

Received 23/10/2020

Published 31/12/2021

## **Towards a Working Definition: Anarchy and the Intellect: A Dialectical Relationship**

**Soumia BAKEZZI<sup>1</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> University L'arbi Ben M'hidi Oum El Bouaghi, Algeria

### **Abstract**

The relationship between intellectualism and revolution has, since the very dawn of authoritarian oppression, been inextricable, with the former being the springboard of the latter. However, most recently, new voices in academia and media alike promulgated that this formula ceased to operate, as what began to incentive revolution is utter anarchy, deriving its ideological lifeline from countering the intellectual as an imposing authority figure. Nevertheless, the perpetual convergence of the anarchy and the intellectual seems sufficiently paradoxical to be dissociated or dissolved, and it reveals more than just an inherent hostile affinity. This observation prompts us to consider the fundamental question about the nature of the relationship between these two concepts and to reassess the validity of the claims attributed to their antagonistic relationship. Thus, our aim in this research paper, which is through theoretical reflection and with the assistance of historical introspection, is to explore the relationship between anarchy and the intellect which we assume to be a dialectical one, as it is one which is fraught with ambiguities and misunderstandings and to examine critically the spirit of anarchy in order for us to connect the dots that link the two. Furthermore, a much more foundational level of this discussion seeks to redefine, most appropriately, the concept of anarchy and to cross this threshold of division. Also central to this discussion is the idea that anarchy as a practice is steeped in theory and cannot escape the shackles of the intellect mind. This is, then, what the following paper will discuss.

**Keywords :** anarchy, intellect, dialectical relationship, redefinition, authority, affinity

### **1. Introduction**

In his seminal book “The Anarchists, Their Faith and Their Record”, Vizetelly (2016) opens up by asserting that anarchists have undoubtedly existed ever since the world began. From a theological perspective, “The holy instinct of revolt” may perhaps have originated from Adam in the Garden of Eden in his incomparable attempt to break free from the orders of God, is said to be the first anarchist the world has come to know. (Vizetelly , 2016, p.381) However, because it is not clear the existence of hierarchical strata in the prehistoric era, the prehistoric man cannot be said, with potent certainty, that he was an anarchist. With that, it suffices to say that who inaugurated this practice, though considerably earlier by some reckonings, remains hitherto unknown. In the historical era, later on, the philosophies of the horary legends in the historical antiquity such as the Hellenistic philosopher and the founder of stoicism, Zeno of

Citium, Taoist sages such as Lao Tzu in ancient China, are said to be impregnated with anti-authoritarian discourse. Moreover, anarchism is featured exponentially in Greek mythology, in the ever eternal Dionysian and Apollonian elements of life force, the Yin and Yang.

The anarchist historian Daniel Guérins writes that anarchism is “a definite trend in the historic development of mankind” (*Anarchism From Theory To Practice*, 1970, p. 1) tacitly insinuating its ever-existence and that it is man’s default state, equally important in this extrapolation is that it accompanied man ever since he could make sense of this world. Not surprisingly, extending the scope of anarchy would surely account for the division in religions and the numbered sects which ensued as a result, as well as in the realm of politics, with the increase in political factions. Anarchism, in this score, involves embodied practices entrenched within its epistemological notion, whether on an intellectual or a practical level. Remarkable personages figure prominently in the history of ideas, who made an ever-lasting contribution that spawned the seed for popular revolutions to outbreak. Therefore, we seek to include the historical significance of anarchism and, consequently, divert from the course of looking at it solely from the nineteenth-century lens of Russian anarchism and the resounding prejudices which became the de facto discourse that endured for decades, for the sole reason: to downplay self-described conceptions of anarchy lest we impoverish the phenomenon at hand.

Beginning from the classical times, with the dawn of philosophy, came Aristotle and Plato, among other ancient philosophers, to the fore to wrestle with vexing questions even to the modern-day intellectual. They have forced exhaustive questions on human nature, on the notions of good and evil, and anything with a political implication affixed to it. Plato’s stance on democracy was an objection, yet his questioning of the individual self-governing occupies a central position in his literary heritage. Human nature, Plato maintains, is unpredictable and many elements, internal and external, may sink in, and the future is riddled with unexpected circumstances. Plato aptly studied the human mind while following no scientific method or procedure and recognized early on that each man’s search for power and domination comes in installments, which is akin to the highest point in Maslow’s pyramid of need “self-actualization”. This a priori knowledge gave way to a perspectivist and speculative reading which would seal the hypothesis that security breeds limitless wants as opposed to needs. First comes the attainment of the basic needs, and as power grows, so is the individual’s greed. History provides us with ample support for this line of argument. The Archaeologist Brian Hayden investigated how inequality emerged out of egalitarian societies, which helps to demonstrate why the historical narrative progressed as it did.

Admittedly, the quest is more sophisticated than it usually seems. In the preface to his book “*Anarchy: from Theory to Practice*,” Daniel Guerin confesses the difficulty in tracing the outlines of anarchism. (Guerin, p. 22) Yet, what is even harder is not the placement of anarchism along the spectrum of left/right political action or in synthesizing its overall philosophy, but in interrogating from where it emanates, as opposed to tracing back its origin. Because we believe that tracing back the place of origin of human action, such as anarchy, is a basic chicken and egg question. The conflict goes back to earlier philosophical discussions about where knowledge comes from. Is it exclusively empirical or one that necessitates philosophical reflection.

Each time, intellectuals acknowledge that they are implicated in the endeavor of resistance, that is resisting the grand narrative, and each time the perennial problem of representing the Dionysian element resurfaces. And so the question that begs to be asked is: can the epistemic ignorance mediate between the epistemology of oppression and “the epistemology of resistance” which is anchored so centrally by José Medina?

Moreover, there is always the cognitive element there to abort our endeavor with regard to psychological matters. Indoctrination, be it incommensurable, cannot be subject to archaeological, and more less anthropological studies on its own unless it is viewed through the lens of psychology through a series of suggestive questions, which is an abstraction made through examining the significance of symbolism. Thereby, revealing aspects of psychology in studying the human past would inform us a great deal about our subject of inquiry, among other things. Therefore, without it, it would be hard to trace the origins of it from an objective scientific perspective, and this relegates us to the realm of philosophy to concretize the abstraction.

The repetitive use of the term anarchism made it an over-consumed term, this is especially true as the dust of every revolution settles and the aftermath of it is being questioned. Anarchism has been extensively researched in relation to the 2011 Arab Spring, and the 2018 “Les gilets jaunes” in France against the regime of Macron, articulate anti-capitalist discourse against the elite and state power which are considered anarchist movements by some estimates. Articles have been published with regards to its essence, and interviews with self-proclaimed anarchists within those movements have been reported (Vizetelly, 2016.VII) .The recurrent pattern in these associations is the credo that these anarchists' movements adhere to, and the determining factor is in them holding views similar to those acclaimed by anarchists. Yet an often overlooked area is an interrogation about the role the philosophical ideals played, and that of the relationship between anarchism and intellectualism is rarely questioned, if not at all brushed in air.

