

The Anarchist Library
Anti-Copyright



Liquid Anarchism

Tyler Dixon

15/01/2019

Tyler Dixon
Liquid Anarchism
15/01/2019

Retrieved on June 5, 2019 from
nightforestpoetry.files.wordpress.com (PDF)

*[Tyler died before finishing the final draft. This was annotated by
Julian Langer and published out of love and respect for the
individual he was.]*

theanarchistlibrary.org

Anarchy, defined as “without ruler,” and differentiated from Anarchism: “non-hierarchical social and political organization as a positive project.” Then it becomes possible to think of Feyerabend’s attitudes to science as helpful for our attitudes to anarchism. The way this attitude can be applied the methodology of science is especially important to the practice of Anarchism from the lens of “liquid anarchism.”

Feyerabend’s “disunity of science” should happen to anarchism, not the theory or the discourse of anarchism as much as the practice thereof. As the state becomes ubiquitous, the practice of anarchism should as well. It should reject itself. It should compete. It should mandate all options on the table.

Anarchism is a method of politics, not a science. It is not a field of study as much as it is a practice of politics. And politics is war by other means. Once it becomes liquid, it can no longer be rigid, static and stagnant.

Feyerabend’s arguments for science do not crossover to politics in general. He is discussing discourse and epistemology, knowledge and truth.

Politics is the conversation of violence and power, and for anarchists, how to fight it, decentralize it, absolve it.

We do not wish to have a battle of wits in the marketplace of ideas. We want to fight you in the street, we want to disturb.

Feyerabend's politics are centrist, essentially. However, in the context of anarchism and its relation to Anarchy, no ruler, the one who seeks anarchy and not anarchism can be very different. They don't want the same thing.

If we want to build, we must destroy, and this creates chasms in anarchism as a "movement"

Because his thinking about science, when applied to politics amounts to [... *the draft Tyler sent us shortly before his passing didn't have an ending to this sentence*]

His ideas about methodology are what matters for us.

Applying his understanding of how to attain knowledge we can think of methods of achieving the knowledge of anarchism, the application of anarchy to anarchism.

It's a nihilist anarchism, we make a distinction between anarchy and anarchism.

"There is no demarcation between science and non-science

There is no demarcation between anarchism and anarchism"

His work informs a liquid anarchism. It is closely related to anarchism without adjectives, but furthermore, LA must negate itself, compete with itself for otherwise, it crystallizes, but to be anarchist (A person who practices anarchism, as one who practices science), against the ubiquitous state, you need to be against methodology, because for scientists, what they want is "objective truth," Politics is about power and the state concentrates this power and at the same time, it directives are [... *again this is another sentence left un-ended – I as a friend of Tyler's would not want to remove or fill in here*]

Politics is not epistemology, it is about power, violence, and conflict. The state which used to concentrate this power in the way of Kings, then Constitutional Monarchies, then Liberal Democracies

has become insidiously invasive at the same time it is also concentrated. This postmodern state needs other forms of social control, so its methods adapt to reach their ends. The state is liquid.

Is clearly "Against Method" in response, any attack on the state. Anarchism must also become "Against Method" it must "flow like water." It's because there is not center, no essence that is stagnant.

His work informs a liquid anarchism. It is closely related to anarchism without adjectives, but furthermore, LA must negate itself, compete with itself for otherwise, it crystallizes, but to be anarchist (A person who practices anarchism, as one who practices science), against the ubiquitous state, you need to be against methodology, because for scientists, what they want is "objective truth," but what anarchists want is nothing short of everything, but nothing in particular. So, beyond competition in a market place of ideas, which is the area of theory. Liquid anarchism incorporates the notion of not just a stagnant "diversity of tactics" but a rejection of methods as a discourse. It sees the tiredness in good/cop bad cop debates with liberals and radicals and flows through it, carving new paths of negation and redirection.

