and strategizing within social movements, where the reclamation or transformation of space and the creation of new networks can serve as effective forms of resistance against established power dynamics.

Kinopolitics, with its focus on movement, space, and the body in political contexts, is a critical component in the synthesis of post-anarchistic thought. It complements

post-anarchism's emphasis on deconstructing traditional power structures and reimagining social organization. By incorporating kinopolitical perspectives, post-anarchism gains a deeper understanding of how physical and symbolic movements within spaces can challenge and alter power dynamics. This integration broadens the scope of post-anarchism, allowing it to address contemporary sociopolitical issues more effectively by understanding the role of spatial dynamics in resistance and social change.

## 6. The Overlap of Anarchism, and Post-Structuralism

Post-structuralism and anarchism are two philosophies that mutually benefit from each other due to their shared critiques of hierarchical power structures and their emphasis on individual freedom, decentralization, and social justice. Michel Foucault's analysis of power shifts the focus from power being held by groups or individuals to its exercise through social institutions, discourses, and practices. Foucault (1977) introduces the notions of 'biopower' and 'governmentality', underscoring the state's control over individual bodies and lives. He posits that power is both pervasive and productive, a constitutive element in social relations that shapes knowledge and subjectivity (Foucault, 1977).

Gilles Deleuze, in collaboration with Félix Guattari, proposes a non-hierarchical, fluid, and networked conception of power and knowledge. Their introduction of the 'rhizome' model challenges traditional hierarchical (arborescent) structures, suggesting a multiplicity in knowledge and power networks that allows for resistance (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). Byung-Chul Han examines neoliberal power structures, emphasizing their exploitation of autonomy and individuality. In the digital age, Han (2017) argues, power operates not through overt domination but through subtle coercion, leading to a state of self-exploitation under the guise of freedom, particularly within consumer culture and digital technologies.

Han is a prominent South Korean philosopher and cultural theorist. He has proffered a nuanced examination of contemporary social dynamics, particularly encapsulated within the framework of what he terms the "society of exhaustion" or "burnout society." (Han, 2015) Han's discourse is notably characterized by an exploration of several interconnected themes that collectively illuminate the challenges and ramifications of modern existence.

Han's analysis in "The Burnout Society" (Han, 2015) offers valuable insights that can be synergistic for post-structuralist anarchist analysis, particularly in adapting



anarchist ideology to contemporary technological and social realities. Han's critique of modern capitalist societies, marked by self-exploitation and the imperative of achievement, can enrich anarchist thought in several ways.

Han's concept of self-exploitation aligns with the post-structuralist anarchist critique of power structures. Post-structuralist anarchism, which focuses on deconstructing traditional power hierarchies, can draw from Han's analysis to understand how power is internalized and reproduced by individuals themselves in modern societies. This understanding is crucial for developing strategies that not only confront external forms of power but also address the ways in which individuals internalize and perpetuate these power structures.

Peter Kropotkin advocates for mutual aid and cooperation as foundational principles for social organization. He critiques centralized power structures and promotes a decentralized, stateless society based on voluntary association and mutual aid, challenging the notion of the state as a necessary social institution (Kropotkin, 1902). Pierre-Joseph Proudhon is critical of property relations upheld by state power, famously declaring "property is theft" (Proudhon, 1840). He envisions a society where individuals and workers control their means of production, free from state or capitalist intervention. Mikhail Bakunin emphasizes the need to abolish the state and implement a federated system of free associations. He views the state as inherently oppressive and advocates for revolutionary action to dismantle state and capitalist structures (Bakunin, 1873).

Both post-structuralists and anarchists provide critical analyses of power structures, but their focuses and methodologies diverge. Post-structuralists like Foucault and Deleuze delve into the complexities of power as embedded in societal practices and discourses. In contrast, anarchists like Kropotkin, Proudhon, and Bakunin concentrate on dismantling centralized, oppressive structures, such as the state and capitalism.

Post-structuralists tend to employ theoretical, discursive analyses, while anarchists propose practical and often revolutionary means to disrupt power structures. While post-structuralists perceive power as diffused within knowledge and societal norms, anarchists focus on its relation to economic and political structures.

In terms of solutions, anarchists offer clear alternatives, including mutual aid, voluntary association, and decentralization.

In summation, while both traditions offer significant insights into the nature and dynamics of power, their approaches, methodologies, and envisaged solutions exhibit notable differences. Post-structuralists provide a nuanced framework for understanding modern power complexities, whereas anarchists focus on direct action and concrete alternatives to existing power structures.

By examining the key aspects of both post-structuralism and anarchism, it is possible to identify the synergies between these philosophies and the potential for their productive intersection. Both post-structuralism and anarchism challenge and critique hierarchical power structures. Post-structuralism exposes the ways in which power operates through discourses, language, and institutions. It reveals how hierarchical power structures, embedded in social, political, and cultural systems, reinforce inequality and oppression. Post-structuralism, through its diverse thinkers, dissects how power permeates discourses and institutions.

Michel Foucault, in "Discipline and Punish," illustrates power's operational mechanisms in societal institutions like prisons, showing how surveillance and discipline become internalized. He exemplifies how power operates through institutions by analysing the prison system. He demonstrates how disciplinary methods create a 'docile body' suited for economic and political systems. In "The History of Sexuality," he explores how discourse around sexuality serves as a means of power. His "The History of Sexuality" delves into how power is exerted through discourse, particularly in shaping societal norms around sexuality. Jacques Derrida, in works like "Of Grammatology," deconstructs language and text, revealing inherent power structures within them. He shows how language and text

embed power structures, arguing that meaning is not fixed but constantly deferred, thus challenging traditional assumptions of linguistic power.

Deleuze and Guattari, especially in "A Thousand Plateaus," conceptualize power as a network of relations. These diverse analyses collectively uncover the multifaceted ways power is embedded in social, political, and cultural systems. They reimagine power as a decentralized web, moving away from a top-down model to one of multiple, intersecting lines of power and influence, which is crucial in understanding the complexity of modern power structures. These perspectives provide a comprehensive view of how power is intricately woven into the very fabric of society. Anarchism, on the other hand, rejects centralized authority and advocates for a society where power is decentralized, and people govern themselves. By dismantling hierarchical power structures, both post-structuralism and anarchism seek to empower individuals and promote a more just and equitable society.

Both philosophies prioritize individual freedom and autonomy. Post-structuralism questions essentialist notions of identity and emphasizes the agency of individuals to construct their own identities and resist oppressive norms. It is important to recognize that reconciling the apparent dichotomy between the post-structuralist critique of the subject and anarchism's emphasis on individual autonomy and freedom is a difficult task in formulating a coherent post-anarchistic narrative. Post-structuralism, especially in the works of thinkers like Foucault and Derrida, often deconstructs the subject, arguing that it is a construct of socio-cultural discourses rather than an autonomous, self-determining entity. This view challenges the traditional anarchist notion of the inherently free and rational individual.

To synthesize these perspectives, one could argue that post-anarchism offers a more flexible and context-sensitive understanding of the subject. It doesn't dismiss the importance of individual agency, as emphasized in anarchism, but rather reframes it within a broader network of power relations and social structures. This

rearticulation allows for an acknowledgment of how individual identities and agencies are shaped by, and interact with, the larger socio-political context.

Post-anarchism can embrace a notion of the subject that is fluid and continuously in the process of becoming, influenced by various social forces but still capable of agency and resistance. This aligns with the post-structuralist view that subjectivities are formed through discourse and power relations, yet it also retains the anarchist commitment to individual autonomy by recognizing the potential for agency within these structures.

Moreover, post-anarchism can utilize the critique of essentialist notions of identity to strengthen anarchist practices. By acknowledging the multiplicity of experiences and identities, post-anarchism can advocate for a form of anarchism that is more inclusive, adaptable, and responsive to different forms of oppression and domination.

In summary, post-anarchism provides a nuanced narrative that acknowledges the complexities of individual subjectivity as shaped by social structures, while still upholding the importance of individual freedom and agency. This synthesis allows for a more inclusive, dynamic understanding of the role of the individual within anarchism, adapting traditional principles to contemporary socio-political realities.

Anarchism, rooted in principles of voluntary association and self-governance, seeks to maximize individual freedom by dismantling oppressive systems of control. It advocates for a society where individuals have the autonomy to make decisions that affect their lives and communities.

The emphasis on individual freedom in both post-structuralism and anarchism aligns them in their rejection of oppressive structures and their focus on empowering individuals. Both also recognize the importance of collective action and solidarity. Post-structuralism highlights the interdependence of individuals and

the ways in which power operates through networks of relationships. It emphasizes the need for alliances and solidarity among marginalized groups to challenge dominant power structures.

Anarchism, with its emphasis on mutual aid and voluntary cooperation, fosters communities built on solidarity and shared responsibility. It advocates for collective action and grassroots organizing to address social injustices. The emphasis on collective agency and solidarity in both philosophies provides a basis for collaboration and shared goals in challenging oppressive systems. The critical and analytical tools of post-structuralism can enrich the theoretical underpinnings of anarchism. Post-structuralist insights into power dynamics, discourse analysis, and the construction of social reality can deepen our understanding of how power operates within anarchist praxis.

Anarchistic philosophy is fundamentally centred on the empowerment of individuals and the collective agency of societies formed by these empowered individuals. This dual focus is a defining characteristic of anarchism. Post-anarchism differentiates itself from other liberal-left ideologies primarily in its foundation and approach to power and authority. Unlike liberal ideologies that often work within the framework of existing state structures and seek reform through established political processes, post-anarchism fundamentally questions and seeks to dismantle hierarchical power structures, including the state. It combines the anti-authoritarian ethos of traditional anarchism with post-structuralist critiques of power, identity, and language. This synthesis leads to a unique stance that is more radical in its critique of power and more experimental in its approach to social organization than many liberal-left ideologies. Post-anarchism's emphasis on decentralization, direct action, and a critical stance towards all forms of domination sets it distinctly apart. It is rooted in the belief that true social and political change is realized through the liberation and empowerment of each individual, which in turn fosters a robust and dynamic collective agency.

Anarchism places a strong emphasis on individual autonomy and freedom. It asserts that every person should have the liberty to live according to their own choices, free from oppressive structures of authority and control. This is not just a matter of personal freedom, but also of personal development and fulfilment. Anarchistic thinkers like Emma Goldman and Max Stirner argued for the intrinsic value of the individual, where self-realization and personal empowerment are seen as fundamental (Goldman, 1910; Stirner, 1844). This perspective views individual autonomy as the cornerstone of a just and free society.

The empowerment of individuals in anarchism also extends to the idea of self-governance. Anarchists advocate for individuals to have a direct role in the decisions that affect their lives, rejecting hierarchical forms of governance. This principle is rooted in the belief that individuals, when free from coercive structures, are capable of organizing their lives and communities in a manner that is both ethical and efficient.

Anarchism, while valuing individual autonomy, also emphasizes the importance of collective action and mutual aid. Contrary to common misconceptions, anarchism does not equate to disorganization or isolationism; rather, it envisions a society where individuals voluntarily cooperate and work together for the common good. Pioneering anarchist thinker Peter Kropotkin highlighted the role of mutual aid as a factor in evolution, arguing that cooperation, not just competition, is a driving force in the development of species, including human societies (Kropotkin, 1902).

The collective agency in anarchistic societies is characterized by horizontal organization and decentralized decision-making. This means that decisions are made collectively, often through consensus or direct democracy, ensuring that the voices of all members of the community are heard and valued. The idea is that empowered individuals, when acting in concert, can create societal structures that are more equitable, just, and responsive to the needs of all members.

