Appendices
1. Notes to serve towards the history of the S.I. from 1969-1971

"As individuals express their life, so they are. What they are, therefore, coincides with their production, both with what they produce and with how they produce."

The German Ideology.

"It is more troublesome, in parties, to live with those who are part of them than to act against those who are opposed to them."

Cardinal de Retz, Memoirs.

The Theses on the S.I. and its time report what the S.I. has done since 1969, and all the reasons for what it has done. It will suffice to add here some succinct information on the principal circumstances which were met with in the same period; and on what became of various individuals.

About a month before the publication of number 12 of the French review, on the 28th of July 1969, Debord announced, by a letter addressed to all the sections of the S.I., that after this number he would cease "to assume the responsibility, as much legal as editorial", for the management of this review. He evoked "the old revolutionary principle of the rotation of tasks", according it "even more weight from the circumstance that several texts of the S.I. have greatly put the accent on the coherence and the sufficient capacities of all of its members". Now, such a displayed satisfaction seemed rather to be given the lie by the fact
that as the number of the members of the French section increased, these had strangely picked up the habit of abandoning to Debord the charge of realising an ever more important part of the recent numbers. An editorial committee was elected without pain a little while after to produce a next number more collectively; all agreeing that this should moreover furnish a complete change of the form and content of this review, to adapt it to conditions of activity become more complex and more advanced. Thus, this first symptom of a crisis towards which the S.I. was rushing passed nearly unnoticed, in the climate of a euphoria which, on the part of several comrades, was real; and on the part of others was simulated.

The Conference of Venice constituted a second symptom, more manifest and of more weight. The VIII Conference of the S.I. was held in Venice from the 25th of September to the 1st of October 1969, in a very well chosen building of the popular quarter of la Giudecca. It was constantly surrounded and watched over by a great number of informers, Italian or delegated by other police. One part of this Conference knew how to formulate good analyses on revolutionary politics in Europe and in America; and notably to foresee the development of the Italian social crisis in the next months, as well as the interventions which we would have to make in it. But, if such a debate certainly showed at work the most extremist, and the best informed, political grouping then existing in the world, the best aspects of what the S.I. also signified in so far as fundamental theory, critique and creation in the whole of life, or simply the capacity for real dialogue between autonomous individuals — “association in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all”, — proved completely absent there. The “pro-situ” mind manifested itself in Venice in a grandiose manner. While some comrades systematically imitated the prudent silence of Vaneigem, half of the participants wasted three quarters of the time in repeating with the greatest firmness the same vague generalities which each preceding orator had just affirmed; and all this was translated step by step into English, German, Italian, and French. Each of these eloquent comrades had evidently as their only aim to underline that he was just as situationist as the next; in such a way therefore as to justify his presence at this Conference, as if he could have found himself there by chance, but just as much as if an ulterior more historical justification had not been abandoned in the sole pursuit of this formal recognition which should have been considered as already assured. In short, the situationists there numbered eighteen, they had the spirit of four.

After Venice, the French editorial committee, composed of Beaulieu, Riesel, Sébastiani and Viènet, did not manage, during more than a year, to produce even fifteen usable lines. Not that their writings were ever rejected by others; quite simply, they were not able to write anything which satisfied them themselves. And on this point one must recognize that they showed they were lucid.

Mustapha Khayati, who had figured among the most intelligent and effective comrades of the recent years of the S.I., had presented his resignation to the Conference of Venice, which accepted it, at the same time expressing profound disagreement on his ulterior perspectives. He had imprudently engaged two months earlier in a participation in the activities of the Popular Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine, at the heart of which he thought he could discern a revolutionary proletarian fraction; and it is known that the S.I. cannot admit of a double membership which would immediately verge on manipulation. Khayati showed by what followed, in Jordan, that he was less sure a revolutionary when he found himself isolated, in to tell the truth a nearly desperate position but one into which he had got himself, than when he was well accompanied. The proletarian fraction of the P.D.F.L.P., and even the least expression of its autonomous perspectives, had only existed in the well intentioned imagination of Khayati, who found himself holding a seat in the simple management of this under-developed leftist misery. All the Palestinian organizations were armed and enjoyed in Jordan a situation of double power, but this latter occurred exactly at the level of local conditions. All the ridicule of the impotent Arab states, divided, and accumulating bombast on their unity, found itself concentrated in the embryonic state pseudo-apparatuses
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which shared that part of Jordanian territory which little by little had escaped the State of Hussein. A double power can never last, however not one of the Palestinian organizations wanted to overthrow Hussein, and thus all of them renounced their sole slim chance of winning, not even wishing to see that it was the last hour to risk everything: for each of them feared that the operation would only profit some rival organization and its Arab protector State. It was thus perfectly evident that Hussein would destroy the Palestinian organizations. One had to be prisoner of a veritable ideological hysteria not to acknowledge that few heads of State can have so constantly shown proof of so much firmness as King Hussein to maintain himself in power cost what it may, in the most difficult conditions; and that he disposes of the most solid and the most faithful army of all the Arab countries (which, certainly, is not to say much, but it was obviously enough to crush the unfortunate Palestinians militarily obeying such strategists). Khayati could not be ignorant of all this; but he literally did not know how to say a word of it, in any form. However, the boukha was drawn, it had to be drunk. Since the revolutionary Palestinian elements had merited Khayati's adhesion, they merited also that he support before them a minimum perspective, and that he put them on their guard. He contented himself with returning to Europe gravely deceived, before the inevitable repression. Undoubtedly he has brought out since, on the 1st of August 1970, in company with Lakhdar, twenty-four theses, very insufficient moreover, entitled En attendant le massacre. But these theses, published in the Trotskyist journal An Nidhal, were in fact written after the massacre, which had begun before the summer and had only to be completed by the autumn. Thus Khayati disappeared definitively from the S.I.; and in leaving he certainly did not come closer to revolutionary praxis, and gave us no ground for congratulating ourselves on the mastery which some comrades are able to deploy there who had been formed by the S.I.

The Italian section of the S.I. succeeded much better in practical circumstances nearly as dangerous; notably in succeeding in escaping from the police who made a show of looking for them after the explosion of the bombs which the protection services of the Italian State utilised, in December 1969, to shatter or retard the movement of wild-cat strikes which just at this moment came to constitute a menace of immediate subversion of society. It was equally able to immediately publish and diffuse clandestinely the tract Il Reichstag brucia? (Is the Reichstag burning?) which, several months before the first timid doubts advanced by the Italian leftists, revealed the essential of this manoeuvre. The Venice Conference had clearly seen coming the troubles of the following term, and had even halted in advance the despatch, in reinforcement of the Italian section, of some "French adventurers, all men of elite and skirmishes", to reemploy the expression of the Loyal Servant at the time of other Italian wars. However, this time, it was the State which was able intrepidly to seize the initiative again (giving an example of what can be easily reproduced elsewhere); and it was the Italian comrades who had to go into exile for some time in France.

The whole of the facts evoked above led us to undertake, at the beginning of 1970, a debate of orientation which had to decide on what the S.I. had henceforth to do, and above all to examine how it was doing it, and why certain people managed to do nothing. This debate which lasted nearly a year, showed clearly the emptiness and abstraction of the conceptions of many contemplative situationists, and even the naïve ruses of certain ones. Some said with assurance that what had to be done was just what they were unable to do; others tranquilly repeated diverse projects which they had absolutely no wish to undertake to execute. (One will be able to read in the International Institute of Social History of Amsterdam, the mass of uninteresting documents and the fastidious correspondence which all those who were unable to do anything else accumulated at this moment).

Certain insufficiencies and errors in this debate or in practical conduct brought about, before the more general rupture which we commenced in November 1970, the retrenchment of a certain number of members of the S.I. Successively and over five distinct affairs, Chevalier, Chasse and Elwell, Pavan, Rothe, Salvadori, were excluded for having gravely failed the organizational rules of the S.I. Beaulieu and Cheval had to resign, but for quite opposing motives: Beaulieu because he was reproached for his silliness and
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Certain insufficiencies and errors in this debate or in practical conduct brought about, before the more general rupture which we commenced in November 1970, the retrenchment of a certain number of members of the S.I. Successively and over five distinct affairs, Chevalier, Chasse and Elwell, Pavan, Rothe, Salvadori, were excluded for having gravely failed the organizational rules of the S.I. Beaulieu and Cheval had to resign, but for quite opposing motives: Beaulieu because he was reproached for his silliness and
lack of dignity, Cheval because he had, after a drinking bout borne worse than the others, attempted to defenestrate Sébastiani, whom he had not recognized, and who was obliged at last to defend himself (one will conceive that the S.I., just because it puts into play a certain violence, cannot accept that this be exercised on whatever occasion it may be, between those who are part of it). One must underline in conclusion that Patrick Cheval, Eduardo Rothe and Paolo Salvadori, despite the regrettable incidents which constrained us to separate ourselves from them, are estimable comrades who no doubt can bring some notable contribution to moments anterior to the revolutionary process of this time. The others, no.

These incidents, just because they had not carried off any but the worst, nor all of the worst, did not at all improve the quality of our thinkers or the verve of our editors. Though everybody always threw themselves as one man into condemnation of the excluded, many situationists continued to be tolerant among themselves, whilst the very conditions that they were living rendered suspect such long-suffering. Despite its recognized urgency, the critique of the pro-situs did not advance any quicker than the critique of the new epoch or the real auto-critique of the S.I. Those of us who brought the most elements to bear on these tasks were approved in principle, but without anything of them being effectively taken up and employed. Nevertheless one could even read in Informations Correspondance Ouvrières, journal generally more senseless and more deceitful, these lines full of sense: "For two years, all the vaneigemists have succeeded very well in concealing the struggle for human adventure, which the S.I. had led for fifteen years, in a given sphere, and not all alone either. The struggle for daily life and from daily life, has frozen into a miserable aestheticization of 'certain' relationships, 'certain' affinities, 'certain' desires, the whole dressed up with a certain apoliticism that makes one doubt their desire to live. As for their ludic and creative possibilities, it is enough to have skirted some to be persuaded that these do not go beyond those of the bons vivants that we all are". (I.C.O., supplement to no. 97-98, undated.)

Since the Venice Conference, and during the whole of this crisis, we had agreed on the fact that the S.I. would not accept new adherences without having first clearly dominated the difficulties that it found in itself. Without doubt, it would have been more expedient to have a certain number of new comrades enter the S.I., who would have immediately undertaken to drive out the incapable and the antiquated. However, this would have presented the grave inconvenience of reinforcing the S.I., when the most general theoretical conclusions that one could already sketch out on this crisis and the new epoch led us on the contrary to the certitude that it was necessary to weaken the S.I. Besides, such a path would forcibly involve, at least at a first stage, a certain subordination of these new comrades to our perspectives, for a struggle that would make them triumph among the situationists of several countries; and we no longer want anything of such a subordination, even momentarily, now that we have clearly seen what it is — and we have seen this so clearly just because the epoch now permits us to do without it. These adherences would thus have constituted a bad path; and would have led to a result itself inopportune. On the other hand, it was good that the S.I. kept silent for a while, above all in France. First of all to interrupt the conditioned reflex of a spectator crowd — certainly more than half of our tens of thousands of readers — who only awaited the next number of the review which it had picked up the habit of consuming, so as to bring to light its "knowledge" and its dreamed of orthodoxy. But also because the S.I. had never written anything which might be secretly in contradiction with what, on the whole, it was. At the moment when the S.I. knew a great part of its misery, but had not yet surmounted it, its silence avoided the unpardonable split between writings which would attempt to present themselves as partially or completely just, and the real miserable conditions which would remain uncriticized: the authentic writings of some justifying the inauthentic existence of the silent followers. Such a dissimulated split would not permit of really saying anything just against the Chinese bureaucracy or American leftist; all would have assumed a lying coefficient. The S.I. thus maintained its truth by saying nothing which could indirectly conceal a lie or a grave uncertainty on itself. Without
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Since the Venice Conference, and during the whole of this crisis, we had agreed on the fact that the S.I. would not accept new adherences without having first clearly dominated the difficulties that it found in itself. Without doubt, it would have been more expedient to have a certain number of new comrades enter the S.I., who would have immediately undertaken to drive out the incapable and the antiquated. However, this would have presented the grave inconvenience of reinforcing the S.I., when the most general theoretical conclusions that one could already sketch out on this crisis and the new epoch led us on the contrary to the certitude that it was necessary to weaken the S.I. Besides, such a path would forcibly involve, at least at a first stage, a certain subordination of these new comrades to our perspectives, for a struggle that would make them triumph among the situationists of several countries; and we no longer want anything of such a subordination, even momentarily, now that we have clearly seen what it is — and we have seen this so clearly just because the epoch now permits us to do without it. These adherences would thus have constituted a bad path; and would have led to a result itself inopportune. On the other hand, it was good that the S.I. kept silent for a while, above all in France. First of all to interrupt the conditioned reflex of a spectator crowd — certainly more than half of our tens of thousands of readers — who only awaited the next number of the review which it had picked up the habit of consuming, so as to bring to light its "knowledge" and its dreamed of orthodoxy. But also because the S.I. had never written anything which might be secretly in contradiction with what, on the whole, it was. At the moment when the S.I. knew a great part of its misery, but had not yet surmounted it, its silence avoided the unpardonable split between writings which would attempt to present themselves as partially or completely just, and the real miserable conditions which would remain uncriticized: the authentic writings of some justifying the inauthentic existence of the silent followers. Such a dissimulated split would not permit of really saying anything just against the Chinese bureaucracy or American leftist; all would have assumed a lying coefficient. The S.I. thus maintained its truth by saying nothing which could indirectly conceal a lie or a grave uncertainty on itself. Without
doubt, many situationists wanted to pursue, through unscrupulous ambition or simple personal vanity, the glorious role of an S.I. which would have added some beautiful pages to its old style, at the price of some semi-critiques of the near past and the last excluded; and thus would have presented an improvement or a supersession of which they themselves were not the bearers. But precisely those who would have liked to maintain this style of publication, were not capable of writing them. Those who on the contrary could accordingly left the incapables to get stuck in the mud for some while, simply by taking at their word, the organizational principles of the S.I. (the in general equal capacities of its members), whence one could see precisely that they could not verify themselves at all any longer with these people, and in such conditions. It was “casting out the nines” which showed that the insufficiency in the form was identical to the insufficiency in the content. In silencing the S.I. in this manner, for quite a while, we made appear — at first in the negative — its crisis; and we thus began to help the thought and action of real autonomous forces to liberate themselves by themselves. On an ulterior level, it seemed to us even better to cease the publication of a review which was beginning to enjoy a too routinish success. Other forms of situationist expression are more suitable to the new epoch. They will trouble even more the habits of the comfortable spectators, who will never know the answer to their most impassioned wait: what metallic colour had been chosen for no. 13? The review called in France Internationale Situationniste was published for eleven years (and moreover during this time it completed the bankruptcy of its two successive printers). It dominated this period, and it attained its goal. It was very important for passing on our theses in this epoch. The numerous pro-sitу aficionados, who do not know at all what this review was for — and who seem quite incapable themselves of doing, on the basis of the equal autonomy which they proclaim to please us, anything which would be on this level —, dreamt no doubt that one would continue to furnish them until the end of the century — and for 3 francs, “interesting price” — their little dose of intellectual “festival”. Oh no! If they are anxious to read such reviews, they will now have to write them themselves.