Although a considerable body of research has addressed this issue, for example in the tenor of anti-intellectualism in Russia’s historically prolonged anarchism, less attention has been paid to the antithesis of it on a large scale: that is the affinity between intellectualism and anarchism. To date, scant attention has been paid to this questionable gap which resulted in assumptions nurturing the antagonistic affair that ties the two. An in-depth analysis of anarchism and the history of ideas is one that would be repetitive and is one that does not fall within the scope of this article.

Despite decades of research on the links established between anarchism and intellectualism. The results have at best been less than satisfactory, and at worse inflammatory. The relationship established between the two yielded more dissimilarities than commonalities. By a de-emphasis on the very word “intellectual” and its semantic variations, intellectualism gained an unfavorable spot in the minds of anarchists and those who envision anarchism without an engagement in its terrain.

In the history of anarchism, the focus has been on pushing intellectuals to the fringes of oblivion, and on wiping out their ideas in favor of a comprehensive model: namely one that is

based on actionable deeds, and on what is known as “propaganda by deed” (The Russian Review , 1989 p.403) , which is to be translated into active engagement and refusal of any mitigated collusion. This unreconciling split has attracted considerable interest. Therefore, an outlooker would see in the split a malevolent adversary, whose underpinnings comprise unsustainable dialogic. This observable dialectic relationship is what informed the title of this paper.

More Recent discussions about the relationship between the two have not entirely eclipsed old ones. Michael Confino (1989) writes that four main objectives have guided recent research on anarchism, of which he stated “are fine analysis of a complex topic riddled with nuances and ambiguities”, as well as “clearing away the cliches emanating from hatreds and infatuations that have always accompanied it”. It follows that in revising the dialogue between anarchism and intellectualism prompts us to take the road less traversed, that of reconciliation. And in thus doing, it is important to demarcate where one ends and the departure of the other one. Of course, this entails interconnectivity.

While the search for the common denominator seems like a naïve and redundant pursuit, it remains nonetheless vital to clear any misconceptions, and when embarking on that, it is vital to briefly define both terms nature Towards a Working Definition . Anarchism is used as a generic term to describe and/or indicate resistance against statehood, state machinery, and institutional oppression. For the most part, we did not experiment with alternative definitions of anarchism besides being anti-authoritarianism. Another definition could be the usurp of power to channel it through collective action against the few, the oligarchical minority. we advance a similar thesis in arguing that Anarchism, though emancipatory in nature, is, in its basic essence, intolerable, and exclusive. Indeed, anarchism is a liberal permutation and a libertarian philosophy par excellence. Insofar as it is considered a critic of the modern state, the dictionary definition implies a rejection of vertical as well as horizontal hierarchies of power. Additionally, anarchism as an -ism is not only rational, as Truncotoa argues, it is rationalist. Because it reflects the lingering influence of predominant universal ideas, it is safe to say that anarchism has an intellectual dimension which in turn has a historical dimension. This is especially true, for the historical record unravels the congruence of political and philosophical thought within the anarchist frame of reference.

Intellectualism, on the other hand, can be defined as mental labor by way of exegetical abstraction, which presupposes that every conceivable sphere of human life is to be put into methodological skepticism. This Cartesian concept which paved the rocky way to modern philosophical thought stipulates the subjection of all knowledge to scrutiny with the goal of sorting out true from false. Philosophies explain the “raison d’etre”, the “why” of things. Intellectualism is the art of “savoir danser avec sa plume”, a metaphor denoting the mastery of the art of writing a priori or posteriori about matters that are obtained from the real world, and in turn correspond to it, which is, in their logic, sufficient to account for the holistic approach to understanding things.

Historically speaking, intellectuals have sought to diagnose the ills of their times, and helped propose supplements. The intelligentsia, which is a prestigious name given to men of letters, or a subset of intellectualism, which wrestles with the most troubling problems of its time, is symbolically associated with authority and occupies a higher position in the hierarchy of

power. Hence, it cannot be denied that there exists a negative connotation that escorts the term “intellect” or “intellectualism” which in turn has repercussions in the realms of objective reality. Therefore, we should point out many lapses in this area before committing ourselves to a final interpretation with regards to this vexed relationship.

Many of us would nod in acceptance to that idea that the primary objective of intellectualism wasn't directed to enter the realm of academia with no intention of escaping its fortified walls, especially when academia was not in vogue in the early days, but to make a palpable contribution that would relieve mankind of its inherent misery and despair.

In his important paper “The Place of Anarchism in The History of Political Thought” (1958) , D. Novak was quick to point out the profound misunderstanding generally associated with the term “anarchism”. Anarchism appears to be defined in what it is not, and this deflects us from the core of its essence. Most scholars and historians seem to agree that the term is shrouded in ambiguity and controversy and is only envisioned on the grounds of ambivalence; however, a conclusive answer seems to be far-reaching as important questions have not abated, despite the continuity of lively animated debates.

Hence, the inconsistency in these definitions signals that a missing piece awaits to be put in its rightful place and that a debate is in the offing, though it is understandable that this discrepancy may point out a languid affair based on the provision of a competitive model for action. That being the case, searching for a label that can set them apart can indeed widen our knowledge on the nature of this adversary relationship. On a visceral level, their definitions could briefly be summed up under two headings. Anarchism as a frame of mind, versus intellectualism as a set of ideas. Of course, this distinction could bear elaboration; however, even with that, there is no denying that the connection between anarchism and political theories runs deep, which may help to forge the link between them. Verily, the chasm will indeed be reduced as we expand the scope of our conceptual knowledge of anarchism.

The links are easily established, one may argue. Throughout human history, intellectuals were always on a crusade against authority and its subservient, even if that meant waking people up to the grim reality and the complete yoke they showed to the authority and authoritative grip. Intellectuals knowing that such an unbreakable tie is not so easily disposed of, that it came at an incremental pace and fashion took a long time to be inoculated in people's minds. This rather empathic tendency is regarded, I should maintain, as the reasonable first step into a relative but not absolute emancipation from voluntary subjugation that the mind deliberately resorts to in hierarchical societies.

Instead, they stressed that freedom is an understanding of the gravity of the situation they are in. Various theories on human nature illuminated what was once obscured, and it provided an understanding of the man's will, on the meaning of life, how we should live life, inter alia. Marxism for one, came as an unprecedented wholesome criticism of capitalism and its medieval form, feudalism, with a methodological scheme on the distribution of justice, burning the bridges behind on further concessions and/or subjugation. However, Descartes's ontological distinction of mind-body dualism may be regarded as a simplified version of representing the abstract and the concrete may be more original in most respects.

