



NON-ANARCHIST ANARCHISMS AND ANARCHISMS OF NON-ANARCHIST ORIGIN IN CONTEMPORARY POLITICAL THOUGHT

NIEANARCHISTYCZNE ANARCHIZMY I ANARCHIZMY
POCHODZENIA NIEANARCHISTYCZNEGO WE
WSPÓŁCZESNEJ MYŚLI POLITYCZNEJ

*Paweł Malendowicz** 

— ABSTRACT —

In contemporary political thought there are currents that have references to the term ‘anarchism’ in their names. These are: anarcho-primitivism, anarcho-transhumanism, and crypto-anarchism. The author formulated a hypothesis according to which the mentioned currents of political thought are currents of anarchism in so far as the idea of freedom is a primary value in them, and they are not currents of anarchism if freedom is treated in them as a consequence of the primordality of other values or as a consequence of the processes of transformations taking place in the modern world and in the past. In order to verify this hypothesis, the author used the analysis of source texts, which made it possible to identify the analysed currents of political thought in the context of validity, superiority or inferiority of the idea of freedom in them, as well as the premises of its presence in these currents.

— ABSTRAKT —

We współczesnej myśli politycznej istnieją nurty, które w swoich nazwach mają odniesienia do nazwy „anarchizm”. Są to: anarcho-prymitywizm, anarcho-transhumanizm i kryptoanarchizm. Nie ma jednak zgodności, czy są to nurty anarchizmu czy też nie. Dlatego autor podjął się ich analizy. Sformułował hipotezę, zgodnie z którą wymienione nurty myśli politycznej są nurtami anarchizmu o tyle, o ile idea wolności jest w nich wartością pierwotną, a nie są nurtami anarchizmu, jeśli wolność jest w nich traktowana jako konsekwencja pierwotności innych wartości lub konsekwencja procesów przemian toczących się w świecie współczesnym i dawniej. Celem zweryfikowania tej hipotezy autor zastosował analizę tekstów źródłowych, która pozwoliła zidentyfikować badane nurty myśli politycznej w kontekście ważności, nadrzędności lub podrzędności w nich idei wolności, a także przesłanek jej obecności w tych nurtach.

* Kazimierz Wielki University in Bydgoszcz, Faculty of Political Science and Administration.

Keywords: anarchism; anarcho-transhumanism; anarcho-primitivism; crypto-anarchism; political thought

Słowa kluczowe: anarchizm; anarcho-transhumanizm; anarchoprymitywizm; kryptoanarchizm; myśl polityczna

Anarchism, whose overriding value is the idea of freedom, is a political thought which reached its peak at the turn of the 20th century. In the 20th century, anarchism, as an independent current of political thought, has evolved, developed diverse tendencies, but gradually has become marginalised as an epigone thought (Malendowicz, 2014, pp. 7–23). Nevertheless, it has had a significant impact on the youth protest movements of the 1960^s and 1970^s and on the New Left thought and movements, and nowadays on anti-globalisation movements and thought.

As late as the twentieth century and the beginning of the twenty-first century, currents took shape in political thought that had the noun ‘anarchism’, the adjective ‘anarchist’, or the prefix ‘anarcho’ in their names to denote their anarchist character. These were: anarcho-primitivism, anarcho-transhumanism and crypto-anarchism. However, researchers of contemporary political thought do not devote space to them in scientific publications. Usually they are treated by them as a curiosity or one of many insignificant tendencies in political thought. Meanwhile, for a researcher of radical currents of political thought, the interesting question should be whether these currents are in fact currents of anarchism and whether they shape its new face. For a proper systematization of the tendencies in the transformations of contemporary political thought, it is important to answer the questions: to what extent do they coincide with anarchism, what premises determine their possible convergence with anarchism, or what makes it necessary to qualify them as tendencies in other – non-anarchist – currents of political thought? Hence, the aim of this paper is to verify the hypothesis that the above-mentioned currents of political thought are currents of anarchism insofar as the idea of freedom is a primary value in them, and they are not currents of anarchism if freedom is treated in them as a consequence of the primordality of other values or as a consequence of the processes of transformation taking place in the modern world and in the past. In order to verify this hypothesis, the author used the analysis of source texts, including documents, journalism and other ideological texts, which made it possible to identify the analysed currents of political thought in the context of validity, superiority or inferiority of the idea of freedom in them, as well as the premises of its presence in these currents. Moreover, the author used the fuzzy set method to determine to what extent

anarcho-primitivism, anarcho-transhumanism and crypto-anarchism have features of anarchism.

AN ATTEMPT TO DEFINE THE IDEAL TYPE OF ANARCHISM

At the beginning of the 20th century, a Polish sociologist and socialist activist Ludwik Kulczycki stated that the essence of anarchism is the recognition of the total and unhindered by law freedom of the individual person and of voluntarily organised human groups, composed of individuals who are not bound by coercion (Kulczycki, 1907, p. 4). The supreme value in anarchism is therefore freedom, which in anarchist interpretations is maximised and given an autotelic or primary character in relation to other values. This means that all other values are secondary to the idea of freedom. Examples are values such as equality or justice, which in anarchism are conditioned by the idea of freedom. For anarchists, therefore, there cannot be a just society of equal people if the individuals and groups that make up the society are not free.

