

NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY  
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

As a manuscript

Semiglazov Georgiy Sergeevich

**Reception of the philosophy of F. Nietzsche  
in the theories of anarchism of the 20th century**

Dissertation Summary

for the purpose of obtaining academic degree

Doctor of Philosophy in Philosophy

Academic supervisor:  
DSc in Philosophy  
Tatiana Lifintseva

**Moscow**  
**2022**

## CONTENTS

<b>The relevance of the thesis.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>State of affairs in the scholarly work on the topic.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Object and subject of research.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Goals and objectives of the study.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Theoretical basis of the study.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Research Methodology.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Research novelty.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Approbation.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Key results of the thesis.....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Contents.....</b>	<b>20</b>

## **The relevance of the thesis**

The topic stated in the dissertation title combines two large blocks. The first one is connected with the general history of Nietzsche's reception. Nietzsche's works influenced the worldview of many authors. The thinkers whose ideas were influenced by those of Nietzsche include the well-known Russian philosophers D. S. Merezhkovsky, N. A. Berdyaev, S. L. Frank, V. V. Rozanov, L. I. Shestov, as well as outstanding European theorists: M. Weber, K. Jaspers, M. Heidegger, J. Deleuze, J.-P. Sartre, T. Adorno, M. Foucault and a number of other names central to contemporary academic discussion.

Thus, one of the reasons for the stated topic's relevance is the key role of Friedrich Nietzsche's works in the 20th and early 21st centuries. Outside the context of the Basel professor's work, it is difficult to imagine the history of philosophy past and present. Nietzsche's works, regardless of how they are treated — critically or, conversely, sympathetically — cannot be ignored if we want to understand the intellectual and historical situation of an era for which the indicated ideas have become symbolic.

In addition, the relevance of addressing the legacy of the *Zarathustra's* author is due to the contemporary discussion. Today we can talk about the formation of a separate area of research called Nietzsche studies which is popular in the global philosophical community<sup>1</sup>. In this regard, the situation in the Russian intellectual sphere is noteworthy. The studies of Yu. V. Sineokaya demonstrate<sup>2</sup> that the German thinker's ideas since the late 1990s acquired a second birth in Russia, which allows one to speak of the Nietzsche renaissance in that country. This image, proposed by Yu. V. Sineokaya, best describes the state of affairs that has developed around the Basel professor.

The existing interest is confirmed by the publication of *Nietzsche's Complete*

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, this is evidenced by the existence of *Journal of Nietzsche Studies*, active since 1991 in English. Leading contemporary Nietzsche scholars such as T. Strong, L. Hatab, D. Owen and others have published there.

<sup>2</sup> See: *Sineokaya Yu. V. Perception of Nietzsche's ideas in Russia: main stages, trends, significance // Friedrich Nietzsche and Philosophy in Russia. Digest of articles. St. Petersburg: Publishing House of the Russian Christian Humanitarian Institute, 1999. P. 7 - 38; Sineokaya Yu. V. The philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche as a mirror for the construction of Russia's post-Soviet national identity // Questions of Philosophy. 2015. No. 12 and others.*

*Works* which was completed in 2014 by the *Cultural Revolution* publishing house. The re-actualization of the Basel professor's philosophy demonstrates that the latter has not lost its significance, providing important concepts for the analysis of the contemporary world.

Nevertheless, it is customary to refer to Nietzsche's work in the context of cultural theory and religious philosophy, while the Basel professor's political thought and, in particular, the interaction of his thought with anarchist theory is hardly given due attention. Based on this, the dissertation may be of interest to both Russian and foreign Nietzsche scholars, since the stated research topic is not so well known and developed, and therefore the question of how Nietzsche's ideas intersect with anarchist programs is still open. This dissertation is specifically trying to answer it.

The second part of the study deals directly with anarchist theory in the 20th and 21st centuries. It is possible for almost every country to write its own history of the anarchist movement. Therefore, the current dissertation does not analyze the history of anarchism in general, but only those anarchist theorists whose work directly intersected with Nietzsche's philosophy.

Anarchism as a socio-political movement became a landmark phenomenon in the public life of many states, such as Russia, Germany, France, Spain and the United States. In this regard, turning to anarchist programs allows one to form an integral socio-political image of the 20th and partially 21st centuries, without which it is impossible to talk about political philosophy. For the latter anarchism has always been a kind of blind spot. This situation risks undermining the very tradition of political thought and provides possibilities to enrich it at the same time.

In addition, in today's world anarchism is one of flagship social movements in a number of countries<sup>3</sup>. The popularity of this theory is also evidenced by Internet

---

<sup>3</sup> See: *Khokhlova D.* Icelandic model of democracy as a symbol of new populism // *Power*, 2017 (6). pp. 160 - 164; *Khokhlova D.* Postanarchy as an alternative political regime // *Ars Administrandi (The Art of Management)*. 2017. Vol. 9, No. 3. C. 312 – 32, and others. One can also point out the attempts of modern researchers to analyze social

platforms directly dedicated to anarchist studies (see *Akrateia.info*, a web resource created in 2019, or *the Anarchist Library* available in various languages). In connection with the marked increase in the popularity of anarchist ideology, philosophers are required to comprehend the goals and objectives of this social project in the realities of the 21st century. The inclusion of anarchist ideas in a broad academic discussion can directly contribute to its revival and theoretical diversity, which is sometimes sorely lacking.

Finally, the two aforementioned blocks of studies are brought up due to one global problem. Nietzsche himself, regardless whether we consider him a political thinker or not, had a negative attitude towards anarchism. However, a large number of the anarchists discussed below were intellectually influenced by Nietzsche's work, attempting to portray the author of *Zarathustra* as a proto-anarchist theorist. This raises the task of understanding which ideas of the Basel professor had a key influence on anarchism and continue to have it so far, and also why anarchists could not bypass the German philosopher.

On these issues, a sufficient number of historical and philosophical studies that comprehensively analyze the connection between Nietzscheanism and anarchism have not yet been written, which speaks in favor of the dissertation's relevance. The thesis is meant to fill this gap.

### **State of affairs in the scholarly work on the topic**

Speaking about the state of affairs in the studies on the topic, it is convenient to divide available literature into two groups: the first consists of studies dedicated exclusively to Friedrich Nietzsche's philosophy; the second one is those works that primarily focus on the history of anarchist movements and anarchist theories.

Turning to the first block which is connected to the intellectual biography of *Zarathustra's* author, one can name both classical texts and contemporary studies on this topic. The classic monographs include books about Nietzsche that were

---

unrest from the perspective of Nietzsche's philosophy. For instance, see: *Iliopoulos Ch. Nietzsche & Anarchism: An Elective Affinity and a Nietzschean reading of the December '08 revolt in Athens.* Vemon Press, 2019.

written by prominent thinkers of the last century. The peculiarity of this kind of research is connected to the fact that in those works the circumstances of the Basel professor's biography are philosophically interpreted in a different manner by a particular author who has their own unique and inimitable style of thinking.

Such publications include monumental works by K. Jaspers<sup>4</sup>, K. Löwith<sup>5 6</sup>, L. Klages<sup>7</sup>, M. Heidegger<sup>8 9</sup>, F. G. Jünger<sup>10</sup>, A. Danto<sup>11</sup>, G. Deleuze<sup>12</sup>, M. Foucault<sup>13</sup> and other researchers. Undoubtedly, this list could go on and on. In a sense, it constitutes an important theoretical foundation for any scholar who studies Nietzsche. However, a number of difficulties is connected to these texts. Namely, a problem arises before every interpreter and commentator of Nietzsche: the researcher must always be on the alert, since it is necessary to be able to distinguish the direct facts from the Nietzsche's life, and his original ideas, from their interpretation provided by the great thinkers of the 20th century. The latter sometimes focused too much on their personal position when speaking about the Basel professor's philosophy (Heidegger's two-volume book is the most indicative in this regard).

If we talk about the contemporary academic format of monographs, then publications of the following Russian researchers and translators of the

---

<sup>4</sup> *Jaspers K.* Nietzsche. An introduction to understanding his philosophizing. St. Petersburg: Vladimir Dal, 2004.

<sup>5</sup> *Löwith K.* Nietzsche's philosophy of the eternal return of the same. Moscow: Cultural Revolution, 2016.

<sup>6</sup> *Löwith K.* From Hegel to Nietzsche. Revolutionary upheaval in the thinking of the 19th century. St. Petersburg: Vladimir Dal, 2001.

<sup>7</sup> *Klages L.* Psychological achievements of Nietzsche. Moscow: Cultural Revolution, 2016.

<sup>8</sup> *Heidegger M.* Nietzsche. Vol.1. St. Petersburg: Vladimir Dal, 2006; Heidegger M. Nietzsche. Vol.2. St. Petersburg: Vladimir Dal, 2007.

<sup>9</sup> *Heidegger M.* Who is Nietzsche's Zarathustra? URL: <http://www.nietzsche.ru/look/xxa/why-is-zarathustra/#:~:text=Кто%20суть%20Заратустра%20у%20Ницше,вечном%20возвращении%20того%20же%20самого> (accessed 11. 12. 2020); *Heidegger M.* Nietzsche's words "God is dead". URL: <http://www.nietzsche.ru/look/xxa/heider/#:~:text=Слова%20«Бог%20мёртв»%20означают%3A,западная%20философия%2C%20понятая%20как%20платонизм.&text=Поэтому%20для%20метафизики%20и%20через,%2C%20собственно%2C%20совершается%20как%20метафизика> (accessed 11. 12. 2020).

<sup>10</sup> *Junger F.* Nietzsche. M: Praxis, 2001.

<sup>11</sup> *Danto A.* Nietzsche as a philosopher. M: House of intellectual book, 2001.

<sup>12</sup> *Deleuze J.* Nietzsche and Philosophy. M.: Ad Marginem, 2003.

<sup>13</sup> *Foucault M.* Nietzsche, genealogy, history. URL: <http://filosof.historic.ru/books/item/f00/s00/z0000552/> (accessed 11. 12. 2020).

Nietzschean corpus are relevant for the current dissertation: K. Swassjan<sup>14</sup>, V. Podoroga<sup>15</sup>, Yu. Sineokaya and N. Motroshilova<sup>16</sup>, B. Markov<sup>17</sup>, A. Pertssev<sup>18</sup> and others.