Politics is not epistemology it is about power, violence, and conflict. The state which used to concentrate this power has become insidiously invasive and at the same time, is liquid. Is clearly "Against Method" In response, any attack on the state. Anarchism must also become "Against Method"

[Obviously much of these paragraphs are a repeat of a previous ones. I believe that when Tyler wrote this, he chose to do this as a poetic approach to articulating his ideas, so have not changed anything here. This continues throughout the essay.]

Just as nihil is not nihilism. Anarchy is not anarchism.

Feyerabend's work informs a liquid anarchism, which is closely related to anarchism without adjectives, but furthermore, LA must negate itself, compete with itself or otherwise, it crystallizes. To be anarchist (A person who practices anarchism, as one who practices science - I am not an anarchist, I am simply a philosopher of

anarchism), against the ubiquitous state, you need to be against methodology, because for scientists, In Feyerabend's view what they want is "objective truth," and no single method will reap this reward. But what anarchists want is nothing short of everything, but nothing in particular. All that ultimately unites anarchists is an agreement that they would like to see Anarchy - The absence. Anarchists therefore often have contradictory and irreconcilable differences of opinion. So, beyond competition in a market place of ideas, which is the area of theory. Liquid anarchism incorporates the notion of not just a stagnant "diversity of tactics" but a rejection of methods as a discourse. It sees the tiredness in good/cop bad cop debates with liberals and radicals and flows through it, carving new paths of negation and redirection.

Liquid anarchism is action that actively seeks the destruction of the state. It is when Anarchy meets Anarchism. It must move. It becomes liquid. It seeps into everything by all means available.

Conceiving anarchism as liquid modifies anarchism further along the lines of the situationists and the post-left anarchists. What differentiates those anarchists from an anarchist liquidity is that here, an attempt will be made to articulate and define the postmodern state in detail, in an effort to understand the problem better. The situationist and post-left critiques are still solid. I mean this in both the colloquial term and in regard to academic jargon. They were "right on" but they had no in-depth analysis of the postmodern liquid state. And this remains a recurring problem in anarchist dialogues and actions world over.

There is no Bastille to storm, we are living in a post-panoptic world.

We have become functionaries of the state. We must fight ourselves. "We must be like water."

Politics is not epistemology. It is about power, violence, and conflict. The state, which used to concentrate this power has become insidiously invasive and charitable, it is liquid. The state is clearly "Against Method." In response, any attack on the state. Which is, by

Method” in achieving social control. In response, any attack on the state - which is, by nature, negation not affirmation, switches domains of use, patterns of logic, terms of agreement between interlocutors. Liquid Anarchism exemplified the linguistic rule that languages are ever-changing. Anarchy’s beauty is the beauty of possibility and imagining. Anarchism, being a philosophy of anarchy and its possibilities, of building replacement or alternative social structures or not building anything at all, already lends itself to liquidity. Anarchists would find things my go differently if we understand our enemy better, and in this post-panoptic liquid modern world, since

[... this is where Tyler left us. We have left his words true to his memory. This piece in many ways’ mirrors much of Tyler himself – repetitive, confused, beautiful, honest and desperate. From across the other side of the Atlantic, I know nothing really of Tyler out of the context of the internet. But as much as I can do given the context of our relationship, I have a great love of him and of this piece he gave to this project. I hope who ever reads this essay will take from it all Tyler wanted to say (but my inner Tyler tells me that that is a desperate hope).]

nature, negation not affirmation, switches domains of use, patterns of logic, terms of agreement between interlocutors. Anarchism, being a philosophy of absence, of building replacement or alternative social structures, already lends itself to liquidity. Anarchism is a lot like *[... another sentence we will never know Tyler’s intended ending (though I like to imagine he’d end it with “nothing”, but perhaps he did)]*

Anarchism must also become ”Against Method”

Anarchy, defined as without ruler,” and differentiated from Anarchy: ”non-hierarchical social and political organization as a positive project.” Then it becomes possible to think of Feyerabend’s attitudes to science as helpful for our attitudes to anarchism. The way this attitude can be applied the methodology of science is especially important to the practice of Anarchism from the lens of ”liquid anarchism.”

”Disunity of science” should happen to anarchism as the state becomes ubiquitous, the practice of anarchism should as well. It should reject itself. It should compete. It should put all options on the table.