One may agree with the statement by Dana M. Williams that: “Anarchism is a philosophy opposed to hierarchy and authority, and is used as a critical lens to analyze the whole of human society” (Williams, 2009, p. 189). Criticism of authority, the state, churches and religions, various hierarchical institutions and social relations based on domination and subordination, and nowadays also of corporations and international banks, are in anarchism a manifestation of maximising the idea of freedom. However, it is not correct to interpret anarchism solely in terms of the negation of power, i.e., ‘freedom from [sth]’. This is because the critique of power stems from the positive layer of political thought, i.e., the goal to which anarchists aspire. This goal is to achieve freedom to do everything that hierarchical institutions forbid, everything that is restricted by social relations that constrain people, as well as by dominant social narratives, ideologies, worldviews, beliefs and religions that perpetuate social hierarchy. Dana M. Williams and Matthew T. Lee have rightly pointed out that “as other research has shown, movements may have multiple, non-state targets. For anarchism, these targets of critique and attack are many, including all forms of domination and authority” (Williams & Lee, 2012, p. 589). The exception is to recognize nature as limiting freedom, although in line with the materialist character of anarchism, similar in this respect to Marxism, the aim of anarchism is to master nature and overcome the limitations it creates.

It should also be added that anarchism is not just political thought, although it is analysed as such in this article. For anarchism is more than that. It is a kind of life choice, a lifestyle and a culture. If they are based on absolutising the idea of freedom, they testify to an anarchist lifestyle and culture. This, however, must apply to both negative and positive freedom. For being an anarchist does not mean just rebelling against the state or the power of transnational corporations, but it means such a rebellion whose premise is to maximise the idea of freedom. This in turn means at the same time striving for the annihilation of all slave-like organisations, institutions or patterns of social relations. Anarchist rebellion must therefore have substantive characteristics. Anti-globalisation movements, environmental movements or movements for gender equality are not anarchist if they do not seek the complete abolition of relations based on domination in all spheres of human life. It is therefore not anarchist for a movement to seek social justice within the state, or to tax transnational corporations but not to abolish them, or to introduce new patterns of social relations without the aim of destroying institutions that perpetuate old patterns of domination and subordination, such as schools, churches and the commercial and state mass media.

Anarchism, however, is not a uniform political thought. The differences between the currents of anarchism concern, among other things, the methods of struggle for the anarchist goal, the analysis of relations between individuals and social groups, the ideas of future social relations and the recognition of the level of importance of certain factors limiting human freedom over other factors. This is why different currents have formed in anarchism. Anarcho-communism is a vision of a communal future, without private property, in which the freedom of some people is manifested in other people. Anarcho-syndicalism involves fighting against the state within anarcho-syndicalist trade unions, then organising a general strike and replacing the state with workers' unions. Insurrectionists plan to organise riots spontaneously turning into uprisings against the state with the help of a small number of informal groups based on friendship (affinity groups). Anarcho-pacifism proposes peaceful methods of struggle. Situationism, which can be considered a strand of anarchism in Central and Eastern Europe at the turn of the 20th century, revealed institutional and non-institutional forms of domination, with a particular focus on culture, customs and the dominant narrative. Anarcha-feminism prioritises the complete abolition of all hierarchies, including gender hierarchies, in line with the idea that women, on an equal footing with men, should divest themselves of the pursuit of power. Ecological currents in anarchism (so-called green anarchism), oppose species chauvinism

and strive for freedom for all living beings. At the same time, they recognise that the freedom of every human being is the freedom to enjoy the benefits of nature while recognising nature's freedom to exist. National currents in anarchism recognise the necessity for nations and regional groups to seek freedom from the state as natural associations of people (national anarchism, however, should not be confused with nationalist anarchism which can be analysed as a separate current of political thought or a tendency in nationalist thought, or a form of continuation of fascism) (see also: Malendowicz, 2013, 2014, pp. 7–23; Williams, 2009, pp. 189–210). In this sense, however, anarchism is not libertarianism (anarcho-capitalism). Although libertarians declare liberty and property as the most important values, maximising the latter – in the view of anarchists – could lead to social inequality, i.e., the domination of those who have property over those who have less or no property. For anarchists, individual freedom is an idea manifested in other people, not in competition with other individuals – as it is in libertarianism.

Values and problems dominating in the last mentioned currents, such as pacifism, gender equality, ecology, regionalism, were issues treated as secondary by the 19th-century anarchist movement. In the twentieth century, under the influence of the youth protest movement of the 1960s and the new social movements, the new trends mentioned above took shape in anarchism. However, they did not displace anarcho-communism and anarcho-syndicalism from their dominant position in the movement. They also inscribed themselves in the epigonism of anarchism.

The orientation of particular currents of anarchism towards selected thematic areas, social problems and values does not mean that the dominant role of the idea of freedom in anarchism has been abandoned. However, it testifies to the transformations in anarchism, the regional specificity of the formation of these currents, the adaptation of anarchism to contemporary problems and challenges in the world, and – which is important – the processes of convergence of anarchism with other currents of political thought. However, this convergence has a limited range. Its limit is the idea of freedom. To abandon it would mean to go beyond anarchism.

Similar processes of convergence can be observed in other currents of political thought that come close to anarchism – in primitivism and transhumanism. At the end of the 20th century, a movement and thought of crypto-anarchism also took shape.

PRIMITIVISM OR ANARCHO-PRIMITIVISM?

In the journalism of the founders and supporters of this current of political thought, the terms 'primitivism' and 'anarcho-primitivism' exist side by side and are often used interchangeably. The main primitivist thinker is an American historian and political scientist John Zerzan (born 1943).