An area of tension within the dialectic of anarchism and intellectualism can be gauged by how anarchists respond to the intellectual call. Writers and critics of anarchists make a strong claim that “there are as many anarchisms as there are anarchists”.(Lewis, 21) Certainly, the historical record reveals anarchist cleavage and variations in the philosophical underpinnings of each strand. We now can count as many as four types of anarchism, each of which has its deep roots in the Classical and Enlightenment period. Of course, such a claim is not refutable. Nonetheless, since we are dealing with a relative phenomenon, this lends itself difficult to draw straight lines of genesis. It follows that a question imposes itself on us, that of the convergence and divergence between two rather strictly causal cognates, one is theoretical and the other is practical. And as such, the dispersion cannot be contained in a single argument, that they all emanate from a theoretical basis. However, we notice, like any philosophical idea that leads to action, that there’s an element of convergence to find a solution inherent in the two stances, even if that is going to lead to a radical cut of ties with any form of authority, among those makers of it.

Throughout history, intellectual insurgents have attuned to the issues facing up their time, and demonstrated, almost single-handedly, the potency of the mind in mapping out tacit and explicit flaws ingrained in the governing systems that reigned during their lifetime, while indicating the extent of their gravity through their cognition of “L’esprit humain à travers l’espace et le temps” and what Forgas and Baumeister (2019) mentioned about the imperfection of our knowledge about the world and the inescapability of fully-fledged answers to the questions we raise. This is a form of a revolution halted halfway. But at the same time, this revolution has been diligently carried towards our time in what is known as the platonic credo of philosophical recollection, the idea that we are innate philosophers born with the possession of knowledge and discovering it is contingent upon our realization (a priori). This latter statement offers a basic understanding that even anarchists are thinkers, free thinkers, but it proves to be in direct opposition to the thesis of precedence.

Extinguishing dialogical thinking by scapegoating intellectualism on the basis of some ulterior motive has its bedrock in the anarchist tradition. What this does is that it creates a lopsided advantage, inferring the superiority and inferiority of one over the other, and it cuts short any supposedly extended discussion about various points of this dialectical dilemma, and it adds another interpretative layer to this problem. Both are adamant on alleviating the veil that obscures the machinery of oppression, injustice, and exploitation. The problem springs up once again as reformism and radicalism, in other words, compliance with authority or total break with statehood and its means of institutionalization. The first problem posed to the anarchists is equating the intellectual with authority. Hence, though unstated, they regard it as an infringement on the first creed of anarchism, not least non-authority. Therefore, we find ourselves drawn into the vortex of “who gets to rule- who is the elite- is never over.” (Applebaum, , 2020) Indeed, from this perspective, intellectualism is regarded as the state's claw whereby it exercises condensed control, and this could explain anarchists’ unjustified frustration with intellectualism. Though this particular area remains particularly unclear.

The major issue is that intellectualism appears to be ill-defined, supplying us with a “backdoor” definition of what is an intellectual and perhaps even what is a non-anarchist

individual, ironically discussing it in the language of the intellectual. The intellectual is one who generates and propagates ideas not in favor of advancing anarchist ideology. Therefore, trivializing centuries-long theories that provided them with thought supplies in times of uncertainty is one that generates many question marks. To further the split, Bakunin insisted on a sharp separation between the intellectual and the ordinary man, his favoritism tilted towards the model of the “whole man”, which was later advanced by Kropotkin, above the hierarchical advantage of scientists over workers, where the two factions, so to speak, engage in an integrated education of science and handicrafts, and later in manual and mental labor. Speaking the language of distrust, their rhetoric was contemptuous, and one that did not breed reconciliatory or inclusive tone. French syndicalists made an extreme statement that “nothing can be gained from the political theories of the intellectuals. Ironically, this last statement can be regarded as an intellectual encroachment, of which the terms are unstated and the window of dialog is rather closed. Obliterating and blurring all individual distinctions, where the manual and the mental melt to produce a representative image of the ideal figure, the revolutionary men. Kropotkin and Bakunin were intellectuals themselves, who sufficiently provided the baseline knowledge needed for action. And with this, we are coming full circle in this dialectic. The upshot is that anarchism seems to be crumbled from within, and this is largely due to the fact that it is ill-defined. Keeping intellectuals at bay seems a recipe for disaster. Therefore, eroding it from within would descend it into crisis. But until we begin to ask different questions, we should acknowledge at a meta-level that the relationship between anarchy and intellectualism is implicitly collaborative. The question that begs to be asked is from whence came this seemingly discordant belief with intellectualism? Is it a unanimous form of dissonance?

## **2. Intellectualism: from Theory to Practice and From Practice to Theory**

In some cases, the quest for separation yields more resemblances and parallels which proves to be more significant than it initially seems. History seems, with hindsight, to be offering overarching explanations and lends itself for revision and rectification. The history of ideas seems a good starting point in bringing to light the false genealogy of anarchism, which is purported to emanate from the people’s will without crediting the tenets from which it sprung to life.

In so far as our understanding permits, what is known about anarchism is largely based on what it opposes. The reception of anarchism in the popular imagination is clouded with misconceptions and uninformed judgment reflects and for a reason. Anarchism is premised upon antagonism with authority, on people's general willingness to exorcize their frustration against all forms of centralized governing. Anarchism seems to offer answers to insoluble problems; however, the main weakness in this worldview is that it does not offer any explanation for what it includes, and demonstrates only what it eclipses. There is this difficulty in delineating the contours of its borders, for it conceptually limits our ways of thinking about alternatives. The explanation would be penetrable if it established parallel lines of rapport and harmony with the realm of intellectualism.

Considering anarchism as divided along historical lines existing along a continuum, historians were able to identify different strands of it. From Pre-anarchism and classical anarchism (the 1860s to 1940s), to postanarchism where, in the words of Carl Levy (2010) “Anarchism was no

longer a revolutionary object but a series of provocative reformist acts” (Levy, 2010, p.7) , thereby coming to the starting point. Spinoza settled on the idea that every thinking has a logical necessity. Following this line of reasoning, it seems, almost retrospectively, that the recurrent pattern within the anarchist circle reflects a dominant preoccupation with the questions long posed by intellectuals, and by extension, it reflects the lingering influence of European Classical and Enlightenment ideals, as well as Eastern wisdom, to state but two widely recognized tranches of thinking from the historical record of the ideas.