For example, the works of Yu. V. Sineokaya and N. V. Motroshilova provide a detailed history of the reception of Nietzsche's philosophy in Russia, which includes three stages: 1900s, the period from the 1920s to 1980s, and finally from the 1990s to the present. This topic is explored in more detail in such monographs as «Ницше и философия в России» (*Nietzsche and Philosophy in Russia*) (1999) or «Ницше: pro et contra» (*Nietzsche: pro et contra*) (2001), showing that the tradition of Nietzsche studies in Russia dates back to the end of the 19th century. The current status of Nietzsche's philosophy in Russia and the world is the focus of the edited volume «Фридрих Ницше. Наследие и проект» (*Friedrich Nietzsche. Legacy and the Project*) (2017). Therein researchers try to answer the question of how Nietzsche is relevant for philosophical discussion today.

However, it should be noted that among Russian Nietzsche scholars there is a tendency one way or another to consider the legacy of the Basel professor from the perspective of the philosophy of culture, ethics, religion, or language (which echoes the very first attempts to interpret Nietzsche by Russian thinkers of the early 20th century). Undoubtedly, all these subdisciplines are important for Nietzsche's work and require close attention and rigorous scholarly analysis.

Russian researchers tend to pay a little less attention to the topic of this dissertation — the issue of Nietzsche and politics, a particular aspect of which is

---

<sup>14</sup> Svasyan K. F. Nietzsche. Martyr of knowledge // Nietzsche F. Works in 2 vols. T. 1. Literary monuments. M.: Thought, 1990. Pp. 5-46.

<sup>15</sup> Podoroga V. Expression and meaning. Landscape worlds of philosophy. Moscow: Ad Margeneim, 1995.

<sup>16</sup> Sineokaya Yu. (ed.), Motroshilova N. (ed.). Friedrich Nietzsche and philosophy in Russia: Collection of articles. St. Petersburg: Russian Christian Institute for the Humanities, 1999; Sineokaya Yu. (ed.), Polyakova E. (ed.) *Friedrich Nietzsche. Legacy and project*. Moscow: YaSK Publishing House, 2017.

<sup>17</sup> Markov B. Man, state and God in Nietzsche's philosophy. St. Petersburg: Vladimir Dal, 2005.

<sup>18</sup> Pertssev A. Friedrich Nietzsche at home. Experience in the reconstruction of the life world. St. Petersburg: Vladimir Dal, 2009; Pertssev A. Unfamiliar Nietzsche. Psychologist, wit and connoisseur of women. St. Petersburg: Vladimir Dal, 2014.

the topic of Nietzsche and anarchism<sup>19</sup>. In this regard, it is necessary to refer to publications of Western researchers who analyze the work of the Basel professor through this perspective much more often. In particular, one can mention the following fundamental works by T. Strong<sup>20</sup>; L. Hatab<sup>21</sup>, H. Drochen<sup>22</sup>; F. Appel<sup>23</sup>; M. Bull<sup>24</sup> and some edited volumes<sup>25</sup>. For example, H. Droshen believes that Nietzsche is relevant today for political philosophy. Nietzsche allows us to rethink a number of key political concepts, such as the state, democracy, and international politics. Nietzsche can remind us that politics is impossible without intellectual self-improvement and development, and therefore, according to Droshen, if faith in democracy is to be preserved today, then the procedures that would educate people according to democratic ideals must necessarily be undertaken. Culture and big politics, according to Nietzsche, have always gone hand in hand with each other.

In turn, L. Hatab also notes that the Basel professor is relevant today — primarily, for democratic theory. However, instead of the dominant representative democracy, Hatab proposes a model of agonal democracy, where people participate equally in political life, thereby trying to move towards a better and fairer community through open competition. Such a project, according to Hatab, was implicitly present in Nietzsche's philosophy, who defended agonalism as a key force in the development of mankind. Other authors mentioned above adhere to similar positions.

Of course, this is only a small part of all publications on the topic, but even concerning the listed works, a remarkable trend can be pointed out. The problem of

---

<sup>19</sup> Although it cannot be said that this discussion is completely bypassed. See, for instance, *Каплун В. (ред.) (2003) Ницше и современная западная мысль. СПб., М.: Европейский университет в Санкт-Петербурге, Летний сад.*

<sup>20</sup> *Strong T. Friedrich Nietzsche and the Politics of Transfiguration, Berkley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1988; Strong T. Nietzsche and the Political: Tyranny, Tragedy, Cultural Revolution, and Democracy // The Journal of Nietzsche Studies, Issue 35/36, Spring/Autumn 2008, pp. 48-66.*

<sup>21</sup> *Hatab L. Nietzsche's Will to Power and Politics // Nietzsche as Political Philosopher, eds. Manuel Knoll and Barry Stocker. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 2014; Hatab L. Breaking the Contract Theory: The Individual and the Law in Nietzsche's Genealogy // Nietzsche, Power and Politics: Rethinking Nietzsche's Legacy for Political Thought, ed. by H. Siemens and V. Roodt. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2008, pp. 169 – 191.*

<sup>22</sup> *Drochen H. Nietzsche's Great politics. Princeton University Press, 2016.*

<sup>23</sup> *Appel F. Nietzsche against democracy. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2016.*

<sup>24</sup> *Bull M. Anti-Nietzsche. Moscow: Delo Publishing House, 2016.*

<sup>25</sup> *Golomb J. (ed.), Wistrich R. (ed.) Nietzsche, Godfather of Fascism? Princeton University Press, 2009.*



Nietzsche and politics, democratic interpretation of Nietzsche's concepts, criticism of the National Socialist distortion of the Basel professor's legacy, as well as reconstruction of the German philosopher's own views on the goals and objectives of politics are often discussed. But the problem of Nietzsche and anarchism is given much less attention, which obviously demonstrates the need for a separate study on this topic. The present dissertation satisfies the need.

If we turn to the texts devoted to anarchist history, then the situation here is not so unambiguous. In my opinion, anarchist ideas in Russian philosophy are considered much less frequently than Nietzsche's work. Although, of course, it cannot be said that they are not considered at all, since over the two decades of the 21st century the number of publications devoted to anarchist theory within the Russian academic community has been increasing year by year.

Speaking about key Russian researchers of anarchism, we should mention P. V. Ryabov, in particular his series of works about A. A. Borovoy, an anarchist-Nietzschean of the early 20th century<sup>26</sup>. P. V. Ryabov's publications provide a detailed analysis of the Russian anarchist's theory. In a sense, Ryabov rediscovered Borovoy's work for the contemporary scholarly discussion. However, due to the author's obvious sympathy for anarchism, P. V. Ryabov's publications do not always consider the controversial aspects of anarchist theory. The current dissertation seeks to fill this gap by looking at A. Borovoy more distantly, subjecting the tenets of his personalistic anarchism to critical analysis in order to identify problems in them.

It is also important to mention I. V. Aladyshkin among Russian specialists in anarchism. His research is mainly devoted to Russian anarcho-individualism in the

---

<sup>26</sup>Ryabov P. V. "The Past and Thoughts" by Alexei Borovoy // *Man*, 2010, No. 3; Ryabov P.V. Romantic anarchism of Alexei Borovoy (from the history of Russian philosophical life) // *Historical and Philosophical Yearbook 2011*. M.: Nauka, 2013; Ryabov P. V. Anarchist philosophy of Alexei Borovoy (from the history of Russian Bergsonianism) // *Bulletin of the Baltic Federal University. I. Kant. Series: Humanities and social sciences*, 2010; Ryabov P. V. Alexei Borovoy and the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche (from the history of Russian Nietzscheism at the beginning of the 20th century) // *Lecturer XXI century*. 2010 (2) and others.

early 20th century<sup>27</sup>. While employing lots of excellent data whereon his dissertation relies among other things, I. V. Aladyshkin's work, however, does not always provide a philosophical understanding of Russian anarchists' work. Therefore, the dissertation attempts to fill in the gap where theoretical analysis — of works by such Russian anarchist-Nietzscheans as L. Cherny (Turchaninov) and A. Borovoy — should be. It considers those elements in their thought that were formed directly under the influence of the Basel professor's ideas.

Finally, it is necessary to point to the publications of V. V. Damier related to the history of anarcho-syndicalism in the 20th century<sup>28</sup>. Here the situation is similar to the works of I. V. Aladyshkin. The texts of V. V. Damier analyze the evolution of syndicalist ideas from the moment they arose in the 19th century and up to their gradual decline in the middle of the 20th century. However, focusing exclusively on the history of social movements, V. V. Damier's work from time to time lacks theoretical analysis of key syndicalist theorists' (such as R. Rocker or J. Sorel) ideas. This dissertation undertakes the necessary theoretical critique.

A separate topic in research on Russian anarchism are encyclopedic articles and archival documents that can clarify the history of the anarchist movement in Russia<sup>29</sup>. These materials reveal how various anarchist groups which operated in the Russian Empire and the USSR interacted with each other at the beginning of the 20th century. In addition, archival information, among other things, clarifies some of the reasons for the rise and fall of Russian anarchism, particularly concerning the relation between anarchist theory and Nietzsche's philosophy that interests me.

---

<sup>27</sup> See: *Aladyshkin I.* On the "outskirts" of the socio-political life of the Russian Empire (on the history of the formation of anarcho-individualism in the first decade of the 20th century) // Bulletin of St. Petersburg University, 2009. Ser. 2, No. 1. P. 116 - 122; *Aladyshkin I.* Riddles of the publishing house "Individual". From the history of Russian anarcho-individualism // *Klio*, 2 (41), 2008. P. 70 - 75.

<sup>28</sup> *Damier V.* History of anarcho-synicism. Brief essay. Moscow: Librocom Book House, 2010.

<sup>29</sup> *Zavelev A. (ed.)* Political parties in Russia: history and modernity. M.: "Russian Political Encyclopedia" (ROSSPEN); *Krivenky V.* Anarchists. Documents and materials. 1883 - 1935 In 2 vols. M.: "Russian Political Encyclopedia" (ROSSPEN), 1999.

Thus, although today anarchist studies in Russia are not likely to be included in the advanced areas of scholarly research, it is not wrong to state that there is interest in this area, as well as demand to expand possible discussion topics within it.