A primitivist John Zerzan saw civilisation as the cause of all the problems of the present day. He saw the beginnings of civilisation in the domestication of plants and animals, and the associated change in people's lifestyles. This led to patriarchy and division of labour (O'Neil, 2008). In his view, the Neolithic domestication revolution that established civilisation required a reorientation of human mentality (Zerzan, 2006, p. 20). An early product of domestication was indeed patriarchy, that is, the formalisation of male domination and the development of institutions that reinforce it. By creating false gender differences and divisions between men and women, civilisation created other pathologies. As in other spheres of social stratification, roles were assigned to women in order to establish a rigid and predictable order favourable to the hierarchy. Woman was therefore seen as property. Ownership and control of land, plants, animals, slaves, children or women, became part of the established dynamic of the development of civilisation. Patriarchy demanded the subjugation of femininity and the usurpation of nature. It meant power, control and dominion over wildness, freedom and life. Patriarchal conditioning determined all human interactions, hence questioning patriarchy also means questioning civilisation (*What Is Green Anarchy?*, n.d.).

According to primitivists, the emergence of civilisation 10,000 years ago, in the Neolithic period, was linked to the formation of new human relationships based on power and control. This, in addition to the depreciation of women, caused wars, population growth, the development of private property, hierarchy, disease and, above all, the renunciation of freedom by people for whom, until then, freedom had been a matter of instinct (*What Is Green Anarchy?*, n.d.). Jeriah Bowser even recognised that civilisation is a decline. It is the collapse of communities, wisdom, beauty, mystery, wildness and connection between people. It is the destruction of balance, disintegration of wholeness, rejection of intimacy, mass extinction of species, destruction of coral reefs, acidification of oceans, pollution, desertification, deforestation, global warming, genocides, wars, patriarchy, slavery, suicide, and famine. For him, civilisation is like a cancer that destroys everything in its path until it dies (Bowser, 2017).

Above all, however, primitivists negated technology. Mathieu O'Neil wrote about primitivists' views on technology: "They reject techno-industrial development, which they equate with individual oppression and environmental destruction. On the biospheric level, primitivists paint an apocalyptic portrait of species extinction, proliferating dead zones, the pervasive poisoning of air, water, and soil. In terms of individual autonomy, anarcho-primitivists argue that we live in a world where the accumulation of technical knowledge is astonishing, and yet we are probably much more lacking in technical know-how than our ancestors: technology can only be created and repaired by someone else" (O'Neil, 2008, p. 253).

John Zerzan analysed that many people consider technology to be a neutral phenomenon, but this is a false point of view. It is enough to look at manufactured objects to see that at every stage of human history they have expressed certain values. Tools for which no division of labour is needed, i.e., those that anyone can produce, characterise a different kind of society. Modern technology means putting oneself under the control of experts, and therefore limiting freedom. It is also important to note that people who claim that technology is neutral think that technology is something positive. However, it is difficult to see the values that it expresses. Technology has contributed to the dehumanisation of people. Furthermore, according to Zerzan, the more technology, the less influence people have over their lives. Another widespread claim is that thanks to technologies we can connect with other people in previously unknown ways. But despite this the degree of isolation of individuals in modern society is increasing. We have fewer and fewer friends, more and more people live alone. On the surface the world looks rich and diverse, but in fact we live in the most standardised world possible. The claim that thanks to computers we will not need paper and we will save forests turned out to be false. According to Zerzan, the point where it all started was when man decided to rule over the earth rather than live in harmony with it (*John Zerzan w Polsce*, 2007, pp. 54–56; *Archiwalna relacja...*, 2016).

John Moore argued that technology, unlike tools, is a large-scale product produced by a complex of interrelated systems of extraction, production, distribution and consumption that require structures of control and obedience on a mass scale. Referring to the publication of the journal *Fifth Estate*, he analysed that technology was not simply a tool, but a form of social organisation. Once committed to its use, people had to accept its power. Anarcho-primitivism, Moore concluded, opposes technology but not the use of tools. However, he did not rule out the preservation of some form of technology in the primitive future

– technology justified by needs, but not opposed to the essence of humanity. It was the same with medicine – primitivists negated the activities of pharmaceutical companies, although they did not negate the achievements themselves in the treatment of people (Moore, 2016; Moore, n.d.).

For primitivists, a feature of civilisation is the deteriorating quality of human life. The quality of life of people in the modern world has been affected by disease. In 2002, John Zerzan wrote in the magazine *Green Anarchy*: “Tuberculosis and malaria have grown resistant to modern antibiotics and other standard medicines. E-coli and West Nile virus outbreaks are now common in the U.S. Infectious diseases of all kinds, once declared conquered, are on the rise. They accompany the major degenerative illnesses that are a staple of civilized life. Rift Valley fever, mad cow disease, hanta virus, Ebola, cholera, etc. ‘At least 20 major maladies have reemerged in novel, more deadly, or drug-resistant forms in the past 25 years’, pronounced the February 2002 National Geographic’s ‘War on Disease’ survey. It is hardly surprising that industrialized medicine is unable to remedy the toll that is inherent in industrialized, standardized, estranged daily” (Zerzan, 2002, p. 4).