The historical impotence of the contemplative situationists, placed in the best experimental light, had by the autumn of 1970 perfectly rejoined its concept. They had to acknowledge that one cannot make revolutionary theory whilst neglecting the material foundations of the existing social relations. It is this critique of real modern capitalism which separates the S.I. from all leftist and also from the lying lyrical sighs of the various vaneigemists. We had to recommence the critique of political economy in understanding precisely and in combating “the society of the spectacle”. And assuredly we had to continue this because this society, since 1967, has pursued its movement of decay in an accelerated manner. Those of the contemplatives who knew themselves to be of the most pitiable, — the Beaulieus, Riesels and Vaneigems — and who consoled themselves by treating on occasion from on high, in the name of the S.I., some individuals who were outside but who were often worth much more than them could neither refuse nor execute this work; and found themselves paralysed in proportion faced with the simplest activities. During this time, history continued, even for us! And there were also, without end, people to see, texts to read, letters to write in ten countries, translations to do, etc. All those who could do nothing, or nearly nothing, of all this — or then did it badly — began to tire us greatly by their simple frequentation: their insistent and boring presence almost claimed to milk part of the time of what they would call our amusements or debauches (realities which are not contrary to the spirit of the S.I. either, although this also remained for them qualitatively quite inaccessible). And they felt some bitterness in finding themselves kept only too much in the background in everyday life, when they were even more dreary there than in political gossip. If “boredom is counter-revolutionary”, the S.I. was becoming so at top speed, without giving rise to as much protest as one might have expected.

On the 11th of November 1970, a tendency constituted itself in the S.I. which announced, in the Déclaration put out on this date, its wish to “break completely with the ideology of the S.I.”, through “a radical critique, that is to say ad hominem”, by accepting “no response which would be in contradiction with the real existence of he who formulates it”, and in wanting to attain as
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On the 11th of November 1970, a tendency constituted itself in the S.I. which announced, in the Déclaration put out on this date, its wish to “break completely with the ideology of the S.I.”, through “a radical critique, that is to say ad hominem”, by accepting “no response which would be in contradiction with the real existence of he who formulates it”, and in wanting to attain as
soon as possible a “split of which the imminent discussion will fix the frontiers.” This tendency gave itself moreover as a first step, and had also to pursue the purge in its own ranks. Our Déclaration had an instantaneous practical efficacy because it concluded with the announcement that we were going to “make known our positions outside the S.I.” The rout of the contemplatives began on the spot.

Horelick and Verlaan, last remains of the American section, wanted nothing of a split. But to avoid a split, the two sides must have the same intention. Besides the faults which one could point out in their practice or their pretensions in our organizational relations, we intimiated to them that their participation in our activities had been all the time too minimal for us to be able to continue to consider ourselves as co-responsible for what they would do. Their split even preferred not to present itself for a long time as such and became, under the title “Create Situations”, an autonomous group in which Verlaan at least pursues an activity principally devoted to the American translation of ancient texts of the S.I.

Vaneigem with his back to the wall had to show to the public what he had become with the text of his resignation (collected in the appendices of the present book), where his clumsiness is just as striking as his ignominy. The poor child whose toy has been broken takes a little piss of spleen in leaving: the S.I. was not at all interesting! Na! He redisovers thus an originality that he had well and truly lost a good five years ago, although in an entirely inverted position, since he (and precisely he . . .) is, without doubt today the only one in the world to pretend that one can brush aside the disquieting historical and social problem of the S.I. with so tranquil a pseudo-disdain. One understands very well why Vaneigem can now ask himself if the S.I. existed: “The proof of the pudding is in the eating”. Vaneigem had written a revolutionary book in a certain period, a book that he knew neither how to translate into practice nor how to correct with the advances of the revolutionary epoch. In this matter, one can only judge the beauty of a book by that of life. Moreover, at a time when so “subjective” a book — where abound pleonastic confidences on himself and on what he needs, or would need, of more radical — can only be the consummation of a life generously risked and tasted, Vaneigem had only prefaced his non-existent life. Now, following his only talent of man of letters, he prefaches others. In a communiqué A propos de Vaneigem (concerning Vaneigem), drafted immediately after by Debord and Viènet, the S.I. had publicly summoned him to point out at least one of the “scheming tactics” which he claimed to have found and would therefore have evidently “let pass”, during all the time he was among us. The personage preferred to admit, by his silence, his calumny; rather than risk himself in backing it up.

One must mention quite apart comrade Sébastiani. He addressed to us at this moment two successive texts, of an undeniable honesty. He criticized himself on the fact that he had been far too inactive, and especially in writing. But one would have to be really petty to reproach Christian Sébastiani who, a little before being in the S.I., was the author of many of the most beautiful inscriptions of May 1968 — and who has thus expressed with an eminent merit one of the most original aspects of this historical moment —, with his laziness before the work of writing in less burning days. What we reproached him with, and which had unfortunately to bring about the end of our collaboration, is that he did not really employ himself, as he should have, with managing the S.I. himself; and that even at the end of this crisis, he did not seem to recognize in theoretical terms all its depth. We must also plainly declare that he cannot be identified with the current image of the pro-situ — or of the pro-situ member of the S.I. — to the extent that this image includes as dominant traits dissimulation, cowardice, meanness in all aspects of behaviour, and frequently unscrupulous ambition. Sébastiani, if one can reproach him with casualness sometimes carried to the point of thoughtlessness, has amongst us always been frank, courageous and generous. He is estimable for the dignity of his life, and pleasant to be around with.

Soon after this split, in February 1971, René Viènet resigned for “personal convenience”. Lastly, and as if so that the drama of civic troubles and banishments in the S.I. might have something really Shakespearian to it, it did not lack the character of the fool:
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Soon after this split, in February 1971, René Viènet resigned for “personal convenience”. Lastly, and as if so that the drama of civic troubles and banishments in the S.I. might have something really Shakespearian to it, it did not lack the character of the fool:
René Riesel. This one had with joy seen disappear several of his rivals, for he thought in that way to progress in his career. But the new situation obliged him to undertake diverse tasks of which he was more incapable than anyone else. Revolutionary at seventeen— in 1968— Riesel has known the rare misadventure of becoming old before reaching 19 years of age. Never had such a dry fruit given himself up so desperately to so extreme an unscrupulous ambition, of which all the means were denied to him. He tried to mask this unscrupulous ambition, and the sour envy that his permanent failure brings about, beneath this air of ill-assured assurance of the feeble that one feels dreading at every moment a hard word or a kick. But now he could mask his supreme impotence in the activities of the S.I. for a few weeks more only by lying wretchedly to all and sundry on the state of advance or the quasi-completion of his non-existent works. Simultaneously, he had cautiously indulged in several other unscrupulousnesses of back-shop and till; and even thought himself obliged to clandestinely guarantee, to certain persons that he thought well chosen, several gross lies by which his burlesque wife attempted to better the image of her standing in society, being evidently left hungry by all the poor reality of her household. All this naturally became very rapidly known, as anyone other than this mediocrity crook could have been certain of in advance. Riesel had to admit, and thus was excluded, in September 1971, to conditions that no one had yet undergone in the S.I., not even the garnautin liars of 1967.

Thus, the theoretico-practical activity of the S.I. and its pleasure, which had fallen asleep, reappeared immediately in the process of the purge. The light and superficial aspects of this affair, and especially the frankly comical reality of several of those who lost there their masks of tragedians and their subversive cothurnuses, must not make it forgotten that it was a question fundamentally, because the results concerned the S.I. and thus many other people, of a confrontation on the most general conditions of the revolutionary struggles of our epoch, and on history itself.

2. On the decomposition of our enemies

"An occult power having refused us the large room at the Cleveland Hall, the meeting was held at the Bell Tavern, Old Bailey, under the chairmanship of citizen Besson. The assembly was crowded and enthusiastic. Citizens Besson, Weber, Paintot, Prévost, Kaufman, Denempont, Lelubez, Holtporp and Debord successively took the floor and energetically demanded the rights of the people, to the applause of the listeners."


In the Theses that we publish at present, we have tried to show what are the profound historical bases of the action of a movement like the S.I.; and what connections must have precisely existed between these bases, our theory, our strategy, and as far as this power of seduction which, quite naturally, the most successful part of our language, and of our very lives, has exerted. It is only at this level of comprehension that one discovers the secret of the historical success of such movements, which throws light inversely from bottom to top on the conditions of the failure of thousands of other attempts. Our enemies however—bourgeois historians, policemen, big bureaucrats, contemplative semi-pro-situs, leftist proprietors of diverse small hierarchical apparatuses—take the problem inside out. They discover before everything else the term "situationist", as empirically corresponding to the acts and perspectives of the most radical revolutionary proletarians of today, in the factories as in the schools—that is to say of their own most direct and most redoubtable enemies. Instead of seeking, from this scientifically indisputable acknowledgement, a
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In the Theses that we publish at present, we have tried to show what are the profound historical bases of the action of a movement like the S.I.; and what connections must have precisely existed between these bases, our theory, our strategy, and as far as this power of seduction which, quite naturally, the most successful part of our language, and of our very lives, has exerted. It is only at this level of comprehension that one discovers the secret of the historical success of such movements, which throws light inversely from bottom to top on the conditions of the failure of thousands of other attempts. Our enemies however — bourgeois historians, policemen, big bureaucrats, contemplative semi-pro-situis, leftist proprietors of diverse small hierarchical apparatuses — take the problem inside out. They discover before everything else the term "situationist", as empirically corresponding to the acts and perspectives of the most radical revolutionary proletarians of today, in the factories as in the schools — that is to say of their own most direct and most redoubtable enemies. Instead of seeking, from this scientifically indisputable acknowledgement, a
real explanation of the phenomenon, they want precisely to reject such an explanation in valuing foolishly the importance of the label alone. On this situationist label, they build instantaneously a certain maleficent ideology, rival of their own, which, even as ideology, is particularly half-witted and incoherent since it is capriciously set up by those who combat it (and, as one would think, these do not even have, far from it, the intellectual means of their predecessors of the XIX century for the refutation, even in bad faith, of opposing positions). Starting from this point, an unsurmountable difficulty is met with on their way: how can so restricted and so stupid an ideology arouse so great an enthusiasm, and rise up annoyingly before them as a practical force? They can only explain it by the perversion and the infamy of the "leaders" of the S.I. — who would have taken a malicious pleasure or would have found a suspicious interest in discrediting the perfection of the society that they represent and in making the admirers despair of it, whether this society is the beautiful commodity abundance of the West or the valiant bureaucratic discipline of the East, or simply the moth-eaten images of the still-born revolutions which aspire to change the ruling personnel of all this. That this explanation of the sole mode of indignation leads immediately to investing these few situationist ringleaders with a literally titanic and perfectly supra-historical power, does not stop our enemies. They prefer to admit that they are ridiculed by the omnipresent conspiracy of a handful of individuals, rather than admit that they are quite simply ridiculed by their century. They must thus ask themselves who aids this conspiracy. Neither able, nor willing, to understand that it is the present historical conditions and the proletariat, nothing more, some will say that it is East Berlin or Havana, and simultaneously others will say that it is big capital or neo-fascism which would have heavily staked so imprudently on the situationist International. Bourgeois, bureaucrats or spectators, our enemies only conceive of history in the guise of spectacular, organizational, police, etc. manipulations, which are those of the anti-historical period that we have just left, and which they themselves, including the most leftist or the supposed "anarchists", have not ceased for one moment to utilize in the measure of their means. In believing thus by assumption, more or less reassuring it must be added, and by affirming that the situationist elements who appear in such and such a wild-cat strike, in such and such conduct of rebel youth, in such and such a riot which outflanks those who undertook to keep it within bounds, or in such and such a sabotage of "the best" hierarchical organization of leftist revolutionaryism, would be inevitably and always militants directed by the S.I. or infiltrated on our order, our enemies show that they understand nothing of the S.I. or of their time. They do not even manage to understand that, most often, it is by their blundering mediation that these revolutionary elements, whom they denounce and whom they hunt down, were themselves able to learn that they "were" situationists; and that in short this is how the epoch names what they are.

"It is then that appear, for the first time, the alarming faces of the situationist International. How many are they? Where do they come from? No one knows." This agitated discovery of the Republican Lorrain of the 28th of June 1967 has since set the tone for the reaction of an entire period of struggles.

If the policemen are legitimately vexed at not having been able to succeed in infiltrating, as elsewhere, observers into the S.I., the leftist organizations are anguished quite wrongly, with regard to an imaginary infiltration of situationists who would come to exercise in their ranks the most dissolving influence. It is in an entirely different manner that the S.I. and the epoch pursue their dissolving action, but one will easily understand that the leftists are the most infuriated by the matter: it is precisely in "their public", amongst the best individuals and groups that they would like to seize, that they meet again their old enemy: proletarian autonomy at its first stage of affirmation. And involuntarily they render us this homage of denouncing it as being under our influence. If it can really to some degree know our influence, that is what corresponds very well to its very being: it refuses every other influence, and does not run the risk of being dominated by ours as a command. Proletarian autonomy can only be influenced by its time, its own theory, and its proper action.
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The most extreme example, and the most fabulous, of this obsession with the combat against the S.I., acknowledged as the primordial task of the most „extremist” apparatuses, has without doubt been furnished by the Carrara Congress of the Italian Anarchist Federation, in April 1971. This Anarchist Federation does not really amount to much in the Italian workers’ milieu, but on the other hand Italy is in a pre-revolutionary situation. What then is the most urgent theoretical and practical enterprise that this Federation assigns itself? To combat the S.I., to extirpate from its ranks the members of the S.I. – not one of whom has ever taken any part in it, nor even had a single contact in it, quite obviously. The entire X Congress of the F.A.I. was openly consecrated to this; all the preparations for this Congress, that is to say the polemics and the internal struggle between the leadership and the faithful or rebel militants, has been dominated by this great affair. The only “theoretical” and political document of this Congress, published under the title The situationists and the anarchists by the “Correspondence Commission” of the F.A.I. as editorial to the number of its newspaper Umanità Nova of the 15th of May 1971, is entirely devoted to it.

“The press has been informed in due time, this communiqué nobly begins, of the decision taken by the anarchists to exclude from the X Congress of the Italian Anarchist Federation (held in Carrara on the 10th, 11th and 12th April) the ‘situationists’, at times improperly called ‘anarcho-situationists’, ‘bordighist-situationists’, ‘council-communists’, ‘wild-cats’, etc. The measure adopted unanimously by the anarchists convened in Congress merits some explanation.” Without knowing who all these people can be, one will note already that, as far as the situationists properly speaking are concerned, the F.A.I. could just as well have excluded from its Congress the Sioux, the retired officers of the Imperial Indian Army, the Black Panthers and the anthropophagi: it would not have recorded after that the departure of a single one of its adherents.

So let us have a look at the explanations: “The influence of the situationist International, particularly negative on numerous Scandinavian, North-American and Japanese extra-parliamentary groupings, has been employed in France and in Italy, since 1967-68, with the aim of destroying the federated anarchist movement of these two countries, in the name of a theoretical discourse which the situationists are in the habit of submerging in an ocean of insolence, of imprecise and tortuous phrases.” These anarchists are still good enough not to attribute to us in addition some other manoeuvres inside Parliaments even. But one will admire the precise and in no way tortuous phrases with which these poor people place themselves tranquilly at the centre of the world, and attribute to us in all certitude the derisory aim of occupying ourselves with them.