Concerning international anarchist studies, we can admit that therein history and theory of anarchism are reconstructed in much more detail. For example, turning to English-language literature is especially relevant when talking about postanarchism, the phenomenon practically unknown to Russian-language journals, with the exception of publications by D. B. Polyakov<sup>30</sup>.

Among the most significant texts by foreign authors, we should mention the works of G. Woodcock<sup>31</sup>, A. Skirda<sup>32</sup>, A. Antliff<sup>33</sup> and R. Graham<sup>34</sup> that analyze anarchist history in several countries at once, including Germany, France and America. These works are therefore the starting point which makes it possible to directly address the anarchist reception of Nietzscheanism after studying the general history of anarchist thought in a particular country.

The publications which allow to study the fate of anarchism in a particular country in more detail are the works by A. Carlson<sup>35</sup>, C. Parvulescu<sup>36</sup>, E. Lunn<sup>37</sup>, S. Taylor<sup>38</sup>, M. Graur<sup>39</sup>, R. Parry<sup>40</sup>, S. Parker<sup>41</sup>, L. Portis<sup>42</sup>, M. Curtis<sup>43</sup>, P.

---

<sup>30</sup> *Polyakov D.* Nietzsche's "will to power" in the context of post-anarchism // *Intellect, innovation investment*, 2016 (1). pp. 71 - 73.

<sup>31</sup> *Woodcock G.* *Anarchism: A History Of Libertarian Ideas And Movements*, New York: Meridian Books, 1962.

<sup>32</sup> *Skirda A.* *Facing the Enemy. A history of Anarchist organization from Proudhon to May 1968.* AK Press, 2002.

<sup>33</sup> *Antliff A.* *Anarchy and Art. From Paris Commune to the Fall of Berlin wall.* Vancouver: Arcenal Pulp Press, 2007.

<sup>34</sup> *Graham R.* (ed.) *Anarchism. A documentary history of liberterian ideas.* Monreal, New York, London: Black books, 2005, 2009, 2013.

<sup>35</sup> *Carlson A.* *Anarchism in Germany, Vol.1: The Early Movement.* The Scarecrow Press, 1972.

<sup>36</sup> *Parvulescu C.* *The individualist anarchist discourse of early interwar Germany.* Presa Universitara Clujeana, 2018.

<sup>37</sup> *Lunn E.* *Prophet of community. The Romantic Socialism of Gustav Landauer.* University of California Press, 1973.

<sup>38</sup> *Taylor S.* *Left-wing Nietzscheans, The politics of German Expressionism 1910 – 1920.* Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, New York, 1990.

<sup>39</sup> *Graur M.* *An Anarchist Rabbi: The Life and Teachings of Rudolf Rocker.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997.

<sup>40</sup> *Parry R.* *The Bonnot Gang. The story of the French illegalists.* Rebel press, 1987.

<sup>41</sup> *Parker S. (ed.)* *Enemies of Society: An Anthology of Individualist and Egoist Thought.* Ardent Press, 2011.

<sup>42</sup> *Portis L.* *Georges Sorel.* (URL: <https://libcom.org/library/georges-sorel-larry-portis> (дата обращения: 21. 01. 2020)).

<sup>43</sup> *Curtis M.* *Three against Old Republic.* Princenton University Press, 2015.

Avrich<sup>44</sup>, P. Glassgold<sup>45</sup> and others. Based on these monographs, as well as a number of related articles, it is possible to understand the context, conditions for the emergence and development of the anarchist movement in countries such as Germany, France or, for example, the United States. In addition, studies directly dedicated to such anarchist Nietzschean theorists as G. Landauer or R. Rocker allow Russian researchers to learn more about the life of these controversial thinkers. Anarchist biographies, as noted earlier, are not so popular in the Russian academic space as a subject for study. But again, these texts practically do not discuss the philosophical topic that interests me: the intersection of anarchist theory with Nietzsche's thought.

Finally, the last group of studies relevant to the thesis topic are publications on contemporary postanarchism<sup>46</sup>. These works critically discuss the foundations of the postanarchist program, formulated by such key theorists as, for example, L. Call or S. Newman. The aforementioned studies make it possible to correct the understanding of postanarchism's philosophical foundations which in one way or another arise through the direct use of Nietzsche's intellectual legacy.

If we talk about Russian researchers who directly address the phenomenon of postanarchism, then first of all we should mention the publications of D. B. Polyakov<sup>47</sup>. Although D. B. Polyakov analyzes, among other things, the relationship between Nietzsche's philosophy and postanarchist thought, this analysis seems to us insufficient and not always consistently critical. And since postanarchism is hardly known within the framework of contemporary Russian philosophy, the expansion and deepening of the discussion on this topic in any case seems necessary.

---

<sup>44</sup> *Avrich P., Avrich K.* Sasha and Emma. The Anarchist Odyssey of Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. 2012.

<sup>45</sup> *Glassgold P.* Anarchy! An Anthology of Emma Goldman's Mother Earth, Berkley: Counterpoint, 2012.

<sup>46</sup> *Purkis J. (ed.)* Changing anarchism. Anarchist theory and practice in a global age. Manchester University Press, 2004; *Rousselle D. (ed.)* postanarchism. A Reader. PlutoPress, 2011; *Christoyannopoulos A. (ed.), Adams M. (ed.)* Essays in Anarchism and Religion. Vol.1. Stockholm: Stockholm University press, 2017 и др.

<sup>47</sup> *Polyakov D.* Postanarchism. The subject in the space of power. Chita: ZabIZhT, 2019.

Summing up the state of affairs of scholarly work on the topic, it should be recognized that two subfields — the history of Nietzscheanism and the history of anarchism — in themselves enjoy a high degree of interest in both the Russian and global scientific community. However, the same cannot be said about the combination of these subfields into a single whole, since there are much fewer publications that straddle them than on each of the research questions separately.

One of such works (in addition to works by C. Parvulescu or S. Taylor), known to the dissertation's author, where Nietzsche's philosophy and anarchist thought, taken together, are directly the subject of research, is a collection of articles edited by J. Moore<sup>48</sup>. However, the essential problem of the collection is that it was written primarily by anarchists themselves for other anarchists. Therefore, it does not always provide an adequate critical analysis of Nietzsche's ideas. For example, M. Cafard, one of the co-authors, writes as follows about the relationship between Nietzsche's philosophy and anarchism: "Probably, in the history of European thought there was no such strong criticism of the state as in the vilification of Zarathustra against the "New Idol""<sup>49</sup>. However, this statement looks rather controversial, since M. Cafard refers to Nietzsche's critique of the state from *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* without referring to the Basel professor's general understanding of politics, i.e. taking critical attacks on the "cold monster" in isolation. This is not a completely fair description, since Nietzsche's attitude to politics and the state is much more complex than what is formulated in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*.

Based on all of the above and also in connection with the previously indicated thesis relevance, it seems to me interesting to combine the two research problems into one, by directly considering the anarchist reception of Nietzscheanism in the 20th century and the present. This is where the novelty of the thesis lies: it

---

<sup>48</sup> Moore J. (ed.) *I Am Not A Man, I Am Dynamite! Friedrich Nietzsche and the Anarchist Tradition*. Autonomedia, 2004.

<sup>49</sup> Cafard M. *Nietzschean Anarchy and the Post-Mortem Condition // I am not a man, I am Dynamite! Friedrich Nietzsche and the Anarchist tradition*, ed. by Moore J. Autonomedia, 2004. P. 92.

combines both an analysis of historical background and a philosophical and theoretical analysis of texts. The latter is often absent from works by other authors who discuss the relation between anarchism and Nietzsche's philosophy.

### **Object and subject of research**

**The object of the study** is both the works of Friedrich Nietzsche himself and a number of key works of anarchist theorists of the 20th and 21st centuries. **The subject of the study** is the anarchist interpretation of Nietzscheanism as an original intellectual phenomenon, which, for a number of reasons indicated before, is of interest for detailed study.

### **Goals and objectives of the study**

**The aim of the study** is historical and philosophical reconstruction of the anarchist reception of Friedrich Nietzsche's philosophy by the most significant anarchist theorists of the 20th and partly the 21st century, while looking for understanding of how the basic philosophical concepts of the German thinker were used in anarchist theory.

To achieve this aim, it is necessary to attain the following **objectives**:

- 1) Reconstruct Nietzsche's political philosophy and the peculiarity of Nietzsche's assessment of anarchism
- 2) discover anarchist origins in Nietzsche's own work
- 3) analyze the prerequisites for the emergence and development of anarchism, as well as the prehistory of Nietzscheanism in a particular country, showing the parallel dynamics of these processes
- 4) proceed to consider the interpretation of the German thinker's ideas by a number of anarchist theorists in the context of how they use the key concepts of Nietzsche's philosophy (will to power, eternal return, etc.)

5) turn to the contemporary theory of postanarchism in order to identify its continuity with both the anarchist theory of the past and directly with Nietzsche's ideas.

### **Theoretical basis of the study**

The thesis' theoretical basis includes the above-mentioned classics of Nietzsche studies by K. Jaspers, K. Levitt, M. Heidegger, J. Deleuze, M. Foucault and others — the leading thinkers of the 20th century. By relying on them, one can significantly enrich one's own understanding of Nietzsche's ideas, correcting it in one direction or another. The theoretical basis also includes the above-mentioned publications of Russian and international researchers of both Nietzsche's philosophy and anarchist thought.

### **Research Methodology**

In order to achieve the stated aim and objectives, one should be guided by an appropriate methodology that is relevant for historical and philosophical research. Such methodology includes the *method of hermeneutic interpretation*, which is rooted in the works of V. Dilthey, as well as the more modern *method of the history of ideas*, which assumes that an idea is an independent object of study that changes from one era to another and in addition has its own characteristics and laws of development. Aimed at understanding a particular text and revealing its meaning, these methods will help to achieve the aim and objectives of the study, and to understand why Nietzsche's thought was drawn upon by a large number of anarchists.

In particular, the hermeneutic method assumes that the object of study is always autonomous in relation to the thinking subject who is trying to cognize unique and inimitable features of the object. Actually, the author of the dissertation relied on this premise, suggesting that the anarchist reception of Nietzscheanism is

an original intellectual phenomenon that requires a comprehensive analysis, which, as noted above, is still missing.