According to primitivists, the antithesis of a society based on the power of technology, as well as an alternative for humanity, is to be a ‘return’ to patterns of existence inspired by an idealistically interpreted past of the primitive era, i.e., before the Neolithic Age. In 2001, the magazine *Green Anarchy* published an article whose author described the imagined life of people from the distant past: “Humans are naturally sociable, but are selective about who they wish to associate with. For companionship and mutual support, people naturally develop relationships with those they share an affinity with. However, only in recent times have people organized themselves in large-scale groupings composed of strangers who share little of relevance in common with each other. For over 99 percent of human history, humans lived within small and egalitarian extended family arrangements, while drawing their subsistence directly from the land. The foraging bands and shifting horticultural communities of past and present are known to have enjoyed extensive leisure time, and have rarely required more than two to four hours daily on average to satisfy subsistence needs. Famine and war are extremely rare in these societies. Additionally, physical health, dental quality and the average life-span of small-scale communities are markedly higher than that of agricultural and early industrial societies. If leaders exist, they are usually temporary, and hold no power beyond their ability to persuade. While hunting/gathering and slash-and-burn gardening do indeed alter local environments and

are sometimes wasteful, they have proven themselves to be ecologically stable adaptations. Foraging served humanity for three million years, while horticulture has been utilized in the Amazon basin for approximately 9,000 years. The small scale cultures that remain today generally prefer their traditional way of life, and many are currently waging impressive political resistance against corporations and governments who wish to forcibly assimilate them so that their land and labor may be exploited. People rarely enter mass organizations without being coerced, as they lead to a decline of freedom and health” (Wilson, 2001, p. 1).

It should also be added that the primitivists treated man as an equal being to others. Their views on this subject can be called biocentric. Biocentrism balances the human world with the plant, animal, climate, geography and spirit of the place where humans live. There is no separation between humans and their environment, separation and objectification, domination and control (*What Is Green Anarchy?*, n.d.).

Primitivists inspired by images of anarchy analysed that anarchy was a state of mind, a culture without exploitation, power and property. Before civilisation and beyond, many cultures existed in a state of anarchy. It means adherence to an egalitarian way of existence in which people do not live to produce, but subsist on what has been given by nature. It is a freedom in which all animals live (*Anti-civilisation?*, 2005, p. 1). This does not mean, however, that interpersonal relations in these societies were devoid of rules. As Jacek Kurczewski argued, in stateless societies various types of norms defining proper human behaviour can be observed: “In these norms, according to the public, are contained the duties or powers of each member of the community. There are more or less coherent systems of norms. In modern state society, binding norms are created or approved by specific law-making bodies and then passed on in a uniform form for use. In a traditional (pre-literate) society and without central authorities, the situation is different. Unity of norms is ensured by unity of tradition and unity of experience. Moreover, these norms are generally valid in a small area and among relatively internally undifferentiated communities” (Kurczewski, 1973, p. 279).

John Zerzan concluded that the hunter-gatherer era was a pleasant way of life without poverty and all-day labour. In mythical terms, it can be described as a ‘golden age’ characterised by peace. Gatherers and hunters lived in a state that was a combination of not too long working hours and material abundance. They worked less and did less labour-intensive jobs than farmers. The hunter-gatherers rejected aggression and competition, shared wealth, valued egalitarianism and personal autonomy but also cooperation in groups (Zerzan, 2007, pp. 60–62).

To summarise: primitivists criticise civilisation from an anarchist perspective, aiming to initiate a comprehensive transformation of human life. They aspire to be free individuals in free communities, to live in harmony with other people and with the biosphere. Power, technology or religion are analysed by primitivists as an integral part of civilisation: “anarcho-primitivism seeks to revive the simplicity of life and the compatibility with nature that humanity experienced prior to civilization. It contrasts the disastrous consequences of civilization with the natural advantages of primitive cultures, underscoring the early and allegedly happier life the nomadic people could enjoy. According to anarcho-primitivists, in those times nature was not an object to be domesticated and manipulated. But with the inauguration of symbolic culture, nature began to be objectified, which in turn resulted in the domestication of the individual” (Jeihouni & Maleki, 2016, p. 66).

Primitivist thought is an example of combining the arguments used in the criticism of civilisation with ideas of a future devoid of the defects of civilisation. The concept of an ‘uncivilised’ future is in primitivism the concept of anarchy, which in the opinion of the leaders of this political thought existed in the deep past. In primitivism, however, images of the past are idealised and do not always correspond to the reality of those times.

It is clear in John Zerzan’s thought that opposition to civilisation is motivated by arguments of freedom, and thus by arguments that characterise anarchism. However, the journalism of primitivists indicates that this is not always the case for other proponents of primitivism. It is their opposition to the properties of modern civilisation that drives them towards ideas of anarchy. However, if they were able to imagine a different future – one that is non-anarchist but which is a negation of modern civilisation, perhaps they would be driven towards such ideas. Thus, since criticism of power, patriarchy, technology, religion, pollution, disease is motivated in primitivism by the primary value of freedom, it is legitimate to speak of anarcho-primitivism. For it is the idea of freedom that is the primary value in this thought, and other critical values are secondary to it. However, while the criticism of civilisation in primitivism is motivated by desires for a return to living in a clean environment, gender equality, family communities, physical and mental health, and citizenship that takes into account the desire of people to influence their lives, which for the proponents of primitivism are visible in times of anarchy located in the deep past, talking about anarcho-primitivism is not justified. For the motivations of the supporters of primitivism and anarcho-primitivism are different, although they have a similar

goal. It is only their common goal – the state of anarchy – that partly justifies the interchangeable use of these terms. To be an anarcho-primitivist is also to be a primitivist, but the reverse is not always true.

TRANSHUMANISM OR ANARCHO-TRANSHUMANISM?

Primitivism is a current of political thought whose founders and supporters look to the past for solutions to the problems of the present and for an ideal vision of the world. Primitivism is therefore a retrospective thought. At the opposite pole is transhumanism. It is prospective thought, that is, in imagining what should be in response to an imperfect present, reaching into the distant future: “the transhumanist philosophy is guided by an evolving vision to take a more proactive approach to technology policy. The vision, painted in broad strokes, is this: To enable those who so wish to live much longer and healthier lives, to enhance their memory and other intellectual faculties, to refine their emotional experiences and subjective sense of well-being, and generally to achieve a greater degree of control over their own lives” (Bostrom, 2001).