In “the heyday of anarchism as a global movement” which coincides with the dissemination and reception of anarchism from the 1880s to 1914, Levy was quick to point out anarchism as a pursuit of the intellectual discussions which took place in the arena of philosophy and political science and later developed. He states, “Anarchism is the cumulative reworking of Rousseau, Comte, and Hegel through the lenses of Godwin, Proudhon, Bakunin, and Kropotkin”, and that it is unfathomable “without [...] the enlightenment” (Levy, 2010, p.8) . This acute observation indicates the Spanish recycling of original ideas and putting them into practice is at the core of the anarchism tradition. Moreover, tacit in this confession is the belief that anarchism, like its predecessors, is a reformist approach, despite the chaos and the exclusion of “benign” forms of reforms it vehemently jettisons. Levy further adds, “thus anarchists active in social movements in the classical phase were in theory philosophical anarchists” (Levy, 2010, p.8). In fact, one is led to believe that it’s rather the action that is aimed at ushering in an objective, rather than moving from first principles -that is having first principles at the back of their head while doing their deed-, it follows that “anarchists of the Spanish war were not primitive, unguided rebels but their actions were steeped in the socialist intellectual debate of the late nineteenth century.” (Levy, 2010, p.8)

Anarchism, in a sense, presented a late philosophy that repudiated earlier ones. With relation to other comparable models, anarchism took refuge in the inner sanctum of Machiavellian preponderance. There is a corollary to this view. Because they are dynamic, revolutions are inherently deductive, that is a deduction from a system of thought, without which it would be bereft of a sturdy and durable basis, and would not leave a substantial and enduring legacy. The instances of such a claim are readily available in the pillars of western civilization, whose works are derivative of Classical antiquity and Eastern wisdom, who devoted their lives in search of the Holy Grail. In men and women of the caliber of The father of liberalism, John Locke, the economist, Karl Marx, connects with a passage in Levy’s work and other historians, who themselves created revolutions that categorically changed history, add to that the fact that their works chart with succinct details mitigated forms of anarchism.

In arguing for the preceding point, anarchists forfeit the pillar upon which the edifice of anarchism has been built, while decidedly dismissing the building blocks of the theories taken and implemented. In this sense, we can say that it is true that anarchy is and has always been winning in the wager of execution, but what is important is its failure to carry out its duty in the post-revolutionary phase, thereby showing the complexity of the entanglement of what intellectuals cautioned us against, i.e., real- world intricacies. History provides us with ample evidence where anarchists found themselves entrapped in what intellectuals feared the most, and what history witnessed, brilliantly depicted in George Orwell’s “The Animal farm”, that is the ascendance of a new oligarchy betraying its foundational oaths. Thus the retreat from



the principal demands exposes the flaws of anarchism and relegates it to scrutiny, to corrective measures made by yet another intellectual, enchained to it in an ever unbreakable chain.

In the history of political philosophy, two opposing views reign. The first is the consensual hypothesis laid out by enlightenment figures who made affirmative statements about the fundamental equality of humans, that all men are born equal. Later, prominent economists like Marx, Engels and, John Stuart Mill prolonged this theory, and their studies led them to place humans on an equal footing and balance the hierarchical strata -momentarily-, yet perhaps the realization of social inequality is what prompted and what has perhaps given way to their theories on institutionalized hierarchy. Second, theorists such as Auguste Comte provided an alternative view in dismissing the first theory by stressing that equality is racially determined. To this very day, the topic of equality and inequality is still stirring debates in the humanities.

For a set of political ideas to inspire social upheavals and revolutionary endeavors, it does not necessarily have to be radical. All theorists of putatively greater stature helped mold the concept of anarchism in their own way. Anarchism is, thus, a “participatory conception”, a democratic instrument that falls under the process of collective perception where all the actors are considered experts. A marginal thesis to this paper that serves as a common thread in the reading of the history of anarchism is in the form of a hypothesis, which suggests that anarchism has been practiced in various guises with varying degrees, and this amorphous state has been culminated due to the impracticality of the derivative models of abstraction. Therefore, we are in need of a revised narrative that acknowledges anarchist's indebtedness to intellectual thoughts that reigned during its early phases of the inception of anarchism as a political theory.

One must admit that speaking about abstract anarchism or the concrete application thereof often invoke concepts that have a parallel in the history of ideas, from Plato's suspicion of democracy in the classical period to its comparatively neo-democracy, and neoliberalism version. “and the speedy commencement of the great social liquidation.” (Le Bon, 2001, p.117) The Enlightenment, Spurring the Cartesian skepticism, and the Hegelian idealism continuum, whose teachings echo to this day, make us question the precedence. The issue of linguistic representation comes into play too, but which regrettably will not be explored at depth.

At face value, with an objective outlook, looking at it from this angle, anti-intellectual discourses and movements can never satisfy the most basic question about the relational definition of the intellectual revolutionary upheaval. Not to mention that it would impoverish our understanding of anarchy, and anarchism from this perspective would, to a great extent, be empty of its own content. For there is no such a thing as complete independence from theory; which seems to confirm the idea that intellectualism provides the foundation of critical thinking; some even argue that a life not examined is not worth living, chief among them is the French philosopher Paul Ricoeur, with that being said, any free thinker would agree up to a certain point with this worldview. Thus, intellectualism is not obsolete and can never be obsolete. Ivan Stenski (2010) maintains, “Concepts are things to be used to grapple with the

world, and not just abstract objects of critical contemplation” ( Stenski , 2010) In other words, it is a means to an end, and not an end in itself.

In this sense, the ubiquity of theory keeps haunting anarchy. By rationalizing suffering, and reducing the chasm between the known and the unknown (the unexplored territory), intellectuals sought to get their grip on some of the means available to alleviate it. It is a contract which prescribes for its signatories that an idea is considered a form of intellectualism, and likewise, any intellectual pursuit pours in the rivers of action, though it may not always lead to it. It is an acknowledged truism that resistance can be done with the readily accessible weapons. To each their own as it is known. We have for so long considered the quill to be a weapon and especially a weapon that is deployed in resistance. This is the mission of the intellectual as is previously mentioned, whose ultimate quest is to elevate ignorance and add a great deal of awareness to the masses’ already built-in system of differentiation between “good and evil”. Thus rendering the human subject highly vigilant.

All the preceding arguments laid forth an important question: How did we come to this state of collective amnesia? The way anarchism is regarded in everyday language and in the academic world does not differ much with regards to its anti-intellectualism stance which has a conceptual and empirical incoherence, which leans heavily on objective positivism while negating the value of the intellectual capital in a rather subjective positivist area. In this sense, our use of the term anarchy is replete with unexamined assumptions. Therefore, saying that anarchism has an inherently concealed complexity is self-evident, and so we became heir to a form of tangled thinking which is reductionist to a great extent. Russian anarchists’ investment in his view drew an avalanche of supporting crowds, which brought about a tacit agreement within intellectuals themselves. This is being played out in academia where the rhetoric of social justice narratives crushed intellectuals with an iron hand.