In addition, the hermeneutic method assumes that the semantic content of a text is always determined by the era in which a particular work is created, and therefore understanding of a work is possible only if the historical context of the text is taken into account. This assumption is important for historical and philosophical research, and the dissertation devotes a special place to the reconstruction of those historical circumstances that led to the emergence of the anarchist reception of Nietzsche's thought at the beginning of the 20th century.

Then, the history of ideas method makes it possible to single out a list of main concepts in Nietzsche's philosophy (eternal return, will to power, etc.), identify their basic definition within the texts by the Basel professor, and then think about how these same concepts are used by anarchist theorists. What new shades of meaning do they acquire and in what context do they generally begin to function? Proceeding from this, it is possible to understand to what extent a specific author consistently applies Nietzsche's ideas in constructing their anarchist doctrine, and in what way the anarchist interpretation agrees, and in what way it diverges from the philosophy of *Zarathustra's* author.

### **Research novelty**

As noted above, in academic studies on Nietzsche's thought the topic of the relationship between the Basel professor's ideas and anarchist theory is practically bypassed, since it is assumed that anarchist reception is either not worth paying attention to (this is due to the general marginal status of anarchist studies), or regarded as self-evident. In addition, Nietzsche is known as a conservative thinker, and therefore radical left-wing interpretations of his philosophy probably do not fit into the general framework for understanding his philosophical legacy.

The dissertation, however, comprehensively reconstructs precisely this leftist radical reception of Nietzscheanism which tries to look at Nietzsche's work from a



different perspective, i.e. different from Nietzsche's conservatism. The novelty of the thesis consists in how it demonstrates the relevance of the Basel professor's thought for anarchism.

Finally, due to its philosophical originality, the anarchist interpretation of Nietzsche's texts cannot be obvious; rather, on the contrary, it is complex and harbors many pitfalls. Therefore, the dissertation's author is also trying to show that anarchism as a doctrine in the 20th century was a complex philosophical system with a number of peculiarities in how it understood the nature of the human, state, society and culture while being directly influenced by Nietzsche's thought.

### **Approbation**

The results of the study were tested in a series of articles in periodicals included in the VAK, Scopus and Web of Science systems. In addition, talks on the topic of the dissertation were made at international and Russian conferences, which shows the relevance of the work done for the field of historical and philosophical research. The dissertation may be of interest both to those who directly study the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche, and to specialists in the field of the history of philosophy, political philosophy, and everyone interested in the history of ideas of the 20th century.

### **Conferences and summer schools**

1. War and Peace, Violence and Nonviolence in Russian Literature and Philosophy. Conference commemorating the 190th anniversary of Leo Tolstoy (June 27-30, 2018, Belgorod, Russia). Talk title: *Violence and myth as a response to the crisis of parliamentarism at the beginning of the 20th century (on the example of the work of A. Borovoy and G. Sorel)*.
2. V International School for Young Researchers *Philosophy of War* (July 4-8, 2018, Belgorod, Russia). Talk title: *The influence of Nietzsche's ideas on*

*the anarchist program: the question of violence in the work of A. Borovoy and G. Sorel.*

3. The relevance of the theoretical legacy of Yu. N. Davydov in the light of old/new problems of social theory (October 17, 2019, Moscow, Russia). Talk title: *Nietzsche contra Tolstoy as a theme in Russian philosophy and its revision in the work of Yu. N. Davydov.*

4. Nietzsche Seminar (October 12-13, 2019, Yelets, Russia). Talk title: *"Thus spake Zarathustra" and the theory of anarchism of the 20th century.*

5. Modes of thinking, ways of speaking 10th international conference (April 22-26, 2019, Moscow, Russia). Talk title: *On the relevance of Nietzsche's concept of "eternal return" for the theories of anarchism of the 20th century.*

6. Participation in the "Nietzsche Seminar" (October 17-18, 2020, Moscow, Russia). Talk title: *Reception of F. Nietzsche's philosophy of culture in R. Rocker's anarcho-syndicalist project.*

7. International scholarly conference *Legitimate domination, charisma and the conduct of life: Max Weber and post-Weberian sociology (1920–2020).* Moscow, Russia, National Research University Higher School of Economics, September 10-11, 2021. Talk title: *Max Weber in the context of anarchist optics: sociological nominalism and anarchist vision of the world.*

8. Interdisciplinary scholarly conference *Political theology of Soviet modernity: from the revolutionary doctrines of this-worldly salvation to the cultural practices of socialist construction,* March 18-19, 2022, Moscow, Russia, National Research University Higher School of Economics. Talk title: *Alexey Borovoy on the anarchist ideal.*

9. Interdisciplinary scholarly conference *„Pictures of the World“ and „Attitude to the World“: Max Weber's Basic Concepts and Perspectives of Fundamental Sociology,* September 16, 2022, Moscow, Russia, National Research University Higher School of Economics. Talk title: *M. Weber's theory of bureaucracy — modern criticism from the left.*

### **Publications:**

**Articles which are published in journals indexed in international indexing and citations databases and included in the list of high-level journals by HSE:**

1. *Semiglazov G. S.* "Anarchy of the subject" and the concept of the individual in the philosophy of F. Nietzsche // *Questions of Philosophy*, 2020, No. 4. P. 177-186. (in Russian)
2. *Semiglazov G. S.* The Forgotten Individualist Georges Palante // *Questions of Philosophy*, 2021, No. 4. P. 109-119. (in Russian)
3. *Semiglazov G. S.* Anarchic sociometry of Lev Cherny // *Journal of Sociology*, 2021, no. 1. P. 122-138. (in Russian)

### **Other publications:**

1. *Semiglazov G. S.* E. Dühring and F. Nietzsche: comparison of two philosophical projects // *Bulletin of the Tomsk State University. Philosophy. Sociology. Political Science*, 2020, No. 54. P. 122-132. (in Russian)
2. *Semiglazov G. S.* Mystical anarchism of Gustav Landauer // *History of Philosophy*. 2020, Vol. 25, No. 1. P. 49- 61. (in Russian)
3. *Semiglazov G. S.* (2020) The concept of the state in the works of M. Weber and G. Landauer: analysis of the Weberian definition from the perspective of anarchist theory // *Sociology of power*, 32 (4). P. 123-145. (in Russian)

### **Key results of the thesis**

1. The anarchist reception of Nietzsche is an independent intellectual phenomenon that also requires scholarly attention, in addition to classical subjects related to Nietzsche's philosophy of culture and religion.

2. The key author, thanks to whom the intersection of Nietzsche's thought with anarchism was possible, is Max Stirner — a Young Hegelian active in the middle of the 19th century.

3. In this regard, Nietzsche's ideas first of all turn out to be close to a specific branch of anarchist theory called anarcho-individualism, but their influence is not exclusive to it alone.

4. The anarchist reception of Nietzsche's texts is variable — different authors focus on different aspects of Nietzsche's thought.

5. However, anarchist reception revolves around the core concepts of Nietzsche's philosophy: eternal return, will to power, resentment.

6. Anarchist reception of Nietzsche influenced the emergence of non-classical anarchism.

7. A natural consequence of the evolution of anarchist ideas is the emergence of postanarchism, which continues to read Nietzsche anarchically.

8. The first difference between non-classical and classical anarchism is the former's rejection of human rational nature, whereon the classics allegedly relied. Therefore, Nietzsche's thought becomes relevant in the context of anarchist critique of essentialism.

9. The second difference is in how the state is understood. The state is not a machine and not a higher organization, but it is people and forms of interaction between them, which are all different types of will to power. Here Nietzsche's philosophy is also relevant in the context of political ontology.

10. Finally, the last difference between the classics and modern authors lies in the assessment of power. Power is no longer viewed as a negative phenomenon, but it pervades all relationships between people. This understanding of power is also consistent with Nietzsche's doctrine of the will to power as the driving force behind all things.

## **Contents**

The dissertation consists of **Introduction, four chapters, Conclusion** and **References**.

The **Introduction** discusses the relevance and novelty of the study, its main goals and objectives, as well as the methodology by which the goals are achievable. In addition, here the main problem is formulated, around which the dissertation is built,

namely, how an anarchist reception of Nietzscheanism is possible, provided that the Basel professor himself assessed this socio-political doctrine negatively.

**Chapter 1** discusses the political thought of Friedrich Nietzsche. This chapter reconstructs Nietzsche's key points about the origins, goals and objectives of the state, as well as the general vision of the political by the German philosopher. In addition, possible lines of intersection between Nietzsche and contemporary thinkers who had a direct and indirect relationship to the anarchist doctrine (M. Stirner, M. Bakunin, L. Tolstoy) are considered.

Structurally, the chapter consists of **two sections**. **Section 1** analyzes the political philosophy of the author of *Human, All Too Human*. It is argued that Nietzsche's views on politics and the state have evolved over his intellectual career.

Young Nietzsche saw the key meaning of the state in the education of geniuses and the protection of culture as the highest form of human activity. This idea was expressed by the thinker in a number of prefaces to unwritten books, in particular, in the texts *On the Future of Our Educational Institutions*, *The Greek State*, *Homer's Contest*<sup>50</sup>. The philosopher believed that initially people exist in a "state of nature", the idea Nietzsche partially borrowed from Hobbes.

In the state of nature, no cultural creativity is possible, since here people are primarily concerned with survival and physiological needs of the body. The emergence of the state which is the imposition of the conqueror's will on conquered peoples, signifies the end of the war of all against all and the establishment of order, as well as the emergence of social differentiation. In particular, Nietzsche believes that it is within the state where appear, on the one hand, the group of people who are engaged in physical labor, and on the other hand, a small number of individuals engaged in cultural creativity. The latter Nietzsche calls geniuses, and believes that they represent the meaning of any state's functioning, the only purpose of which is to protect culture and create conditions for the further emergence of geniuses.

---

<sup>50</sup> Nietzsche F. On the future of our educational institutions // Complete Works. In 13 volumes. T 1.1. Moscow: Cultural Revolution, 2012; Nietzsche F. Greek State // Complete Works. In 13 volumes. T 1.1. Moscow: Cultural Revolution, 2012; Nietzsche F. Homeric Contest // Complete Works. In 13 volumes. T 1.1. Moscow: Cultural Revolution, 2012.