One of the creators of transhumanism is a Swedish philosopher Nick Bostrom (born 1973), quoted above. He wrote that: “Transhumanism is a way of thinking about the future that is based on the premise that the human species in its current form does not represent the end of our development but rather a comparatively early phase” (Bostrom, 2003, p. 4).

Nick Bostrom defined transhumanism as: “The intellectual and cultural movement that affirms the possibility and desirability of fundamentally improving the human condition through applied reason, especially by developing and making widely available technologies to eliminate aging and to greatly enhance human intellectual, physical, and psychological capacities” (Bostrom, 2003, p. 4). Bostrom also wrote that transhumanists describe themselves as follows: “The study of the ramifications, promises, and potential dangers of technologies that will enable us to overcome fundamental human limitations, and the related study of the ethical matters involved in developing and using such technologies. Transhumanism can be viewed as an extension of humanism, from which it is partially derived. Humanists believe that humans matter, that individuals matter. We might not be perfect, but we can make things better by promoting rational thinking, freedom, tolerance, democracy, and concern for our fellow human beings. Transhumanists agree with this but also emphasize what we have the potential to become. Just as

we use rational means to improve the human condition and the external world, we can also use such means to improve ourselves, the human organism. In doing so, we are not limited to traditional humanistic methods, such as education and cultural development. We can also use technological means that will eventually enable us to move beyond what some would think of as “human” (Bostrom, 2003, p. 4).

Transhumanism is not a unified movement and is not a homogeneous thought. Referring to the findings of the Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies, based on the typologies of the proponents of transhumanism themselves, the following currents of transhumanism can be listed:

- extropianism, whose adherents advocate a proactive approach to human evolution and progress, with a strong emphasis on rationality and optimism;
- singularitarianism, based on the belief that the technological Singularity, as a moment in the history of the world, is possible and necessary, and that the transition to a posthuman world will be a sudden event achieved through the superintelligence of machines;
- hedonistic imperative, whose aim is the abolition of suffering through the achievements of genetics and nanotechnology;
- democratic transhumanism, defined as a synthesis of transhumanism with social consciousness and democratic decision-making procedures, supporting equal access to human enhancement technologies to promote social equality and reduce divisions between socio-economic classes;
- survivalist transhumanism, which advocates the radical prolongation of life and the defeat of death as the ultimate goal of transhumanism;
- libertarian transhumanism, a combination of libertarianism and transhumanism, whose adherents want access to technologies that enhance human capabilities and consider modernisation a civil right;
- religious transhumanism, recognising the compatibility of (different) religions with the values of transhumanism;
- cosmopolitan transhumanism, which recognises that the rapid development of technology is inevitable, may be something useful if humanity abandons nationalistic, patriotic and geopolitical affiliations in favour of a global citizenship that fosters cooperation and the mutual benefits of progress;
- cosmism, according to which science in its present form, like religion and philosophy, may prove excessively limited for understanding life, mind, society and reality, but also teaches that active engagement with the world,

study and engineering, and thoughtful and intelligent self-reflection, will enable us to discover the next stage in the evolution of collective thinking;

- anarcho-transhumanism, which assumes that, thanks to technological developments, the need for the existence of states will disappear (Pellissier, 2015).

Regardless of the current of transhumanism, all its proponents advocate the pursuit of perfection, the consequence of which would be the transformation of a human being into a transhuman and then into a posthuman. This would be a non-human and perfect being. On their way to this goal, transhumanists – while still human – should be guided by the values defined by Nick Bostrom. Core value for Bostrom is: “Having the opportunity to explore the transhuman and posthuman realms”. Whereas derived values are:

- nothing wrong about “tampering with nature”, the idea of hubris rejected;
- individual choice in use of enhancement technologies;
- improving understanding – encouraging research and public debate; critical thinking, open-mindedness, scientific inquiry, open discussion of the future;
- getting smarter – individually, collectively and develop machine intelligence;
- willingness to re-examine assumptions as we go along;
- the humanistic renaissance ideal of the well-developed personality;
- pragmatism, engineering – and entrepreneur-spirit;
- affirmation of the diversity of life – race, species, religious creed, sexual orientation, life styles (Bostrom, 2001).

The above set of transhumanist values indicates that the essence of transhumanism is what transhumanism turns against. And these are human limitations and their consequences. Another transhumanist, philosopher and futurologist from England Max More (Max T. O’Connor, born 1964) in the text entitled *Letter to Mother Nature* listed the various aims and demands of transhumanists. Here are some excerpts: “We will no longer tolerate the tyranny of aging and death”, “We will expand our perceptual range through biotechnological and computational means. We seek to exceed the perceptual abilities of any other creature and to devise novel senses to expand our appreciation and understanding of the world around us”, “We will improve on our neural organization and capacity, expanding our working memory, and enhancing our intelligence”, “We will supplement the neocortex with a ‘metabrain.’ This distributed network of sensors, information processors, and intelligence will increase our degree of self-

awareness and allow us to modulate our emotions”, “We will no longer be slaves to our genes. We will take charge over our genetic programming and achieve mastery over our biological, and neurological processes. We will fix all individual and species defects left over from evolution by natural selection. Not content with that, we will seek complete choice of our bodily form and function, refining and augmenting our physical and intellectual abilities beyond those of any human in history”, “We will cautiously yet boldly reshape our motivational patterns and emotional responses in ways we, as individuals, deem healthy”, “While we pursue mastery of our own biochemistry, we will increasingly integrate our advancing technologies into our selves” (More, 2009).