Academia, which is the stronghold of examination gives ample testimony to the claim that anarchism grows organically from the people’s will, that it stands independently from the condition which offers the basic ground to produce and nourish it. This last point highlights the argument that even academicians joined parole with the public in calling intellectuals out on the entrenched privilege they possess and are complacent in criticizing them on the grounds of disparaging the linguistic expression because it is not considered laborious manual work and that saying something like anarchy is imbued with the esoteric ideals (which is synonymous with the intellectuals’ rendering of reality) is something of an infringement on Rousseau’s concept of “the General Will”. however, nothing could be further from the truth.

It is in this fashion that preposterous anti-intellectualism made its way into common parlance. The issue with questioning this sacrosanct is that it prompts us to reconsider the conventional wisdom and the weight that this relationship has in people’s minds. The proclivity towards dispensing with intellectuals is an instance of Bakunin’s ad hominem and anarchists’ character assassination which lead them to thwart the rule of the intellectual over the people. The idea that full autonomy should be the corollary to the waning of the element of intellectual capital offers a diversion from the real issue and strikes us as virtually untenable. To do so is to join in with the Socratic Paradoxes that revolution is based on uninformed opinion, or that it has no underpinnings in the philosophical realm and is irrational. Indeed, such a fallacy merits revision. This connects with a passage in Raymond Heberski’s (2018)

original book “American Labyrinth: Intellectual History for Complicated Times”, where he argues about the relevance and importance of intellectual history to public life in the U.S. In it, he provided the argument by analogy that “the size of the enemy’s army is not as important as the enemy’s philosophy.” (Haberski, 55) By considering intellectualism as indispensable and as a provider of necessities and amenities is key to understanding any form of revolution.

It is well known that intellectuals, throughout the history of time, produced ideas that ran counter to the conventional ideas in their time, ideas that have in their tenor contour the ruling of the oligarchy, in all its various forms, shapes, and appellations. This can only be considered as a rebellious detour. It goes without saying that this generalization surely contains flawed reasoning, for there were always servants to the sovereign's cause, but the books which made their way to us prompts us to ask the following question: To what extent did their echoing voices comply with the conventions of their time? This is a question whose answer is aimed at breaking away the adamance that is purported to be deeply inherent in it and to give full credit to them.

In 1901, Ferdinand Pelloutier declared that all systems of ideas came from a class of intellectuals who “have sought the remedies for our ills in their own ideas, burning the midnight oil instead of looking at our needs and at reality” (Lorwin p.18) . Intellectuals were, in his estimation, a double-edged sword which was testified in his claim that bears both an appreciation and an accusation. Under unrealistic assumptions, intellectualism had inexplicably been excluded from the general discourse of anarchists, and some anarchists go as far as to demonize them. “Nothing could be gained from the political theories of intellectuals” as Bakunin believes. The ad hominem personalized arguments made such attacks groundless and underscored the relentless efforts of propagandists to wipe out an entire vision anchored so centrally to many strands of anarchy. And the dictionary definition of the concept of “anarchy” which is always framed within an appropriate context, and under one rubric, “the absence of law, and “the state of lawlessness” is a testimonial to this vision, which is based on uninformed opinion at best, and is propaganda laden at worst. Therefore, it is fair to say that the historical constancy of the meaning held with it an unrightful hostility as was propagated by esteemed anarchists who antagonized intellectuals and their tiers, but rarely drew attention to the assaults or condemned acts of terrorism made by terrorists.

Such a parochial perspective about anarchy and anarchism circles around the idea of the dire need to thwart the revolutionary’s desire to connect to the thoughts behind the rebellious mindset, stressing that the two spin in opposing directions, and the confluence is in itself a conspiracy against anarchism. It remains important to trace the roots of this antagonistic relationship. Intellectualism is frowned upon from its position of assumed moral superiority, and the formative role it played has been negated. In these assembled examples, the ubiquity of theory keeps haunting, and, with the benefit of hindsight, anarchism appears as a more complex phenomenon than the merely simplified version of it. Could this antagonism be attributable to what Jean-paul Sartre said about the intellectual in that “L'intellectuel est quelqu'un qui se mêle de ce qui ne le regarde pas.”

A marginal thesis of this paper is to trace back the origins of the conflict, therefore, the relationship between both will be revealed in due time. The conflict, I believe, goes back to an earlier philosophical discussion about where knowledge comes from: is it necessary or

contingent? Which is more viable and credential: a priori or posteriori knowledge? Elaborating on such interesting questions is one that would be out of the scope of this paper, but asking those questions would undoubtedly enrich us with decisive answers as regards this present dialectic. Transiently, one would argue that the relationship with both should be historical empiricism rather than a priori. Indeed, the historical record is full of evidence in favor of this worldview, but we lean towards a peripheral approach to examining anarchy, namely that it is a priori knowledge made comprehensible by intellectual apparatus. To a great extent, questioning what the lens of reductionism might lead us to obscure is a nuanced version of approaching the affinity between anarchism and intellectualism. Reductionism deflects us from seeing with clarity the overdependence of the former on the latter, and it is not hyperbolic to say that it gives us an argumentative leeway to the advantage of reconciling them.

One of the chronic issues we stumble upon in the twentieth-century notion of polarization. Polarization is, without a shadow of a doubt, easily achieved through the lumping together of two similar, yet opposing views. Polarization is thus anchored on the shifting factors, while the constant elements remain as magnets to draw the connection. Thus giving the past a stranglehold on the future. This is what we are currently seeing at play in the social and political arena. Nowadays, polarization is invoked to keep the lid on the historical diversity and to shun away from digging into the heart of the matter. Follow the same direction of the strict undesirability of the “us” vs. “them”, and to iterate the biblical verse "Whoever is not with Me is against Me, and whoever does not gather with Me scatters" (Matthew 12:30), justifiably altered and used by George Bush, who, in the events of 9/11 stressed that “you are either with us or against us”.

Needless to say, there are weak grounds for assuming an outright rejection of intellectualism by anarchists. Russian staunch anarchists such as Bakunin and Kropotkin made irreversible vitriolic criticism on intellectuals. Russian anarchism compromised, to a large extent, the “absolute freedom” and resorted to deliberately eschewing anything with relation to the hierarchical strata, that includes the intelligentsia. Paul Averich (1959) writes, “The anarchists, rejecting the notion that society is governed by rational laws, maintained that so-called "scientific" theories of history and sociology were artificial contrivances of the human brain which served only to impede the natural and spontaneous impulses of mankind.” Therefore, as the aforementioned statement, anarchists are holding positivism at high esteem came at the cost of the attack on intuitive or introspective knowledge.