However, since the mid-1870s Nietzsche becomes more and more pessimistic about politics, realizing that his philosophy of the state has nothing to do with reality. In particular, the thinker notes that the state and culture are rather antipodes. The reason for his disappointment was the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71, in which Germany was victorious. Nietzsche, on the other hand, believes that military successes do not indicate the cultural development of the Germans. Rather, on the contrary, where patriotic and militaristic sentiments come to the fore, culture perishes, since the highest value is provided by the state, and not by the outstanding genius that creates culture. Nietzsche pronounces his assessment of Realpolitik in the cycle called *Untimely Reflections*. In particular, he does so in the text *David Strauss, the Confessor and the Writer*<sup>51</sup>. Such a critical point of view is maintained almost until Nietzsche's late works, most clearly manifested in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, where Nietzsche depicts the state as a monster, the coldest of all cold monsters, which tells lies in all languages.

Changes in Nietzsche's assessment of politics and the state occur in the last years of the thinker's life when he turns to the idea of big politics. It again assumes that the key issue of political activity is the issue of culture and education of peoples, and therefore Nietzsche hopes that in the future the legislators of states will realize this most important mission entrusted to them, and again through politics they will promote and develop certain cultural values and norms. Thus, it turns out that, as a political thinker, Nietzsche is rather far from anarchist ideas, since in his work he treats the state as a necessary evil without which culture is impossible.

In this regard, Nietzsche on the whole speaks critically about anarchism. Nietzsche considers anarchy in the context of continuity between the modern socio-political ideology and Christianity — anarchism is actually a secularized form of this religion. It has two aspects in common with its metaphysical source: the first is related to teleology. Just as Christianity assumes the movement of the world towards the final

---

<sup>51</sup> Nietzsche F. *Untimely Reflections I. David Strauss - Confessor and Writer // Complete Works*. T. ½. Moscow: Cultural Revolution, 2014.

form of order (the Kingdom of God), so anarchism follows the logic of the possibility of establishing a complete form of society wherein the exploiters will get their just deserts for the injustice they inflicted on the oppressed classes (for example, workers). Obviously, Nietzsche does not accept any teleology, since for him the world is the becoming and interplay of forces that do not strive for completeness. The philosopher expressed this insight in the concept of eternal return (to be discussed separately).

The second line of succession between anarchism and Christianity is the driving force that gives birth to them. It is resentment — the envy a weak person feels for a strong one. As Christianity, according to Nietzsche, seeks to take revenge on the world for its imperfection, so anarchism tries to take revenge on unjust social reality, whose distinguishing feature is social inequality.

Anarchism, Christianity, socialism and all sorts of other -isms are built in by Nietzsche in the movement of nihilism and the devaluation of life, leading to the decline of creative and vital forces. In particular, the concept of anarchy is used by Nietzsche not only in his analysis of nihilistic cultural processes, but also from the point of view of the decadence of physiological processes that destroy a person as an integral organism. The philosopher calls this state of bodily disease "anarchy of instincts"<sup>52</sup>.

**Section 2** analyzes anarchist origins of Nietzsche's own thought in the context of how it was influenced by M. Stirner and M. Bakunin as well as L. Tolstoy and F. Dostoevsky who directly and indirectly contributed to the discussion about the foundations of anarchism.

The most important of these authors is M. Stirner, the founder of the individualist trend in anarchism. The possible theoretical continuity between the two thinkers gave rise to many philosophical disputes that have not subsided to this day. In particular, one can even hear that Nietzsche simply borrowed a number of ideas from Stirner and therefore did not offer anything original in his own philosophy.

---

<sup>52</sup> *Nietzsche F.* The birth of tragedy from the spirit of music / Per. with him. G. Rachipsky // Complete Works: In 13 volumes. T. 1/1. Moscow: Cultural Revolution, 2012. P. 10.

Whether this is true is difficult to judge, since the question of intellectual continuity between Nietzsche and the Young Hegelian is complicated by the fact that Stirner's name is never mentioned in Nietzsche's texts. Therefore, all assumptions that the Basel professor was familiar with *The Ego and Its Own* are based only on indirect evidence from students and close friends to whom Nietzsche allegedly recommended to read this outstanding text on radical philosophy<sup>53</sup>.

If we turn to the analysis of Nietzsche's works and Stirner's book, we can identify a number of apparent intersections. For example, both thinkers criticize the traditional morality of good and evil and defend the ideal of a strong personality independent of public opinion. On the other hand, Stirner could be called a typical nihilist, a critic of culture as such with whom Nietzsche undoubtedly disagreed.

Nevertheless, despite the absence of a definitive point of view on whether Nietzsche knew about the Young Hegelian or not, it was the discovered consonance between the ideas of the two thinkers that in many respects paved the way for an anarchist interpretation of Nietzsche's own work.

**Chapter 2** turns to historical and philosophical reconstruction. It analyzes the popularization of Nietzsche's philosophy in different countries (Germany, Russia, France, etc.) and shows how this process went in parallel with the development of regional anarchism. This reconstruction reveals the fact that it was often anarchists who played an important role in the popularization of Nietzsche's thought. This chapter is necessary because it demonstrates that anarchists in general were among the first to appreciate the philosophical significance of Nietzsche, trying to interpret him not only as a philosopher of culture or religion, but also as an important thinker within the framework of political discussion. The chapter consists of *5 sections*.

*Section 1* is devoted to the German anarchist movement. We can say that anarchism as an independent force appeared in the country in the early 1890s. By and large, it was formed through the opposition to the SPD (Social Democratic

---

<sup>53</sup> Levy A. (1904). Stirner and Nietzsche, Paris. URL: <https://www.marxists.org/subject/anarchism/levy/stirner-nietzsche.htm> (date of access: 27.04.2020).



Party of Germany) whose policies were one way or another based on reformism and compromise with the authorities. Anarchists opposed it with the radicalism of "direct action". Among those sympathetic to anarchism were a large number of bohemians, artists and intellectuals who shared radical individualistic sentiments.

One such thinker was J. H. McKay, the first popularizer of Stirnerian ideas. McKay published a detailed biography of the Young Hegelian and republished the text of *The Ego and Its Own*. It was McKay who uttered the thesis that Nietzsche was not the first to mention a superhuman rebelling against an unjust order. The primacy, according to McKay, undoubtedly belonged to Stirner.

However, in the 1890s' Germany Nietzsche's philosophy was already popular among the same radical individualists. Therefore, the dispute about who first created radical philosophy — Stirner or Nietzsche — did not at all reduce, but only fueled interest in both thinkers. The two became more and more relevant for German anarchism which also fought against the surrounding unjust reality of the state.

**Section 2** reconstructs the history of the Russian anarchist movement. It is noted that both anarchism and the thought of F. Nietzsche gradually gained popularity in Russia from the late 1890s. In particular, one should point out the fact that in the first critical responses to the works of the Basel professor, Nietzsche was directly called an anarchist and a revolutionary who rebelled against the old order<sup>54</sup>.

Since Nietzsche's thought was seen as intentionally anti-Christian, the first impression of Nietzsche's writings was rather negative in Russian Orthodox Christian culture. However, in the early 1900s the situation changed, as more and more texts began to appear that compared the views of the German thinker and the great Russian writers Tolstoy and Dostoevsky. It turned out that there were a large number of common features between these authors, and thus Nietzsche got gradually integrated into the Russian culture of the Silver Age.

---

<sup>54</sup> *Grot N. Moral ideals of our time. Friedrich Nietzsche and Leo Tolstoy // Blue-eyed Yu. (ed.) Nietzsche: pro et contra. St. Petersburg: RKhGI, 2001*

In parallel with this, anarchist ideas gained strength in Russian society, and one of the important authors who contributed to the popularization of anarchism was again Stirner (whose thought experienced renaissance in Germany at that moment). The Young Hegelian's ideas became relevant not only for socio-political theories, but also for the general decadent culture of the country at the beginning of the 20th century, in which radical individualistic sentiments intensified. In this regard, not only Stirner, but also Nietzsche played an important role in shaping the mood of the Russian intelligentsia. In particular, for a short time the minds of Russian thinkers were captivated by mystical-anarchist ideas directly conditioned by the works of these two philosophers.

*Section 3* turns to France, also discussing the background and precursors of the local anarchist movement and the intellectual climate in the country at that time. It is noted that France at the turn of the century was the undisputed leader in the prevalence of individualistic ideas which propagated thanks to both Nietzsche and Stirner. Just at that time their works were translated into French, and, just as in other countries, they gained popularity among the radical bohemia of writers and artists.

The specificity of French anarchism at the end of the 19th century was that it emphasized maximization of violence expressed through individual terror. The first anarchist terrorist acts were committed in 1881, partly influenced by the assassination attempt on Alexander II in Russia. Subsequently, from 1891 to 1894 French society was in fear due to regular acts of "propaganda by deed", the most famous example of which was activities of the anarchist Ravachol and his followers<sup>55</sup>.

A little later, already in the first decade of the 20th century, a movement of so-called illegalism arose in France exemplified by the Jules Bonnot gang<sup>56</sup> which inherited the methods of anarcho-terrorists of the 1890s. This group of illegalists

---

<sup>55</sup> Skirda A. Facing the Enemy. A history of Anarchist organization from Proudhon to May 1968. AK Press, 2002. P. 56.

<sup>56</sup> For details, see: Parry R. The Bonnot Gang. The story of the French illegalists. Rebel press, 1987.

was notable for the fact that, despite their openly criminal methods, its members were inspired by Stirnerian philosophy, placing at the center the desires and aspirations of a single individual no matter how negatively they were perceived by society.

Of course, in addition to radical anarchism, in the 1890s in France syndicalism was gradually gaining strength<sup>57</sup>. Basically being a mass labor movement, syndicalism was able to attract the attention of intellectuals as well. In particular, Georges Sorel, combining in his *Reflections on Violence* (1908) the ideas of Marx, Bergson and in part also Nietzsche, expressed his understanding of the goals and objectives of the syndicalist project.

