Post-anarchist Islam ?

René Berthier

In the anarchist movement, we are used to attempts to recuperate the main themes of anarchist doctrine by Marxism, but we are generally unaware that recently the temptation to "recuperate" anarchism has not spared certain Muslims. Thus, in the Wikipedia article "Islam and Anarchism" we learn that "although anarchism is usually associated with atheism and the rejection of organised religion, and Islam is often associated with authoritarian regimes and criticised for its human rights abuses in some parts of the Islamic world, there have also been significant anarchist currents throughout Islamic history. This became particularly the case in the late 20th century with the emergence of liberal movements within Islam, when the concept of Muslim anarchism first appeared."

The Wikipedia article further tells us that Muslim anarchism is based on the strict interpretation of Islam as "submission to God", and on the concept of freedom from coercion in religion – a concept whose meaning we will have to clarify. Muslim anarchists believe that only Allah has authority over Muslims; they reject the fatwas of imams, relying on the concept of *ijtihad*[1] for a personal interpretation of Islam – which is more like an Islamic version of the Protestant Reformation than an "anarchist" approach.

Muslims who proselytise the "infidels" and want to prove the peaceful and tolerant nature of their religion quote a verse from the Qur'an (2:256) which says: "No compulsion in religion". With this, they manipulate the naive into believing that Islam exerts no pressure to force people to convert. The "anarchist Muslims" use the same subterfuge, not being different from other Muslim proselytisers.

If we take a rational, i.e. historical, approach to the issue, we get a completely different picture. It is not advised to rely on the founding texts of a religion to judge its tolerance of contrary opinions. For then Christianity is also a tolerant religion, which obviously goes against everything we know about the history of Christianity, marked by a long series of massacres by iron and fire.

---

1 See: René Berthier, *La fermeture de la pensée critique en Islam* (The closure of critical thinking in Islam), http://monde-nouveau.net/spip.php?article541

The suras of the Qur'an are not listed in chronological order, and it is accepted that when several suras contradict each other, the more recent one abrogates the oldest. Many Muslims seem to be unaware of this detail, or they ignore it when it suits them. In order to know which verses are law when there are several, it is therefore necessary to do some exegesis in order to know the most recent verse – which Muslim scholars do with great skill, but not the "Muslim anarchists", obviously. This rule of abrogation is attested to by the Qur'an itself: Sura 2 (Medinan Sura, 87th revealed, verse 106 (or 100): "If We abrogate a verse or cause it to be forgotten, We bring in a better or similar one. Do you not know that Allah is omnipotent?"

So to return to Sura 2:256, "No compulsion in religion" (and incidentally on the fragment of Sura 18:29, "Whosoever wills, let him be an infidel"), it should be noted that at that time Islam was in its infancy, Muhammad had only few followers, and he was then in very hostile territory, in Mecca. Thus, "No compulsion in religion" was not uttered at a time when Islam was in a hegemonic position and dominated part of the Mediterranean world, but at a time when it was in an extremely weak position. It is obvious that when one is not in a position of strength, one is tolerant and conciliatory. All the verses that preach tolerance are from this Meccan period. Then there was the Medinan period, when Muhammad and his party had the balance of power in their favour. Here it is a different story: Sura 9:29-32: "Kill those who do not believe in Allah". However, according to Sura 5:73, the extermination orders would not apply to Jews, Sabeans and Christians. The fact remains that the phrase "no coercion in religion" is not the instruction of a dominant religion to tolerate other beliefs: it is the request of an ultra-minority group that begs *tolerance for itself*!

Islam as it appears in its founding text is not tolerant, it is no more tolerant than any other religion. And as with any religion, there is a difference between theory and practice: ordinary believers in Islam practice their religion quietly without bothering the world and ask only one thing: that they not be bothered. As with any religion, Islam only "works" because the basic believer does not follow the rules to the letter.

On the question that interests us here, let us specify that anarchism is not a doctrine that limits itself to criticising religions, churches and clergy or anything that might resemble them: it simply denies the very existence of God, of a transcendent being who is supposed to be the creator of everything and to whom people must submit. Religions, churches and clergy are only forms through which belief in God is manifested. Anarchism rejects all ideas of transcendence, first causes and creation.

Anyone who does not share this approach should therefore be denied the status of "anarchist".