And here they are, after having in this manner revealed our essence, showing its realisation in an historical form: “Situationism is born of the fertile fantasy of a group of intellectuals who, in 1957, gathered around a table to discuss art and urbanism, decided to exploit their cultural contacts to found a pseudo-revolutionary political movement, a sort of qualunquist ‘revolutionary’ movement.” One sees where the discussion on art and urbanism can lead, and all discussion maybe, if the F.A.I. was not there to spare people all these intellectual effronteries. These parish priests go even further than the stalinists who, as long as the leftists are not in their prisons, are content generally to declare that “objectively” the latter play into the hands of capitalism, or that they are manipulated in spite of their naive good-will. Here, one knows from the very beginning the perverse intention of the founders of the S.I. “Qualunquism”, the “party of the commonplace man”, was precisely, in post-war Italy, the name under which the ex-fascists and neo-fascists disguised themselves. But what dangerous artists! Never has the “fantasy” which pushes men to deny dogmas and to transform the world had more dreadful consequences, in any case for its very centre, which is the F.A.I. And, to crown everything, all this was decided “around a table”. There indeed is the crime! So we had a table — but no kind of relations or “cultural contacts”. Besides, the table seems amply to suffice to prove our bad character, and to permit, a little farther on, to identify us with “the gilded youth”. This anarchist conclave, which seems clearly to prefer the rostrum, or maybe the pulpit, thus ignores that probably the most important part of
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human actions, if one recognizes that the bed merits being placed out of competition, have always taken place round tables ever since this instrument was invented. These ill-willed idiots insist: "Quite conscious however of the impossibility of the coexistence of a situationist International with the other revolutionary political movements, and particularly with the anarchist movement, they decided..." Here, one must say that we have never considered the existence of the "anarchist movement", but only that of the realities of our epoch. It is true however that we believe the perspectives of the S.I. incompatible in the long run with the existence and the pretensions of "other revolutionary political movements", and for the simple reason that, if today the wretched anarchist bureaucracy puts itself in tow to such unspecified "other political movements", for our part we did not recognize in them in any way the quality of "revolutionary" movements; and everything that has gone since confirms us in our opinion. But what in 1957 did the situationists decide, according to the F.A.I. of 1971? "They decided that before everything else their task would be to infiltrate the other revolutionary political movements (N.B.: again this majestic multitude which serves as foils) so as to destroy them, by accusing them of ideologism and organizational bureaucratism, by utilizing without discrimination calumny and provocation." One can really see where the shoe pinches: the S.I. has become the bad conscience of the ideologues and the bureaucrats who everywhere find themselves challenged at home. As regards calumny and provocation, one would think one was reading The Protocols of the Elders of Zion, since nowhere has anyone ever been able to cite a single instance of a member of the S.I. having infiltrated any organization. What?, would say the policemen and the judges of the F.A.I., and the thousands of our agents who they have unmasked everywhere, "and particularly" in their own organization! These paranoiacs only express, with more stupidity, the torment that so many other bureaucratic organizations attempt to exorcize more discreetly.

But they continue, and settle in passing the tangled question of the very organization of the S.I. Whilst so many others reproach us, too falsely, with being pure spontaneist enemies of all organizational accord of proletarians, the Congress of the Italian anarchists reveals: "Their critique of ideologies and organizations does not however apply to their own ideology and to their own hierarchical organization. This latter is founded on national sections and on local groups (apparently autonomous under no matter what contingent denomination), which, in reality are the cover for a political brain composed of a small number of intellectuals who dispose as they please of financial means whose origin is unknown." What artists! One must admit that the bosses of the F.A.I. really have something to tremble about, in finding themselves exposed to the hostility of such condottieri, so devoid of scruples and so well provided with all sorts of means. One can already conclude from their virtuous indignation that they themselves will never indulge in the excesses of Netchaiev, and that, if they manage their F.A.I. bureaucratically, it will be like a vague P.S.U. (the French "Unified Socialist Party"), and not according to the model of Bakunin's "Hundred International Brothers", or of the Durruti group in the Spanish C.N.T. But if this point is interesting for the people who occupy themselves with the present doctrinal conceptions of the ultimate moment of Italian anarchism, it does not apply in any way to the S.I., and thus one cannot extract anything from the reveries of these characters on this matter, neither to blame us nor to approve us. One has seen in passing the old stalinist, and even more anciently counter-revolutionary, argument of the "financial means whose origin is unknown". Certainly, if we had need of particularly notable financial means, and if we had succeeded even in obtaining them, their origin would without doubt remain unknown to the policemen of the F.A.I. But where has one ever seen that we had "financial means"? Nowhere else than in counting the thousands of agents that we keep in our pay all over the world to disturb impartially the repose of Brezhnev and the F.A.I., of Nixon and the Principality of Monaco! By attributing to us "diverse and expensive publications of an international and local character", whose financial source seems to them "astonishingly suspect", they feign to believe that we have to pay the bill for half of this multitude of contestatory publications which since two or three years ago are published at every instant in the smallest towns of
human actions, if one recognizes that the bed merits being placed out of competition, have always taken place round tables ever since this instrument was invented. These ill-willed idiots insist: "Quite conscious however of the impossibility of the coexistence of a situationist International with the other revolutionary political movements, and particularly with the anarchist movement, they decided..." Here, one must say that we have never considered the existence of the "anarchist movement", but only that of the realities of our epoch. It is true however that we believe the perspectives of the S.I. incompatible in the long run with the existence and the pretensions of "other revolutionary political movements", and for the simple reason that, if today the wretched anarchist bureaucracy puts itself in tow to such unspecified "other political movements", for our part we did not recognize in them in any way the quality of "revolutionary" movements; and everything that has gone since confirms us in our opinion. But what in 1957 did the situationists decide, according to the F.A.I. of 1971? "They decided that before everything else their task would be to infiltrate the other revolutionary political movements (N.B.: again this majestic multitude which serves as foil) so as to destroy them, by accusing them of ideologism and organizational bureaucratism, by utilizing without discrimination calumny and provocation."

One can really see where the shoe pinches: the S.I. has become the bad conscience of the ideologues and the bureaucrats who everywhere find themselves challenged at home. As regards calumny and provocation, one would think one was reading The Protocols of the Elders of Zion, since nowhere has anyone ever been able to cite a single instance of a member of the S.I. having infiltrated any organization. What?, would say the policemen and the judges of the F.A.I., and the thousands of our agents who they have unmasked everywhere, "and particularly" in their own organization! These paranoiacs only express, with more stupidity, the torment that so many other bureaucratic organizations attempt to exorcize more discreetly.

But they continue, and settle in passing the tangled question of the very organization of the S.I. Whilst so many others reproach us, too falsely, with being pure spontaneist enemies of all organizational accord of proletarians, the Congress of the Italian anarchists reveals: "Their critique of ideologies and organizations does not however apply to their own ideology and to their own hierarchical organization. This latter is founded on national sections and on local groups (apparently autonomous under no matter what contingent denomination), which, in reality are the cover for a political brain composed of a small number of intellectuals who dispose as they please of financial means whose origin is unknown." What artists! One must admit that the bosses of the F.A.I. really have something to tremble about, in finding themselves exposed to the hostility of such condottieri, so devoid of scruples and so well provided with all sorts of means. One can already conclude from their virtuous indignation that they themselves will never indulge in the excesses of Netchaiev, and that, if they manage their F.A.I. bureaucratically, it will be like a vague P.S.U. (the French "Unified Socialist Party"), and not according to the model of Bakunin's "Hundred International Brothers", or of the Durruti group in the Spanish C.N.T. But if this point is interesting for the people who occupy themselves with the present doctrinal conceptions of the ultimate moment of Italian anarchism, it does not apply in any way to the S.I., and thus one cannot extract anything from the reveries of these characters on this matter, neither to blame us nor to approve us. One has seen in passing the old stalinist, and even more anciently counter-revolutionary, argument of the "financial means whose origin is unknown". Certainly, if we had need of particularly notable financial means, and if we had succeeded even in obtaining them, their origin would without doubt remain unknown to the policemen of the F.A.I. But where has one ever seen that we had "financial means"? Nowhere else than in counting the thousands of agents that we keep in our pay all over the world to disturb impartially the repose of Brezhnev and the F.A.I., of Nixon and the Principality of Monaco! By attributing to us "diverse and expensive publications of an international and local character", whose financial source seems to them "astonishingly suspect", they feign to believe that we have to pay the bill for half of this multitude of contestatory publications which since two or three years ago are published at every instant in the smallest towns of
Europe and the United States. In fact, we have now a dozen publishers, and some of them even go so far as to pay us royalties. As for the reviews, not so numerous, that we have published with our own means, they managed so quickly to be read so widely that they became commercially profitable, despite their extremely low selling price. That moreover is the moment when we decided not to rest on this type of laurels, and to stop the publication of the most famous one. In a word, it is not a conspiracy which gnaws at the old world of leftism, it is history.

"Situationism is indeed far from the world of work, say these people that the world of work expels, as the anarchists are far from the situationist gilded youth, which wants - knowingly or unknowingly, in good faith or bad faith - to play a role of counter-revolutionary provocation..." And for good measure, they affirm that it is "five pale representatives of the situationist International in Italy" who, "in the evening of the 14th of April", would have brained one of the bureaucrats of the F.A.I. in Florence; and they insinuate also that we were mixed up round that time with the incendiaries of the premises of an Italian fascist newspaper, and with the sole aim, of course, of playing into the hands of an anti-anarchist repression. Lastly they condemn, always in the name of the "world of work", the insurgents of Reggio-Calabria: such facts "are not, as the situationists maintain, the revolutionary manifestation of a proletariat which succeeded in self-managing its everyday life. They are sanfedist manifestations..."Sanfedism was a popular movement, guided by the clergy, against the French troops of the First Republic occupying the kingdom of Naples. It would be about as serious to say that this wretched Congress of the F.A.I. conveys a Girondist Federalism bribed with Pitt's gold. The S.I. had been alone in Italy in taking up the defence of the proletarians of Reggio, calumniated by the government, stalinism and all leftism, in the brochure *Giù i peccatori d'Italia e la rivolta di Reggio Calabria* (Milan, October 1970) which had everywhere the keenest success, and was republished several times abroad by other rebels. After some time, many leftists changed their opinions, if not the power that is at the end of them. Even the Italian stalinists have had to considerably nuance their first anathemas. Only the F.A.I. remains purely faithful to the christian-democrat government in this affair and, to insult us, calumniates the calabrian workers with as much good fortune as when it qualified the S.I.

The anarchists of the F.A.I. are not content with being foul and ridiculous at their own expense; they want to be exemplary. At the same time as they denounce us publicly to the police - which is not very grave, for this latter knows from experience the feeble judicial value of the evidence of the informers who they maintain in this anarchist milieu - , they teach their leftist colleagues the best way of conjuring up the devil: "The decision adopted by the Congress of the F.A.I. removes from the situationists (N.B.: which was tantamount to removing from us a thirty-third tooth, or the right to be elected to the Hungarian Parliament) the possibility of bringing to perfection their action of provocation, in the first place in the F.A.I., and in so far as it risks serving as an example to the groups and to the local federations, adhering or not to the F.A.I., into which the situationists seek to infiltrate to lead them to their ruin through ideological equivocation and through the activity of systematic contradiction which recall very closely sorenian chauvinism hidden beneath the principles of violence for the sake of violence." One sees from here, as if one were there, these situationists who infiltrate everywhere, "seeking whom to devour", and whom to lead to his ruin, thanks to their anti-ideological dialectics and their activity of systematic contradiction which, in short, makes them resemble very closely *history itself*. They are the face of *historical evil* for all proprietors, even the ill-provided who have no other property than the F.A.I. Let us add that Georges Sorel, if he is known in France rather as a theoretician of revolutionary syndicalism, has in Italy quite another reputation, from the fact that the mussolinists of the first phase claimed to have been inspired by him.

As in so many other cases, if the laughable F.A.I. had no situationists in its ranks, it has not failed to create them by its idiotic repression. And, as always, it is *after* such confrontations in sects that we ignored completely, that certain elements address themselves to us, and in particular communicate to us the repugnant "confidential" internal documents with which the
Europe and the United States. In fact, we have now a dozen publishers, and some of them even go so far as to pay us royalties. As for the reviews, not so numerous, that we have published with our own means, they managed so quickly to be read so widely that they became commercially profitable, despite their extremely low selling price. That moreover is the moment when we decided not to rest on this type of laurels, and to stop the publication of the most famous one. In a word, it is not a conspiracy which gnaws at the old world of leftist, it is history.

"Situationism is indeed far from the world of work, say these people that the world of work expels, as the anarchists are far from the situationist gilded youth, which wants – knowingly or unknowingly, in good faith or bad faith – to play a role of counter-revolutionary provocation..." And for good measure, they affirm that it is "five pale representatives of the situationist International in Italy" who, "in the evening of the 14th of April", would have branded one of the bureaucrats of the F.A.I. in Florence; and they insinuate also that we were mixed up round that time with the incendiaries of the premises of an Italian fascist newspaper, and with the sole aim, of course, of playing into the hands of an anti-anarchist repression. Lastly they condemn, always in the name of the "world of work", the insurgents of Reggio-Calabria: such facts "are not, as the situationists maintain, the revolutionary manifestation of a proletariat which succeeded in self-managing its everyday life. They are sanfedist manifestations..."Sanfedism was a popular movement, guided by the clergy, against the French troops of the First Republic occupying the kingdom of Naples. It would be about as serious to say that this wretched Congress of the F.A.I. conveys a Girondist Federalism bribed with Pitt's gold. The S.I. had been alone in Italy in taking up the defence of the proletarians of Reggio, calumniated by the government, Stalinism and all leftist, in the brochure Gli operai d'Italia e la rivolta di Reggio Calabria (Milan, October 1970) which had everywhere the keenest success, and was republished several times abroad by other rebels. After some time, many leftists changed their opinions, if not the power that is at the end of them. Even the Italian Stalinists have had to considerably nuance their first anathemas. Only the F.A.I. remains purely faithful to the Christian-Democrat government in this affair and, to insult us, calumniates the Calabrian workers with as much good fortune as when it qualified the S.I.

The anarchists of the F.A.I. are not content with being foul and ridiculous at their own expense; they want to be exemplary. At the same time as they denounce us publicly to the police – which is not very grave, for this latter knows from experience the feeble judicial value of the evidence of the informers who they maintain in this anarchist milieu –, they teach their leftist colleagues the best way of conjuring up the devil: "The decision adopted by the Congress of the F.A.I. removes from the situationists (N.B.: which was tantamount to removing from us a thirty-third tooth, or the right to be elected to the Hungarian Parliament) the possibility of bringing to perfection their action of provocation, in the first place in the F.A.I., and in so far as it risks serving as an example to the groups and to the local federations, adhering or not to the F.A.I., into which the situationists seek to infiltrate to lead them to their ruin through ideological equivocation and through the activity of systematic contradiction which recall very closely sorelian chauvinism hidden beneath the principles of violence for the sake of violence." One sees from here, as if one were there, these situationists who infiltrate everywhere, "seeking whom to devour", and whom to lead to his ruin, thanks to their anti-ideological dialectics and their activity of systematic contradiction which, in short, makes them resemble very closely history itself. They are the face of historical evil for all proprietors, even the ill-provided who have no other property than the F.A.I. Let us add that Georges Sorel, if he is known in France rather as a theoretician of revolutionary syndicalism, has in Italy quite another reputation, from the fact that the mussolinists of the first phase claimed to have been inspired by him.