Anarchism seeks a synthesis of individual and collective empowerment, viewing them as mutually reinforcing. The liberation of the individual is seen as integral to the creation of a free society, just as a free society is essential to the full realization of individual potential. This dialectical relationship underscores the anarchist vision of a society where individuals are not subsumed by the collective but are instead its vital components, contributing to and benefiting from a shared social and political life.

Conversely, anarchism's emphasis on decentralization, direct action, and egalitarian social relationships can provide a practical framework for enacting the political ideals explored within post-structuralist theory. The broader political ideals of post-structuralism are rooted in a critique of fixed structures, binary oppositions, and grand narratives that have traditionally dominated Western thought. This philosophical approach, emanating from the works of thinkers like Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Gilles Deleuze, and others, challenges the conventional foundations of authority, identity, and knowledge.

Post-structuralism inherently questions and deconstructs rigid structures and hierarchies. It posits that structures, whether linguistic, social, or political, are not naturally given but are constructed and therefore mutable. This scepticism towards fixed structures aligns with anarchism's critique of hierarchical and authoritarian institutions, especially the state.

Another key aspect of post-structuralism is its critique of metanarratives or grand narratives – overarching stories or perspectives that claim universal truth. This critique parallels anarchism's scepticisms towards all-encompassing ideologies and its preference for diverse, decentralized perspectives and experiences.

Foucault's analysis of power as diffuse, pervasive, and embedded in everyday practices is a central theme in post-structuralist thought. This view of power as not merely concentrated in the state or in institutions, but as exercised through a myriad of social practices, resonates with anarchist concerns about power in all its forms and the need for constant vigilance and resistance.

Post-structuralism also challenges essentialist notions of identity, arguing that identities are not fixed or inherent but are socially constructed and fluid. This aligns with anarchism's resistance to fixed categories that define and constrain individuals, advocating instead for a more fluid understanding of self and community.

Deleuzian thought, particularly the concept of the rhizome, presents a model of knowledge and social organization that is non-hierarchical, non-linear, and interconnected. This approach to organization and knowledge mirrors the anarchist emphasis on decentralized, non-hierarchical networks and communities.

Post-structuralism often emphasizes the role of individual autonomy and the capacity for resistance within existing power structures. This idea of individual and collective agency is a core principle in anarchism, which advocates for self-governance and resistance against oppressive structures.

The intersection of post-structuralism and anarchism offers a fertile ground for dialogue and collaboration. By combining the insights of post-structuralism with the transformative aims of anarchism, it becomes possible to envision a more just and emancipatory society that challenges oppressive systems, empowers individuals, and fosters collective agency.



## 7. The Target of Anarchist Critique, and Its Transformative Aims

Capitalism, as traditionally understood, refers to an economic system where trade and industry are controlled by private owners for profit. It's characterized by private property, capital accumulation, wage labour, voluntary exchange, a price system, and competitive markets.

Hyper-capitalism, a term used in political philosophy, refers to an intensified form of capitalism that goes beyond these traditional characteristics. It is marked by the dominance of financial markets, the commodification of almost all aspects of life, extreme consumerism, and significant power held by multinational corporations over political and social affairs. In this sense, today's world is often seen as hyper-capitalistic due to the global reach of capitalism, the pervasive influence of consumer culture, and the extensive power wielded by corporations and financial institutions. This evolution has led to increased economic inequalities, environmental degradation, and challenges to traditional social structures and values.

From an anarchistic perspective, the critique of hyper-capitalism focuses on its intensification of power imbalances, commodification of life, and environmental degradation. Anarchists argue that hyper-capitalism exacerbates economic inequalities, undermines democratic processes, and prioritizes profit over social and environmental welfare. They emphasize the need for decentralized, community-based systems that promote mutual aid and sustainable practices, rejecting the centralized power structures inherent in hyper-capitalism. This critique aligns with anarchism's broader goal of dismantling hierarchical systems and advocating for a society based on egalitarian principles and cooperative living.

Hyper-capitalism, a term used in political philosophy, refers to an intensified form of capitalism that goes beyond these traditional characteristics. It is marked by the dominance of financial markets, the commodification of almost all aspects of life,

extreme consumerism, and significant power held by multinational corporations over political and social affairs. In this sense, today's world is often seen as hyper-capitalistic due to the global reach of capitalism, the pervasive influence of consumer culture, and the extensive power wielded by corporations and financial institutions. This evolution has led to increased economic inequalities, environmental degradation, and challenges to traditional social structures and values.

Anarchistic philosophy, in its transformative aims against hyper-capitalism, seeks to dismantle hierarchical power structures and replace them with decentralized, egalitarian communities. Anarchism challenges the centralization of power and wealth inherent in hyper-capitalism, advocating for a society based on mutual aid, cooperative economics, and sustainable living. This approach emphasizes direct action and grassroots organizing as means to resist and transform the current capitalist system into one that values human needs, social equity, and environmental stewardship. Anarchists envision a radical restructuring of society where decisions are made democratically at the local level, and resources are shared equitably among all. Such has been demonstrated in neo-utopian literature.

Ursula K. Le Guin's "The Dispossessed" serves as a seminal exploration of anarchist principles and their transformative potential, artfully interweaving a narrative with the ideological underpinnings and practical challenges of an anarchist society. Le Guin's novel, set on the twin planets of Urras and Anarres, encapsulates the struggle to realize and maintain an anarchist utopia against the backdrop of contrasting political and social systems.

Le Guin's Anarres represents a tangible manifestation of anarchist ideals. The society, founded by Odo, a revolutionary thinker reminiscent of historical anarchist figures, embodies principles like mutual aid, collective responsibility, and the absence of hierarchical governance (Le Guin, 1974). This setting becomes a canvas for exploring the efficacy of anarchism as a transformative agent.

The protagonist, Shevek, a physicist from Anarres, embarks on a journey to Urras, symbolizing a confrontation between anarchist ideals and capitalist/authoritarian structures. His experiences and reflections throughout the novel underscore the transformative aims of anarchism: the radical restructuring of societal norms, values, and power dynamics.

Le Guin does not shy away from the complexities and challenges inherent in an anarchist society. Anarres, despite its foundations, is not free from problems such as social conformity, bureaucratic tendencies, and the subtle emergence of power structures. This nuanced portrayal highlights the perpetual tension in maintaining an anarchist society and the ease with which ideals can be compromised (Le Guin, 1974).

A central theme in "The Dispossessed" is the relationship between anarchism and individual freedom. Shevek's journey is as much about his personal liberation as it is about his scientific pursuits. Le Guin delves into how anarchism fosters individual creativity and freedom, yet also explores the paradoxes that arise when individual desires conflict with collective needs.

Urras, in contrast to Anarres, embodies capitalist and authoritarian principles, providing a foil to the anarchist model. Le Guin uses Shevek's experiences on Urras to critique these systems, highlighting issues of inequality, oppression, and environmental degradation. The stark differences between the two societies underscore the transformative potential of anarchism in addressing these systemic issues.

"The Dispossessed" provides a profound contrast between the anarchist society of Anarres and the characteristics of today's hyper-capitalistic society. This comparison illuminates the differing values, structures, and outcomes inherent in these two socio-economic systems.

Anarres represents a society built on anarchist principles, where the economy functions without money, property, or centralized government. The social fabric is

woven through mutual aid, collective decision-making, and a strong emphasis on communal welfare (Le Guin, 1974). This contrasts sharply with today's hyper-capitalistic societies, characterized by market-driven economies, private property, wealth accumulation, and significant socio-economic disparities.

In the Anarresti society, resources and goods are distributed based on need, ensuring a level of egalitarianism, and minimizing economic disparities. In contrast, contemporary hyper-capitalistic systems often result in significant wealth concentration, with market mechanisms and capitalist values prioritizing profit and individual accumulation over equitable distribution.

Le Guin's Anarres champions a form of collectivism that values the community and collective well-being above individual gain. This is in stark contrast to hyper-capitalistic societies, where individualism and competition are often celebrated, leading to social stratification and a focus on personal success, sometimes at the expense of communal well-being.

In "The Dispossessed," work is seen as a communal duty and a means of contributing to the society, devoid of exploitation or class struggle. The hyper-capitalistic model, however, often results in labour commodification, where work is primarily a means to earn wages and labour dynamics are influenced by class and power hierarchies.

Anarres demonstrates a keen awareness of environmental stewardship, understanding the intrinsic value of nature and its sustainable use. Hyper-capitalistic tendencies, conversely, have often led to environmental exploitation for economic gain, raising concerns about sustainability and ecological impact.

Anarchism in "The Dispossessed" is associated with a high degree of personal freedom within the context of communal responsibility. Hyper-capitalistic societies, while promoting individual liberty, often see this freedom constrained by market forces and socio-economic hierarchies, leading to differing degrees of freedom based on economic status.



## 8. Deleuze and Guattari in Anarchist Theory and Praxis

In their edited volume "Deleuze and Anarchism," Chantelle Gray van Heerden and Aragorn Eloff present a compelling case for the relevance of Deleuze and Guattari's philosophical thought to anarchist theory and praxis.

They argue that Deleuze and Guattari's concepts and ideas align with key principles of anarchism, such as decentralization, anti-authoritarianism, and the rejection of fixed hierarchies. As it will be further discussed below, Deleuze and Guattari's philosophy shares a strong critique of hierarchical structures and centralized power, emphasizing the dismantling of fixed hierarchies and the creation of alternative forms of organization. This resonates with anarchist principles that reject oppressive power structures and advocate for horizontal, non-hierarchical relationships. Deleuze advocates for a society where power is decentralized, dispersed, and negotiated among individuals and communities, aligning with anarchist aspirations for autonomy and freedom.

Deleuze and Guattari's concept of assemblages, as explored in "A Thousand Plateaus," offers a powerful framework for understanding the complex and dynamic nature of social formations. Assemblages are not static, monolithic structures but rather fluid networks of heterogeneous elements, constantly in flux and open to transformation. This notion resonates with the anarchist emphasis on decentralization and the rejection of rigid hierarchies. Anarchists envision a society composed of self-governing communities, where power is distributed among individuals and groups rather than concentrated in a central authority. Deleuze and Guattari's assemblages provide a way to conceptualize these decentralized structures, highlighting the interconnectedness and fluid boundaries between different components of a society.

Deleuze and Guattari's concept of rhizomes, introduced in "A Thousand Plateaus," further complements anarchist ideals by challenging the notion of a stable, hierarchical social order.

In "Difference and Repetition," Gilles Deleuze's concept of 'becoming' is an intricate exploration of change, difference, and the non-static nature of identity. Deleuze rejects traditional notions of static being and fixed identity, proposing instead that existence is characterized by constant flux and transformation. 'Becoming' refers to this process of continuous change and differentiation, where entities evolve not towards a final form or identity, but through an ongoing series of transformations influenced by their interactions and relationships. This concept challenges conventional metaphysics and ontology, emphasizing the dynamic, interconnected nature of reality.