Deeply centered in this discussion is the legacy of intellectual thought which, we argue once again, has been foundational with every inception of every revolution with anarchist tendencies and characteristics. Each time, intellectuals acknowledge that they are implicated in the endeavor of resistance. That they are resisting the grand narrative, and each time proves to be a decisive time to be working out the perennial interplay of the Dionysian and Apollonian elements and the representation thereof resurface. Hence, the bottom line should be narrowed down to what intellectuals seek to do rather than to understand, though I mildly object to this point. At face value, their duty solely rests on numbing the Dionysian element so centrally anchored in day-to-day life and retracing its origins back to from where it

emanates, and what side is pumping life in its veins, and what are its apparatus. This identification of the defect infiltrates a great body of the blocks they report.

Intellectuals, in making the issues intelligible, through analytical lenses have allowed the issue to escape the language of silence and helped in relocating the ground of action from the abstract sphere to real life. The 18th century sought the man of letters questioning the hierarchical conundrum and dismantling it. In his legendary book “The Social Contract”, Jean Jacque Rousseau concluded that “L’homme est née libre, et partout il est dans les fers”. His legacy was carried in the subsequent centuries and is flourishing in the humanities and social sciences of present-day academic institutions. From these facts, one may conclude that intellectuals knew how to decode incognito terrains, and Anarchists did not find such suggestions are hard to encrypt in reality. It suffices to say, at this point, that intellectualism is needed to keep the wheels of anarchism turning. Surely, anarchism gains more currency with every resurgence of revolution, and what makes it sustainable is the fact that it is grounded in theory, which in turn came as a result of an outright frustration with statehood. Here lies the visible link, in it being an extension of theoretical claims, a more concrete replica. However, this does not settle the issue, as more questions continue to lurk in the discussion, particularly the issue of radicalism and reformism Taking refuge in action.

A lopsided antagonism makes such questions hardly surface. Until recently, the Russian anarchist movement has featured veneered anarchists, whose names are engraved in history books. If anything, this demonstrates that such compliance rests partially, if not entirely on the pillar of intellectualism. Therefore, the relationship between the two should be investigated rather than ruled out of court. It is not a matter of nature but of attuned preference. Trivializing their theories, which provided them with thought supplies discredits the unspoken shared responsibility between “l’homme de lettres” and the performer of action. These views hold in common the underlying premise of a wrong taxonomy. Categorizing all intellectual practice under the same tag as what one may call “Intellectual eugenics” is a fatally impaired judgment, and the character assassination of intellectuals by classical anarchists is an even more grave deed. Surely, the common denominator between the good and the wicked, so to speak, types of intellectuals is in their functionality, in what they bring to the table, namely charting conceptual maps, providing solutions. there is the wicked type of intellectuals. Hence, forging the wrong links creates uncoveted entanglements and encroachment.

The tendentious reading of history eliminates a central player, perhaps even an arbiter and usurps the narrative of change to a single referential body under the pretense that it encirculates and shrouds the epistemic foundation and cements it with indispensable action which will bring about absolute change to the human condition, and may with “mutual aid” wipe out forms of injustice, inequality, uneven distribution of power and supplement it with the enigmatic factor of cooperative effort; all these will have contributed to an outright widespread neglect of a non-materialistic class, whose ultimate quest is, by definition, to elevate ignorance and add a great deal to the masses’ awareness. All that can be presented here are lines of theoretical argument. However, the anarchist’s frame of reference was fashioned by people like Marx and Engels, and this is perhaps why Communist anarchism is the only anarchism that echoes to this day. Building on the reconstruction and recycling of

past ideas anarchism appears to be the culmination of canonical theses put forward by people we consider as intellectuals by modern-day standards as well as by the standards of their time.

The argument that anarchism may, by necessity contain a certain amount of intellectualism as the spur and the incentive that keeps pushing the wheels of revolutionary execution have been approached from another angle. To move beyond the aforementioned de facto polarity is to cease to defer a discussion about their confluence, and to only stress on their perpetual antagonism yields very little to understanding both sides. It is not an understatement to say that they are two sides of the same coin, especially. This line of reasoning culminates in viewing intellectuals as preachers of action, such as grand Russian anarchists, in rendering their supporters vigilant of their own cause. Intellectualism served as an incubator in which the seeds of anarchism germinated, and it has had, and this relationship continues to have an irreversible impact on anarchism in at least two ways. First, we can count the provision with which it replenishes the stock of anarchism with an indispensable asset, i.e. the intellectual capital, and from a historical perspective, the philosophical Recollection, and how it is the sum total of this intangible propriety. Second, it carries the duality of action, which is not a zero-sum game in any way, unless it is conceived of as such by an insular outlook of the anarchist. Indeed, these elements are not superficial but central to all we seek to understand.

“By contrast, Kinna argues we should understand the theory of mutual aid in the context of political action and rhetoric. It is a theory to motivate anarchist action.” (Frazer , 2016, p.8) Herein we find that the ubiquity of theory keeps haunting. However, this is hardly an original claim. Elizabeth Frazer and Kimberly Hutchings wrote on Proudhon’s view on violent anarchism with “aversion”, and resorted to “appropriating him into the category of ‘utopian’ thinkers, in contrast to Marxist realism”. Parallels of such claims continue to lurk in the discussion with Kropotkin, Tolstoy and the examples thereof can be multiplied endlessly. Anarchism as an ideology of resistance featured grand names such as Mikhail Bakunin (1814–1876), Leo Tolstoy (1828– 1910), and Peter Kropotkin (1842–1921) who received aristocratic education, and “They all dramatically dissented from their social inheritance”. During the 19th and 20th centuries, the thought of anarchism of Tolstoy, Kropotkin, and Bakunin would conjure up scenes of violence (Frazer et al. 2016), the actual state of fact couldn’t be further from the truth. Circumstantial nature of anarchy allowed for violence as efficacious only when non-violence proved to be ineffective. Though this is not germane to our theme, like anarchists, these classical anarchist thinkers were vehemently anti-hierarchy and anti-authoritarianism. They were concerned about power structures, relations of domination, the arbitrariness of authority, the sustainability of hierarchies. In other words, their conceptual window accounted for the local and the universal, proving a priori the universality of the human mind, as well as the universality of the human condition, and the inescapability from the harshness of the material world, and offered an antidote to it in what we call “anarchy”.

The foundational and post foundational philosophies aimed at a “profound destabilization” of authoritative “cognitive boundaries and frameworks” in challenging the hitherto loud universalizing tendencies and “meta-narratives” of their era, arguing that the ideal reason will triumph is to a great extent akin to the actionable deeds of anarchists. Intellectuals, whose talks and writings sparked the need for a model for democracy, which cannot be

underestimated now that it has been misused, have guaranteed, at least on paper, the transition from oppressive authoritarian to a form of governing of the people, by the people, and for the people. The anarchists' aims and means are equipollent when the means are bounced back to what they cause. There is no epistemological insulator between the means and the coveted end. It is of vital importance to broach a topic we have for so long been avoiding at all costs. It is very observable the rallying around the flag of emancipation, and of emancipating men from all forms of subjugation as the equalizer element in this equation.