The transhumanist values formulated by Nick Bostrom and the postulates of Max More were based on the idea of freedom to improve and perfect the human being. Freedom is a postulate of anarchism, but the values in transhumanism are improvement and perfection. Their combination constitutes the essence of anarcho-transhumanism. Anarcho-transhumanism is the recognition that social freedom is inseparable from material freedom, and that freedom is ultimately a matter of extending human possibilities and opportunities to engage with the world around human beings. This means not only freeing oneself from the arbitrary constraints that bodies can impose on humans, but also being free to shape the world around us. It is transcending the limitations of gender, genetics and all human experience. It is questioning limitations and seeking to change the conditions that govern human beings. Anarchotranshumanism is the claim that if the tools exist to improve the quality of life, they should be used, for no one should experience hunger or other scarcity if they can be eliminated (Gillis, n.d.).

In the above view, anarcho-transhumanism is a consequence of transhumanist thinking. For it means freedom from the limitations of human nature and freedom to improve and perfect the human being.

Anarcho-transhumanism is a current of anarchist thought when it treats the idea of freedom as a primary value and as a condition for other values, and the improvement and perfecting of man as methods for achieving the goal of freedom. Anarcho-transhumanism is not a current of anarchist thought when its primary value is the perfection of man and his transformation into a posthuman, and a state without power and hierarchy is the result of posthumans achieving perfection.

One more aspect seems to be important in the analysis of the relation between transhumanism and anarchism. Well, because transhumanism aims at creating perfect beings, it will always lead to anarcho-transhumanism. Perfect beings

do not need power and can enjoy freedom without the threat of its negative consequences. The problem is that the future imagined by transhumanists is a future not of humans, but of posthumans. And anarchism does not think of such 'life forms' as transhumans and posthumans.

CRYPTO-ANARCHISM – ANARCHISM IN THE VIRTUAL WORLD

Crypto-anarchism is a current of social thought and a practice of activity that manifests itself in activities in the virtual world, free from state interference, as well as in the creation of virtual space in order to displace the state from areas where its domination manifests itself.

Proponents of crypto-anarchism recognise the superior effectiveness of using cryptographic means to achieve freedom over the effectiveness of other means and tools. Crypto-anarchists are those who consciously and deliberately seek to build a decentralised and then networked society, which is what cryptography is meant to serve. However, there are also groups that use cryptographic tools without understanding that they lead to anarchy. They use cryptographic tools to pursue their own interests, promoting anarchic social relations. They promote non-state trade or new types of means of payment (von Guttenberg, 2014). Such individuals and groups can fit into the practical dimension of implementing crypto-anarchism. For, according to crypto-anarchists, strong cryptography will prove that authoritarian governments are unsustainable. In their vision, governments will not be able to collect taxes and exercise power in a world where a large number of transactions will be completely anonymous and yet secure (Zuzga, n.d.).

As a social movement, crypto-anarchism, so interpreted, has taken shape since the late 1980s. In 1988, the American engineer Timothy C. May (1951–2018) wrote the *Crypto Anarchist Manifesto*, which was publicly read at the Crypto'88 international cryptologic conference in the United States and at a hacker conference that year. In 1992, it became the founding document of the crypto-anarchist movement. Timothy C. May concluded his manifesto with the following words: "Just as the technology of printing altered and reduced the power of medieval guilds and the social power structure, so too will cryptologic methods fundamentally alter the nature of corporations and of government interference in economic transactions. Combined with emerging information markets, crypto anarchy will create a liquid market for any and all material which can be put into words and

pictures. And just as a seemingly minor invention like barbed wire made possible the fencing-off of vast ranches and farms, thus altering forever the concepts of land and property rights in the frontier West, so too will the seemingly minor discovery out of an arcane branch of mathematics come to be the wire clippers which dismantle the barbed wire around intellectual property. Arise, you have nothing to lose but your barbed wire fences!" (May, 1988).

The basis of the critical layer of crypto-anarchist thought is the negation of the state done in the libertarian convention, using references to the achievements of information technology, the development of the Internet and cryptography. The state is treated by crypto-anarchists as an antagonist limiting individual freedom through the historically established system of domination and penetration of power into all areas of individual life. Crypto-anarchists opposed the appropriation of virtual space by states and transnational corporations. They strived to keep it free from their interference. This is confirmed by the words of *A Declaration of the Independence of Cyberspace* from 1996, written by John Perry Barlow: "Governments of the Industrial World, you weary giants of flesh and steel, I come from Cyberspace, the new home of Mind. On behalf of the future, I ask you of the past to leave us alone. You are not welcome among us. You have no sovereignty where we gather. We have no elected government, nor are we likely to have one, so I address you with no greater authority than that with which liberty itself always speaks. I declare the global social space we are building to be naturally independent of the tyrannies you seek to impose on us. You have no moral right to rule us nor do you possess any methods of enforcement we have true reason to fear. Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. You have neither solicited nor received ours. We did not invite you. You do not know us, nor do you know our world. Cyberspace does not lie within your borders. Do not think that you can build it, as though it were a public construction project. You cannot. It is an act of nature and it grows itself through our collective actions" (Barlow, 1996).