*“Whether we are individuals or groups, we are made up of lines and these lines are very varied in nature. The first kind of line which forms us is segmentary — of rigid segmentarity (or rather there are already many lines of this sort): family — profession; job — holiday; family — and then school — and then the army — and then the factory — and then retirement. And each time, from one segment to the next, they speak to us, saying: ‘Now you’re not a baby any more’; and at school, “‘You’re not at home now’; and in the army, ‘You’re not at school now’. . . In short, all kinds of clearly defined segments, in all kinds of directions, which cut us up in all senses, packets of segmentarized lines. At the same time, we have lines of segmentarity which are much more supple, as it were molecular. It’s not that they are more intimate or personal — they run through societies and groups as much as individuals. They trace out little modifications, they make detours, they sketch out rises and falls: but they are no less precise for all this, they even direct irreversible processes. But rather than molar lines with segments, they are molecular fluxes with thresholds or quanta. A threshold is crossed, which does not necessarily coincide with a segment of more visible lines. Many things happen on this second kind of line - \_becomings, micro-becomings, which don’t even have the same rhythm as our ‘history’. This is why family histories, registrations, commemorations, are so unpleasant, whilst our true changes take place elsewhere — another*

*politics, another time, another individuation. A profession is a rigid segment, but also what happens beneath it, the connections, the attractions, and repulsions, which do not coincide with the segments, the forms of madness which are secret, but which nevertheless relate to the public authorities: for example, being a teacher, or a judge, a barrister, an accountant, a cleaning lady? At the same time, again, there is a third kind of line, which is even more strange: as if something carried us away, across our segments, but also across our thresholds, towards a destination which is unknown, not foreseeable, not pre-existent. This line is simple, abstract, and yet is the most complex of all, the most tortuous: it is the line of gravity or velocity, the line of flight and of the greatest gradient ('the line that the centre of gravity must describe is certainly very simple, and, so he believed, straight in the majority of cases . . . but, from another point of view, this line has something exceedingly mysterious, for, according to him, it is nothing other than the progression of the soul of the dancer. . . .')* This line appears to arise [surgir] afterwards, to become detached from the two others, if indeed it succeeds in detaching itself. For perhaps there are people who do not have this line, who have only the two others, or who have only one, who live on only one. Nevertheless, in another sense, this line has always been there, although it is the opposite of a destiny: it does not have to detach itself from the others, rather it is the first, the others are derived from it. In any case, the three lines are immanent, caught up in one another. We have as many tangled lines as a hand. We are complicated in a different way from a hand. What we call by different names — schizoanalysis, micro-politics, pragmatics, diagrammatism, rhizomatics, cartography — has no other object than the study of these lines, in groups or as individuals." (Deleuze and Parnet 2007, 124)

Deleuze's concept of 'becoming' significantly informs post-anarchism, particularly in its emphasis on fluidity, change, and the rejection of fixed identities. This notion aligns with post-anarchism's critique of essentialist and static understandings of



social structures and identities. Post-anarchism, integrating post-structuralist ideas, embraces the idea that identities, social relations, and power dynamics are not fixed but are continuously in flux<sup>4</sup>. This perspective challenges traditional anarchist views of a static end-goal society, advocating instead for an understanding of social change as an ongoing process. The concept of 'becoming' thus reinforces post-anarchism's focus on dynamic social organization, decentralized power, and the continuous evolution of resistance strategies. This framework allows post-anarchism to effectively address the complexities and nuances of modern sociopolitical challenges, adapting and evolving in response to changing circumstances.

It also relates to post-anarchism, addresses anarchist concerns about fixed and essentialized notions of identity. Traditional anarchism, while critiquing hierarchical structures, often hinges on a stable understanding of identity and social categories. In contrast, the idea of 'becoming' in post-anarchism challenges these fixed identities. It suggests that identities are fluid, constantly shaped and reshaped by social interactions and power dynamics. This perspective encourages a more flexible approach to social organization and activism, where changing individual and group identities are acknowledged and embraced, allowing for more inclusive and adaptive strategies in anarchist practice. This approach is particularly relevant in addressing issues of diversity, intersectionality, and the multifaceted nature of oppression in contemporary societies.

Deleuze and Guattari's philosophical contributions offer a unique lens through which to view anarchism and its potential for a more just, equitable, and liberatory society. His concepts of assemblages, rhizomatics and becoming provide valuable insights into the dynamics of power, social structures, and individual identities, aligning with key anarchist principles. As anarchism continues to evolve and adapt to the challenges of the 21st century, Deleuze and Guattari's thought remains a

---

<sup>4</sup> A more in depth exploration has been done in *Is A New Life Possible? Deleuze and the Lines* (Miranda 2013)

valuable source of inspiration and guidance. His ideas can help anarchists refine their strategies, expand their understanding of power dynamics, and envision new forms of decentralized, self-organized societies.

Deleuze and Guattari's philosophical framework has also found a significant resonance with. Both Deleuzian thought and kinopolitics share a common emphasis on the fluidity, interconnectedness, and transformative potential of movement. Deleuzian notion of assemblages, as articulated in "A Thousand Plateaus," provides a conceptual tool for understanding movement as a dynamic and interconnected network of heterogeneous elements. Assemblages are not static entities but rather fluid and ever-evolving constellations of bodies, ideas, and practices. This emphasis on fluidity resonates with kinopolitics' focus on the movement of people, ideas, and resources across borders and boundaries. Deleuzian concept of rhizomes, introduced in the same work, further complements kinopolitics by challenging the notion of a stable, hierarchical social order. Rhizomes, with their non-hierarchical and non-linear structure, represent a more fluid and open-ended mode of organization. This aligns with kinopolitics' challenge to traditional notions of power and authority, which often rely on rigid hierarchies and fixed structures.

Deleuzian idea of "*becoming*," explored in "Difference and Repetition," offers a perspective on identity and subjectivity that mirrors kinopolitics' emphasis on the fluid and transformative nature of movement. "*Becoming*" challenges the idea of fixed and essentialized identities, instead suggesting that they are fluid, multifaceted, and constantly in a state of transformation. This aligns with kinopolitics' critique of static and predetermined identities, which often serve to reinforce hierarchical power structures.

The intersection between Deleuzian thought and kinopolitics offers a valuable framework for understanding and navigating the complex dynamics of movement in contemporary society. Both perspectives emphasize the fluidity, interconnectedness, and transformative potential of movement, providing insights

into how movement can be harnessed for both emancipatory and oppressive purposes.

Deleuze and Guattari's concepts of assemblages, rhizomes, and becoming can be applied to analyse kinopolitical phenomena such as migration patterns, social movements, and the circulation of ideas and images. These concepts can also guide kinopolitical strategies and tactics for challenging oppressive power structures and creating avenues in which the goals of anarchism can be expanded on.

As such, while acknowledging the foundational contributions of traditionalist anarchism, there is a growing recognition of the value of a Deleuzian, kinopolitical, post-structuralist approach. This perspective not only challenges entrenched assumptions but also broadens the scope of anarchist thought, offering new pathways for social transformation that are attuned to the complexities of the modern world.

## 9. Introducing Kyriarchy into The Equation

Kyriarchy is a term and concept that significantly broadens the scope of analysis in critical theory, particularly in the field of feminism and intersectionality. The term was coined by Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza in 1992 in her work "But She Said: Feminist Practices of Biblical Interpretation." It derives from the Greek words "kyrios" (lord or master) and "arche" (rule or dominion) and is used to describe a social system or set of connecting social systems built around domination, oppression, and submission. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, a feminist theologian, introduced the term as a critique of both patriarchy and androcentrism in theological and ecclesiastical structures. She argued that the traditional feminist focus on patriarchy was too limited as it did not adequately address the multiplicity of oppressions that intersect in complex ways.

Kyriarchy, a concept highlighting intersecting and overlapping power structures, poses a significant challenge to anarchist projects. It expands the critique of power beyond traditional anarchist concerns, encompassing various forms of domination like racism, sexism, and classism. Addressing kyriarchy within anarchist philosophy is crucial for a comprehensive understanding of power dynamics and oppression. Anarchism, traditionally focused on state and capitalist structures, must broaden its analysis to include these intersecting hierarchies. This expanded focus is essential for building inclusive, effective resistance movements that address all forms of oppression, not just those traditionally recognized by anarchist thought.

The concept of kyriarchy was embraced and expanded within intersectional feminism. Scholars like Kimberlé Crenshaw, who coined the term "intersectionality," contributed to this development by highlighting the importance of understanding how different forms of oppression (such as racism, sexism, classism, and ableism) intersect and reinforce each other. It posits that distinct kinds of oppression are interlinked and cannot be examined in isolation. In the broader

field of social theory, kyriarchy has been used to critique traditional power structures and social hierarchies. It offers a more comprehensive framework for analysing the complex and multifaceted nature of power and oppression in society. In contemporary discourse, particularly in discussions around social justice, identity politics, and systemic inequality, kyriarchy is increasingly used to understand and articulate the dynamics of power and oppression in more nuanced and comprehensive ways. Kyriarchy, therefore, represents an important conceptual shift in critical theory, offering a framework for understanding the interrelated and overlapping structures of power and oppression that shape individual and collective experiences in society. It underscores the necessity of a multidimensional approach to social justice, one that recognizes the diverse and interconnected ways in which various forms of inequality and domination operate.

Kyriarchy is not merely the sum of these individual systems; it is a complex matrix of power that operates simultaneously and interdependently. These systems reinforce and reproduce each other, creating a hierarchical structure that elevates certain groups while marginalizing others. It can be argued that kyriarchy poses a significant threat to anarchist projects, which aim to create a more just and equitable society free from oppression. Anarchists envision a world without hierarchies, where individuals are self-governed and empowered to participate in decision-making processes.

However, kyriarchy undermines these aspirations by perpetuating and reinforcing existing power structures. At the core of kyriarchy lies the intertwining of multiple axes of oppression, each reinforcing and exacerbating the others. These axes, including race, class, gender, sexuality, ability, and religion, together form a hierarchical system that privileges certain groups while marginalizing others.

Kyriarchy normalizes these power imbalances, making them seem natural and inevitable, thereby obscuring the possibility of a more just society. The multifaceted nature of kyriarchy poses a significant impediment to anarchist projects.

By dividing oppressed groups along these intersecting lines, kyriarchy hinders collective action and solidarity, weakening the potential for radical social transformation. It fosters mistrust and competition among marginalized individuals, preventing them from recognizing their shared experiences of oppression and uniting in resistance.

Moreover, kyriarchy can insidiously hijack anarchist messaging, appropriating its language and concepts to further its own oppressive agenda. This co-optation can lead to the dilution of anarchist principles and the marginalization of voices critical of kyriarchy within anarchist movements. In response to these challenges, anarchists must adopt a multi-pronged approach to dismantling kyriarchy. Firstly, a nuanced understanding of power dynamics is crucial to identifying and addressing the interconnected forms of oppression that kyriarchy perpetuates. This requires critical analysis of social structures, institutions, and individual interactions, revealing the subtle ways in which kyriarchy maintains its hold on society.

The juxtaposition of post-anarchism with kyriarchy is crucial for a comprehensive critique within anarchist philosophy. Post-anarchism, with its roots in post-structuralist thought, offers tools for deconstructing traditional power narratives, extending this critique to the complex and interlocking hierarchies inherent in kyriarchic systems. Recognizing and addressing kyriarchy is essential in post-anarchist critique as it reveals the multiplicity of oppressions that intersect with class and state power. This expanded focus enables post-anarchism to form more inclusive and effective strategies against diverse forms of domination, ensuring that anarchist praxis remains relevant and responsive to the varied experiences of oppression in contemporary society. Keeping kyriarchic forces in view aligns with post-anarchism's commitment to challenging all forms of power structures, thus fostering a more holistic approach to anarchistic projects.