As in so many other cases, if the laughable F.A.I. had no situationists in its ranks, it has not failed to create them by its idiotic repression. And, as always, it is after such confrontations in sects that we ignored completely, that certain elements address themselves to us, and in particular communicate to us the repugnant "confidential" internal documents with which the
leadership of the F.A.I. prepared its Congress, and only obtains the rupture with all those who could no longer bear being solidary with its stupidities and its infamies. One can read there this avowal of a strange pessimism: “To chase the situationists from our groups is the guarantee of the survival of these groups themselves.” One of these documents designates personally “Sanguinetti, representative of the S.I. for Italy” as the secret agent who has directly organized the opposition and the explosion of this Congress of Carrara.

As for the exclusive and general hatred which “all the representatives of the old world and all parties” have vowed him, comrade Sanguinetti has ensured, in the year 1971 alone, a kind of record that all revolutionaries can be envious of. Stalinist thugs have tried to assassinate him in Milan, wanting to run him over with cars, and only the intervention of workers prevented them from achieving their goal. The F.A.I. has designated him, although much more academically, as the enemy of anarchy and the man to destroy. Lastly, on the 21st of July, the Minister of the Interior had him deported from France without delay, although he had never fixed his residence there, for the sole motive that his presence in Paris was highly prejudicial to the safety of the State.

The show of the F.A.I., in effect, has done nothing other than summarize a counter-situationist mythology which, everywhere, is the product of the same interested confusionism, and the same impotence. One could read, in December 1970, in a modernist dish-rag called Actuel, a kind of magazine of intellectual pollution, among ten other arbitrary inventions, this same imagery of the invisible empire of the S.I., of a Ku-Klux-Klan of the Revolution: “The police of Europe file them and track them. Elusive and underground, conspirators in the tradition, they refuse all legalities and conformisms, that they might be socialists. They do not practice confraternity with regard to other leftist groups, outlaw aristocrats of the revolution”. This aristocracy could not fail to find its king, hereditary or elected, one does not really know, Guy Debord: “He is a little man with the face of a teacher and badly cut jackets. (...) With age, he is obsessed by his enemies, he uncovers everywhere betrayals and scandals: he does not want to combat them, but to annihilate them. Only one book of his is known, The Society of the Spectacle, a unique and jerky discourse.” Certainly, the physical description will not be able to aid those who “track” us, since this journalist has evidently never seen Debord, and it is not sure either whether he knows what a teacher looks like nowadays. But the old secular mythology of revolutions and their ringleaders, recounted in the bourgeois style — “They know how to take money where it is to be found” — impregnates to the highest degree these few lines. The idiocies of the dead weigh very heavily in the brains of the living cretins. This little man the colour of the wall, and who seems to be nothing, it is Blanqui, it is “The Old Man”, irreducible and terrible because he is surrounded by his fanatics, devoted and ready for anything. The image is also cross-bred with Trotsky and, if drugs and political assassinations silhouette themselves there, perhaps also with the Old Man of the Mountain. Moreover, recognize this “unique and jerky discourse” of a theoretical book which the hack would not in any case have known how to read: but it’s Marat! Uncovering betrayals everywhere, wanting to annihilate his enemies, it is certainly to spare rivers of blood that Debord presses you to spill a few drops of it, a hundred thousand heads or, in these times of inflation, five hundred thousand, for example. It is not bad that revolutionaries become less and less indulgent: so many others age obeying more and more without a word, and some have never even done anything but pretend to refuse whatever it may be. But as for Debord, his frightful reputation in the matter of rupture and exclusion was already well established twenty years ago, when he was twenty (this is noted by all those who have written about him; cf. Asger Jorn, and even Jean-Louis Brau). One must thus agree that “with age” — prematurely worn out by orgies, probably —, he will not really have dealt treacherously with anyone!

Books come out in Germany, in America, in Holland, in Scandinavia, which all admire what the S.I. has done in the years of Before-May, and deplore only that all these beautiful virtualities — felt principally with regard to the role that such and such a local situationist, excluded long ago, has later on been able to play more mediocly at the beginnings of German or Dutch contestations — have been ceaselessly cut down with an iron hand by what a recent
leadership of the F.A.I. prepared its Congress, and only obtains the rupture with all those who could no longer bear being solidary with its stupidities and its infamies. One can read there this avowal of a strange pessimism: “To chase the situationists from our groups is the guarantee of the survival of these groups themselves.” One of these documents designates personally “Sanguinetti, representative of the S.I. for Italy” as the secret agent who has directly organized the opposition and the explosion of this Congress of Carrara.

As for the exclusive and general hatred which “all the representatives of the old world and all parties” have vowed him, comrade Sanguinetti has ensured, in the year 1971 alone, a kind of record that all revolutionaries can be envious of. Stalinist thugs have tried to assassinate him in Milan, wanting to run him over with cars, and only the intervention of workers prevented them from achieving their goal. The F.A.I. has designated him, although much more academically, as the enemy of ancestry and the man to destroy. Lastly, on the 21st of July, the Minister of the Interior had him deported from France without delay, although he had never fixed his residence there, for the sole motive that his presence in Paris was highly prejudicial to the safety of the State.

The show of the F.A.I., in effect, has done nothing other than summarize a counter-situationist mythology which, everywhere, is the product of the same interested confusionism, and the same impotence. One could read, in December 1970, in a modernist dish-rag called Actuel, a kind of magazine of intellectual pollution, among ten other arbitrary inventions, this same imagery of the invisible empire of the S.I., of a Ku-Klux-Klan of the Revolution: “The police of Europe file them and track them. Elusive and underground, conspirators in the tradition, they refuse all legalities and conformisms, that they might be socialists. They do not practice confrontation with regard to other leftist groups, outlaw aristocrats of the revolution”. This aristocracy could not fail to find its king, hereditary or elected, one does not really know, Guy Debord: “He is a little man with the face of a teacher and badly cut jackets. (...) With age, he is obsessed by his enemies, he uncovers everywhere betrayals and scandals: he does not want to combat them, but to annihilate them. Only one book of his is known, The Society of the Spectacle, a unique and jerky discourse.” Certainly, the physical description will not be able to aid those who “track” us, since this journalist has evidently never seen Debord, and it is not sure either whether he knows what a teacher looks like nowadays. But the old secular mythology of revolutions and their ringleaders, recounted in the bourgeois style — “They know how to take money where it is to be found” — impregnates to the highest degree these few lines. The idiocies of the dead weigh very heavily in the brains of the living cretins. This little man the colour of the wall, and who seems to be nothing, it is Blanqui, it is “The Old Man”, irreducible and terrible because he is surrounded by his fanatics, devoted and ready for anything. The image is also cross-bred with Trotsky and, if drugs and political assassinations silhouette themselves there, perhaps also with the Old Man of the Mountain. Moreover, recognize this “unique and jerky discourse” of a theoretical book which the hack would not in any case have known how to read: but it’s Marat! Uncovering betrayals everywhere, wanting to annihilate his enemies, it is certainly to spare rivers of blood that Debord presses you to spill a few drops of it, a hundred thousand heads or, in these times of inflation, five hundred thousand, for example. It is not bad that revolutionaries become less and less indulgent: so many others age obeying more and more without a word, and some have never even done anything but pretend to refuse whatever it may be. But as for Debord, his frightful reputation in the matter of rupture and exclusion was already well established twenty years ago, when he was twenty (this is noted by all those who have written about him; cf. Asger Jorn, and even Jean-Louis Brau). One must thus agree that “with age” — prematurely worn out by orgies, probably — he will not really have dealt treacherously with anyone!

Books come out in Germany, in America, in Holland, in Scandinavia, which all admire what the S.I. has done in the years of Before-May, and deplore only that all these beautiful virtualities — felt principally with regard to the role that such and such a local situationist, excluded long ago, has later on been able to play more mediocly at the beginnings of German or Dutch contestations — have been ceaselessly cut down with an iron hand by what a recent
Swedish book of nashist history (two words which annihilate each other in their proximity) calls the dictatorship of “general Debord”, who without intermission has constantly excluded each and everyone. It remains to be understood how and why so much could be realised in this way; and why it is precisely Debord, and not Nash, the ganautins or the vaneigmists, who found himself ceaselessly to have within reach people to exclude, ceaselessly renewing themselves and always ready to be taken in? Is there not there some concretely historical reason for this? And what is the use of speaking of authoritarian prestige when it is notorious that Debord has always been besieged by quantities of persons who wanted to be employed at something; and that he has repulsed almost all of them at the first instant? As for those therefore who want to explain everything by some narrow-minded verifications of “so-called psychological reflection”, they will always be stopped by this mystery: why then is it this one who has diabolically been able to catch all these people in his nets? and why then have they been ready to follow him everywhere that he would want to lead them?

Other subordinate inventions proliferate on this terrain, first of all to make good what is lacking in the information of authors of padding. Certain works make Debord’s birthplace Cannes: it is probably, after Paris, the beginning of a list of seven towns in France which will boast of this very debatable honour. One persists in printing, even as far as America, that he was the heir of a very rich industrial father – when it is patent that he has led the most adventurous life, and that he had to develop his critique of political economy even before having found his Engels. With the same aim of reducing the unknown which disturbs the reassuring known, one claims more or less everywhere that Debord could only be an agré in philosophy, when he is nothing of the kind, and not even attache to the C.N.R.S. (National Centre for Scientific Research). Neither is he, whatever one may say, collection editor with Champ Libre.

The pro-situs, as has been pointed out, steeped in insults, cannot all remain perpetually admirers of the S.I.; and when they find themselves compelled to rejoin our detractors, they are sometimes funnier than the F.A.I. What have we not been reproached with? Some pretend that we manipulated the crowds of May barricaders and the assemblies of the Sorbonne. We would have succeeded in leading astray the advanced workers of Glasgow and in perverting the blousons noirs of Paris. We would have manoeuvred the wild-cat strikers of FIAT in Turin, as the most radical of the armed Palestinian elements (one has seen by what skilful intermediary). It is thus because of us that the latter waited blindly to be put to death; and without us the miners of Kiruna might have liberated the first territory of the Councils of the polar circle. Without us, the workers of Reggio would not have taken up arms; or then they would have overthrown the Italian State in forty-eight hours. On the one hand, we would have almost fomented all the troubles that modern society has become so rich in; on the other hand, our sectarian and always clumsy directives would have led them by the shortest way to all their failures. Well, let it go at that.

Stupid impudence is carried even further, because placed in a little more practical dimension, by certain publishers, oscillating and torn between the hatred that we rightly inspire in them and their longing to make a little more money for themselves, or even to take out of bond their woeful reputation, by publishing us now. At the end of 1971, the Feltrinelli Publishing House asked us for the translation rights of the review l.S. We answered, quite coldly, that we had no wish to be edited by the stalinist Feltrinelli. Thereupon, the director of this house, somebody called Brega, writes to us that this refusal is referable to psychiatry, that it is formulated “in a stupidly arrogant tone”, and that moreover Feltrinelli has never been a stalinist. So many counter-truths! This Brega feigns to be astonished that after having mentioned in our reviews that the texts are under no copyright, we had fallen back into what he himself is not afraid to call “the beaten tracks of publishing and bourgeois authors”. Thus the S.I. answered him, on the 14th of February 1971, a little more harshly: “You would like, tord, to be in the very position of Stalin so as to fix all alone the canonical definition of words. According to you, Feltrinelli would not be a stalinist; nor Dubcek either then, nor Kadar, nor Arthur London, nor Castro, nor Mao. And you yourself, Brega, on
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The pro-situs, as has been pointed out, steeped in insults, cannot all remain perpetually admirers of the S.I.; and when they find themselves compelled to rejoin our detractors, they are sometimes funnier than the F.A.I. What have we not been reproached with? Some pretend that we manipulated the crowds of May barricaders and the assemblies of the Sorbonne. We would have succeeded in leading astray the advanced workers of Glasgow and in perverting the blousons noirs of Paris. We would have manoeuvred the wild-cat strikers of FIAT in Turin, as the most radical of the armed Palestinian elements (one has seen by what skilful intermediary). It is thus because of us that the latter waited blindly to be put to death; and without us the miners of Kiruna might have liberated the first territory of the Councils of the polar circle. Without us, the workers of Reggio would not have taken up arms; or then they would have overthrown the Italian State in forty-eight hours. On the one hand, we would have almost fomented all the troubles that modern society has become so rich in; on the other hand, our sectarian and always clumsy directives would have led them by the shortest way to all their failures. Well, let it go at that.

Stupid impudence is carried even further, because placed in a little more practical dimension, by certain publishers, oscillating and torn between the hatred that we rightly inspire in them and their longing to make a little more money for themselves, or even to take out of bond their woeful reputation, by publishing us now. At the end of 1971, the Feltrinelli Publishing House asked us for the translation rights of the review L.S. We answered, quite coldly, that we had no wish to be edited by the stalinist Feltrinelli. Thereupon, the director of this house, somebody called Brega, writes to us that this refusal is referable to psychiatry, that it is formulated “in a stupidly arrogant tone”, and that moreover Feltrinelli has never been a stalinist. So many counter-truths! This Brega feigns to be astonished that after having mentioned in our reviews that the texts are under no copyright, we had fallen back into what he himself is not afraid to call “the beaten tracks of publishing and bourgeois authors”. Thus the S.I. answered him, on the 14th of February 1971, a little more harshly: “You would like, tord, to be in the very position of Stalin so as to fix all alone the canonical definition of words. According to you, Feltrinelli would not be a stalinist; nor Dubcek either then, nor Kadar, nor Arthur London, nor Castro, nor Mao. And you yourself, Brega, on
this count, you would not be a slut and an imbecile. We understand well your interest in this, but stop dreaming! ( . . . ) It is your publishing house which has played, according to its custom, this bourgeois legal game, by asking us for the translation rights. And rightly we refuse them to you, because of everything you are. If our contempt is immaterial to you, sweet wheedler, you should not have asked us for anything. Revolutionaries, on their part, have always been able to reproduce everything they wanted to of the S.I.'s texts; and we were never opposed in any way to the multiple pirate-editions of our texts and our books in a good number of countries. But the firm of Feltrinelli is not even worthy of pirate-editions. And even you, moreover, if you proceed further to our refusal, you can be assured that we would not oppose it by any legal or bourgeois proceedings. It is you, Gian Piero Brega, since you have had the effrontery to put yourself forward with this letter, that we would consider as personally responsible for any edition of our texts by the Feltrinelli Brothel. And it is your hide that we would take it out on." (This exchange of letters was immediately printed and posted in Italy under the title Corrispondenza con un editore.) Some will not fail to insinuate therefore that it is the S.I. which, some days afterwards, assassinated Feltrinelli with dynamite. In the Corriere d'Informazione of the 18-19th March, one even claims that the S.I. had imposed a fine on Feltrinelli, and of no less than a billion lire to start with, which permits them to conclude: "From there to assassination, there is only one step." In the spring of 1971, in the third reprinting of La Société du Spectacle, Editions Buchet-Chastel dared to introduce on it unilaterally and by surprise a sub-title: "La théorie situationniste". This adjunct, contrary to the usages of publishing — and even explicitly to bourgeois law — was under the circumstances all the more monstrous in that the word situationist was employed only once in this book (in thesis 191); and this very deliberately, to be distinguishable from so many ass-in-lion's-skin revolutionaries who thought to guarantee the radicality of their prose by stuffing it with reminders and praises of the S.I. As has been said, it is not our style to place ourselves on the level of bourgeois justice, by instituting proceedings against Buchet-Chastel which assuredly they would have lost. It was more dignified to have La Société du Spectacle re-published by another Parisian publisher; which Editions Champ Libre proposed to do without delay. Thus one has seen since the picturesque adventure of the forger publisher submitting his cast to justice, and having the authentic edition of Champ Libre seized by order of a judge in Chambers. But this, quite obviously, will not suffice to bring him back this book, nor its author. The French edition, reprinted since in Holland, as well as the translations edited in the United States, in Denmark and in Portugal, refuse to recognize the rights, as much moral as financial, of Buchet (this latter thus will only have been able to negotiate the Italian edition published by De Donato, which besides comprises such an erroneous translation that it will not fail to be rivalled at an early date in Italy by a more rigorous pirate edition).