Crypto-anarchism is therefore the call for cyberspace to be freed from the power of the state. However, it is also a demand for the freedom of individuals surfing the Internet from the power of the state. Crypto-anarchists use cryptographic means to avoid prosecution by the state by providing and sharing information on computer networks to protect their privacy. This is a realisation of a paraphrased claim by the anarchist Peter Kropotkin (1842–1921): "From each according to the code, to each according to the keys!" (*Bitcoin...*,

2017), whose thought was referred to above all by the epigonic non-libertarian anarchists.

The space where the ideas of crypto-anarchism are implemented is 'Darknet'. Darknet (or Deepweb) is a network hidden from popular search engines such as Google, Bing or Yahoo. Sites on the Darknet – anonymous websites, shops, forums, portals – have an *.onion* domain extension. This provides their visitors with potentially greater anonymity. Therefore, they exist in the “underground” and insiders share their addresses, they can also be found in special search engines (for example Grams). In order to browse the content of the Darknet, the user does not need to have advanced knowledge in the field of IT or professional equipment. All he has to do is download a suitable browser such as Tor (The Onion Router) and install it on his computer. Tor is a crafted version of Firefox. However, it provides hiding of the browser's IP address by preventing analysis of network traffic. At the same time, Tor uses multi-layered encryption to ensure the confidentiality of data transmission between routers. Addresses in the Darknet are entered directly, but they look much more mysterious than normal URLs, e.g., <http://zqkltwi4fecvo6ri.onion>. In the Tor browser, the user can also open 'normal' websites. The technology used in the Darknet is similar to anonymising services. In the Tor network, Darknet sites are hosted on individual computers. When an address is opened, data packets flow through two randomly selected Tor node points, which each time give the packet a new masking IP address. The data transfer is encrypted until the last node point, at the end of which the transmitted data reaches the recipient in open text (*Darknet...*, 2016; Zamora, 2017).

Transactions on the Darknet take place using anonymous payment cards or, more commonly, the digital currency bitcoin. The most important feature of bitcoin is its decentralisation. No institution controls the bitcoin network. Bitcoins are 'mined' using computing power in a distributed network. This network also processes transactions made using bitcoin. Bitcoin, unlike traditional currencies historically based on gold, is based on a mathematical formula (*Czym jest Bitcoin?*, 2015).

The use of the term 'crypto-anarchism' is a direct reference to the idea of libertarian freedom (interpreted in an individualistic way, thus different from the interpretation inherent in epigonic anarchism) from state interference in interpersonal relations and the freedom to create them based on the unfettered aspirations of individuals and the groups they form, as well as to forms of action based on the concealment (encryption) of information. The origins of crypto-anarchism can be traced to developments in information technology,

cryptography, alternative media and libertarian thought. In this context, it should be mentioned that counter-economy projects were drawn up, among others, by the libertarian Samuel Edward Konkin III (1947–2004), for whom a key role in the economy was to be played by state-suppressed sectors such as prostitution and drug trafficking (Bartyzel, 2010, pp. 38–39).

Crypto-anarchism is not an anarchism referring to the thought of the precursors of anarchism from the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century. It is an individualistic anarchism with libertarian origins, promoting the use of new means and tools in the fight for freedom from state interference. It does not recognise traditional revolutionary forms of struggle for social liberation. It is anarchism of the 21st century, individualistic, modern, promoting the fight for freedom in the virtual world, the consequence of which could be freedom in the real world.

CONCLUSIONS

Anarcho-primitivism and anarcho-transhumanism are two currents of political thought with different attitudes to time. The first represents retrospective political thought, the second prospective thought. They differ in seeking the pattern of an ideal society in the distant past or in drawing a vision of the future. Both anarcho-primitivism and anarcho-transhumanism can be treated as currents of anarchism only if their proponents treat the idea of freedom as a primary value, i.e., conditioning other values and other aspects of their social concepts. Anarcho-primitivism and anarcho-transhumanism understood in this way shape the new face of anarchism in the 21st century. However, if the vision of anarchy is for them only a consequence of the transformation of the world, then they constitute the currents of primitivism and transhumanism. This is the case with those primitivists who consider the collapse of civilization as an inevitable process, and the state of anarchy of the primitive age as necessary for the survival of humanity, the only possible or most probable one. This is also the case with transhumanists, who believe that anarchy is a natural consequence of human improvement and transformation into a posthuman. It is not the idea of freedom that motivates them, but the ideas of improvement and perfection. Freedom is only their consequence. This means the confirmation of the hypothesis formulated in the introduction of the article.

However, it is different in the case of crypto-anarchism. It is a thought and activity not based on anarchism of the turn of the 20th century, in which the idea of freedom had a social dimension. Freedom in anarchism of that time was treated as a value manifested in and towards other people, rather than in competition between individuals. Crypto-anarchism therefore has a different – libertarian – genesis, and libertarianism is not treated by social anarchists as anarchism. Nevertheless, the idea of freedom can be treated as a primary value in crypto-anarchism, and although it would be realised in the virtual world, it could also be realised in the real world.