## 10. The Legacy of Foucault and The Frankfurt School

In the age of digital technology and hyperconnectivity, Han's observations about the pressures of constant productivity and achievement provide a framework for understanding new forms of control and exploitation. Given this I posit that post-structuralist anarchism, in its adaptation to contemporary realities, can utilize these insights to critique and navigate the complexities of digital culture and the gig economy, which often disguise exploitative practices as freedom and flexibility.

Han's critique of the achievement society can inform anarchist strategies that resist not just external authorities, but also the internalized drive to conform to societal norms of productivity and success. This resistance can take the form of promoting alternative values such as communal cooperation, mutual aid, and leisure, countering the prevailing ethos of individual achievement and competition. Han's analysis underscores the need for collective solutions to individual malaises. In a society where burnout and mental health issues are rampant, post-structuralist anarchist thought can advocate for communal forms of care and support, emphasizing the importance of social bonds and community networks over individualistic approaches to well-being.

Furthermore, Han's work highlights the importance of reclaiming individual autonomy and authenticity in a world dominated by performance and efficiency metrics (Han, 2015). Post-structuralist anarchism can incorporate this perspective by emphasizing the liberation of the self from societal expectations and norms, advocating for a form of individuality that is not tied to productivity or achievement.

Han's analysis offered in "The Burnout Society" can significantly contribute to the evolution of post-structuralist anarchism, providing a nuanced understanding of contemporary power dynamics and strategies for resistance. It offers a path forward for adapting anarchist ideology to address the challenges posed by modern capitalist societies, especially in relation to technology, work, and individual well-being.

One pivotal element of Han's analysis centres on the notion of the "achievement society." He posits that present-day societal structures are defined by an unrelenting pursuit of success, productivity, and an overarching positivity. This emphasis on ceaseless achievement imposes significant pressures on individuals, ultimately culminating in stress and burnout. Han critically scrutinizes the ramifications of the "achievement society," underscoring its contributory role in the exhaustion experienced by individuals.

Furthermore, Han delves into the paradigm shift from traditional disciplinary societies to an "achievement society" marked by individualization. In this context, the locus of oppression transitions from external authorities to internalized self-exploitation. Individuals, driven by an imperative for self-optimization, find themselves immersed in a culture of constant striving and relentless competition. The advent of digital technology constitutes another focal point in Han's analysis. While digital connectivity ostensibly promises heightened communication, Han contends that it concurrently engenders a state of perpetual distraction and surveillance. The digital age exacerbates the pressure for constant visibility and accessibility, thereby contributing to feelings of isolation and fatigue.

Han also critiques the prevalence of positive psychology and the tyranny of positivity within contemporary discourse.<sup>5</sup> The insistence on maintaining a perpetually positive mindset, he argues, fosters the repression of negative emotions and internalized stress. This pervasive emphasis on positivity, Han asserts, yields a superficial sense of happiness that conceals underlying societal issues. Consumer culture, according to Han, plays a substantial role in the exhaustion of individuals. The relentless pursuit of novel experiences and commodities inherent in consumerism generates a perpetual sense of dissatisfaction and restlessness. Moreover, the attribution of success or failure to individual responsibility within consumer culture fosters sentiments of guilt and anxiety.

---

<sup>5</sup> *Psycho-Politics: Neoliberalism and New Technologies of Power*



The erosion of privacy in the digital age is another facet of Han's analysis (Han, 2017). The loss of boundaries between public and private spheres, exacerbated by the voluntary sharing of personal information online, is critiqued for inducing self-censorship and conformity. Central to Han's theoretical framework is the concept of "psychopolitics." He posits that contemporary societies employ psychological techniques to govern individuals, operating through the management of minds and emotions. This psychopolitical governance, Han argues, leads to self-exploitation and a gradual erosion of personal freedom.

Han's concept of "psychopolitics" represents a departure from Foucault's earlier notion of "biopolitics." (Alphin and Debrix, 2021) While both concepts delve into the intricate workings of power in modern societies, they diverge significantly in their respective focuses and implications. Michel Foucault's formulation of biopolitics, articulated in later works such as "Society Must Be Defended" and "Security, Territory, Population," revolves around the premise that contemporary forms of power extend beyond individual disciplining to encompass the management of entire populations. Biopolitics, as conceptualized by Foucault, involves the regulation of life at the population level, entailing state interventions in domains such as public health, medicine, and demographic policies. The purview of Foucault's biopolitics encompasses macro-level dynamics, exploring how power operates through institutions and technologies that govern the biological aspects of life.

In contrast, Han's concept of psychopolitics shifts the analytic lens from the macro-level dynamics of populations to the micro-level intricacies of individual subjectivity. Articulated in works such as "Psychopolitics: Neoliberalism and New Technologies of Power," Han posits that contemporary power operates not only through external mechanisms but also through the internalization of norms and the self-regulation of individuals. In psychopolitics, the locus of analysis shifts to the management of minds and emotions, with Han contending that, in neoliberal societies, individuals actively partake in their own subjugation by internalizing the imperatives of constant self-optimization, positivity, and productivity. The

psychological and emotional dimensions of subjectivity become central sites of power, with the self willingly participating in its own governance.

In his middle period, Michel Foucault's analysis of power and authority, especially in his seminal work "Discipline and Punish" (1975), centres significantly around the concept of the Panopticon, an architectural design for prisons proposed by the English philosopher and social theorist Jeremy Bentham. Foucault uses the Panopticon as a metaphor to explore the internalization of surveillance and the subtle mechanisms of power in modern societies.

The Panopticon is a circular building with a central observation tower and cells arranged around the circumference. The key feature is that prisoners in the cells can be observed at any time from the central tower but cannot see into the tower. This creates a sense of constant visibility, ensuring compliance and control.

For Foucault, the Panopticon symbolizes modern disciplinary power's operational principle: constant, unseen surveillance that leads to the internalization of disciplinary mechanisms.

Foucault argues that the Panopticon's primary effect is not physical imprisonment but the continuous psychological awareness of being observed. The possibility of constant surveillance compels the prisoners to regulate their own behaviour, effectively internalizing the authority of the observer.

This internalization of surveillance is a crucial mechanism in Foucault's theory of power. It shifts the focus from overt, repressive forms of power to subtle, normalizing controls embedded in everyday life.

Foucault extends the Panopticon's principle beyond prisons, suggesting that similar disciplinary mechanisms operate in various institutions like schools, hospitals, and factories. This represents a shift from sovereign power (focused on ruling and punishment) to disciplinary power (focused on surveillance and normalization).

Disciplinary power, according to Foucault, works by categorizing, observing, and normalizing individuals, leading to what he terms a "disciplinary society."

The Panopticon model prefigures modern surveillance societies. Foucault's analysis anticipates contemporary concerns about privacy, data surveillance, and the pervasive nature of state and corporate monitoring in the digital age.

It highlights the way power operates not just by prohibitions and laws but through the shaping of norms, behaviours, and identities.

Foucault's concept of the Panopticon has been both influential and controversial (Mathiesen, 1997). It can be argued that it presents a somewhat totalizing and pessimistic view of power and surveillance, potentially underestimating the ways individuals resist and negotiate power structures.

Tying Han's analysis in "The Burnout Society" to Foucault's conceptualization of the Panopticon in "Discipline and Punish" reveals resonance between these two philosophical critiques of modern society (Durmuşahmet, 2022). Both Han and Foucault analyse the mechanisms through which individuals are subjected to forms of power and control, albeit in different socio-historical contexts and with varying focal points.

Han's concept of the burnout society describes a contemporary condition where the imperatives of achievement and self-optimization have led to a new form of self-exploitation. In this society, the drive for productivity and success is internalized to such an extent that individuals voluntarily exploit themselves. This self-exploitation is seen as more efficient than external coercion because it is accompanied by a deceptive feeling of freedom. Han's analysis echoes Foucault's notion of internalized surveillance, as both theorists highlight how modern power dynamics have shifted from overt, external forms of control to more insidious, internalized forms. In Han's society, the panoptic gaze is internalized to the point where the individual becomes both the observer and the observed, constantly pushing themselves towards greater achievements and productivity.

The convergence of Foucault's and Han's analyses lies in their shared focus on the internalization of control mechanisms. While Foucault's Panopticon metaphor addresses how societies produce disciplined subjects through the threat of constant surveillance, Han's Burnout Society extends this to a contemporary setting where the pressure to perform and achieve has become a form of self-surveillance and self-exploitation.

Both frameworks illustrate a transformation in the nature of power and control in modern societies. Foucault's disciplinary power is paralleled in Han's society of achievement, where the maximization of productivity and efficiency has become a voluntarily pursued, yet ultimately oppressive, goal.

In essence, Han's analysis of the Burnout Society can be seen as a contemporary extension of Foucault's ideas about power and surveillance. Both philosophers provide critical insights into the ways modern societies shape individual behaviours and identities, emphasizing the shift from external imposition of power to its internalization and self-perpetuation.

Han's concept of psychopolitics can be viewed as both a critique and an extension of Foucault's biopolitics. While Foucault focused on the external regulation of life at the population level, Han accentuates the internalization of power dynamics within the individual psyche. In the era of psychopolitics, the self becomes a locus of continual self-monitoring, and the subject becomes intricately implicated in the production of their own subjectivity. Han's analysis is particularly attuned to the influences of technology, consumer culture, and the imperative for constant connectivity in shaping contemporary subjectivity, positing the digital age as an intensifying factor in the internalization of societal norms, ultimately leading to a form of self-exploitation and a diminution of genuine freedom.

Han's analysis of modern social dynamics also bears resonance with the foundational tenets of the Frankfurt School's Critical Theory (Delanty and Harris, 2021), particularly in its critique of contemporary culture and societal structures.

The Frankfurt School, a group of scholars associated with the Institute for Social Research in Frankfurt, Germany, developed a critical perspective on culture, mass media, and capitalism during the mid-20th century. One key concept from the Frankfurt School that aligns with Han's analysis is the notion of the "culture industry."

The concept of the culture industry, as elucidated by Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer in their work "Dialectic of Enlightenment," posits that cultural products in advanced capitalist societies are mass-produced commodities designed to generate profit. This commodification of culture, according to the Frankfurt School, leads to a standardization and homogenization of cultural expressions, undermining genuine individual expression and creativity. Han's exploration of the impact of consumer culture on individual well-being dovetails with the Frankfurt School's concerns about the culture industry. The connection between Byung-Chul Han's analysis in "The Burnout Society" and the works of the Frankfurt School, particularly Herbert Marcuse's "One-Dimensional Man" and Max Horkheimer's "Eclipse of Reason," is worth mentioning. While Han is often associated with contemporary post-modernist thought, his critique of modern capitalist societies and the psychological impacts of these systems bear a striking resemblance to the critical theory of the Frankfurt School.

Marcuse, in "One-Dimensional Man," critiqued advanced industrial societies for their pervasive, one-dimensional thinking and the repressive nature of technological rationality. He argued that this one-dimensionality suppresses critical, two-dimensional thinking, leading to a loss of negative thinking and the capacity for critical opposition.

Han's concept of the burnout society parallels this as he describes a societal shift where productivity and achievement have become the sole imperatives, leading to self-exploitation and a loss of individual autonomy. This echoes Marcuse's concerns about the loss of critical, individual thought in favour of a conformist society.

Horkheimer in "Eclipse of Reason" discussed the decline of objective reason and the rise of subjective or instrumental reason in modern societies. He argued that this instrumental rationality reduces reason to a tool for achieving practical ends, neglecting its role in understanding, and critiquing the world.