The movement of occupations of 1968, with the recession of some years, has taken its place before the eyes of all — and for its very enemies, who are the least prompt to admit it, but not to feel it — in the long series of French revolutions: it has well and truly made appear, as simple outline, the principal traits of modern revolution, its veritable content. And as time goes by, the books which continue to come out on May are obliged to give an ever bigger place to the S.I. But mythology still reigns there. The recent book of Raspaud and Voyer, L'Internationale Situationniste is the only research of which one can praise the seriousness without reserve, but it keeps to the terrain of chronology and of bibliography, without tackling the properly historical aspect. Many of these books, like the stupid Action-Image of Society (Seuil, Paris; Tavistock Publications, London; 1970), sputtered by Alfred Willener and his team of sub-sociologists, try to establish a distinction between the situationists, insofar as brilliant precursors and theoreticians, and those who were effectively in 1968 in the practical movement. Thus reappears the old academic nuance of those who "express" an historical current and those who put it into acts. But the central scandal that these researchers would like to hide, is precisely that the same situationists were there: at the barricades, at the Sorbonne, at the factories. There we made the theory of the very moment. History, even university history, and
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even with better researchers than Adrien Dansette or A. Willener, will not find better texts, understanding so well the event and foreseeing more clearly its consequences, day by day and for the whole of an historical period, than the principal writings then diffused massively by the S.I. and by the “Council for the Continuation of Occupations” — notably the Address to all Workers, of the 30th of May 1968, of which we immediately sent abroad thousands of copies, and that we had then considered, whatever might happen, as the testament of all of the movement of occupations. The old academic quarrel to know to what degree history can ever be foreseen by those who live it, has there been settled once more by the revolutionary experience. The revolutionary moment concentrates all the historical possible of the whole of society in only three or four hypotheses, whence one can clearly see evolving in proportion the relation of forces, the growth or the reversal; whereas ordinarily the routine of society is unforeseeable — except in its general truth where it can be recognized as this well-defined routine, and where one can foresee in this way the principal outline of its continuation —, because this routine, itself, is the product of an infinity of dispersed processes, of which the singular developments and the interactions are incalculable in advance. Those who, in ordinary days, do not think, start to think in such moments according to the logic of ordinary days. The leftists only recalled Smolny, or the Long March, and thus they were even more blundering in the Paris of 1968 than they would have been, them, without Lenin, at Smolny. The masses could feel, already present, the possible transformation of their life. However, out of all the leftists who opined in the assemblies, there was not one who had the slightest idea not only of what would follow, but of what could follow (many did not even measure by what hair’s breadth one had then avoided an extreme repression, when the movement subsided). One has seen since then, in France, the absurd dialectic of the leftist and the spectacle. Each time that the spectacle must start over again to admit that the workers do not cease to become more subversive, it feigns to rediscover the leftists, as the responsible of this disturbing result; it blames them for it and reassures itself in blaming them. In fact, of the 150,000 persons who occupy the street for the burial of Overney, everyone knows that the leftist parties together do not control a tenth. Leftism has for the last four years constantly shown its capacity for extra-terrestrial unrealism. The ensemble of the leftist parties, with the exception of the maoists, but including the French anarchist “organizations” which follow the same path as their Italian correspondents, ceaselessly and scandalously handle with kid gloves the official stalinist party. The maoists — it is unnecessary to say that the fragments of “situationism” that they often mix into their revolutionary broth cannot either be understood or utilized by them, precisely no more than marxism — attack very frankly this party but in the name of another stalinism — and notably pseudo-Chinese — far more combative but even more decomposed than the bureaucratic conservatism of Marchais; and which constantly ridicules itself, from “popular tribunals” to “people’s prisons”, without being able to understand for an instant what is really going on in France and in the world. The observers of the government as well as those of the so-called communist party speak of what the workers are — and each time re-establish how much the workers are not revolutionary, for the sole fact that they can say so confirms empirically their analysis. On the same terrain of bourgeois methodology, but even more extravagant, the maoists believe that the workers are altogether revolutionary — and, in addition, according to the grotesque maoist modalities! —, and they sincerely want to help them to be so: as in Canton in 1927. But the historical problem is not at all to understand what the workers “are”, — today they are only workers — but what they are going to become. This becoming is the only truth of the being of the proletariat, and the only key to understanding really what the workers are already. At this moment, for example, a considerable phenomenon is coming into being, which as yet escapes the specialized observers and nearly all the militants, and that promises them bad days: as in the last century the workers are starting to read again, and they themselves are going to understand what they do. Certain antediluvian workerists, totally disarmed and meaning indeed to remain so, have reproached the S.I. with having applied a strategy in May 1968. It is true that we acted resolutely according to certain strategic goals, but we did not do
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so for ourselves. We did it for the movement which was there. And in this movement we deceived nobody. One will tell us that it failed. But we never claimed as probable its immediate success in France — this is equally verifiable in our texts of the moment — when all the wonder-struck neophytes of the "university revolution", the Geismars and the Peninious, believed they would be able to palaver for ten years in the furniture of power. Moreover, it had some chance of succeeding; and when such a movement has begun, one must be with it by engaging in it the maximum of one's utilizable talents. But above all: according to us, the movement of May succeeded. We wanted to see it take at least half the extension that it did take, and that already would have been a victory on a world-wide scale. What followed has proved us right.

As for Vaneigem, he has recently seized the poor occasion of a presentation of chosen bits of Ernest Coeurdery, he is so utterly flummoxed, to graft very arbitrarily thereon his opinion on the revolution. It is the typical text of the vulgar pro-situ, who has nothing to say but who wants to sign; who would like to sell to the best the feeble advertising value of his name on the wrapper of somebody else's book. But he has also to sign, to speak by himself on questions which escape him. So that the most hollow formulae, and the long series of concepts without use, accumulate in a slap-dash manner in what seems to be a bad pastiche of the Vaneigem of 1962. The spectacle, just like Vaneigem, would not cease to reinforce itself by weakening itself; and, if by ill luck there is no revolution, one will have ever more terrorist confrontations between the ones and the others; and cryptically he hints that the S.I. could well find itself at the extremist pole of this terrorism, on the leftist side. A bit of worthless "theory" sprinkles his frozen and archaic abstractions. He shows a certain conflict between the "rich and ruling bourgeoisie", which is for him simply and literally represented by "technocrats, union leaders, politicians, bishops, generals and chief-cops", and the "poor and exploited bourgeoisie of the departmental managers, subordinate cops, small shopkeepers, seedy priests, and cadres". One can see the rigour and the precision of his analyses. And further on he discovers that "what weighs upon us, is no longer capital but the logic of the commodity". He knows well that Marx did not wait for him to demonstrate that capital is nothing other than the "logic of the commodity"; but he naively calculated that his phrase will appear to be modern. In the same way that, by a lucky windfall of vaneigemism become solitary, what weighs on us, "is no longer the power of one man or of one class conscious of its predominance..." But who will he get to believe this? The dominant class is everywhere as conscious of its predominance as Vaneigem is himself conscious of his inferiority. By the very tone, these hasty revisions do not recall Bernstein, nor even Edgar Morin, but Louis Pauwels. Like a more learned Lefebvre, or a Nash less audacious in faking, believing he can save himself by omission, Vaneigem declares himself strongly in favour of the "situationist project", hoping that the reader will be able to forget how much he has himself become unworthy of it, and will not be able to see straight away that these few recent pages provide the overwhelming proof of this. How little Vaneigem spares his wretched reader (weakness, to put up with survival, must needs suppose that nearly everywhere else others are of an equal or superior weakness), that is what two enormous details will suffice to show: Vaneigem says quickly in passing that in November 1970 the S.I. no longer inspired in him anything but "indifference". He believes he can pass the thing off, without further explanation, as a sudden mystery. But, in the same way that there is nothing mysterious there, there was nothing sudden (cf. herewith a report of the VII Conference of the S.I. in 1966). And, just as he slips out this truth, somehow a bit cynical on his part, that "theory is not seized radically as long as it is not experimented", he attempts to recapture, as if nothing had happened, his old deflated bluff by praising those who were, in May 1968, "the insurrectionists of the will to live". We have shown that the S.I. was in the movement of occupations, like before, something less vague and more precisely historical. But the Communiqué of the S.I. concerning Vaneigem, of the 9th December 1970, reveals also that the will to live of Vaneigem was already then rather far from this insurrection.
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The theory of the S.I. is clear at least on one point: *one must make use of it.* Presenting itself already as a collective platform, and having really a meaning only in the perspective of a vast collective enlargement of our critique, it obliges us to answer to this question: If we are together, it is to do effectively what? This question indeed poses itself really, both because the ensemble of theories of the S.I., being all the contrary of an intellectual specialization, covers a rather great complexity of elements whose importance is unequal; and *above all* because the origin of the accord between us being simply theoretical, all its reality depends finally upon the manner in which we conceive and realise the use of this theory. What must be this common activity for ourselves, and toward others? This question is one. The bad answer, that is to say that we have an immediate intuition of the totality, and that this is already a total qualitative attitude, which would permit us to discourse superbly on everything, would obviously be a pre-hegelian manifestation of idealism, because this conception lacks *the seriousness and the work of the negative.* Our activity cannot be this absolute, this night where all cows are radically black, that is to say also this *repose.* It is in the same movement that our common understanding can remain partially inactive, and that individual activities can remain partially misunderstood by those who accommodate themselves to them. If we do not have a correct judgement of the S.I., we will be mistaken in proportion on all the rest. (...)

That is to say that we must not collectively burden ourselves with individual questions which escape our common activity; and in the same way none of us must burden himself in his individual life with the collective *pretensions* of the S.I. which would be beyond
the real common practice. I want to say that the existence of these common abstract positions must neither serve to embellish any particular inactivity, nor to encumber the effective life of any of us. This supposes of course that there is effective participation in a real common activity. It is only this practical activity which is the judgement that we recognize between us, in the same way that it is that which will pronounce our objective judgement by others.

It is certain that our common activity must enlarge itself. I propose simply to look in the face this reality which at the present, in so far as practical activity, is poor. One must admit its limits and its poverty, precisely to enlarge it practically. On the other hand, it is in so far as it is not at all practically measured that it can appear as grandiose. But such a grandiose character would be contradicted as soon as a certain unconscious practice of inactive relations would establish itself amongst us. I consider therefore that we are not obliged, literally, to be together independently of an activity defined by our common programme (and defining it further). This activity is itself commanded by our place in the world, what we have to do in the way of critique of the actual world, and in the way of meeting the critical elements which appear in it.

I take account here of some discussions which have taken place amongst us, fragmentarily, in the last months. I take account even more of some individual uncertainties which have sometimes manifested a sort of disarmament before the problems of the practical translation of what we affirm quite easily together. Two parallel positions will follow from it, more or less clearly, which it is best to clarify immediately:

1. A pseudo-critique of the S.I., which would express an unacceptable dissatisfaction from this fact that the S.I. does not magically transfigure all the aspects of the life of those who encounter it. The young man of letters François Georges was a good example of this, reproaching us with his insufficiencies.

2. A factitious eulogy of the S.I., that I judge even worse because it contains already a sort of ideology of an illusory power. This eulogy would try to make believe that the S.I., from the moment that it “exists”, is already everything that it should be in fact (coherence, etc.). Such an illusion can lead corollarily to extravagant illusions on what the S.I. should still become, in so far as development born of the imaginary base with which it is credited from today. This eulogy and this denigration — the one moreover having to bring about the other — are the two sides of the same coin: incomprehension and absence with regard to the conditions of our real activity, and of our really possible activity.

It is the weakness and the primitive character of the new aspects of the class struggle in modern society which can produce around us, and even amongst us, neo-idealist hopes of an intellectual apocalypse, with regard to the S.I. existing concretely; and, inevitably, deceptions in return sprung from the same anticipation. Only the development of this movement of struggle will transform the real problems, and the false problems into the bargain.

Our concern is first of all to constitute a global critical theory and (therefore, inseparably) to communicate it to all the sectors already objectively engaged in a negation which remains subjectively fragmentary. The definition, the experimentation, the long and exacting labour around this question of communication is our real principal activity as organized group. The deficiencies on this summarize all our deficiencies (as group). The rest is gossip. (. . .)

It is not a theoretical guarantee of the old German thought, but the revolt in real life today and for us which leads to understanding together both the critical culture parallel to Marxism in its time (for example, modern poetry as auto-negation of art) and all the forms of the present century, that we have to criticize concretely, beyond a simple denunciation of the publicity of commodities.

The complete participation in what I call our principal activity at the present stage obviously presupposes, and reinforces, individual capacities; both in theoretical consciousness and in the present use of life. However, under no circumstances, are we justified in putting forward as our common task a refined study of pure
the real common practice. I want to say that the existence of these common abstract positions must neither serve to embellish any particular inactivity, nor to encumber the effective life of any of us. This supposes of course that there is effective participation in a real common activity. It is only this practical activity which is the judgement that we recognize between us, in the same way that it is that which will pronounce our objective judgement by others.

It is certain that our common activity must enlarge itself. I propose simply to look in the face this reality which at the present, in so far as practical activity, is poor. One must admit its limits and its poverty, precisely to enlarge it practically. On the other hand, it is in so far as it is not at all practically measured that it can appear as grandiose. But such a grandiose character would be contradicted as soon as a certain unconscious practice of inactive relations would establish itself amongst us. I consider therefore that we are not obliged, literally, to be together independently of an activity defined by our common programme (and defining it further). This activity is itself commanded by our place in the world, what we have to do in the way of critique of the actual world, and in the way of meeting the critical elements which appear in it.

I take account here of some discussions which have taken place amongst us, fragmentarily, in the last months. I take account even more of some individual uncertainties which have sometimes manifested a sort of disarmament before the problems of the practical translation of what we affirm quite easily together. Two parallel positions will follow from it, more or less clearly, which it is best to clarify immediately:

1. A pseudo-critique of the S.I., which would express an unacceptable dissatisfaction from this fact that the S.I. does not magically transfigure all the aspects of the life of those who encounter it. The young man of letters François Georges was a good example of this, reproaching us with his insufficiencies.

2. A factitious eulogy of the S.I., that I judge even worse because it contains already a sort of ideology of an illusory power. This eulogy would try to make believe that the S.I., from the moment that it "exists", is already everything that it should be in fact (coherence, etc.). Such an illusion can lead corollarily to extravagant illusions on what the S.I. should still become, in so far as development born of the imaginary base with which it is credited from today. This eulogy and this denigration — the one moreover having to bring about the other — are the two sides of the same coin: incomprehension and absence with regard to the conditions of our real activity, and of our really possible activity.

It is the weakness and the primitive character of the new aspects of the class struggle in modern society which can produce around us, and even amongst us, neo-idealist hopes of an intellectual apocalypse, with regard to the S.I. existing concretely; and, inevitably, deceptions in return sprung from the same anticipation. Only the development of this movement of struggle will transform the real problems, and the false problems into the bargain.