**Section 4** explores Italy. It discusses the work of the Italian poet Gabriele D'Annunzio, a popularizer of Nietzschean ideas. D'Annunzio's life story is important because, in fact, he was the first to pay attention to Nietzsche's philosophy in Italy, even before the peak of its popularity at the beginning of the 20th century. In addition, D'Annunzio laid down a certain vector for the reception of Nietzsche's ideas in Italy. For example, the Italian individualist anarchist Renzo Novatore<sup>58</sup> read Nietzsche's works through the prism of D'Annunzio's poetry. His texts thus synthesized socio-political and artistic concepts.

**Section 5** analyzes the history of anarchism and Nietzscheanism in the USA. It is argued that such American thinkers as R. Emerson and H. Thoreau partially shared the anarchist worldview. This is important since Emerson was a significant author for Nietzsche himself, which reveals another anarchic source for the Basel professor's thought. It is shown that in the United States people learned about Nietzsche specifically because of anarchists who came as immigrants from the Old World and brought with them both rumors and books of the Basel professor.

One such popularizer, who belonged to the local anarchist tradition, was Benjamin Tucker (1854-1939), a fellow and active correspondent of J. Henry

---

<sup>57</sup> Woodcock G. *Anarchism: A History Of Libertarian Ideas And Movements*, New York: Meridian Books, 1962. P. 318.

<sup>58</sup> See: *Novatore R. Collected writings*. Ardent Press, 2012.

McKay. Tucker, like his European counterparts, belonged to the individualist school of anarchist thought. Thanks to him, the *Liberty* magazine functioned for a long time in America (from 1881 to 1908). The magazine became the center of individualistic theory and in terms of influence was second only to Goldman's publication *Mother Earth* (1906-1917). It was in *Liberty* in the 1890s where the first translated fragments of Nietzsche's work appeared<sup>59</sup>, as well as a complete edition of Stirner's *The Ego and Its Own* in the 1900s. This fact directly confirms that Nietzsche's fame among the American public was due to anarchist circles. Tucker himself, of course, like other individualists, sympathized more with the German Young Hegelian than with the author of *Zarathustra*, considering the latter to be an insufficiently anarchist thinker.

**Chapter 3** is devoted to the conceptual analysis of ideas. It examines the basic concepts of Nietzsche's texts: eternal return, will to power, resentment, etc., and analyzes how these concepts were used by a specific anarchist theorist. Thus, the hidden anarchic potential which is present at an implicit level in the works of the German philosopher, is revealed. The chapter consists of *four sections*.

*Section 1* deals with the key idea of Nietzsche's philosophy — the eternal return. This concept was formed by the German thinker in contrast to Christian thought. Nietzsche was not satisfied with the two aspects of the Christian religion: its source of origin and ontology. Christianity, as the philosopher assumed, arose from resentment, the concept described in *On the Genealogy of Morals* (1887). In the realm of ontology, Nietzsche's criticism was directed against teleology as the progress of the world towards a perfect order.

Consequently, the two aspects can be distinguished in the doctrine of the eternal return. First, the natural-scientific character of this idea can be pointed out. It describes cosmology in terms of the science contemporaneous with Nietzsche. This level of hypothesis aims to overcome teleology. Nietzsche recognizes the

---

<sup>59</sup> See: McElroy W. Benjamin Tucker, *Liberty, and Individualist Anarchism // The Independent Review*, v. II, n. 3. Pp. 421 - 434.

dynamism of forces, therefore he claims it is impossible to establish any final form of order — the movement towards the goal turns out to be unacceptable for such a model of the cosmos. Following Heraclitus, the philosopher is inspired by the idea of the variability of the world, but in a different way: becoming is constant, which means that it has the character of eternal becoming and therefore is close to the well-formed being and is not a simple chaotic change of things.

The second aspect of the eternal return concerns the metaphysical realm. Nietzsche recognizes the insufficiency of a mere natural-scientific hypothesis — it must serve as an illustration of a philosophical idea. The metaphysical nature of the concept of eternal return is expressed in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* (1883-85) and Nietzsche's diary entries. Here the idea is that not only physical compounds of forces and atoms of inanimate nature return, but also human deeds and destinies. This is the most important element of the repetition: the eternal return is associated with the Dionysian acceptance of the world, which means reconciliation with suffering and the imperfection of the surrounding reality. In this case, Nietzsche's thought is directed against another aspect of Christianity — resentment. Acceptance of life with its injustice means getting rid of desire for revenge and unclean conscience: everything in the world happens as it happens, a person is left with the joy of watching the eternal game of fate in relation to their own destiny.

Further, it is revealed how the doctrine of the eternal return was used in anarchist theories through citing the work of the German anarchist G. Landauer (1870-1919) and the Russian anarcho-individualist L. Cherny (1878-1921), who since their youth were well acquainted with Nietzsche's philosophy.

Speaking about the connection between Landauer's thought and Nietzsche's doctrine of the eternal return, it is necessary to mention Landauer's work *Revolution* (1907). Here Landauer introduced two key concepts around which his reasoning was built: the concepts of "topia" and "utopia". Topia means the current social order, laws and norms of behavior; utopia is the idea that motivates social change and transformation.

In history, according to Landauer, there is eternal switching of two constructions: a utopian idea appears inside the topia and destroys the old order, but again leads to the establishment of a new topia. It is important to note that Landauer denied the existence of the first topia with which history began, as well as the possibility of establishing the last topia towards which history aspires.

Thus, Lanauer could borrow, among other things, the Nietzschean perspective on the world. In many notes, Nietzsche criticized teleology — for him the world was not a progressive movement towards the final goal, but a game that never freezes in some final state. The overcoming of teleology, as well as the view of the Cosmos as a static and motionless being, were united by Nietzsche in the concept of eternal return, indicating dynamism of forces, their constant repetition in the same forms.

Analyzing L. Cherny's text *A new trend in anarchism: associational anarchism* (1907)<sup>60</sup>, one can come to a similar conclusion as was made in relation to Landauer. Namely, Turchaninov distinguishes three main types of social orders. The first one he calls the *democratic* order, in which the values of the universal dominate over the individual. The second order is the *monarchical (despotic)* state system headed by one person who has unlimited power over other people. Finally, the third kind of order must arrive with *anarchism*, whereby the feeling of respect of one person for another is established.

Cherny believes that the political structure is based on *moral feelings* — love, selfishness and respect — replacing each other in the course of history. Together with these feelings the socio-political system is changing. From Turchaninov's reasoning, one can conclude that the feeling of mutual respect and the anarchist order associated with it represent the best social order. However, it does not follow from this that anarchism is the final and conclusive stage in the development of mankind with which the best order will be established once and for all. When the moral sense changes, the social order changes with it.

---

<sup>60</sup> Cherny L. *A new direction in anarchism: associational anarchism*. New York, edition of the workers' union "Self-education", 1923.

Such dynamics of social life is described by Cherny through the metaphor of "circulation". This metaphor can refer to Nietzsche's concept of the eternal return, although in addition to it, for example, to Plato's political philosophy. Nevertheless, it is precisely Nietzsche's philosophical intuition that directly contains the idea that it is impossible to establish a finite form of order, no matter how favorable it may be: the world is an interplay of forces, the number of which is finite which causes the repetition of their combinations in potentially infinite time. Therefore, even when the most perfect balance of forces occurs, it does not mean completeness. This intuition is what Cherny and Landauer explicitly express: anarchism is undoubtedly an ideal system, but, unfortunately, it is not the end of history.

**Section 2** turns to Nietzsche's second most important idea, the doctrine of the will to power. Being both a metaphysical and a natural-scientific concept, this idea does not have one possible way of interpretation. In this concept, one can see a naturalistic idea about the desire of every living organism to expand the sphere of its own influence and power; the ethical imperative of power over oneself, as it was proclaimed, for example, since the Stoic philosophy; finally, a metaphysical hypothesis, a kind of transformation of Schopenhauer's doctrine of the will as the main force in the universe.

Using the example of the anarcho-syndicalist Rudolf Rocker's work, it is revealed how the will to power is interpreted as a social force driving the development of human society. In particular, Rocker believes that it is the will to power that influences political interests in the course of history. For Rocker, the will to power is not a natural, but explicitly a social law. In particular, when a ruling elite appears in society, striving to expand its own sphere of influence, it is precisely this elite that becomes the main bearer of the will to power.

In Rocker's interpretation, the mechanism for the emergence and implementation of power is very complex. He believes that power can only be power if it is connected with some transcendent source, in particular, with God.

Here emerges the following picture of the Rockerian view of human history. Initially, people were in a state of nature, which is characterized by feelings of mutual assistance and solidarity. Despite the fact that conflict was allegedly alien to primitive man, this could not rid him of natural fears such as the fear of death. To overcome this negative feeling people invented religion.

However, being an artificial creation religion began to function according to its own rules. The main one turned out to be the will to power, since the finiteness of human existence was explained through the intervention of higher powers that have power over mortals. In turn, religion served to ensure that among the initially equal group of people, clergymen stood out, capable of influencing the gods. This is how social inequality arose.

Then the top leaders, thanks to their exclusive religious status, began to consolidate their exclusive social position. The latter meant the emergence of a state whose laws were aimed at preserving the power of the masters. Initially, the state was closely intertwined with religion. However, gradually the religious area was secularized leaving the "pure" state. Accordingly, it required a new way to justify the state as an institution. It was the idea of a nation gaining unity and a full-fledged place in the historical arena supposedly thanks to the state. In this regard, Rucker believes that just as any religion has a set of sacred texts that are responsible for dogmatics, so the nation-state must have a doctrine that justifies its existence. For example, such a doctrine is democratic theory based on Rousseau's concept of the general will.

Therefore, Rucker believes that as long as there are religions and states, there is also will to power, and therefore happiness in the social state is impossible. Anarchism can put an end to the tyranny of violence, being also one of the forms of will to power. However, unlike the state, anarchism transforms the will to power from a desire for dominance into creativity that develops cultural and intellectual values and ideals. Rucker follows Nietzsche in contrasting the state and culture: they are mutually exclusive antagonists. It turns out that anarchism for Rucker is



one of the types of big politics, the main goal of which is to take care of culture and educate a new type of people which should become workers who rebel against the capitalist order. Their uprising must first of all constitute cultural revolution, and only secondarily direct confrontation with the state.