Han's analysis of the achievement-driven society, where individuals are reduced to performance machines, can be seen as a continuation of Horkheimer's critique of instrumental reason. The focus on productivity and efficiency as ultimate goals reflects the dominance of instrumental rationality at the expense of more contemplative, critical forms of thinking.

The Frankfurt School's critical theory has been influential in the development of post-modernist thought, particularly in its critique of modernity, rationality, and the capitalist socio-economic structure.

Han, while not a direct successor of the Frankfurt School, extends these critiques into the 21st century. His work reflects a post-modern sensibility in its analysis of contemporary societal issues, particularly in terms of the self and social malaise in the digital age.

In synthesizing Han's work with that of the Frankfurt School, it is possible to trace a continuous line of thought critiquing the dehumanizing aspects of modern capitalist societies. This line of thought encompasses the critique of one-dimensional thinking, the dominance of instrumental reason, and the resultant psychological impacts on individuals.

Han's work can be seen as a modern continuation of these themes, updated to reflect the unique challenges of the 21st-century society, particularly in the context of technology, hyperconnectivity, and the internalization of capitalist imperatives.

## 10. Demonstration Within the Genre of Cyberpunk

Now, a demonstration of how these threats manifest, and how such a synthesis as discussed so far, may be in order. There is insight to be found in culture and media. Ernst Bloch's concept of the "Epic Theatre" marks a significant moment in the history of art as a medium for socio-political critique, particularly from a Marxist perspective. His approach to theatre was not merely about entertainment but was intended to provoke critical thinking and social change.

From Bloch's perspective, cultural products like theater are instrumental to this endeavour. Bloch, a Marxist philosopher, saw art not just as a reflection of society but as a powerful force in shaping it. He believed in the potential of art, particularly theater, to awaken hope and the imagination in audiences, thereby inspiring the desire for a better world.

Theater, through its narrative and performative elements, can challenge prevailing ideologies, stimulate critical thinking, and envision alternative realities, making it a vital tool for social critique and change. Bloch's view underlines the transformative power of culture in the broader context of social and political activism. Anarchist philosophy could similarly harness cultural products, such as artistic media, such as movies and video games, with their wide reach and immersive nature, offer unique platforms for conveying anarchist ideas and critiques. They can be used to articulate anarchist critiques of existing social structures and propose alternatives.<sup>6</sup>

Movies can effectively communicate complex anarchist themes through narrative and symbolism. For example, a film could depict the consequences of authoritarianism or the erosion of individual freedoms in a dystopian setting, thus

---

<sup>6</sup> Chomsky in "Manufacturing Consent" demonstrates how media is co-opted for neo-liberal purposes, I conversely attempt to demonstrate other forms of cultural products can be similarly used for anarchistic purposes.

illustrating the dangers of centralized power and the importance of autonomy and individual rights.

Through character arcs, films can explore the transformation of individuals from passive acceptance of authority to critical awareness and active resistance. This aligns with the anarchist emphasis on awakening individual consciousness and encouraging action against oppressive systems.

The visual medium of film can be used to starkly contrast different societal structures, such as hierarchical versus egalitarian communities, thereby visually articulating the anarchist critique of power structures.

Video games offer a unique interactive experience where players can explore alternative social structures and outcomes based on their actions. This agency can be used to demonstrate anarchist principles such as self-organization, mutual aid, and voluntary association.

Games can create immersive worlds that reflect anarchist ideals or dystopias that represent the antithesis of these ideals. Through gameplay, players can experience the consequences of different political and social systems, thus understanding the practical implications of anarchist theory.

The branching narratives in games can illustrate the concept of multiple perspectives, a key tenet in anarchist thought which opposes monolithic narratives and promotes a plurality of viewpoints.

Bloch's use of Epic Theatre set a precedent for using art as a form of social critique. Similarly, anarchist philosophy can co-opt movies and video games to provide a nuanced critique of existing societal structures. This approach is particularly relevant in the contemporary context, where digital media forms are integral to cultural discourse and have a significant impact on shaping public opinion and individual worldviews.



The cyberpunk genre is interesting to examine in this context as it highlights the issues identified Thus far. It is a playground for examining the relationship between power, technology, and social organization.

Cyberpunk, emerging as a significant cultural force in the late 20th century, offers a dark, gritty, and often dystopian vision of the future, where advanced technology is juxtaposed with societal decay and corporate dominance. This genre is not just a set of aesthetic choices; it's a critical response to contemporary socio-political and technological trends, often resonating deeply with anarchist critiques of dehumanization, alienation, and estrangement.

Cyberpunk typically presents a near-future world where technological advancements, especially in the fields of information technology, cybernetics, and artificial intelligence, coexist with societal breakdown. Central themes include the fusion of man and machine, the omnipresence of computer networks, and the blurring of lines between reality and virtual reality. The genre is heavily influenced by the works of authors like William Gibson, whose seminal novel "Neuromancer" set the tone for much of the genre's aesthetic and thematic focus. Anarchist critiques of dehumanization in modern societies find a strong echo in cyberpunk narratives.

The punk genre has a rich anarchic heritage, rooted in its rebellion against mainstream societal norms and its promotion of individual freedom and anti-authoritarianism. Emerging in the 1970s, punk was not just a musical movement but a cultural one, embodying a DIY ethic, a disdain for commercialism, and a critique of political and social structures. This anarchic ethos translated into a raw, unfiltered musical and aesthetic expression that challenged the status quo.

This anarchic spirit of punk significantly influenced the development of the cyberpunk genre. Cyberpunk, emerging in the 1980s, took the rebellious and anti-establishment themes of punk and combined them with futuristic, technological contexts. It presented dystopian visions of societies dominated by technology and mega-corporations, critiquing the dehumanizing effects of advanced capitalism and

technology. Cyberpunk maintained the punk ethos of challenging authority and questioning societal norms, but within the context of a technologically advanced world. The genre's narratives often revolve around marginalized characters fighting against oppressive systems, reflecting punk's anti-authoritarian stance.

The genre often depicts a world where technology, rather than serving humanity, becomes a tool for dehumanizing oppression. This is evident in the frequent portrayal of individuals augmented or replaced by machinery, losing their essential humanity in the process.

Cyberpunk literature often mirrors anarchist concerns about the dehumanizing effects of capitalist and hierarchical systems. These stories typically depict dystopian futures dominated by mega-corporations and technocratic elites, where individuals are subsumed into an impersonal, oppressive system. This reflects the anarchist critique of how capitalism and hierarchical structures can erode individual autonomy and reduce people to mere components within a vast, uncaring machine. The genre's focus on marginalized characters struggling against these overpowering forces aligns with anarchist themes of resistance against oppressive structures and the fight for individual freedom and agency. Cyberpunk thus serves as a narrative exploration of the consequences of unchecked corporate power and technocratic control, issues central to anarchist thought.

"The Blade Runner" and "The Mirror's Edge" are two distinct universes within the cyberpunk genre, each offering a unique vision of a dystopian future marked by advanced technology, societal stratification, and themes of control and resistance.

The universe of "Blade Runner" is primarily depicted in the films "Blade Runner" (1982) and "Blade Runner 2049" (2017), both based on Philip K. Dick's novel "Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?". This universe is characterized by its neo-noir aesthetic, combining futuristic technology with a gritty, urban environment.

The story is set in a dystopian future Earth, where environmental decay and overpopulation have led to the creation of off-world colonies. The setting is a rain-

soaked, neon-lit Los Angeles, marked by towering skyscrapers, dense urban sprawl, and a multicultural, yet fragmented society.

Advanced technology, especially in the field of bioengineering, is a hallmark of this universe. The most notable technological creation is the 'replicants' — bioengineered beings virtually indistinguishable from humans, created for labour and entertainment in off-world colonies.

Central themes include the nature of humanity, the ethics of artificial intelligence, and the quest for identity and autonomy. The story often revolves around 'blade runners,' special police operatives tasked with 'retiring' (i.e., killing) rogue replicants on Earth.

The narrative explores existential and moral questions through the interactions between humans and replicants, delving into what it means to be human in a world where the line between human and machine is blurred.

"The Mirror's Edge" is a video game series, with the original game released in 2008 and its prequel "Mirror's Edge Catalyst" in 2016. The universe of "Mirror's Edge" presents a visually distinct, highly stylized world.

The game is set in a seemingly utopian city where life is highly regulated by a conglomerate of corporations. The city is characterized by its clean, minimalist architecture, with an emphasis on stark whites, bright colours, and sharp contrasts.

The technology in "Mirror's Edge" revolves around advanced surveillance and security systems used to monitor and control the populace. The society is under constant surveillance, with little to no privacy for its citizens.

Key themes in "Mirror's Edge" include surveillance, freedom, and control. The game critiques corporate totalitarianism and the surveillance state, exploring the consequences of sacrificing freedom for security.

The protagonist, Faith Connors, is a 'Runner' — part of an underground courier network that bypasses surveillance to transport sensitive information. The storyline follows Faith's fight against the oppressive regime, highlighting themes of rebellion and the struggle for personal autonomy.

Both universes, while distinct in their aesthetic and narrative specifics, share common cyberpunk themes of advanced technology, societal control, and the tension between autonomy and oppression. They offer compelling explorations of future societies where technology both empowers and subjugates, raising profound questions about freedom, identity, and the human condition in a technologically advanced world.

In "Psycho-Politics," Han discusses the pervasive nature of digital surveillance and how it has led to the erosion of privacy in modern society (Han, 2017). This is a central theme in the world of "Mirror's Edge," where the city is under constant surveillance by a totalitarian regime. The game's protagonist, Faith, navigates a cityscape where personal freedoms are curtailed in the name of security, mirroring Han's concerns about how surveillance technologies, under the guise of providing safety, intrude into the private lives of individuals.

Similarly, "Blade Runner" portrays a future where the distinction between human and artificial life blurs, raising profound questions about identity and surveillance. The replicants, who are under constant scrutiny, embody the existential struggle of individuals under the watchful eye of an omnipresent authority, reflecting Han's observations about the loss of privacy and autonomy in the digital era.

Han also discusses the aestheticization of violence in digital culture (Han, 2015). This is vividly depicted in "Mirror's Edge," where the sleek, sanitized urban environment contrasts sharply with the brutal enforcement of corporate authority. The game's emphasis on visual style and kinetic action illustrates Han's argument about how violence becomes aestheticized and normalized in modern media culture.

"Blade Runner," with its neo-noir aesthetic, also embodies this theme. The film's portrayal of violence, whether through the replicants' struggle for survival or the actions of the blade runners, is stylized, underscoring Han's critique of how violence is made palatable and even attractive in contemporary society.

These works reflect a critique of corporate culture and power relations in capitalism provided by Han, and by post-anarchists. In the movie the portrayal of a society dominated by mega-corporations and the blurring lines between human and technology mirror Han's observations about the dehumanizing effects of hyper-capitalism and technological overreach. "Mirror's Edge" presents a world where surveillance and control are omnipresent, aligning with Han's critique of the surveillance state and post-anarchist concerns about the invasive nature of modern power structures. Both narratives underscore the loss of individual autonomy and the struggle against oppressive, technocratic systems, central themes in Han's work and post-anarchist thought.

Han's examination of the paradoxes of freedom in the age of technology and capitalism (Han, 2017) is another theme that resonates with the Cyberpunk genre. "Mirror's Edge" presents a world where the illusion of freedom and choice masks a deeply controlled and monitored society. The protagonist's role as a 'runner' symbolizes a fight for true freedom, echoing Han's concerns about the deceptive nature of freedom in a hyper-connected, capitalist society.