Anarchism is a method of politics, not a science. It is not a field of study as much as it a practice of politics. And politics is war by other means. Once it becomes liquid, it can no longer be rigid, static and stagnant.

Feyerabend’s arguments for science do not crossover to politics in general. He is discussing discourse and epistemology, knowledge and truth.

Politics is the conversation of violence and power, and for anarchists, how to fight it, decentralize it, absolve it.

We do not wish to have a battle of wits in the marketplace of ideas. We want to fight you in the street, we want to disturb.

Feyerabend’s politics are centrist, essentially. However, in the context of anarchism and its relation to Anarchy, no ruler, the one who seeks anarchy and not anarchism can be very different. They don’t want the same thing.

If we want to build, we must destroy, and this creates chasms in anarchism as a "movement"

Because his thinking about science, when applied to politics amounts to

His ideas about methodology are what matters for us.

Applying his understanding of how to attain knowledge we can think of methods of achieving not the knowledge of anarchism, but anarchism itself. the application of anarchy to anarchism.

It's a nihilist anarchism, we make a distinction between anarchy and anarchism. Anarchism must negate itself to achieve anarchism, on principle.

"There is no demarcation between science and non-science"

A concern for anarchists is the tension between anarchy and anarchism. Anarchy is simply the absence of something. Anarchism is the Nietzschean problem of the absence.

Just as nihil is not nihilism. Anarchy is not anarchism.

Feyerabend's work informs a liquid anarchism, which is closely related to anarchism without adjectives, but furthermore, LA must negate itself, compete with itself or otherwise, it crystallizes. To be anarchist (A person who practices anarchism, as one who practices science - I am not an anarchist, I am simply a philosopher of anarchism), against the ubiquitous state, you need to be against methodology, because for scientists, In Feyerabend's view what they want is "objective truth, "and no single method will reap this reward. But what anarchists want is nothing short of everything, but nothing in particular. All that ultimately unites anarchists is an agreement that they would like to see Anarchy - The absence. Anarchists therefore often have contradictory and irreconcilable differences of opinion. So, beyond competition in a market place of ideas, which is the area of theory. Liquid anarchism incorporates the notion of not just a stagnant "diversity of tactics" but a rejection of methods as a discourse. It sees the tiredness in good/cop bad cop debates with liberals and radicals and flows through it, carving new paths of negation and redirection.

Liquid anarchism is action that actively seeks the destruction of the state, but also the destruction of rigid anarchisms of massification (What the fuck is an IWW? Nobody cares), of inactive resignation (though I am partial to Monsieur Dupont's stance of not condemning this course of action), and organization that is not adhoc and/or easily evaporated. Liquid anarchism is when Anarchy meets Anarchism. Everything must move. It becomes liquid. It seeps into everything that attacks the state by all means available but does not formulate any anarchism due to its liquid nature.

Conceiving anarchism as liquid modifies anarchism further along the lines of the situationists and the post-left anarchists. What differentiates those anarchists from an anarchist liquidity is that here, an attempt will be made to articulate and define the postmodern state in detail, in an effort to understand the problem better. The situationist and post-left critiques are still quite solid. I mean this in both the colloquial term and in regard to academic jargon. They were "right on" but they had no in-depth analysis of the postmodern liquid state as we perceive it today. No situationists had a twitter account or received dick pics from some guy named Michael at 3am on a Saturday on a device that monitors you, keeps you connected, aids in finding employment. The smartphone is a good example of the liquidity of the post-panoptical liquid modern state. The situationists were seeing a major problem with anarchist methods because the state was becoming liquid. More so with the Post-Left. And this remains a recurring problem in anarchist dialogues and actions world over.

There is no Bastille to storm, we are living in a post-panoptic world.

We have become the state. We must fight ourselves. "We must be like water." And water will kill, and it will sustain.

Politics is not epistemology. It is about power, violence, and conflict. The state which used to concentrate this power in physical spaces, has become insidiously invasive, amorphous and paternally charitable, it is liquid. The state is clearly "Against