Our concern is first of all to constitute a global critical theory and (therefore, inseparably) to communicate it to all the sectors already objectively engaged in a negation which remains subjectively fragmentary. The definition, the experimentation, the long and exacting labour around this question of communication is our real principal activity as organized group. The deficiencies on this summarize all our deficiencies (as group). The rest is gossip. (...)

It is not a theoretical guarantee of the old German thought, but the revolt in real life today and for us which leads to understanding together both the critical culture parallel to Marxism in its time (for example, modern poetry as auto-negation of art) and all the forms of the present century, that we have to criticize concretely, beyond a simple denunciation of the publicity of commodities.

The complete participation in what I call our principal activity at the present stage obviously presupposes, and reinforces, individual capacities; both in theoretical consciousness and in the present use of life. However, under no circumstances, are we justified in putting forward as our common task a refined study of pure
theoretical problems, because our theory of dialogue must not be content with a simple dialogue of theory: the theory of dialogue is, from its origin to its ultimate development, a critique of society.

Contrary to what some seem to think, it is not so difficult to understand us theoretically, when one is in contact with us, when one is prompted to construe like us the realities of which we speak. It is not obligatory to again read Machiavelli or Kautsky. It must be easier to understand us now than, for example, five years ago. (...)

What is difficult is thus not so much to understand finely the theories of the S.I. as to make something of them even roughly. It is that which must occupy us above all.

The S.I. should therefore take care not to any longer sing its own praises. One must cease to develop, amongst us and around us, an admiring contentment founded on what we have done in the past (let us admit that it is at the same time a lot and very little); and envisage on the contrary how we can make use of it now. And what are in this connection the practical capacities of the people who approach us. If we have defended the title "situationist", by different means, of which the exclusions, it is uniquely to prevent it becoming "valorized" against us. It is not with the aim of valorizing it for ourselves. We must recall which movement to come we are betting on.

The multiple (theoretical and practical) activity which proceeds from this central point of advanced revolutionary communication, understood in its widest sense, is what alone can decide the mode of being together of the situationists, as all the criteria which permit us to judge the coherence and the capacities of our possible comrades. Please consider that there is hardly any personal characteristic, even in the most "subjective" tastes and attitudes which does not have a directly measurable effect on this terrain of our communication towards the outside. It is here, for example, that the lack of talent in expression appears as a dangerous stammering, or diffusion of partial truths which become lies. It is here that the conformist demeanour of one of us in no matter what aspect of his own life could certainly serve to discredit all the theoretical pretensions of the S.I.; and this all the more quickly as they seem more trenchant. It is a question of being at least at the level of emancipation which is beginning to manifest itself all over the place without theoretical consciousness; and of having only the theoretical consciousness in addition. Just as obviously as we must refuse the "prestigious role" in the S.I., we must reject whoever would present amongst us and outside the contrary of prestige: insufficiency with regard to our asserted bases.

It has been said recently that the situationists could not recognize amongst themselves any "thinker in retirement". It is quite true, for this would transform us into an intellectual guild for the diffusion and the recognition of our "master-pieces", and of the fixed doctrine which could be deduced from it, then taught. I think however that this caution would be party to a sort of glorious utopism if one put it forward as the principal peril. Firstly, because we risk even more gathering "thinkers in the cradle" (which is not bad under the sole condition that they come out of the cradle quickly). But above all, I insist on this point, we have no need of "thinkers" as such, that is to say people producing theories outside of practical life. To the extent that our theories in formation seem to me as accurate as possible, for the time being and in the conditions that we have confronted, I acknowledge that all theoretical development which can enter into the coherence of the "situationist discourse" comes from practical life, proceeds from it legitimately. But this is in no way sufficient. It is necessary that these theoretical formulae come back into practical life, otherwise they are not worth a quarter of an hour's trouble. Two points are to be considered: 1. the visible agreement between theory and the life of the bearer of this theory to the full extent of the practically realizable; 2. the utilization of this theory in so far as it is communicable to forces practically drawn towards the search for this theory (where where "reality seeks its theory", according to a classical formula). Deficiency in the first case clearly furnishes the unconscious ideologue in disagreement with himself; in the second case the utopian sect, where most certainly
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It has been said recently that the situationists could not recognize amongst themselves any "thinker in retirement". It is quite true, for this would transform us into an intellectual guild for the diffusion and the recognition of our "master-pieces", and of the fixed doctrine which could be deduced from it, then taught. I think however that this caution would be party to a sort of glorious utopism if one put it forward as the principal peril. Firstly, because we risk even more gathering "thinkers in the cradle" (which is not bad under the sole condition that they come out of the cradle quickly). But above all, I insist on this point, we have no need of "thinkers" as such, that is to say people producing theories outside of practical life. To the extent that our theories in formation seem to me as accurate as possible, for the time being and in the conditions that we have confronted, I acknowledge that all theoretical development which can enter into the coherence of the "situationist discourse" comes from practical life, proceeds from it legitimately. But this is in no way sufficient. It is necessary that these theoretical formulae come back into practical life, otherwise they are not worth a quarter of an hour's trouble. Two points are to be considered: 1. the visible agreement between theory and the life of the bearer of this theory to the full extent of the practically realizable; 2. the utilization of this theory in so far as it is communicable to forces practically drawn towards the search for this theory (there where "reality seeks its theory", according to a classical formula). Deficiency in the first case clearly furnishes the unconscious ideologue in disagreement with himself; in the second case the utopist sect, where most certainly
there is real agreement between the participants, but solely among themselves. For us, this aggravating circumstance is suspended in that we proclaim the historical refusal of ideology, and the supersession of all utopia by the effective possible of the present. The extent of the realizable, and thus of deficiency, in both cases can very easily be established — and always enlarged — by the very practice of the situationists if they apply with consequence the basic banalities which they affirm already. (...)

I reject just as much the contentment or the menace of discontent with regard to the S.I., which would manifest themselves around this exigency according to which we should be, as it were, the organizers of days of festivals. We do not have to answer to such a demand for particular festivals. We must leave this dimension to individuals; that is to say not obstruct anyone with a forcibly half-witted collectivism in this matter. What we must inherit from modern art, in the present conditions, is a more profound level of communication, and not a pretension to some sub-aesthetic enjoyment. (...)

We will have to succeed in recapturing this faculty of speech, which is in culture, but in no way its "prestige" or any consequence of its prestige. (The "prestigious roles" which can be derived from the S.I., of the miserable "master at thinking" — or "at living" — kind, we must guard ourselves against by systematically undermining every prestigious attitude.) The search for a sort of festival in the S.I. would lead to the trivial practice of entertainment in society, which is certainly not bad in itself, but would be bad for us because it would be coated in an ideology of the ludic: that is to say an attempt at collective ludic without its means, but aggravated by a sort of doctrine of play. Where then are all its means or realization, immediate and future? Precisely in our practice of communication with "the real movement which abolishes the existing conditions". In default of this, why should a meeting of situationists, in such conditions of abstract heaviness, be entertaining in itself?

In the alienation of everyday life, the possibilities of passions and of play are still very real, and it seems to me that the S.I. would perpetrate a grave misconception by letting it be understood that life is totally refuted outside of situationist activity (which would then be a mystic rescue in concept — see some persons who address themselves to us at present having this impression). Quite the contrary, it seems to me that this clear field is more normally exterior to our common activity, which implicates a certain fatigue. This seems to me even more obvious to consider the personal theoretical work that participation in the situationist project can lead to undertake.

The development of situationist theory has kept pace — through an infinity of interactions of which certain cases of spectacular plagiarisms are nothing but the amusing anecdotal aspect — with a development of the dominant cultural world itself. The idea of unitary urbanism, the experience of the drift, must be understood today in their struggle with the modern forms of utopian architecture, of the Venice Biennales, or of happenings. In the same way our possible use of "communication containing its own critique" must impose itself against the recuperated neo-dadaism or the neo-aesthetic combinative (a "visual Arts Group" constructing situations in the ets of Paris, etc.). The fact however that the few attempts which have been made to recuperate the S.I. en bloc into this cultural world have been repulsed justifies these first moments of our experience: we have followed the possibility of radicalization which they contained. That is why the movement of supersession of which we speak does not suppress them. It is owing to these very experiences — to be pursued — that the task of communication of our theory, that I conceive as our principal practical link, has nothing to do with political activism, but is radically the enemy of all the relics of this activism of specialists. However, the only position which totally discredits the necessary critique of specialists is inactivity in the name of the totality, of which I spoke to begin with.

The question of the communication of a theory in formation to the radical currents themselves in formation (communication which should not be in any way unilateral) derives at the same
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The development of situationist theory has kept pace — through an infinity of interactions of which certain cases of spectacular plagiarisms are nothing but the amusing anecdotal aspect — with a development of the dominant cultural world itself. The idea of unitary urbanism, the experience of the drift, must be understood today in their struggle with the modern forms of utopian architecture, of the Venice Biennales, or of happenings. In the same way our possible use of "communication containing its own critique" must impose itself against the recuperated neo-dadaiism or the neo-aesthetic combinative (a "visual Arts Group" constructing situations in the eets of Paris, etc.). The fact however that the few attempts which have been made to recuperate the S.I. en bloc into this cultural world have been repulsed justifies these first moments of our experience: we have followed the possibility of radicalization which they contained. That is why the movement of supersession of which we speak does not suppress them. It is owing to these very experiences — to be pursued — that the task of communication of our theory, that I conceive as our principal practical link, has nothing to do with political activism, but is radically the enemy of all the relics of this activism of specialists. However, the only position which totally discredits the necessary critique of specialists is inactivity in the name of the totality, of which I spoke to begin with.

The question of the communication of a theory in formation to the radical currents themselves in formation (communication which should not be in any way unilateral) derives at the same
time from "political experience" (organization, repression) and from the formal experience of language (from the critique of the dictionary to the use of a book, a tract, a review, film, and of the spoken word in daily life). Immediately after, the not negligible problem of finance poses itself here. I assume the problem of the maintenance of whatever comfort it may be is decidedly negligible for us all. It is certain that there where we begin to succeed in a certain communication of what we want to say, the result can return to us in different rather uncomfortable forms, like the bomb at Martin's. But the least negligible problem of all is that of our capacity, on diverse occasions, to judge the practical possibilities. Our emissary in Algeria, for example, had recently brought back most optimistic conclusions on our possibilities of an organization of diffusion, without which the best analyses are only good for offering directly to the International Institute of Social History. What followed showed that he had been too enthusiastic. The conditions of clandestinity, naturally, reduce to a very small number of individuals those among whom one must choose whether to confide in or not. According to what these precisely will do or will not do, one can arrive at results, or at nothing. But you know how the matter presents itself to us everywhere, and that is why I find this example of conspiracy interesting in passing. The whole world is for us like this Algeria, where everything depends on what we can do with the first come; and where thus we must all be more and more capable of judging them practically and of creating conditions for such meetings. We do not have the mass media, and no radical current will have them for very long. It will be necessary to learn to recognize and make use of at every moment the other ways.

If we have a certain theoretical advance at this moment, it is the unfortunate product of the complete absence of the practical critique of society in the epoch which we are leaving, and of its subsequent theoretical dissolution. But, since it seems that the reappearance of struggles in a new form begins to confirm our fundamental hypothesis, we have to make known our positions to the new currents which are feeling their way in politics as in culture, to this extent that we are their own unknown theory. This task seems to me to define all our present activity, and inversely

nothing can be really defined beyond this. For, no more than it is a question of pretending to a monopoly of critical excellence in any domain whatsoever, we must not reason in the perspective of a prolonged maintenance of any monopoly of theoretical coherence.

(July 1966)
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Comrades,  
The tendency which has constituted itself, on the 11th of November 1970, in the French section has the merit of being the last abstraction to be able to formulate itself in, for and in the name of the S.I. If it is true that the group has never been but the sum of the capacities and the weaknesses, very unequally distributed, of its members, there is, in the moment which preoccupies us, no more apparent community, not even a tendency, which can make us forget that each one is alone answerable for himself. How could what was passionate in the consciousness of a common project transform itself into a malaise of being together? This is what the historians will establish. I feel neither the vocation of historian, nor that of thinker, in retirement or not, to become a veteran. Apart from the fact that the easy analysis of the little penetration of situationist theory into the workers’ milieu and of the little workers’ penetration into the situationist milieu would at the moment only be a pretext for the false good consciousness of our failure. But without doubt, to be at last concrete — for there is no concrete answer outside of the proof that each one will have to give of what he really is — I must speak rather of my failure. As far as the past is concerned, I have always attributed, very rashly, to most of the comrades or ex-comrades of the S.I. at least as much capacities and honesty as I acknowledged in myself, thus deluding myself at the same time on the others and on myself. I estimate enough what such an attitude could, contradictorily, arouse, in the International, of scheming tactics more or less cunning and always odious; and create at the same time conditions of ideology. This said, the individual history of the comrades, mine and the
5. Communiqué of the S.I. concerning Vaneigem

At last obliged to seriously say something precise on what the S.I. is and what it has to do, Raoul Vaneigem has immediately rejected it in totality. Up to this instant, he had always approved of all of it.

His stand of the 14th of November has the ultimate and sad merit of expressing very well, and in few words, what was at the centre of the crisis which the S.I. has known during 1969-70. It is evidently inversely that Vaneigem passionately envisages the truth of this crisis, but he shows it exactly and, displayed to this degree, the inversion does not risk spoiling the reading.

Vaneigem qualifies our position as the "last abstraction to be able to formulate itself in, for and in the name of the S.I."; and as he had never perceived the preceding ones, he wants at least to combat this one. Thus we will have to speak here of the concrete, of abstraction and of he who speaks of abstraction.

The concrete terrain of this crisis is equally, from its origin, a defence of the concrete of the activity of the S.I., and the real conditions in which it accomplished itself effectively. The crisis began when certain of us perceived, and began to make it known, that others surreptitiously left them to take the monopoly of responsibilities, as well as the greater part of operations to execute: the critique begun with regard to the under-participation (quantitative and above all qualitative) in the editing of our principal common publications, quickly extended itself to the under-participation, more dissimulated, in the matter of theory, of strategy, of encounters and of outside struggles, and even of current discussions, on the most simple decisions which were incumbent upon us. Everywhere there existed a fraction in point of fact composed of contemplative comrades, systematically

collective history will allot the share of my errors and of my correct options. (Nevertheless I specify that I spit in the face of whoever, present or to come, would discern in me secret intentions, whatever they might be, and with this critical good faith that one has seen so often laid down after the event.)

For the present, it is enough for me to establish my default in having advanced a movement that I always held for the condition of my radicality. It would be disarming naïvety itself to still want to save a group so as to save myself when I did not know how to make of it any of what I really wanted it to be. Thus I prefer to take up again the bet that my adhesion to the S.I. had deferred: to vanish absolutely or to remake absolutely my own coherence, and to remake it alone so as to remake it with the greatest number.

But before leaving to the revolution the care of recognizing its own, I insist from today that the exigencies I have formulated on autonomous groups apply to myself: I will resume contact with the comrades who will desire it, and who I will desire to see again, only in the effective success of a revolutionary agitation that my taste for radical pleasure will have known how to undertake.

However if the tendency judged its critique sufficient in itself, without further proof, to reconstitute the French section, it would immediately have to consider me as having resigned, with the consequences, that I accept, of never seeing each other again.