In "Blade Runner," the replicants' quest for freedom and identity amidst a technologically dominated world highlights the diminishing essence of human experience and autonomy, aligning with Han's views on how technological advancements, rather than liberating individuals, often lead to new forms of control and alienation.

The universes of "Blade Runner" and "Mirror's Edge" serve as poignant reflections of the issues identified by Han regarding the trajectory of modern society. They provide a narrative and visual exploration of the implications of technological

advancement and corporate power on individual freedom, privacy, and identity. Through their depiction of dystopian futures, these Cyberpunk worlds underscore Han's philosophical critiques, offering a grim forecast of the potential consequences of unchecked technological and corporate domination.

## 11. Critiques of Post-Anarchism

Traditional anarchists express several criticisms towards post-structuralist anarchism, stemming from fundamental differences in philosophical approaches and political objectives.

Traditional anarchists perceive post-structuralist anarchism as deviating from or misunderstanding the core tenets of classical anarchism. An example of this is Murray Bookchin's assessment of the post-anarchist trend. In his essay "Social Anarchism or Lifestyle Anarchism: An Unbridgeable Chasm," (1996) Bookchin critiques what he perceives as the individualistic and subjective nature of post-anarchist thought. He argues that post-anarchists, in their emphasis on personal identity and subjective experiences, deviate from the core principles of classical anarchism, which prioritize social revolution and collective action against systemic injustices and hierarchies. Bookchin's critique reflects a broader tension within anarchist circles regarding the direction and focus of the movement. This criticism arises partly because post-structuralist anarchism is seen as an intellectual vacuum that fails to acknowledge the continued relevance and evolution of classical anarchist principles. Traditional anarchists argue that their ideology is not merely an historical phenomenon but a living, ongoing project, which contrasts with the post-structuralist portrayal of classical anarchism as a forerunner to post-structuralist thought.

Post-structuralist anarchism is characterized by a tactical approach to politics, focusing on local, pluralistic interventions. In contrast, traditional anarchism often embraces a more strategic perspective, seeking to address centralized sources of power such as the State. This strategic focus is seen as essential in confronting and dismantling overarching structures of oppression, whereas the tactical approach of post-structuralist anarchism is criticized for being overly fragmented and lacking in unified direction. Bookchin argues that the focus on individualism, personal identity, and subjective experiences in post-structuralist anarchism detracts from the collective struggle against systemic issues. He sees this approach as a deviation

from the core tenets of classical anarchism, which emphasize social revolution and organized action against widespread societal injustices. Bookchin's critique represents a broader debate within anarchist circles regarding the focus and methods of the movement.(1996)

Traditional anarchists are wary of post-structuralist critiques of autonomy and the subject, as seen in the works of Foucault, Deleuze, and others. While post-structuralist anarchism emphasizes the complexity of power relations and how they are internalized within individuals, traditional anarchists maintain a clear distinction between oppressive power structures and the individual. They argue that post-structuralist thought, with its scepticism towards the notion of an autonomous, self-determining individual, undermines the core anarchist value of individual freedom and agency.

Anarchism traditionally distrusts political representation, advocating direct decision-making and consensual action in social life. This contrasts with post-structuralist approaches that sometimes appear more theoretical and less grounded in direct, practical resistance to oppressive structures.

Traditional anarchism is founded on certain moral principles, such as equality and mutual respect, and often opposes the subordination of individuals to external ideals. Post-structuralist anarchism's rejection of overarching moral ideals and its emphasis on the deconstruction of traditional concepts is viewed by traditionalists as potentially leading to moral relativism or nihilism. Bookchin (1996) in particular, emphasizes this concern in his critiques of what he perceives as the individualistic and subjective tendencies in post-anarchism. He argues that this focus could undermine the collective ethical foundations necessary for the implementation of anarchist ideals, which traditionally emphasize communal values and collective social action. This debate highlights a fundamental tension within anarchist theory about the role of ethics and the nature of social change.

Traditional anarchists typically view power as a primarily negative and repressive force, emanating from centralized institutions like the state. In contrast, post-



structuralist anarchism, drawing from thinkers like Foucault, views power as more dispersed and even productive. This fundamental difference leads traditional anarchists to critique post-structuralist anarchism for what they see as an inadequate understanding of the nature of power and the dynamics of oppression. They argue that by viewing power as dispersed and complex, post-structuralist anarchism risks diluting the focus on combating centralized forms of authority, which are seen as the primary sources of oppression.

Traditional anarchists often prioritize direct, collective action aimed at overthrowing oppressive structures and institutions. They argue for a strategic, cohesive approach to political activism, focusing on broader structural changes. Conversely, post-structuralist anarchism, with its emphasis on micropolitics and localized, diverse forms of resistance, is criticized for lacking a unified direction and for being too theoretical or abstract, potentially leading to fragmentation and ineffectiveness in achieving significant social change.

Traditional anarchists place a high value on individual autonomy and the capacity for self-determination, seeing the individual as a key agent of change. Post-structuralist anarchism, however, often challenges the notion of the autonomous subject, suggesting that individuals are deeply shaped by and embedded in power relations and discursive formations. This stance is seen by traditional anarchists as undermining the agency and moral integrity of individuals, potentially leading to a form of nihilism or passivity in the face of oppression.

Traditional anarchism typically embraces certain ethical principles, such as mutual aid, equality, and freedom, as foundational to its vision of a just society. Post-structuralist anarchism's tendency to question or deconstruct these ethical ideals is seen as problematic. Traditional anarchists argue that without a clear ethical framework, the movement risks losing its moral compass, which is essential for building a cohesive and equitable anarchist society.

Traditional anarchists are often critical of post-structuralist anarchism's scepticisms towards overarching ideologies and metanarratives. While post-structuralists

critique these as totalizing and oppressive, traditional anarchists argue that certain ideological foundations are necessary to guide and unify the anarchist movement. They contend that the rejection of these guiding principles could lead to a lack of purpose and direction in the anarchist struggle.

John Zerzan, an influential figure in the anarchist milieu, particularly within the anarcho-primitivist stream, offers a pointed critique of post-structuralism and post-modernism in his essay "The Catastrophe of Postmodernism." (2014) His perspective can be integrated into the broader discourse of traditional anarchist criticisms of post-structuralist anarchism.

Zerzan's primary contention with post-structuralism, and by extension post-structuralist anarchism, revolves around several key areas:

Zerzan argues that post-structuralism, with its focus on language and symbolism, overlooks the material conditions and realities of social and political life. He posits that this focus on the semiotic and discursive aspects of society leads to a neglect of the tangible, real-world consequences of capitalist and industrial systems. This critique aligns with traditional anarchist concerns about post-structuralist anarchism being too abstract and removed from practical action.

As an anarcho-primitivist, Zerzan is critical of technological and industrial advancements, which he sees as inherently oppressive and alienating. Post-structuralism, in his view, fails to adequately critique modernity's reliance on technology and industrialization, and in some cases, it appears to embrace these elements. This stance contrasts sharply with Zerzan's advocacy for a return to more primitive, pre-industrial forms of social organization.

Zerzan challenges the post-structuralist tendency towards relativism and nihilism, arguing that it leads to a lack of clear moral and ethical foundations. He contends that this philosophical stance undermines the potential for genuine resistance and revolutionary change, as it lacks a firm grounding in objective reality and concrete ethical principles.

Zerzan is sceptical of identity politics, which he sees as a product of post-structuralist thought. He argues that focusing on fragmented identities detracts from addressing broader systemic issues and unifying against common oppressors. This perspective resonates with traditional anarchist critiques that post-structuralist anarchism's emphasis on individual and fragmented identities can lead to a dilution of collective revolutionary action.

All in all, traditional anarchists' critiques of post-structuralist anarchism centre on its perceived shortcomings in addressing the nature of power and oppression, its approach to political activism, its views on individual agency and ethics, and its scepticism towards overarching ideologies. These critiques reflect a deeper philosophical divide between the two approaches, with traditional anarchists advocating for a more unified, strategically oriented movement grounded in clear ethical principles and a focus on combating centralized forms of power.

From the perspective of post-structuralist anarchism, the criticisms levelled by traditional anarchists and figures like John Zerzan can be addressed and counter-argued effectively, particularly in the context of reconciling high-technology with the liberatory and emancipatory impetuses of anarchism.

Post-structuralist anarchism argues that its focus on language and discourse is not a negation of material realities but a nuanced understanding of how power is embedded in and operates through language. This perspective asserts that social and political structures are deeply intertwined with discursive practices, and any meaningful change must address these aspects. The critique of language and symbolism is vital in deconstructing and challenging the narratives that uphold oppressive systems. For example, in Saul Newman's work (2001), there is a deep exploration of how language and discourse shape social and political realities. Newman argues that discourses not only reflect but actively construct power dynamics, thereby influencing our understanding of authority, identity, and resistance. This approach stresses the importance of critically engaging with and challenging dominant narratives and discourses, seeing them as key mechanisms through which oppressive systems are maintained and reproduced. Newman's

analysis exemplifies how post-anarchist thought seeks to deconstruct these narratives to facilitate meaningful social change.

Regarding Zerzan's criticism of technology, I propose other anarchists could argue that Han's analysis of the Burnout Society provides a pathway for reconciling high technology with anarchist principles. Han's critique of the achievement-driven society and the self-exploitation fostered by modern technology highlights the need for a critical approach to technology.

Post-anarchism can utilize Byung-Chul Han's critique of technology to reconcile anarchism with high technology, while avoiding its oppressive potentials. Han's insights into how modern technology can lead to self-exploitation and surveillance state are crucial. Post-anarchism can leverage this understanding to advocate for a use of technology that aligns with anarchistic values like decentralization, autonomy, and community empowerment. By critically engaging with technology and emphasizing its ethical use, post-anarchism can navigate the balance between harnessing technological advancements and preventing their coercive applications, thus fostering a society where technology enhances freedom rather than constraining it.

Post-structuralist anarchism can advocate for using technology in ways that align with anarchist values, focusing on decentralization, empowerment of individuals, and fostering communal ties, rather than contributing to capitalist exploitation and alienation.

Post-structuralist anarchism contends that its approach does not lead to moral relativism but instead promotes a more context-sensitive and dynamic understanding of ethics. Rather than adhering to fixed moral principles, it advocates for a continuous ethical engagement that is responsive to changing circumstances and diverse perspectives.

This approach is seen as more adaptable and relevant in addressing the complexities of contemporary social and political issues. In response to the critique of identity politics, post-structuralist anarchists can argue that recognizing diverse identities

and experiences is crucial in understanding the varied and intersectional nature of oppression. This recognition does not fragment resistance but rather enriches it by bringing multiple perspectives and experiences into the struggle against common oppressors. It helps build a more inclusive movement that acknowledges and addresses the specific needs and challenges faced by different groups.

Post-structuralist anarchism defends its tactical approach as being more suited to the dispersed and networked nature of power in contemporary society. By focusing on localized, pluralistic interventions, it aims to create spaces of resistance and alternative practices that challenge and weaken oppressive structures. This approach is seen as more pragmatic and effective in the current social and political landscape, where power is not solely centralized in institutions like the state but is diffused across various social and cultural domains.