**Section 3** analyzes Nietzsche's idea of the person. It is argued that the German philosopher criticizes all thought that interprets a person as an unchanging subject, a bearer of certain stable features (for example, rationality). Nietzsche believes that the immutable subject and human nature are fictions and remnants of European metaphysics. Instead of the notion of an individual, it is more appropriate to speak of a *dividuum* — that is, a multitude of personalities within one person.

In Nietzsche's model of the subject, two aspects can be distinguished: the level of the social and the level of the directly individual, that is, that which gives a particular person uniqueness and originality. The public sphere is equated by Nietzsche with the area of consciousness rooted in language. Through language and awareness, a person "socializes", that is, they adopt rules and norms of behavior that are external to their unique personality. These rules and norms are always someone else's rules and norms.

True individuality, however, belongs to the realm of instincts, inexpressible in language, but manifesting itself in human actions. "Knowing oneself" is possible only through the actions that a person performs — the pre-existing theoretical foundation and validity of the action are not enough, moreover, they usually come after the deed.

The key idea of the subject, according to Nietzsche's view, can be formulated as follows: the individual is not just an ensemble of instincts, but strict hierarchy thereof, in which one force dominates at each particular moment of time. Thus, the Nietzschean *dividuum* is a set of successive forces that obey the will to power principle.

Further, it is shown how Nietzsche's understanding of the human is relevant

for anarchism on the example of the previously mentioned theorists G. Landauer and L. Cherny. Both thinkers believe that the human cannot be defined by means of once and for all given features. Moreover, any fixed definition of the human always comes from the state. In turn, relying on a dynamic and ever-changing divdium directly means a departure from the political logic of the state and constitutes an important element of the anarchist struggle against the old order.

For example, for Landauer the human personality has a mystical depth, and therefore cannot be known in artificially constructed concepts of science. For the German anarchist, as for Nietzsche, there is no self-enclosed individual; personality always means openness to the other, and therefore the divdium is constituted by a huge number of forces and not by any single feature such as rationality.

**Section 4** is dedicated to issues in ethics. Here Nietzsche's doctrine of resentment and getting rid of it is reconstructed. Originating as an independent concept in the work *On the Genealogy of Morals* (1887), resentment means a hidden desire for revenge held by a weak person towards a strong one. Moreover, it is rather an unconscious desire — the weak takes revenge on the strong without realizing it.

Ressentiment becomes the driving morale of rebellious slaves together with reassessment of values: the values of the strong are depreciated, while the ideals of the weak come to the fore. Nietzsche saw the peak of this reassessment in Christianity, the religion of the weak, as well as anarchism as the ideology of the disadvantaged. If Christianity took revenge from a metaphysical perspective, then anarchists took revenge literally, in practice. This socio-political doctrine, according to the Basel professor, is not conceivable outside the current state structure, being only a reaction to it when the oppressed class takes revenge on its masters in various ways in acts of terror and riots.

However, the example of Alexei Borovoy and Georges Sorel's work demonstrates how this Nietzschean task of ridding people of a hidden sense of

revenge is used in anarchist theory. This attitude is expressed most distinctly in Borovoy's late work *Anarchism* (1919).

Despite the fact that the text begins with a critique of individualistic philosophy, in particular the thought of Nietzsche and Stirner, there are occasional sympathetic mentions of Nietzsche's ideas. In particular, Borovoy is sympathetic to the philosopher's romanticism expressed in Nietzsche's beliefs in the advent of a new world and the emergence of a new person. Borovoy believes that anarchism is also possible in the future as the new order that will arise after the state disappears. However, the Russian anarchist rejects violent struggle. For him, anarchism means disappearance of violence, and therefore Borovoy does not accept violent confrontation with the state.

Instead, Borovoy emphasizes the renewal of human nature. He believes that anarchism becomes reality when a person is freed from timidity, humility, envy, and, most importantly, the desire for revenge towards other people. In this regard, the Russian theorist notes that it is Nietzsche who provides the clearest understanding of the problem of revenge and its harmful effect on people's souls<sup>61</sup>. Therefore, anarchists should heed the Basel professor, since in the task of ridding people of vindictiveness the goals of anarchism and Nietzscheanism coincide. Here Borovoy sees the anarchist potential and anarchist motives of Nietzsche's own philosophy.

In the work of G. Sorel with which Borovoy was also well acquainted, similar intuitions are found. In *Reflections on Violence* (1907), Sorel paints a picture of a grandiose proletarian myth capable of inciting workers to fight capitalism. This myth is the myth of the general strike — the last heroic battle when the proletariat rises up against injustice.

Sorel notes that the proletarian strike is reminiscent of warfare. At the same time, he believes that any war is rather a war waged by the rules, when the opponents do not try to destroy each other but rather perceive the enemy as equal

---

<sup>61</sup> Borovoy A. *Anarchism*. M.: URSS, 2016. P. 118.

to themselves. Therefore, a just war and a proletarian strike take place without a sense of revenge and hatred for opponents<sup>62</sup>. In this statement, in my opinion, Sorel repeats Nietzsche's idea about the danger of resentment.

In particular, for Sorel, Borovoy and Nietzsche, it is obvious that vindictiveness gives rise to acts of uncontrolled violence. If we understand violence as a chain of actions (every violent act gives rise to a response like defense or retaliation, also violent), then this chain goes to infinity and the human community cannot abide in a non-violent state which is the anarchist ideal. Accordingly, anarchism can only be achieved through *forgiveness*. The latter turns out to be a suspension of the logic of violence and a direct refusal to respond to it, thereby stopping the chain of uncontrolled violent acts. In my opinion, this statement is the key to the anarchist interpretation of Nietzsche's philosophy.

Finally, **Chapter 4** addresses contemporary postanarchist theory. It emerged at the end of the 20th century. In the 1980s the term postanarchism itself was introduced, alluding to incipient transformation of the anarchist doctrine caused by conceptual developments in post-structuralism and psychoanalysis. This chapter has *4 sections*.

*Section 1* discusses the history of postanarchism. Postanarchism, on the one hand, arose through criticism of the existing anarchist tradition, its renewal and adaptation to new conditions. However, this anarchist program immediately acquired a number of problems. In particular, it is quite difficult to define the boundaries of the concept of postanarchism, as well as the conditions due to which it is possible to speak of this concept as an independent direction of anarchist theory.

In particular, contemporary anarchist theorists argue that classical anarchism of the 19th — early 20th centuries had some theoretical problems. Chief among them was essentialism. Allegedly, past authors assumed the existence of the innate "good" human nature, which must be protected from the "evil" state, the Leviathan.

---

<sup>62</sup> *Sorel J.* Reflections on violence. M.: Falanster, 2013. P. 117.

Such an idea of the once and for all given human nature does not suit contemporary postanarchists who follow the theorists of post-structuralism in their criticism of essentialism. They assert the historicity of everything human and deny that people possess some innate characteristics.

However, this view of the foundations of classical anarchism is erroneous (or at least controversial)<sup>63</sup> because it is not confirmed by primary sources with which postanarchists are often not familiar. As a result, the overcoming and transformation of the classical anarchist tradition by postanarchists turns out to be moot since this very tradition has never contained elements that are subject to reappraisal.

Therefore, in order to justify the foundation on which postanarchism is built, we can offer another criterion in addition to criticizing and opposing classical anarchism. Namely, postanarchism began to take shape at the moment when a key author appeared within the framework of the anarchist program. This author turned out to be Nietzsche<sup>64</sup>. From this follows that the 1890s can be called the decade when postanarchism started to emerge because at that time Nietzsche's philosophy was adapted to suit anarchist theory in several countries.

All the authors who have been previously discussed in the dissertation do not only constitute the galaxy of anarchist-Nietzscheans but are also among the proto-postanarchists who laid the groundwork for the recent discussion about anarchist theoretical foundations. The next **3 sections** discuss the main features of postanarchism in the context of Nietzsche's ideas.

**Section 2** is devoted to the political ontology and epistemology of postanarchism using the work of A. Koch and T. May as an example. The most indicative here is A. Koch's *Post-structuralism and the epistemological foundation*

---

<sup>63</sup> Jun N. Reconsidering Post-Structuralism and Anarchism // postanarchism. A Reader / Ed. by D. Rousselle and S. Evren. London, New York: Pluto Press, 2011. P. 231.

<sup>64</sup> For instance, see: Day R. Hegemony, Affinity and the Newest Social movements: at the End of the 00s // postanarchism: a reader, ed. by Rousselle D, and Evren S. Pluto Press, 2011. Pp. 95 – 117; Day R. Landauer Today // Landauer G. Revolution and Other Writings: A Political Reader, ed. by Kuhn G. PM Press, 2010. Pp. 6 – 10.

*of anarchism*<sup>65</sup>, released for the first time in the 1990s and later reprinted several times.

Reconstructing main trends of Koch's reasoning, we can offer the following specifics of the "political ontology" of postanarchism, as well as its main differences from the ontology of classical anarchism. In particular, Koch believes that the main claim made by classical 19th century anarchists about the state was that the latter did not create conditions for living together but led to numerous social conflicts. It was a confrontation between the artificial order, which is *evil in itself*, and the good human nature which anarchists sought to protect from the Leviathan. Thus, classical anarchism, according to postanarchists, rested on the logic of the two principles manifested in the world. It was this opposition of absolute good and evil in the socio-political space that required a critical reassessment, since it hardly satisfied the realities of the modern world.

To build a postclassical epistemology and ontology of anarchism, a new philosophical optics is needed. Connected with the concepts of human nature, good and evil, is the fundamental idea of *truth as such*, understood as objective reality that exists independently of human cognitive abilities. Classical anarchism allegedly existed within this Platonic (or Enlightenment) paradigm which after post-structuralist philosophy can no longer be relevant in the 21st century.

Consequently, the problem of overcoming the concept of truth within the framework of the anarchist doctrine arises here. Solving the problem requires creating another language for this theory. As one might guess, Nietzsche's philosophy perfectly fits the task of criticizing the Platonic paradigm of classical anarchism. Nietzsche's genealogical method calls into question the phenomenon of truth, since genealogy reveals the premises of any statement that claims absolute status.