(14th November 1970)
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His stand of the 14th of November has the ultimate and sad merit of expressing very well, and in few words, what was at the centre of the crisis which the S.I. has known during 1969-70. It is evidently inversely that Vaneigem passionately envisages the truth of this crisis, but he shows it exactly and, displayed to this degree, the inversion does not risk spoiling the reading. Vaneigem qualifies our position as the “last abstraction to be able to formulate itself in, for and in the name of the S.I.”; and as he had never perceived the preceding ones, he wants at least to combat this one. Thus we will have to speak here of the concrete, of abstraction and of he who speaks of abstraction.
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The concrete terrain of this crisis is equally, from its origin, a defence of the concrete of the activity of the S.I., and the real conditions in which it accomplished itself effectively. The crisis began when certain of us perceived, and began to make it known, that others surreptitiously left them to take the monopoly of responsibilities, as well as the greater part of operations to execute: the critique begun with regard to the under-participation (quantitative and above all qualitative) in the editing of our principal common publications, quickly extended itself to the under-participation, more dissimulated, in the matter of theory, of strategy, of encounters and of outside struggles, and even of current discussions, on the most simple decisions which were incumbent upon us. Everywhere there existed a fraction in point of fact composed of contemplative comrades, systematically approves, and never manifesting anything other than the most firm tenaciousness in inactivity. They behaved as if they estimated they had nothing to gain, but perhaps something to lose, in upholding a personal opinion, and in undertaking to work by themselves, on any of our precise problems. This position, of which assured silence was the principal weapon, covered itself also, in its days of festival, with some general proclamations, always very euphoric, on the perfect equality realized in the S.I., the radical coherence of its dialogue, the collective and personal grandeur of all its participants. Vaneigem remained, right up to the end, the most remarkable representative of this sort of practice.

When several months of discussion, of very precise texts, brought the critique of this default to a degree where not one of the individuals concerned could any longer, honestly, either delude himself about himself, or believe that he could still maintain the same illusion about his comrades, Vaneigem more than any other took refuge in silence. It is only on learning, on the 11th of November, that our positions would from now on be diffused outside of the S.I., that he immediately estimated he could no longer remain it. Vaneigem, having reached this point, alludes, against us, to "scheming tactics more or less cunning and always odious". He will evidently not make anyone believe that it would be necessary to have a tactic, to be more or less cunning, or to scheme in whatever manner it may be, to oblige a comrade, for so many years member of an organization always affirmed egalitarian, to participate effectively in the decisions of this organization and their execution; or otherwise to avow quickly that he cannot and will not. The absence and the silence of Vaneigem, or of others, can no doubt succeed in disguising themselves for quite a long time, through schemes more or less paltry, but find themselves eliminated, quite easily, as soon as no matter who announces that he no longer wants to put up with them, while the contemplative position must from its side admit that really it wanted nothing else in the world than to continue to be supported among us. But Vaneigem employs a plural which evokes a past where such schemes — "always odious" — were not yet aimed either at him or his present imitators. We will not content ourselves with recalling
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that Vaneigem, having never opposed, either in writing, or in a single meeting, or even — to our knowledge — in any personal conversation with a member of the S.I., any one of these alleged “schemes”, having never evoked in any way their existence or their possibility, would be inexcusably and miserably an accomplice to them. We will naturally go further: we defy him formally, before the judgement of all the revolutionaries who already exist today, to point out straight away a single one of these “scheming tactics” which he would have noted, and let pass, in the S.I., during the ten years when he was a member of it.

Vaneigem, who feigns to believe that the S.I. is going to disappear because his absence must make it withdraw (“to still want to save a group”, “to reconstitute the French section”), states that he did not know how to make of this group “any of what (he) really wanted it to be”. Certainly we do not doubt that Vaneigem wanted to make of the S.I. an organization, not only revolutionary, but of a quite sublime, and perhaps even absolute, excellence (cf. Traité de Savoir-vivre [part of which has been published in two parts in English under the title The revolution of everyday life], etc.). Other comrades have said, for years, that the real historical success of the S.I. did not all the same go that far, and above all included too often avoidable deficiencies (their existence besides rendering even more tiresome the myth of the admirable perfection of the S.I., which hundreds of stupid spectators outside gargled with — and unfortunately also some spectators among us). But Vaneigem, in assuming now, post festum, this tone of disabused leader, who did not “know” how to make of this group “any” of what he wanted to make of it, forgets to pose himself this cruel question: what did he ever, himself, try to say, to do, by arguing or by serving as an example, so that the S.I. should become even better, or closer to his proclaimed best personal tastes? Vaneigem did nothing towards such goals; though meanwhile the S.I. did not really remain as a consequence to be nothing! Before the evidence of what the S.I. has done, Vaneigem today discredits himself completely, for every individual who is able to think, by laudably, so childishly, the sulking and burlesque counter-truth of a complete failure of the S.I., and of himself in the first place. Vaneigem never wanted to recognize a part of failure in the action of the S.I., precisely because he knew himself to be too intimately linked with this part of failure; and because his real deficiencies constantly seemed to him to call for as remedy, not their supersession, but the simple peremptory affirmation that everything was for the best. Now that he can no longer continue, the part of failure which he must truly admit the existence of is brusquely presented, in contempt of all verisimilitude, as the total failure, the absolute non-existence of our theory and our action in the last ten years. This bad joke judges him.

In this fundamental buffoonery, appear only in so far as particularly amusing details the very socio-logico-journalistic allusion of Vaneigem to the “little penetration of situationist theory into the workers’ milieu”; and above all his overwhelming discovery, in the unexpected light of this Last Judgement of the S.I. marked for him by his departure, that not one of the situationists works in a factory! For, if Vaneigem had known it earlier, since he seems so affected by it, he would certainly have called attention to the problem and some radical solution.

On this score, one must recall that Vaneigem, when he was serious, had not only articulated the admirable goals that he reserved for the S.I. The one among all of us who spoke the most abundantly of himself, of his subjectivity, and of his “taste for radical pleasure”, had also admirable goals for himself. But did he realize them, did he even struggle concretely to realize them? Not at all. For Vaneigem as for the S.I., Vaneigem’s programme was formulated only to spare himself all the fatigues, and all the little historical risks, of the realization. The goal being total, it is only envisaged in a pure present: it is already there as a whole, as far as one believes one can make it believed, or else it remained purely inaccessible: one did not succeed in doing anything to define it or to approach it. The qualitative, like the spirit of table-turning, had made believe that it was there, but one must admit that it was only a protracted error! Vaneigem discovers finally that the mayonnaise which he feigned to savour did not take shape.

In such a metaphysical light, one can certainly await the pure moment of the Revolution and, in this restful expectation, one
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In such a metaphysical light, one can certainly await the pure moment of the Revolution and, in this restful expectation, one
can amiably leave it “the care of recognizing its own” (but it will be necessary nevertheless for its own to know how to recognize it, this revolution, and for example cancel the reservations for their holidays, if by mischance the two phenomena coincide). However, when it is a matter of questions more immediately close to our consciousness and our direct action, like the S.I. and Vaneigem in person, if one pretends that everything that was wished for is already realised in totality, the mystique sinks into bluff. What one has affirmed perfect, one will thus one day have to affirm totally non-existent. Joyous discovery, which affects in no way the altogether extra-historical radicality of Vaneigem. In this way therefore, in acknowledging today his total error over the S.I., it does not enter into Vaneigem’s head that he has already implicitly acknowledged a total error over himself. He thinks he is still in 1961, ten years having passed as a simple dream, this negligible nightmare of history, after which Vaneigem rediscovers, simply and purely “deferred”, his project, always equal to himself, to “remake absolutely (his) own coherence”. However, if the S.I. has not yet existed, neither has Vaneigem yet existed. But one day, soon perhaps? Tomorrow, one will razè coherence gratis! But just as historical justice, quite as much as real action in history, is foreign to the preoccupations of Vaneigem, he does not do himself justice.

Vaneigem has occupied in the history of the S.I. an important and unforgettable place. Having joined in 1961 the theoretico-practical platform constituted in the first years of the S.I., he immediately shared and developèd its most extreme positions, those which were then the newest, and which went towards the revolutionary coherence of our time. If at this moment what the S.I. brought to Vaneigem was certainly not negligible, giving him the occasion, the dialogue, some basic theses and the terrain of activity to become what he wanted and could be of authentic, and of profoundly radical, it is also true that Vaneigem brought to the S.I. a very remarkable contribution: he had a lot of intelligence and culture, great daring in ideas, and all this was dominated by the truest anger against existing conditions. Vaneigem then had genius, because he knew perfectly how to go to the extreme in everything that he knew how to do. And everything that he did not know how to do, he had simply not yet had the occasion to confront personally. He burned to begin. The S.I. of the years 1961 to 1964, and it is an important period for the S.I. as for the ideas of the modern revolution, was heavily marked by Vaneigem, more perhaps than by any other. It is in this period that he, not only wrote the Traité and other texts which he signed in the review I.S. (Banalités de Base [translated into English as The Totality for Kids], etc.), but also participated greatly in the anonymous collective texts of number 6 to 9 of this review, and very creatively in all the discussions of this epoch. If he forgets it now, we do not forget it. If he today wishes to spit in his own plate, too bad, the revolutionary generation which took shape in the following years has already served itself from it.

This period of the beginning of the sixties was to be that of the general formulation of the most total revolutionary programme. The revolution, of which we announced the return and the new exigencies, was then totally absent, just as much in the way of truly modern theory as in individuals and groups fighting concretely in the proletariat, by new radical actions and for new objectives. A certain generality, a certain abstraction, the use sometimes even of a tone of lyrical excess, were the inevitable products of these precise conditions and were even as such, necessary, justified, excellent. We were not many in that moment and Vaneigem was one, to know how to and to dare say what we were saying. We did well.

Very luckily the course of modern society did not fail to follow, more and more visibly, the path which we saw it enter upon; and at the same time the new revolutionary current, which did not fail either to manifest itself corollarily, took up much of our critique, armed itself partially with our theory (which continued obviously to develop and to become more precise), or was even able to draw its inspiration from certain examples of our practical struggles. We had to make more precise analyses, and also experiment diverse forms of action become possible. The situationists entered, with their epoch, into these more and more concrete struggles which deepened up until 1968, and even more since. Vaneigem was already no longer there.
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"How, he asks himself today, could what was passionate in the consciousness of a common project transform itself into a malaise of being together?" But he takes good care not to reply to his question, which thus remains purely elegiac. How did pure gold change into base lead? It is quite simply, in this case, because the consciousness of a common project ceased to exist in a common practice - in what became the common practice of the S.I. Some lived the practice of the S.I., with its difficulties and its inconveniences, of which the worst was certainly to have to struggle against the growing heaviness introduced into our common activity by the contemplative and self-admiring tendency of several situationists (cf. La question de l'organisation pour l'I.S., text of April 1968 taken up again in I.S. 12). On the contrary, Vaneigem only maintained the pure "consciousness" of the abstract generality of this project; and thus, in the measure that concrete action spread further, a consciousness always more outmoded and deceitful, false consciousness on the supposed terrain of common historical consciousness, simple bad faith. In these conditions, it was less and less passionate to meet Vaneigem (and others who, for their part, had even never been able to impassion anyone). To repeat vainly the same critiques, then to get tired of them, please no one. And it was surely even more boring for Vaneigem to meet for years, in a completely changed style, comrades of whom he was very well aware that they knew, nearly as well as he knew them himself, his defaults. However Vaneigem preferred to continue to figure, formally, among us, propped up on the memory of an authentic participation and the promise always further off and more abstract of a future accomplishment, in playing on the truly cold remains of an amicable dialogue, and by turning a deaf ear. As President de Brosses wrote about a character of this type: "One cannot resolve to take an angry stand against a colleague, against a man very amiable and so gentle that he never replies at all to anything that one may say to him. The misfortune is that gentle spirits are the most obstinate and the most insensible of all. They never contest you anything. But, neither can one persuade them, nor can one determine them."

In the years 1965 to 1970, the fading of Vaneigem manifested itself quantitatively (he hardly participated in our publications any more except by three little articles which he signed in the last three numbers of I.S., and he was very often absent from meetings, where generally he kept silent) and above all qualitatively. His very rare interventions in our debates were struck with the sign of the greatest incapacity to envisage concrete historical struggles; marked by the feeblest escapes with regard to all relation to be maintained between what one says and what one does, and even by the smiling forgetfulness of dialectical thought. At the VII Conference of the S.I., in 1966, we had to argue for two hours against a strange proposition of Vaneigem: he held for certain that our "coherence" would always indicate in no matter what debate on a practical action to be undertaken, and after a thorough discussion, the sole right path, univocally recognizable in advance. In such a way that if a minority of situationists did not declare itself, at the end of this discussion, totally convinced, it would thus have proved that it did not possess the coherence of the S.I., or else that it dishonestly held hidden goals of sabotage, or at least a dissimulated theoretico-practical opposition. If the other comrades obviously defended the rights and the obligations of every minority in a revolutionary organization — with a hundred concrete examples — and even more simply the rights of reality, one must recognize that Vaneigem never risked contradicting himself afterwards on this point by being, not even for ten minutes, in peril of passing "for one in the minority" on the slightest question debated by the S.I. At the end of 1968, we recognized, against the advice of Vaneigem, the right should the occasion arise to constitute tendencies in the S.I. Vaneigem rallied gladly to this majority, but in specifying that he could not even conceive how a tendency could ever come to exist among us. In the spring of 1970, a tendency having formed to resolve quickly and clearly a practical conflict, Vaneigem, of course, immediately enrolled in it. It is useless to multiply the examples. The permanent refusal to envisage a real historical development, produced by his knowledge, and his acceptance, of a relative personal incapacity (which thus always went on worsening), was accompanied normally with Vaneigem by the enthusiastic
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insistence on every caricature of totality, in the revolution as in the S.I., on the magical fusion, one day, of at last liberated spontaneity, (that of the masses, and that of Vaneigem) with coherence: in such weddings of identification, the vulgar problems of real society and real revolution will be instantaneously abolished even before one has had the displeasure of considering them, which is obviously an amiable perspective for philosophy of history at the end of a banquet. Vaneigem handled by the ton the concept of the qualitative forgetting resolutely what Hegel called, in The Science of Logic, “the most profound and the most essential quality”, contradiction. “With regard to it, in effect, identity is only the determination of what is simple and immediate, of the dead being, whilst contradiction is the source of all movement, of all life. It is in effect only in the measure that a thing contains within itself a contradiction that it shows it is active and alive.” Vaneigem, except to begin with, did not like the life of the S.I., but its dead image, a glorious alibi for his commonplace life, and an abstractly total hope for the future. Since he put up so well with such a phantom, one understands that he scatters it totally with a single breath, precisely on the 14th of November 1970, when he had to begin to express his discontent, because the rank obstinacy of satisfied silence was no longer tenable.

Most certainly, we have in no way insinuated that Vaneigem could have had “secret intentions”. Our Declaration of the 11th of November is far from being devoted to Vaneigem alone; and he knows very well that the American situationists had addressed to us shortly before, at a few days interval, three letters contradicting each other completely, and none of which thought it had to cite or correct the previous one, which obliges us to formulate in this case the hypothesis of “hidden goals” of these comrades, for we do not for one instant believe in their mental debility. But all of Vaneigem’s conduct among us has always been well known by all, and of an undeniable unhappy transparency. The whole question — dwindling with time — was to know if what in the S.I. has earned Vaneigem so many times critiques or laughter would be finally overcome or maintained to the end. Now one knows the answer. Vaneigem (or anybody else) has certainly not been taken unawares by a debate which several texts — on which, no one has ever had any reservations — affirmed for months that it was decisive; that its conclusion was urgent; that everyone had to declare himself knowing that our common action was entirely at stake. So Vaneigem has nothing to fear from this “critical good faith that one has seen so often laid down after the event”. Here moreover his irony is ill-advised, for we know well that there have been in the S.I., several cases of sudden and surprising ruptures, where the explanation of the behaviour of an individual could only become evident to us after the event. We know even better that one of the rare exercises of Vaneigem’s radicality has been always to approve the exclusions of the S.I. as soon as they occurred, and to trample without regret on individuals who, the night before even, he had never taken the trouble to criticize. And what, fundamentally, does this anti-historical rage signify against the judgement “after the event” of what has brought about the event? Have we not, for example, to answer the commonplace that Vaneigem has just amassed in his text of the 14th November? He had never breathed a word of them beforehand. Here, we are indeed obliged to criticize after the event a precise manifestation of unconsciousness that it would have been really rash to forecast in all its details before Vaneigem’s final glorious deed.