In summary, from the perspective of post-structuralist resistance and criticisms of traditional anarchists and figures like Zerzan are addressed by emphasizing the importance of discourse in understanding and challenging power structures, advocating for a critical and emancipatory use of technology, promoting a dynamic and context-sensitive approach to ethics, recognizing the value of diverse identities in building inclusive resistance, and defending the tactical approach as suited to contemporary forms of power. This synthesis of post-structuralist thought with anarchist principles offers a nuanced framework for addressing the challenges and complexities of modern society.

## 12. Interpretation and Synthesis: A Path Forward for Anarchist Thought

Todd May, in his influential work "The Political Philosophy of Post-Structuralist Anarchism," (1994) offers a significant synthesis of traditional and post-structuralist anarchism. He acknowledges the strengths and limitations of both approaches, arguing that they can complement and enrich each other.

May recognizes the importance of both the tactical focus of post-structuralist anarchism and the strategic orientation of traditional anarchism. He suggests that while post-structuralist anarchism is adept at identifying and resisting the diffuse and micro-level manifestations of power, traditional anarchism provides a broader framework for understanding and combating centralized forms of power, such as the state. By integrating these approaches, May proposes a more holistic anarchism that is capable of addressing power dynamics at both the micro and macro levels.

May acknowledges the post-structuralist critique of the autonomous subject but also appreciates the emphasis traditional anarchism places on individual freedom and agency. He suggests that an integrated approach would recognize the ways in which individuals are shaped by power relations while still affirming their capacity for autonomy and resistance. This synthesis allows for a more nuanced understanding of subjectivity, one that acknowledges both the influence of external structures and the potential for individual and collective agency.

While post-structuralist anarchism tends to question overarching moral ideals, traditional anarchism is grounded in ethical principles like mutual aid and equality. May proposes that these ethical commitments can be maintained while still embracing the post-structuralist scepticism towards fixed, universal truths. This approach leads to a flexible, context-dependent ethical framework that can adapt to different situations and challenges.

May synthesizes the post-structuralist analysis of power as a complex, networked phenomenon with the traditional anarchist focuses on decentralization and direct action. He suggests that understanding power in its multiple forms can inform more effective strategies for decentralization and resistance, moving beyond a simplistic focus on the state to address various forms of domination and control in society.

Recognizing the importance of identity and diversity highlighted by post-structuralist thought, May argues for an anarchism that is inclusive and attentive to the experiences of marginalized groups. This approach does not fragment resistance but rather enriches it by bringing a wide range of perspectives and experiences into the struggle against oppression.

Todd May's work represents a thoughtful and innovative attempt to bridge traditional and post-structuralist anarchism. He emphasizes the need for an anarchism that is adaptable, context-sensitive, and capable of addressing the complexities of modern power structures. By synthesizing these two currents, May contributes to the development of a more comprehensive and effective anarchist philosophy.

Stirner, in his seminal work "The Ego and Its Own," presents ideas that are distinct yet potentially complementary to both traditional and post-structuralist anarchism.

Stirner's focus on the sovereignty of the individual ego challenges both the collective focus of traditional anarchism and the decentralized power critique of post-structuralism. He argues for the primacy of the individual against all forms of collective ideology and external authority. This radical individualism can enrich the synthesis by emphasizing the importance of personal autonomy and self-determination, which aligns with traditional anarchism's emphasis on individual freedom, while also resonating with post-structuralist scepticisms towards grand narratives and fixed identities.

Stirner's rejection of all fixed ideals and ideologies, including the state, religion, and moral constructs, parallels post-structuralist critiques of essentialism and

universal truths. I posit that his perspective can be used to deepen the post-structuralist anarchism critique of the ways in which ideologies and discourses construct and constrain subjectivities and social relations.

Stirner proposes a form of social interaction based on egoistic association, where individuals associate based on mutual self-interest rather than moral or ideological imperatives. This concept can contribute to the synthesis by offering a model of social organization that acknowledges individual desires and interests, while also allowing for flexible and voluntary forms of cooperation, a notion that complements the tactical approach of post-structuralist anarchism.

Stirner's critique of traditional morality aligns with post-structuralist anarchism's questioning of fixed moral principles. However, his advocacy for a form of amorality based on individual self-interest challenges both traditional and post-structuralist anarchism to reconsider their ethical frameworks and the role of morality in anarchist thought.

Stirner's concept of the "Union of Egoists" offers a model for collective action that is based on the voluntary and temporary association of individuals, each pursuing their own self-interest. This model can be integrated into the synthesis by offering a way to reconcile the collective action emphasized in traditional anarchism with the individual autonomy championed in post-structuralist thought.

Reconciling Max Stirner's radical individualism with the anarchist focus on collective agency is a complex endeavour that requires a nuanced understanding of both perspectives. Stirner's individualism, centred on the sovereignty of the ego, might at first seem antithetical to the collective ethos of traditional anarchism. However, a synthesis is possible through a deeper analysis of their underlying principles and objectives.

Stirner's concept of the "Union of Egoists" provides a framework for reconciling individualism with collective action. In this model, individuals come together in associations that are voluntary and based on mutual benefit, rather than on any fixed



ideological or moral grounds. This approach aligns with the anarchist principle of voluntary cooperation and mutual aid, where the emphasis is on free association of individuals who recognize the mutual benefits of working together. This form of association respects individual autonomy while facilitating collective action.

Both Stirner and traditional anarchists share a critical stance towards oppressive systems and fixed ideals imposed by external authorities. Stirner's rejection of all dogmas and ideologies, including the state and religious doctrines, complements the anarchist critique of authoritarian structures. This common ground forms a basis for collaboration between individuals who, though primarily motivated by their own interests, recognize the oppressive nature of these structures, and work collectively to dismantle them.

The reconciliation can also involve a redefinition of self-interest to include the recognition that individual well-being is often intimately tied to the well-being of the community. Stirner's egoism does not necessarily imply a narrow or selfish perspective but can be interpreted as an enlightened self-interest that understands the value of social bonds and cooperative efforts for the fulfilment of individual goals. Stirner's emphasis on spontaneous, non-hierarchical organization complements the anarchist advocacy for decentralized and non-coercive forms of social organization. Both approaches reject top-down structures in favour of organic, fluid, and adaptive forms of organization that emerge from the needs and desires of individuals.

A synthesis of Stirner's individualism with anarchist collectivism involves balancing individual autonomy with a sense of social responsibility. While respecting individual freedom and self-determination, there is also an acknowledgment of the interconnectedness of individuals within a society and the impact of one's actions on others.

Integrating Stirner's approach into the synthesis of traditional and post-structuralist anarchism adds a layer of radical individualism and a critique of fixed ideologies

and moral constructs. His emphasis on individual autonomy, egoistic association, and the rejection of traditional moral and ideological structures offers a unique perspective that can enrich and challenge both traditional and post-structuralist strands of anarchist thought.

Felipe Corrêa's argument in "Towards an Anarchist Theory of Power" (2019) that a society without power dynamics is impossible, and that the focus should instead be on organizing these dynamics equitably, resonates with the post-structuralist anarchist approach. Post-structuralist anarchism provides a nuanced framework for understanding and organizing power dynamics in a way that aligns with anarchist principles. Post-structuralist thought, particularly Foucault's, conceptualizes power as not merely repressive but also productive and pervasive. It operates through various social practices, institutions, and discourses, creating subjectivities and social realities. This conception of power as dispersed throughout the social fabric aligns with anarchism's aim to address and dismantle power dynamics in all their forms, not just in the state or economy. By recognizing the capillary nature of power, post-structuralist anarchism can develop strategies to distribute power equitably and prevent its concentration.

Post-structuralist anarchism's emphasis on the deconstruction of fixed identities and hierarchies offers tools to analyse and dismantle the structures that enable unequal power distribution. This approach critiques essentialist notions of identity and challenges hierarchical organization, which is crucial in creating a society where power is not used to coerce or oppress.

Drawing on the tactical approach of post-structuralist thought, this form of anarchism advocates for localized, decentralized forms of power organization. By focusing on specific, contextual interventions, it seeks to create spaces where power can be exercised more equitably and collectively, in line with anarchist principles of direct democracy and voluntary association.

Post-structuralist anarchism can contribute to developing an ethics of power relations that emphasizes responsibility, mutual aid, and respect for autonomy. This framework would ensure that power is exercised in ways that are accountable and non-coercive, reflecting the anarchist commitment to freedom and equality. Post-structuralist anarchism, with its critique of representation, aligns with the anarchist tradition of direct action and self-management. It advocates for forms of organization where individuals and communities have direct control over the decisions that affect them, thereby reducing the potential for power to be abused.

The post-structuralist emphasis on pluralism and diversity can enrich anarchist theory by acknowledging the multiplicity of experiences and perspectives within society. This approach helps in organizing power dynamics in a way that is sensitive to different needs and contexts, ensuring that power structures do not privilege one group or perspective over others.

Post-structuralist anarchism, with its nuanced understanding of power, its critique of fixed identities and hierarchies, its advocacy for localized and decentralized power structures, its development of an ethics of power relations, its emphasis on direct action and representation, and its embrace of pluralism and diversity, provides the necessary tools to develop a solid theory of power within an anarchistic framework. This theory of power is crucial for organizing society in a way that power is equitably distributed and never used to coerce or oppress, aligning with the core objectives of anarchism.

Post-structuralist anarchism, equipped with a nuanced theory of power and a kinopolitical approach, offers a robust framework to counter kyriarchic forces that resist anarchistic projects. Post-structuralist anarchism's approach to power dynamics and kinopolitical strategies provides a multifaceted response to such complex systems of domination.

Post-structuralist anarchism, with its emphasis on deconstructing hierarchies and questioning fixed identities, is well-positioned to analyse and dismantle kyriarchic

structures. It recognizes that power is not only concentrated in obvious institutions like the state but is also diffused through various social, cultural, and economic relations. By challenging these intersecting forms of oppression, post-structuralist anarchism can expose and undermine the complex networks that sustain kyriarchy.

Armed with a theory of power that sees it as both pervasive and potentially equitable, post-structuralist anarchism advocates for reconfiguring power relations in a more horizontal and decentralized manner. This reconfiguration involves creating spaces where power is shared and where decisions are made collectively and democratically, countering the centralization of power typical in kyriarchic systems.

A kinopolitical approach, which emphasizes the role of movement, space, and bodily experience in politics, complements post-structuralist anarchism's goals. It focuses on the physical and symbolic mobility of individuals and groups, challenging spatial and social restrictions imposed by kyriarchic systems. This approach enables the formation of dynamic and adaptable resistance strategies that can navigate and disrupt the spatial and social constraints of kyriarchy involving reimagining and actively reshaping spaces to counteract oppressive structures. This can include creating safe, inclusive community spaces that empower marginalized groups, organizing grassroots movements that physically reclaim and repurpose public spaces for communal use, and fostering networks of solidarity that transcend traditional geographical boundaries. Such strategies emphasize the importance of movement and spatial autonomy in challenging and dismantling the multi-dimensional power structures of kyriarchy.

Post-structuralist anarchism's commitment to pluralism and inclusivity is crucial in countering kyriarchy. By recognizing and valuing diverse identities and experiences, it fosters a form of resistance that is inclusive and attentive to various forms of oppression. This inclusive approach is essential in building broad-based movements capable of addressing the multifaceted nature of kyriarchy.

The emphasis on direct action and grassroots organizing in post-structuralist anarchism is key to confronting kyriarchic forces. By encouraging local, community-based actions and initiatives, post-structuralist anarchism fosters a bottom-up approach to resistance, which is more effective in challenging the decentralized and networked nature of kyriarchic power structures.