Basel professor's philosophy extirpated the space of things-in-themselves, leaving only the world of the will to power for which the category of truth is not

---

<sup>65</sup> Koch A. (2011) Post-Structuralism and the Epistemological Basis of Anarchism // postanarchism. A Reader / Ed. by D. Rousselle and S. Evren. London, New York: Pluto Press, 2011. P. 23 – 41.

applicable. Accordingly, the rejection of the concept of truth within postanarchist language means that this movement itself cannot be described, say, from an anthropological perspective. If past anarchists started with claiming the existence of the true human nature, postanarchists understand the subject as a process of constant becoming, but not as reflection of a predetermined essence.

In turn, relying on the concept of will to power within the political ontology of postanarchism makes it possible to overcome the "passivity" of the anarchist movement. While before Nietzsche, according to Koch, anarchists considered the state an independent reality and a source of domination, then, after their accepting the thesis that the world is the will to power, the idea of the state apparatus standing "above" people ceases to be relevant. Rather, all reality is described as confrontation of forces, and therefore our understanding of power is expanding — it is no longer associated only with state institutions. Politics now boils down simply to a clash of forces (which in itself, of course, is not a new statement, but it is interesting how it contrasts with classical anarchist theory), or wills. Among them are, on the one hand, the "will to pluralism", which is in fact anarchism, on the other — "the will to totality", identical to the desire to preserve the state. In this confrontation, it is important that none of the parties claims the correctness of their own position, since the category of truth has lost its significance.

Moreover, in the world of the will to power there can be no reactive forces, but only active forces. Therefore, anarchism since it springs from the world of the will to power automatically turns into an active creative element that opposes the state as another pole of the will to power. It should be noted that neither anarchism nor the state are evaluated in terms of good and evil. This point distinguishes postanarchists from the classics (Bakunin, Kropotkin, Proudhon) who saw an absolutely evil principle in the state and power. Such a binary language does not work in a postanarchist perspective.

*Section 3* directly discusses the model of the postanarchist subject using L.

Call's work *Postmodern Anarchism*<sup>66</sup>.

L. Call's key innovations are his concepts "anarchy of becoming" and "anarchy of the subject". They hold the key to an anarchic reading of Nietzscheanism beyond what has already been discussed previously. These concepts, among other things, were developed under the influence of J. Deleuze and M. Foucault's philosophies to which a separate chapter in Call's monograph is devoted. The French post-structuralists similarly defined the subject dynamically, without appealing to universal attributes, such as rationality.

What is meant by "anarchy of becoming" and "anarchy of the subject"? The main idea harks back to the days of Stirner. "Anarchy of the subject" suggests that we are unable to say anything concrete about a person. Any statement that claims to capture some once and for all given aspect of subjectivity is within the Enlightenment paradigm, and therefore will be erroneous in the world of Nietzsche's will to power which is "anarchy of becoming" devoid of anything static.

Call believes that such a changeable model of the subject should be adopted by contemporary anarchists. Dynamism is regarded as one of the ways of resistance to power relations represented by rationality. According to the Foucauldian definition of rationality, it produces individuals by applying the norm to them. That means that the question of the nature of power is no longer considered from a purely political point of view.

Through a dynamic understanding of the person among other things, a distance is established between contemporary and classical anarchists like Proudhon, Bakunin and Kropotkin. Call believes that classical anarchism used the model of a static and universal subject. It was also constrained by the boundaries of human nature, defined, for example, as the desire for mutual assistance in Kropotkin. Classical anarchists, according to Call, could not distance themselves from the order that they criticized because they did not reform their language —

---

<sup>66</sup> Call L. *Postmodern Anarchism*. Lexington Books, 2002.



through it, the political logic of the social reality against which the anarchist thought was directed was borrowed, and therefore it was impossible to talk about complete transformation of public life.

Based on this, Call pays tribute to Nietzsche's philosophy, since Nietzsche rethinks the linguistic foundations of subjectivity in which the static nature of rationality was manifested. It was Nietzsche, Call believes, who was the first to talk about the nomadic subject which escapes definition by means of rational discourse. Nietzsche considered the human as a work of art, subject to endless possibilities for interpretation, and therefore there cannot be a given human nature once and for all.

Following the Basel professor, Call notes that a new type of subject must permanently reinterpret its own boundaries, going beyond them — this is how dynamism and "anarchy of becoming", main elements of contemporary anarchist tactics, are achieved. In a world where power exists in hidden forms different from political power alone, it is also resisted within the realm of the subjective or individual. The idea of "anarchy of the subject" is an illustration of such opposition to power relations by overcoming the static nature of rationality, normalization and discipline.

Finally, *Section 4* comprehensively analyzes postanarchist theory using the work of S. Newman as an example. This author is today one of the leading postanarchist thinkers developing a whole program of postanarchism. Newman relies both on the conceptual developments of A. Koch, T. May, L. Call and other contemporary theorists.

For example, like the authors discussed above, Newman refers to the Nietzsche-Foucauldian genealogy of power. Whereas the former anarchist tradition believed that a person can be free from power since its source is the state, the destruction of which means the end of all domination, Newman suggests that it is impossible to imagine a social order completely devoid of power. As long as

individuals enter into relations with each other, they also exist within power. The very fact of communication makes power possible, as do many other practices.

Newman's key interpretation of anarchism is that this socio-political movement is the expression of radical politics that exists to the other side of state politics. Removing the task of creating a harmonious society, Newman offers the *war model*<sup>67</sup> as an interpretation of the social order. It had been already implicitly outlined in A. Koch and T. May's works, but was not thought through to its logical conclusion.

Nietzsche helps Newman in constructing this concept. Namely, the war model of "society" assumes that reality is identical to multiple confrontations and intersections of forces, is open to interpretation, and is never in a state of final completeness. In a sense, Newman's idea of social order is close to Nietzsche's idea of the eternal return of the same when dynamism and variability give the Cosmos the character of a formed being through the never-ceasing transformation of various configurations of forces.

In turn, the implementation of anarchism is possible, according to Newman, in "autonomous zones" of direct action, outside the state bureaucratic regulation. If postanarchism positions itself as an anti-globalist and anti-universalist theory, focusing on local resistance to power here and now, then anarchist practice can be understood as introducing an element of randomness and irregularity into the dominant discourse, leading to its destabilization.

In particular, Newman believes that one of the most effective ways of destabilization is destroying the identity of subjects of the current state order. This means that such destabilizing elements due to which a certain type of subjectivity in a particular state begins to blur can be marginal groups, both included and excluded from the regime of power. These include migrants and various sexual or racial minorities. The only important thing to consider is that these minorities do

---

<sup>67</sup> Newman S. From Bakunin to Lacan: Anti-Authoritarianism and the Dislocation of Power. Lexington Books, Oxford, 2001. P. 50.

not isolate themselves in their own essentialist subjectivity, but focus on the common anarchist goal of resisting domination in the name of freedom and equality (no matter how ideological, of course, this may sound). Thus, modern anarchism does not represent a single movement (although has it ever?), but instead is an intersection of many local points of resistance to power. Anarchism is situational.

Finally, Newman comes to the conclusion that anarchism is the underside of politics. Namely, anarchism is both "apolitical" (if this term is understood as a rejection of legal political activity) and totally politicized, addressing the political dimension directly. If the modern state is a space of depoliticization, then only anarchism retains today the inherent conflict of the political dimension. Therefore, for Newman, the future of anarchism is connected with the creation of an increasing number of autonomous zones in which people could decide their own fate directly, without the participation of third parties and the state as such. And Nietzsche is very comfortably integrated into this task, providing a powerful toolkit for criticizing any ideological -isms and exposing both the foundations of state power and the utopian and dogmatic elements of the old classical anarchist doctrine.

The **conclusion** summarizes the work and lists the following key points. Firstly, Nietzsche is a key influence on anarchist thought as a critic of its socio-political program. Many authors agree that the philosopher rightly blames the anarchist movement for its reactive character which is directly related to resentment. Anarchism should not be a passive response to the problems that are associated with the state but create new ideas and values that have no relation to the current order.

Secondly, Nietzsche's philosophy provides an important foundation for anarchist ethics. Instrumental here are the Basel professor's reflections about Christian morality, its shortcomings, as well as his attempt to find a new foundation for moral feelings (what Nietzsche called the ethics of love for the

distant). Anarchists agree with the author of *Zarathustra* that real-world implementation of anarchism is impossible without the moral transformation of the human person who must learn new norms of behavior associated with respect for other people, as well as love for culture. Without the latter, the advent of anarchism is impossible.

Thirdly, Nietzsche sets new parameters for the anarchist definition of human. If political philosophy begins with anthropology, then it is Nietzschean anthropology that turns out to be the foundation of anarchist political thought. Namely, Nietzsche introduces the important concept of *dividuum* as a human person who does not have any stable nature and is able to constantly change social roles and masks. Such variability of the subject is endorsed by anarchist theorists since they draw a direct connection between rationality, power and the state. Wherever the rational *cogito* is abolished, the subject liberates itself from the internalized action of power, and thus takes another step towards anarchy.

Fourthly, Nietzsche constructs a new "political ontology" directly related to the eternal return and the will to power. Reality for the German philosopher is immanent, it is made up of forces that are constantly colliding, neither good nor bad. This means that the foundation of life is action and the ability to realize these same forces. In this regard, anarchist theorists develop this logic further. They believe anarchism is one of the forces manifested in politics, such that it is free of moral judgment. The truth of anarchism is measured not by absolute categories but by the success of the struggle for anarchist ideas which always takes place here and now.

Finally, one should also pay attention to anarchist historiography in the 20th century and today. Since Nietzsche became a new author within the framework of anarchist programs in the 20th century, the very appeal to the German philosopher heralded the next stage in the evolution of anarchist thought. In fact, thanks to Nietzsche the post-classical direction of anarchism already emerged in the 1890s and later at the turn of the 20th century took shape under the postanarchist label.

This allows one to conclude that the anarchist reception of Nietzsche's philosophy is not a distortion of the thinker's ideas, as was the case with National Socialism. Despite Nietzsche's own rejection of anarchist thought, it turns out that there is much in common between them, which makes it possible to consider anarchism (with a number of important reservations) an authentic interpretation of the German thinker's ideas within the framework of socio-political philosophy.