Between theory and action, we notice that the two share what is known in linguistics as "mutual intelligibility" as the single thread attached to both parties. Furthermore, the recourse to classify intellectualism as receptively elitist is morally defensible. From the above points, it suffices to say that from the above points, a new requirement is needed to get the gist of anarchy, and that is a reading of history, not what reputative figures utter. An important aspect that is potently made clear through the previous arguments is that anarchy undeniably harbors the seeds of the intellectual capital. One could only rationalize that these fallacious associations are attributable to canned answers, once again, uninformed or propagandists' discourses reinforced in the echo chamber of academia.

### **3. Domesticating Anarchy**

All the preceding arguments laid forth an initial remark purported by Bert Altena in her account of "Anarchism as a Social Movement, 1870–1940" (2016) Who readily identified Anarchism as being characterized by two patterns, those of appearance and disappearance which coincide with moments of decline and resurgence; however, the determining factors that cause and undo it depends on the strength or the fragility of the soil that is built upon, which will either sustain or cause it to collapse. In so doing, we may risk descending into false genealogy. Nonetheless, one should accept that in escaping categorization, we may not be able to carry out our discussion. Equally relevant to the issue is the question of taxonomy. Bert Altena (2016) pointed out two areas of contentions pithing anarchism and social theory. Not surprisingly, the issue about whether anarchism can be called a social movement and what theories of social movement can be called anarchist theories was brought to the fore. In which case, the disavowal rests on the extent to which the inherent tolerance level in partaking and absorbing the delimitations of extremism of the other, i.e., anarchism and social theory wrought by anarchy and social movements in their variations.

However, a consensual understanding of anarchy is that all its elements factor in the fabric of social movements, if we take them all, the equivalent would be resistance. If social movements are uprooted from the theories that generated them, then what this attests to is that even the generic form of anarchism has its roots in theory. To reason by analogy would be to a drop in the sea of conscious awareness which is at the core of social movements for change. The second line of argument is that philosophers found their catharsis in action. Therefore, pursuing the previous line of argument would yield a resounding failure in terms of the compatibility with the values of enlightenment. Jean Jacques Rousseau, whose understanding of anarchy, seems to offer a baseline for understanding the zeitgeist of anarchism within the matrix of his epoch. For him, anarchy as an aspect of a wider and more complex resolution sustained a similar thesis in making a strong case for the "General Will" as being unalterable

and beneficial even when it is corrupted or injured. Thus, taking the will of people, though collectively, as indispensable, though it can be charged for being overly descriptive.

A tendentious reading of social theories or their play in the context of history casts a pall on the interplay between an action and its ensuing consequences. Unveiling it reveals a serious degree of causative dependency. This is merely an extension of Newton's third law of physics but history itself bears the brunt of such an affixed law. One can agree up to a certain point with the fact that this homologation provides an easy way out from this theoretical impasse, in the sense that we would cease to interrogate concepts or make anarchy and intellectualism a basic chicken and egg situation. That seems to offer a baseline for understanding these intricacies.

With the receding of postural rebellion remains the intellectuals' residue deeply engraved to testify and to reveal the cornerstone upon which anarchy has been set. As far as anti-intellectualism is concerned, no one has played a greater role in this than Michael Bakunin who wanted to create the world in his own image "No theory, no ready-made system, no book that has ever been written will save the world," herein resides a philosophy which is hinged on a stinging critique of intellectuals, and an outcry of the apotheosis of Reason. A vision of a future society where all individual distinctions are blurred and obliterated, where the manual and the mental thawed to produce a representative image of the ideal figure, the revolutionary man. Kropotkin and Bakunin were intellectuals themselves, an intellectual feature that should not go amiss. So we see that not just non-anarchist intellectuals who recognize the obligation of a vision and the discourse that goes in its articulation, but all staunch anarchist figures. This discursive narrowness dilutes intellectual participation in acts of resistance and it leads us to ask what the explanation made in reductionist terms may lead us to obscure, neglect, or marginalize.

This last observation highlights an important fact, that is the downplaying of intellectuals as the conventional authority and integrating them with the larger crowds of commoners. The oft-unquestioned anti-intellectualism stance of Kropotkin is taken at face value without proper examination of his valence in the hierarchy of anarchism, as well as his role in exercising his enviable entrenched privilege, especially when considering him to spur from an aristocratic class, muzzling intellectuals from occupying the central stage in public life, while his ideas, in essence, retaining many signs of libertarian ideas in their sermons, reflecting the lingering influence of predominant Western ideas. It is in this spirit that we should approach the theoretical gap. Reviving the language of marxism, especially when viewed from the perspective of precedence as far as the idea of emancipation and "disguised slavery" or "salaried slavery", spanning concerns such as elevating the economic struggle are concerned. Indeed, what Marxists vouch for can lend a valuable perspective to understanding anarchism and intellectualism. Thereby, bracketing Bukunin, Kropotkin with the wave of intellectual revolution which coincided with social revolution and was aligned with what Rousseau calls "the general will". Along these lines, anarchism comes closer to common grounds with intellectualism, and the distinction between them can be slippery. Although there is little supporting evidence to show that this had some basis of fact, it is difficult to avoid the impression that anarchism is now part of the Marxist landscape.



This argument is clearly tenable. The social revolution, Paul Averich stresses, was what Marx advocated, is in turn the anarchist's dream.( Avrigh, 1966, p.84) In this light, anarchy is penetrable only through access to Marxist ideas. This might be a false genealogy; however, an important question persists: Could it be possible to say that the communist manifesto is the anarchists' Bible?

Categorizing all intellectual practice under the same tag as what one may call "Intellectual eugenics" is a fatally impaired judgment. Surely, the common denominator between the good and the wicked, so to speak, types of intellectuals is in their functionality, in what they bring to the table, namely in charting conceptual maps, and in providing solutions. Certainly, there is the wicked type of intellectuals as there are lethal outlaws. Again, everything is to exist within a spectrum (to avoid the word "hierarchy"). Anarchy may, by necessity contain a certain amount of intellectualism as the spur and the incentive that keeps pushing the wheels of revolutionary execution as Altena aptly proposed to be identified and defined as networks as the "skeleton" of a movement. Though this is a non-anatomical description, added to that the transnational dimension which networks give to movements, and particularly the movement under our scrutiny, it remains unscalable the fact that it falls under the lens of political philosophy. The growing frustration of anarchists and the violence that ensues following their incapacity to solve the myriad social problems. "Hence, where basic mechanisms for the realization of human rights have not been established, people's right of combat would be activated." (Forman, 2005, pp. 2-8) This truism gives place to anarchy as a branch of socialism, anarchism wrestles with humanitarian causes, and the principles derived from it are embedded in it. Its kinship with socialism, Novak maintains, aids in exploring both its relative strength in the second half of the nineteenth century and its decline in the twentieth century. In other words, it is concomitant to it. Another evidence for their interconnectivity is that both grapple with notions of 'the new society', means of production and distribution, in what is generally referred to as "anarchist communism".