The fluid and non-dogmatic nature of post-structuralist anarchism allows for flexible and adaptive tactics in the face of kyriarchic resistances. This flexibility is crucial in responding to the ever-changing forms and manifestations of power within kyriarchic systems, enabling anarchists to stay one step ahead in their resistance efforts.

Post-structuralist anarchism, with its comprehensive theory of power and kinopolitical approach, provides a potent framework for countering kyriarchic forces. Its focus on deconstructing hierarchies, reconfiguring power relations, emphasizing movement and space in politics, promoting inclusivity, and employing direct and grassroots tactics makes it well-equipped to challenge and dismantle the complex and interlocking systems of oppression that characterize kyriarchy.

Post-structuralist anarchism, with its theoretical frameworks and critical tools, is uniquely positioned to adapt anarchism to contemporary sociopolitical challenges, particularly in the context of high technology. This adaptability is a fundamental strength, crucial for navigating and countering the potential coercive and oppressive uses of technology as depicted in the cyberpunk genre. Integrating Han's analysis enriches this perspective by offering insights into the effects of modern technology on society and individuals.

Post-structuralist anarchism can critically analyse the ways in which technology, especially in its high-tech forms, becomes entangled with power structures. Han's analysis in "The Burnout Society" provides insights into how modern technology contributes to new forms of self-exploitation and achievement pressure. Post-

structuralist anarchism can use these insights to critique the ways technology can be used to reinforce existing power structures and create new forms of domination.

This approach deconstructs dominant techno-centric narratives that often portray technological advancement as inherently progressive or beneficial. By challenging these narratives, post-structuralist anarchism reveals the ways in which technology can exacerbate inequality, surveillance, and control, echoing dystopian visions often found in cyberpunk literature.

Post-structuralist anarchism advocates for a more equitable and decentralized use of technology. It seeks to harness technology in ways that empower individuals and communities, rather than centralize control. This could involve promoting open-source platforms, community-owned technological infrastructures, and the use of technology to enhance direct democratic practices.

With its emphasis on resisting all forms of domination, post-structuralist anarchism is well-suited to challenge the increasing surveillance and control enabled by high technology. This resistance can take the form of advocating for privacy rights, developing counter-surveillance technologies, and building awareness about the implications of data collection and AI.

Post-structuralist anarchism's flexibility and critical stance towards power make it adept at adapting to the challenges of the digital age. It encourages a critical engagement with technology, recognizing both its potential for liberating and oppressive uses. This balanced perspective is essential in a world increasingly mediated by digital technologies. Post-anarchism can adapt to these challenges through strategies like promoting decentralized digital platforms that resist monopolization by tech giants, advocating for open-source and community-driven technology development, and fostering digital literacy campaigns to raise awareness about data privacy and surveillance. Additionally, it can encourage the use of technology in grassroots organizing and direct action, ensuring that digital

tools are used to enhance democratic participation and community building rather than perpetuating hierarchical and oppressive systems.

Integrating Han's critique, post-structuralist anarchism promotes an ethical approach to technology. It questions not just how technology is used, but the values and intentions that underpin its development and deployment. This ethical approach is crucial in ensuring that technology serves human needs and freedoms, rather than becoming a tool for exploitation and control.

Post-structuralist anarchism, supplemented by Han's insights, provides the necessary tools to adapt anarchism to the challenges posed by high technology. Its critical analysis of power, flexible approach to resistance, and commitment to decentralization and ethical engagement make it a potent framework for ensuring that technology is used in ways that enhance freedom and equality, rather than creating new forms of coercion and oppression. This adaptability is a key strength in the face of rapidly evolving technological landscapes and the complex sociopolitical challenges they present.

The synthesis of traditional and post-structuralist anarchism, further enhanced by the integration of kinopolitics, represents a progressive and adaptable path forward for future anarchistic projects. This synthesis draws on the strengths of each approach, creating a multifaceted framework that is better equipped to respond to the complexities of modern sociopolitical challenges.

The synthesis effectively balances Stirner's radical individualism with traditional anarchism's focus on collective agency. It acknowledges the importance of individual autonomy while also recognizing the value of collective action in challenging oppressive structures. This balance is crucial in creating a more inclusive and effective anarchist movement that can accommodate diverse perspectives and tactics.

Post-structuralist anarchism's nuanced understanding of power dynamics complements traditional anarchism's emphasis on direct action against centralized

structures of power. This combined approach allows for a more comprehensive analysis of power relations and the development of strategies to ensure power is distributed equitably and not used to coerce or oppress.

Creating rhizomatic structures using digital technologies in a post-anarchistic framework involves developing decentralized, networked platforms that empower users and communities. This can be achieved by supporting peer-to-peer technologies, fostering collaborative online environments that resist hierarchical control, and encouraging the use of digital tools for horizontal communication and organization. These structures can facilitate collective decision-making and action, reflecting the interconnected, non-hierarchical ethos of rhizomatic thinking. By utilizing technology in this way, post-anarchism can create digital spaces that are adaptable, resilient, and resistant to centralization and control.

The incorporation of kinopolitics into anarchism underscores the importance of movement, space, and bodily experiences in the political realm. It provides a lens through which to understand how physical and social mobility can be utilized as forms of resistance and empowerment. Kinopolitics emphasizes the significance of movement and spatial dynamics in political contexts. Post-anarchism would interpret acts like protests, marches, or occupation of spaces not just as symbolic gestures, but as direct challenges to and reconfigurations of existing power structures. It would view these movements as expressions of autonomy and resistance, emphasizing their role in disrupting and transforming the spatial and social status quo. This approach aligns with post-anarchism's focus on fluidity, decentralization, and the critique of traditional power structures. Kinopolitics also emphasizes the significance of spatial dynamics in the struggle against oppression, aligning with anarchism's goal of dismantling spatial and social constraints.

By integrating Han's critique of technology and the burnout society, this synthesis offers a critical perspective on the role of technology in modern society. It advocates for an approach to technology that prioritizes decentralization, community empowerment, and ethical use, countering the potential for technological advancements to be used in oppressive and coercive ways.



The synthesis promotes an ethical approach to anarchism that is sensitive to the diverse needs and contexts of different individuals and communities. It embraces pluralism and inclusivity, ensuring that the anarchistic movement is adaptable and responsive to various forms of oppression, including those highlighted by the concept of kyriarchy.

In conclusion, I claim that integration of traditional and post-structuralist anarchism with kinopolitics offers a dynamic and comprehensive framework for future anarchistic endeavours. It combines the insights and strengths of these varied approaches, creating a versatile and robust path forward that is well-suited to addressing the multifaceted challenges of the contemporary world. This synthesis represents a significant evolution in anarchistic thought, one that is capable of responding effectively to evolving social, political, and technological landscapes.

### 13. Bibliography:

1. Colson, D. (2007). Deleuze, Guattari et l'anarchie. *Le Portique*, [online] 20. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4000/leportique.1356>.
2. CORRÊA , Felipe, 2019. Towards an Anarchist Theory of Power. *Black Rose/Rosa Negra Anarchist Federation*. Online. 24 July 2019. Available from: <https://blackrosefed.org/towards-anarchist-theory-of-power-correa/>.
3. Bloch, E. (1964). *The Principle of Hope*. MIT Press.
4. Deleuze, G. (2014). *Difference and repetition*. Bloomsbury.
5. Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (2017). *A thousand plateaus: capitalism and schizophrenia* (Massumi, B., Trans.). Bloomsbury. Original work published 1980.
6. Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (2009). *Anti-Oedipus: capitalism and schizophrenia*. Penguin Books. Original work published 1972.
7. DURMUŞAHMET, Anıl. Surveillance Flow: Culture in Byung-Chul Han's the Performance Society. 4. *BOYUT Medya ve Kültürel Çalışmalar Dergisi / 4. BOYUT Journal of Media and Cultural Studies*. 25 October 2022. Vol. 0, no. 20, p. 57–75. DOI <https://doi.org/10.26650/4boyut.2022.003>.
8. Electronic Arts. (2016). *Mirror's Edge*. [Computer Game].
9. Fiorenza, S. E. (2005). *But she said: Feminist Practices of Biblical Interpretation*. Beacon Press.
10. Franks, B. (2007). The Direct-Action Ethic from 59 Upwards. *Anarchist Studies*.
11. Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and Punish*. Vintage.
12. Foucault, M. (2020). *Society must be defended: Lectures at the College de France, 1975-76*. PENGUIN Books.
13. Gray, C. (2019). *Deleuze and Anarchism*. Edinburgh University Press.
14. GILLES DELEUZE and PARNET, Claire. *Dialogues II*. New York : Columbia University Press, 2007. ISBN 9780231141352.
15. Goldman, E. (1910). *Anarchism and Other Essays*. Mother Earth Publishing Association.
16. Han, B.-C. (2015). *The Agony of Eros*. MIT Press.

17. Han, B.-C. (2017). *Psycho-Politics: Neoliberalism and New Technologies of Power*. Verso.
18. Han, B.-C. (2017). *The Burnout Society*. Stanford University Press.
19. Horkheimer, M. (2018). *Eclipse of reason*. Bloomsbury Academic, An Imprint of Bloomsbury. Original work published 1947.
20. Jameson, F. (1991). *Postmodernism, or, The cultural logic of late capitalism*. Duke University Press.
21. Kropotkin, P. (2021). *Collected works of Peter Kropotkin*. [illustrated].
22. Kropotkin, P. (1902). *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution*. William Heinemann.
23. Marcuse, H. (1964). *One-dimensional man: studies in the ideology of advanced industrial society*. Routledge.
24. May, T. (1989). Is post-structuralist political theory anarchist? *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, [online] 15(2), 167–182. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/019145378901500204>.
25. May, T. (1994). *The Political Philosophy of Poststructuralist Anarchism*. Penn State University Press eBooks. Penn State University Press. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780271071695>.
26. May, T. (2013). [Personal communication, 13 July]. In Van Heerden, C. G. (2019). *Deleuze and Anarchism*. Edinburgh University Press.
27. Bakunin, M. A. & Shatz, M. (2005). *Statism and anarchy*. Cambridge University Press. Original work published 1873.
28. MATHIESEN, THOMAS. The Viewer Society: Michel Foucault's 'Panopticon' Revisited. *Theoretical Criminology*. Online. May 1997. Vol. 1, no. 2, p. 215–234. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480697001002003>.
29. MIRANDA, Luis de, 2013. Is A New Life Possible? Deleuze and the Lines. *Deleuze Studies*. February 2013. Vol. 7, no. 1, p. 106–152. DOI <https://doi.org/10.3366/dls.2013.0096>.
30. Moore, J. (1994). *Anarchism & Poststructuralism*.
31. NEWMAN, Saul. *From Bakunin to Lacan : anti-authoritarianism and the dislocation of power*. Lanham, Md. : Lexington Books, 2001. ISBN 9780739102404.

32. Newman, S. (2003). Stirner and Foucault: Toward a Post-Kantian Freedom. *Postmodern Culture*, [online] 13(2). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1353/pmc.2003.0007>.
33. Proudhon, P.-J. & Tucker, B. R. (2013). *Qu'est-ce que la propriété? = What is property?* Jiahu Books. Original work published 1840.
34. Sartwell, C. (2008). Anarchism and Art. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*.
35. Stirner, M. (1844). *The Ego and Its Own*.
36. Le Guin, U. K. (1999). *The Dispossessed*. Turtleback Books.
37. Zerzan, J. (2014). *The Catastrophe of Postmodernism*.