“The coherence of critique and the critique of incoherence are one and the same movement, condemned to destroy itself and to freeze into ideology from the moment when separation introduces itself between different groups of a federation, between individuals of an organization, between the theory and practice of a member of that organization” (Vaneigem in I.S. 11). One cannot say better; and one can hardly denounce with more impudence in abstract universality, the very deficiency from which one suffers, to make believe that, since precisely one has denounced it in general and everywhere, one would oneself be necessarily exempt from it. Vaneigem was not unaware that his comrades would not cover, in the last analysis, an imposture of this kind, even if estimable memories and the remains of an indulgent friendship founded on them, can delay for some time the conclusion that the least lucidity imposes, first in all the details, and then at the very centre of the problem. We cannot claim we are sure of anything,
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“The coherence of critique and the critique of incoherence are one and the same movement, condemned to destroy itself and to freeze into ideology from the moment when separation introduces itself between different groups of a federation, between individuals of an organization, between the theory and practice of a member of that organization” (Vaneigem in I.S. 11). One cannot say better; and one can hardly denounce with more impudence in abstract universality, the very deficiency from which one suffers, to make believe that, since precisely one has denounced it in general and everywhere, one would oneself be necessarily exempt from it. Vaneigem was not unaware that his comrades would not cover, in the last analysis, an imposture of this kind, even if estimable memories and the remains of an indulgent friendship founded on them, can delay for some time the conclusion that the least lucidity imposes, first in all the details, and then at the very centre of the problem. We cannot claim we are sure of anything,
or of anyone. Only of the movement of history, as long as we are able to recognize it by participating in it; and without doubt each one of us with regard to himself, at least as long as we are capable of proving it. It is in any case evident that complicity, real and necessary, in an enterprise like the S.I., could not be founded on a community of defects, and on the “common project” of dazzling from afar a multitude of followers, with the insipid and vacuous image of our collective splendour: we have always all been agreed to spurn these people and denounce this image, but it is not possible to really accomplish this work thoroughly when in the S.I. itself, this attitude of vague and sweet effusion, this pietism of the S.I., existed in fact, without even having the excuse of the ignorant distance. One has thus let too exaggeratedly assert itself in the S.I., “without further proof”, the comfortably optimistic notion of the complementariness of the participants. Every one found himself again and no one was lost, since some specialties had their place in the sun: the Chamfort of the totality, the loyal drunkard, the thrower of paving stones of excellent intentions, etc. It is there that absence became a policy of pacific coexistence, and approbation a necessity that passed itself off as chance. And it is there that Vaneigem deceived the most, if not himself — he has been through worse than that — at least his comrades. How could the contemplative situationists think — however true their goodwill was on this score — to fight against the hierarchic following which manifested itself around the S.I., and which we so much rejected and condemned, whilst they themselves in the S.I. were indeed effectively followers, adorned only with an abstract and proclaimed intention of egalitarian participation? At this moment, to despise the exterior followers becomes in fact an imaginative confirmation of internal equality. But this “followism” must be understood in its real complexity. Neither Vaneigem nor others have ever been servile approvers of a policy which they would in fact have disapproved of: it is only the last text of Vaneigem which gives, very unjustly, this image of himself. In reality, Vaneigem and some other comrades have always followed the decisions taken in the practice of the S.I. because they approved of them veritably and, we will dare to say it — just as long as other revolutionaries more consequent than us, or placed one day in more favourable conditions than us to understand the strategy we have followed and others which would have been possible, will not have perceived our veritable errors — because they were good for our common project. Vaneigem, always very firm against our enemies, has never done anything or envisaged doing anything in these ten years which opposes in any way the radicalism of the declared action of the S.I. He only concurred very badly in the exercise of this radicalism. Vaneigem seems never to have wanted to face up to this simple fact that he who speaks so well undertakes to be there a little in a number of analyses and practical struggles on pain of deceiving radically. The violence or the real perspectives of the S.I., as semi-community, could not discharge him from the obligation of manifesting his own on diverse concrete occasions. The distance that Vaneigem had taken for a long time vis-a-vis our action dissimulated to him many of the relations, in reality hierarchic, which existed in this action, and which his attitude of flight accepted and encouraged. But this very distance was precisely taken so as not to see this reality; instead of helping to surmount it. Having placed his confidence in the S.I. to be the radical guarantee of the personal life which he accepted, he came to be in the S.I. as he is in his own life. Thus, the Traité de Savoir-vivre has entered into a current of agitation of which one has not heard the last, and in the very same movement its author has left it. He spoke as so not to be. However the importance of this book should escape no-one, for no-one, not even Vaneigem, in time, will have escaped its conclusions. In proportion as Vaneigem let the old world tread on his toes, the project in which he had believed became exorcism, vulgar sacralization of a daily routine which, recognizing at every instant the extremely unsatisfying character of what had been accepted, had even more need of edifying character of an independent empire in the clouds of a spectacular radicality. It is the totality which consoles, alas, and which sustains he who is determined to put up with everything in no matter what detail, in affecting even to find nearly everything very good. Besides his opposition, well affirmed once and for all, to the commodity, the State, hierarchy, alienation and survival, Vaneigem is very visibly someone who has never opposed himself to anything in the precise
or of anyone. Only of the movement of history, as long as we are able to recognize it by participating in it; and without doubt each one of us with regard to himself, at least as long as we are capable of proving it. It is in any case evident that complicity, real and necessary, in an enterprise like the S.I., could not be founded on a community of defects, and on the "common project" of dazzling from afar a multitude of followers, with the insipid and vacuous image of our collective splendidour: we have always all been agreed to spurn these people and denounce this image, but it is not possible to really accomplish this work thoroughly when in the S.I. itself, this attitude of vague and sweet effusion, this pietism of the S.I., existed in fact, without even having the excuse of the ignorant distance. One has thus let too exaggeratedly assert itself in the S.I., "without further proof", the comfortably optimistic notion of the complementariness of the participants. Every one found himself again and no one was lost, since some specialities had their place in the sun: the Chamfort of the totality, the loyal drunkard, the thrower of paving stones of excellent intentions, etc. It is there that absence became a policy of pacific coexistence, and approbation a necessity that passed itself off as chance. And it is there that Vaneigem deceived the most, if not himself — he has been through worse than that — at least his comrades. How could the contemplative situationists think — however true their goodwill was on this score — to fight against the hierarchic following which manifested itself around the S.I., and which we so much rejected and condemned, whilst they themselves in the S.I. were indeed effectively followers, adorned only with an abstract and proclaimed intention of egalitarian participation? At this moment, to despise the exterior followers becomes in fact an imaginary confirmation of internal equality. But this "followism" must be understood in its real complexity. Neither Vaneigem nor others have ever been serve approvers of a policy which they would in fact have disapproved of: it is only the last text of Vaneigem which gives, very unjustly, this image of himself. In reality, Vaneigem and some other comrades have always followed the decisions taken in the practice of the S.I. because they approved of them veritably and, we will dare to say it — just as long as other revolutionaries more consequent than us, or placed one day in more favourable conditions than us to understand the strategy we have followed and others which would have been possible, will not have perceived our veritable errors — because they were good for our common project. Vaneigem, always very firm against our enemies, has never done anything or envisaged doing anything in these ten years which opposes in any way the radicalism of the declared action of the S.I. He only concurred very badly in the exercise of this radicalism. Vaneigem seems never to have wanted to face up to this simple fact that he who speaks so well undertakes to be there a little in a number of analyses and practical struggles on pain of deceiving radically. The violence or the real perspectives of the S.I., as semi-community, could not discharge him from the obligation of manifesting his own on diverse concrete occasions. The distance that Vaneigem had taken for a long time vis-a-vis our action dissimulated to him many of the relations, in reality hierarchic, which existed in this action, and which his attitude of flight accepted and encouraged. But this very distance was precisely taken so as not to see this reality: instead of helping to surmount it. Having placed his confidence in the S.I. to be the radical guarantee of the personal life which he accepted, he came to be in the S.I. as he is in his own life. Thus, the Traité de Savoir-vivre has entered into a current of agitation of which one has not heard the last, and in the very same movement its author has left it. He spoke so as not to be. However the importance of this book should escape no-one, for no-one, not even Vaneigem, in time, will have escaped its conclusions. In proportion as Vaneigem let the old world tread on his toes, the project in which he had believed became exorcism, vulgar sacralization of a daily routine which, recognizing at every instant the extremely unsatisfying character of what had been accepted, had even more need of edifying character of an independent empire in the clouds of a spectacular radicality. It is the totality which consoles, alas, and which sustains he who is determined to put up with everything in no matter what detail, in affecting even to find nearly everything very good. Besides his opposition, well affirmed once and for all, to the commodity, the State, hierarchy, alienation and survival, Vaneigem is very visibly someone who has never opposed himself to anything in the precise
life which was made for him, his entourage and his frequentations — including finally his frequentation of the S.I. This strange timidity has prevented him from confronting what displeased him; but evidently not from feeling it keenly. He shielded himself against it by circulating, by dividing his life into several permanent hourly and geographical sectors, between which he was left with a sort of railway liberty. Thus he can console himself for a certain number of displeasures undergone everywhere with some miniscule revenge of his so often derided radical importance, with little childish insolences, amiably covered besides by a gentle smile: by making himself awaited a little, by repeatedly forgetting a minute detail which he took upon himself, by missing a few rendezvous, by making himself, he thinks, desired. It is in this that he compensates a very little for the wretched consciousness of not having really become Vaneigem, of having recoiled constantly before adventure, or even discomfort, as well as the pursuit of quality of people and moments; in brief, of not having done what he wanted, after having said it so well.

Of the disastrous separation between theory and practice — which all his life illustrates, to the point of having rapidly sterilized his capacities as theoretician — nothing without doubt can be more striking an example than the following anecdote. On the 15th of May 1968, Vaneigem, having arrived in Paris only the night before, countersigned the circular Aux membres de l’I.S., aux camarades qui se sont déclaré en accord avec nos thèses (To the members of the S.I., to the comrades who have declared themselves in agreement with our theses), which called for immediate action on the most radical bases in what would become, in the two or three days following, the movement of occupations. This circular analysed the unfolding of the first few days of May, said where we were in relation (notably to the Committee of Occupation of the Sorbonne), envisaged the following possibilities of repression, and even the eventuality of “social revolution”. The first factory had been occupied the day before, and at this date the most imbecile member of the most retarded group could not doubt that a very grave social crisis had begun. Nevertheless Vaneigem, much better informed, as soon as he had opposed his signature to our circular, left the same afternoon to take his train to rejoin the place of his

holidays on the Mediterranean, fixed a long time ago. Several days later, learning abroad, through the mass media, what was continuing as foreseen in France, he naturally set about returning, traversed with great difficulty the country on strike, and rejoined us one week after his ridiculous faux-pas, when already the decisive days, when we were able to do the most for the movement, had passed. Now, we know well that Vaneigem truly does like revolution and that it is in no way courage that he lacks. One can thus only understand this as a borderline case of the separation between the rigorous routine of an unshakeably orderly daily life and the passion, real but heavily disarmed, for revolution.

Now that the alibi of the S.I. is withdrawn from him, since Vaneigem continues to announce just as superbly the objective of perfecting his coherence on foot or by car, alone and “with the greatest number”, he must expect all those who will henceforth associate with him and who will not be stupid — a minority, no doubt — to ask him from time to time how, where, in doing what and in fighting for what precise perspectives he puts into play from now on this famous radicality and his remarkable “taste for pleasure”. The prepossessing silence which said much for the mysteries of the S.I. certainly cannot suffice any longer; and his replies will be full of interest.

We have replied seriously here to what, manifestly, no longer was. It is because we continue, ourselves, to occupy ourselves with the theoretical tasks and the practical conduct of the S.I. and because, in this sole perspective, all this has its importance. An epoch has ended. It is this real change, and not our bad mood or our impatience, which has obliged us to cut through a state of affairs, to break with a certain situationist conservatism which has for too long shown its force of inertia and its pure will for self-reproduction. We no longer want with us, either Vaneigem and he who could still aspire to imitate him, or any other comrades whose participation was summed up just about solely in the formalist game of organization, the hollow correspondences “between sections” on trifles, nuances and false interpretations maintained and withdrawn, from one continent to another, and six months after, on the most simple decisions taken in ten
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We have replied seriously here to what, manifestly, no longer was. It is because we continue, ourselves, to occupy ourselves with the theoretical tasks and the practical conduct of the S.I. and because, in this sole perspective, all this has its importance. An epoch has ended. It is this real change, and not our bad mood or our impatience, which has obliged us to cut through a state of affairs, to break with a certain situationist conservatism which has for too long shown its force of inertia and its pure will for self-reproduction. We no longer want with us, either Vaneigem and he who could still aspire to imitate him, or any other comrades whose participation was summed up just about solely in the formalist game of organization, the hollow correspondences “between sections” on trifles, nuances and false interpretations maintained and withdrawn, from one continent to another, and six months after, on the most simple decisions taken in ten
minutes by all those who, being there, had direct experience of the question — while the participation of the same comrades in our theory and in real activity comes down, with regard to this, to something nearly imperceptible. Some revolutionaries who are not members of the S.I. have done much more, to diffuse our theory (and even several times already, to develop it), than many immobilist “situationists”; and without draping themselves inflexibly in the “quality” of situationist. We will prove again that we are not playing to be the leadership of the new revolutionary current, by breaking as precisely as possible the derisory myth of the S.I., inside as outside. The real activity of the S.I. pleases us more, now as formerly. And the reality of the revolutionary epoch into which we have entered is even more our veritable victory.

Vaneigem affects at present, in an out of date academic style, to want “the historians” to judge the action in which he took part. He has thus also forgotten that it is not “the historians” that judge, but history, that is to say those who make it. The professional historians, as long as they will not have been eaten (as one of our friends once said), do nothing but follow. In the same way therefore, on this question, as on several others, the historians will only confirm the judgement of the S.I.

(9th December 1970.)

The Veritable Split in the International
Printing completed September 1974

ERRATA

Page 25, Thesis 14, line 3: ‘requirement’ should read ‘requirement’.
Page 40, Thesis 31, line 2: ‘text’ should read ‘texts’.
Page 84, line 16: ‘gone since’ should read ‘gone on since’.
Page 90, line 6: ‘garnautins’ should read ‘garnautins’.
Page 93, line 5: ‘submitting his cast’ should read ‘submitting his cause’.
Page 104, 5 lines up: ‘means or realization’ should read ‘means of realization’.
Page 105, paragraph 2, line 11: ‘the eets of Paris’ should read ‘the streets of Paris’.
Page 105, paragraph 2, line 12: ‘the few attempt’ should read ‘the few attempts’.
Page 112, paragraph 2, last line: ‘remain it it’ should read ‘remain in it’.
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