REFERENCES:

- Anti-civilisation?* (2005). *Wildfire. An Anti-Civilisation Bulletin*, 2.
- Archiwalna relacja z wizyty Johna Zerzana w Polsce w 2007 r. oraz wywiad udzielony Agnieszce Marii Wasieczko i Januszowi Krawczykowi dla „Innego Świata” (nr 25, 2007) (2016, April 14). Retrieved from: <https://zielonaanarchia.wordpress.com/category/john-zerzan/>.
- Barlow, D.H. (1996). The Effectiveness of Psychotherapy: Science and Policy. *Clinical Psychology. Science and Practice*, 3(3), 236–240.
- Bartyzel, J. (2010). Geneza i próba systematyki głównych nurtów libertarianizmu. In: W. Bulira, & W. Gogłóza (Eds.). *Libertarianizm: teoria, praktyka, interpretacje* (pp. 15–46). Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Bitcoin Is the Most Valuable Asset in Human History* (2017, December 13). Retrieved from: <https://btctheory.com/2017/12/13/bitcoin-is-the-most-valuable-asset-in-history/>.
- Bostrom, N. (2001, April 18). *Transhumanist Values*. Retrieved from: <https://www.nickbostrom.com/tra/values.html>.
- Bostrom, N. (2003). *The Transhumanist FAQ – A General Introduction*. Retrieved from: <https://www.nickbostrom.com/views/transhumanist.pdf>.
- Bowser, J. (2017, January 18). *Garść refleksji o cywilizacji i upadku*. Retrieved from: <https://zielonaanarchia.wordpress.com/category/anarchoprymitywizm/>.
- Czym jest Bitcoin?* (2015, February 28). Retrieved from: <http://kryptopolonia.info/czym-jest-bitcoin/>.
- Darknet: ciemna strona Internetu* (2016, October 30). Retrieved from: <http://www.komputerswiat.pl/artykuly/redakcyjne/2016/10/darknet-ciemna-strona-internetu.aspx>.
- Gillis, W. (n.d.). *What Is Anarcho-Transhumanism?*. Retrieved from: <http://humaniterations.net/2012/01/06/what-is-anarcho-transhumanism/>.
- Jeihouni, M., & Maleki, N. (2016). Far from the madding civilization: Anarcho-primitivism and revolt against disintegration in Eugene O’Neill’s *The Hairy Ape*. *International Journal of English Studies*, 16(2), 61–80. DOI: 10.6018/ijes/2016/2/238911.
- John Zerzan w Polsce* (2007). *Inny Świat*, 25, 54–56.

- Kulczycki, L. (1907). *Anarchizm w obecnym ruchu politycznym w Rosji*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo „Przeglądu Społecznego”.
- Kurczewski, J. (1973). *Prawo prymitywne. Zjawiska prawne w społeczeństwach przedpaństwowych*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.
- Malendowicz, P. (2013). *Ruch anarchistyczny w Europie wobec przemian globalizacyjnych przełomu XX i XXI wieku*. Warszawa: Difin.
- Malendowicz, P. (2014). Współczesny anarchizm europejski. Myśl polityczna epigonów czy kreatorów nowej teorii? *Athenaeum. Polskie Studia Politologiczne*, 41, 7–23.
- May, T.C. (1988). *The Crypto Anarchist Manifesto*. Retrieved from: <https://groups.csail.mit.edu/mac/classes/6.805/articles/crypto/cypherpunks/may-crypto-manifesto.html>.
- Moore, J. (2016, April 17). *Elementarz prymitywisty*. Retrieved from: <https://zielonaanarchia.wordpress.com/category/anarchoprymitywizm/>.
- Moore, J. (n.d.). *A Primitivist Primer* [Booklet].
- More, M. (2009, May 25). *A Letter to Mother Nature: Amendments to the Human Constitution*. Retrieved from: <http://strategicphilosophy.blogspot.com/2009/05/its-about-ten-years-since-i-wrote.html>.
- O'Neil, M. (2008). Radical Tribes at Warre: Primitivists on the Net. In: T.L. Adams, & S.A. Smith (Eds.). *Electronic Tribes: The Virtual Worlds of Geeks, Gamers, Shamans, and Scammers* (pp. 251–268). Austin: University of Texas Press. DOI: 10.7560/717732-018.
- Pellissier, H. (2015, July 8). *Transhumanism: There Are [at Least] Ten Different Philosophical Categories; Which One(s) Are You?*. Retrieved from: <https://ieet.org/index.php/IEET2/more/pellissier20150708>.
- von Guttenberg, M. (2014, September 29). *Crypto-Anarchists and Cryptoanarchists*. Retrieved from: <https://bitcoinmagazine.com/articles/crypto-anarchists-cryptoanarchists-2-1412033787/>.
- What Is Green Anarchy?* (n.d.). Retrieved from: <http://blackseed.anarchyplanet.org/what-is-green-anarchy/>.
- Williams, D.M. (2009). Red vs. Green: Regional Variation of Anarchist Ideology in the United States. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 14(2), 189–210. DOI: 10.1080/13569310902925816.
- Williams, D.M. & Lee, M.T. (2012). Aiming to Overthrow the State (Without Using the State): Political Opportunities for Anarchist Movements. *Comparative Sociology*, 11(4), 558–593. DOI: 10.1163/15691330-12341236.
- Wilson, Ch. (2001). Against Mass Society. *Green Anarchy*, 6. Retrieved from: <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/chris-wilson-against-mass-society>.
- Zamora, S. (2017, September 26). *Ukryty internet? Co to jest darknet?* Retrieved from: <https://itwiz.pl/czym-jest-darknet-warto-wiedziec-ukrytej-czesci-internetu/>.
- Zerzan, J. (2002). What Ails Us. *Green Anarchy*, 10.
- Zerzan, J. (2008). The Iron Grip of Civilization: The Axial Age. *Green Anarchy*, 22.
- Zerzan, J. (2007). Prymityw przyszłości. *Inny Świat*, 25.
- Zuzga, B. (n.d.). *The Crypto-Anarchists*. Retrieved from: <http://groups.csail.mit.edu/mac/classes/6.805/student-papers/fall94-papers/brian-zuzga.html>.