"Bakunin left a legacy of a libertarian brand of socialism "which provides an alternative vision to the bankrupt authoritarian socialism of the twentieth century". Bakunin follows in the path of Engels whose idea about rebellion was eloquently put, "to hold out the promise of redemption, the redemption that would come not as a result of rebellion. (Himmelfarb, 1991, pp.109-117) But in the very act of rebellion" still finds its way in today's world: "The impulse to rebel was the saving grace, the one glimmer of humanity in an otherwise dehumanized race."

An unexamined assumption bringing forth a moot point that is tacitly dominating this paper is that if the revolution is the means to engage in political conflict, then can anarchy really be apolitical? Because an intrinsic part of anarchism which has been passed into common parlance is that it is apolitical. Yet in light of what we know, resistance and revolution have an important political aspect to it. In this sense, anarchism risks being called utopian. This is not an original claim. Historians have conceded in drawing attention to the utopian element in it being emblematic of the anarchist thought. An important aspect of anarchy is Durkheim's notion of endemic violence, which he described as "an expression of transitional threshold states of society" inadvertently equates anarchy with novel ideas, in the sense that a new idea can also be defined as such. As a trend away from violence and terrorism, anarchy found

acceptance by the revolters and was no longer seen to be a derogatory-laden word or to denote discord, but rather the opposition to power based on humanitarian precepts.

Other precepts of anarchism, such as those of transcendent anarchism depend on the substitution of the law of men by The Law of God, which is the religious anarchism advocated by Tolstoy. Puritanism and the early settlements of colonies in America bear a strong resemblance to individualist anarchism as well as religious anarchism in their attempt to establish a ‘City upon a Hill’ which shaped American social and political life. Indeed, this found acceptance by the founding fathers who championed individualistic values. By and large, other forms of anarchism find a parallel in immigration, and exodus towards a foreign land as perhaps one of the most extreme forms of peaceful anarchism. Pursuing the further, anarchism in its totality can be understood as the satisfaction of the primitive consciousness of people, and as though it means the canceling of every authority and an impending inauguration of the big social revolution which takes place in the immediate vicinity or naively exporting the imported principles and establishing a society based on those very principles. Anarchism and intellectualism are the fine lines between revolution and resistance.

The rejection of the state is not the only common feature in the anarchist trends. This is not a novel claim by any measure. D. Novak asserts that apart from the rejection of authority, what unites them is the pursuit in the mission of emancipating the individual from the grips of ignorance that lead to his enslavement. And the state appears to exercise that with the use of a fully-fledged apparatus, or what Adam Smith calls “the invisible hand” to annihilate his autonomy, freedom, leading to the denial and condemnation of any authority which hinders him from achieving his freedom and full development. However, anarchism has a lot of leeway in terms of how to set out executionist actions. It found expression in Kropotkin’s mutual aid, Tolstoy’s non-violence, and pacifism, and Bakunin’s cooperative collective political efforts. Kropotkin’s mutual aid is teaching high ethical standards as a part and parcel of anarchist revolutionary theory and action. He also envisions the society of the future as integrating rural and urban life, “cultivating both the individual’s manual and mental skills” This correlation of the Newtonian of action and counter-action signals the dependence of individual actors on well-founded ideas from which they derive its element of power. Intellectualization finds expression and an outlet in the actualization of its most stressed resolutions. This is where anarchists derive the most basic cardinal principles of the anarchist ideology, what I would call “taming anarchy”.

#### **4. Conclusion**

The conclusion of these compressed arguments is that anarchy comes closer to grounds with intellectualism, despite the fact that its practitioners seem to exercise undue stricture on intellectuals and its miscellaneous theories. An important retainment from this paper is that, just like in the intellectual arena, anarchism itself finds many competing answers: anarcho-individualism, anarcho-communism, and religious and moral anarchism. One could safely say that they are cognates in terms of the unifying ideas that underlie them. Therefore, saying otherwise would offer no leeway for rational argument, and would abort all effort to bring into fruition a conciliatory tone. To move away from centrifugal opposition to affinities and kinship, we should aim for revamped ways of seeing the anarchy/intellectualism relationship.

In some respects, it is to be considered a symbiotic relationship, one that is based on a muted filiation, which ought to be redefined accordingly.

### **Bibliography**

- Applebaum, Anne.( 2020) *Twilight of Democracy: the Seductive Lure of the Authoritarian State*. Signal.
- Avrich, Paul.( 1966) “Anarchism and Anti-Intellectualism in Russia.”
- *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 27, no. 3.
- Avrich, Paul. (1970 ) “The Legacy of Bakunin.” *Russian Review*, vol. 29, no. 2 .
- Forgas, J. P., & Baumeister, R. (2019) *The social psychology of gullibility: Conspiracy theories, fake news and irrational beliefs*. Routledge.
- Fortman, Bas De Gaay. (2005) “Violence among Peoples in the Light of Human Frustration and Aggression.” *European Journal of Pharmacology*, vol. 526, no. 1-3.
- Frazer, Elizabeth, and Kimberly Hutchings(2016)“Anarchist Ambivalence: Politics and Violence in the Thought of Bakunin, Tolstoy and Kropotkin.” *European Journal of Political Theory*, vol. 18, no. 2, , pp. 259–280.
- Guérin, D., Chomsky, N. and Klopfer, M., n.d. *Anarchism ( 1970) From Theory To Practice*. New York: Monthly Review Press,
- Haberski, R. and Hartman, A., (2018) *American Labyrinth*. Hayden, B., (2013). *Naissance De L'inégalité*. Paris: CNRS.
- Himmelfarb, G., (1991). *Engels in Manchester: Inventing the Proletariat, Western Civilization, Vol. 2*. pp.109-117.
- LeBon, G., (2001) *The Crowd. A Study Of The Popular Mind*. Dover Publications.
- Levy, C., (2010) *Social Histories of Anarchism*. *Journal for the Study of Radicalism*, vol. 4, no. 2.
- Lorwin, V., n.d. *Reflections On The History Of The French And American Labor Movements*.
- Strenski, I., (2010) *Why Politics Can't Be Freed From Religion*. Chichester, U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Vizetelly, E., (2016) *The Anarchists, Their Faith And Their Record, Including Sidelights On The Royal And Other Personages Who Have Been Assassinated ; With Six Illustrations*. London: John Lane, The Bodley Head.
- Vizetelly, E., (1972) *The Anarchists*. New York: Kraus Reprint.
- Waterlow, S., (1912) *Book Review:The Anarchists, Their Faith and Their Record*. E. A. Vizetelly. *The Russian Review*, vol. 23, no.1, pp.403-412.