However, if believers feel attracted to a certain number of anarchist themes (social property and collective management of the means of production, etc.) and intend to base their political and social practice on them, I think that this is a very good thing, since it demonstrates that these people recognise the universal value of these themes; but they cannot be considered as "anarchists". It would be desirable to find another word to avoid confusion: it is a simple question of coherence. We could speak of "anti-authoritarian Islam", for example; but we must question the "anti-authoritarian" quality of a current of thought that believes it must seek its legitimacy in the founding text of a religion – an observation that is applicable to all religions.

Mohamed Jean Veneuse, wrote a text, *Anarca-Islam*[2] in which he tries to justify the existence of an islamic anarchism on the basis of the Qur'an. Veneuse quotes Deleuze, Guattari and Foucault very often (70 times, 64 times and 16 times respectively), never Proudhon. Bakunin and Kropotkin are mentioned 6 and 5 times respectively. This means that he is very clearly situated in a "post-anarchist" perspective, i.e. anarchism developed from post-structuralism and post-modernism.

According to post-anarchists, the state and capitalism are no longer the same enemies as before, and new approaches are needed to fight them. In the light of post-anarchism, Mohamed Jean Veneuse integrates elements of the thought of Michel Foucault, Gilles Deleuze, Jacques Derrida, Jacques Lacan, and Jean-François Lyotard, who are not anarchists, and who obviously don't know much about anarchism, but whose concepts can be admittedly used to reflect on certain issues such as the liberation of the

---

2   https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/mohamed-jean-veneuse-anarca-islam
    Mohammed Jean Veneuse, pseudonym of Mohammed Abdou, is of Egyptian
    origin. He was a lecturer at Queen's University in Kingston, Ontario, where he
    is currently pursuing his doctoral studies. In his master's thesis entitled Anarca
    Islam, written in 2009, he first sought to lay the foundations for an articulation
    between Islam and anarchism.
    In a second text ("The Body of the Condemned Sally: Paths to Queering
    anarca-Islam",   https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/mohamed-jean-veneuse-
    the-body-of-the-condemned-sally-paths-to-queering-anarca-islam),   published
    in the journal *Anarchist Developments in Cultural Studies*, the author
    attempted to delineate a point of articulation of trans theories to what he
    proposed in his thesis, in order to put an end to the hostilities and prejudices
    that undermine relations between the Muslim, trans and anarchist
    communities. Muhammad Abdou's ideas were briefly discussed by Francis
    Dupuis-Déri in an article published in Ricochet22 .

subject through the "deconstruction of discourse" the "denaturation of the body and sexuality", the rejection of the "repression of hypotheses", the "deconstruction of the binary order of Western thought", the "deconstruction of status based on gender difference", etc. I will not engage in a debate on these issues.

I will simply say that I question the legitimacy of the notion of post-anarchism, which is largely based on ignorance of the founding texts of "classical" anarchism. It is not a matter of desperately clinging to these "classical" authors, or to deny that society has evolved and asserting the need to define new approaches to combat capitalism and the state. The authors who serve as references for "post-anarchism" seem to be quite ignorant of the founding texts of anarchism, and their commentators even more so. That Saul Newman bases his "Lacanian anarchism" on Stirner is significant, because Stirner was never an anarchist. Lewis Call, who thinks he has found a radical form of anarchism by discovering the "becoming", would not say such nonsense if he had bothered to read Bakunin's philosophical texts. And so on.

The updating of anarchist thought to a society that no longer has much to do with the one known by Proudhon and Bakunin is necessary, but if you want to go *beyond* anarchism (sorry: "*deconstruct*" it...) you must first know what it is constructed of. The recourse to the writings of Max Weber, Eric Fromm, Pierre Legendre or even Franz Oppenheimer (who, although classified as a "liberal", provides a perfectly anarchist theory of the state), would undoubtedly have been much more profitable[3].

"Post-anarchism" is in fact a diversion made by authors who have no connection whatsoever with the workers' movement or any social protest movement, who have decided to recuperate a certain number of themes from anarchism, to dispute others, to add their own problematics and to call it "post-anarchism". It is in this perspective that Veneuse's approach is situated, questionable in that it starts from an arbitrary definition of anarchism, from which he tries to show its compatibility with the belief in God and the Qur'an.

Jean Veneuse's idea (Jean Veneuse is a character in a novel by René Maran[4], but it is also an allusion to Franz Fanon), is that Muslims in

---

3   The authors I quote are not anarchists, but I think their works are more stimulating than those of the "French philosophers" to whom Veneuse refers.

4   René Maran (1887-1960) est un écrivain français d'origine martiniquaise, lauréat du prix Goncourt en 1921 pour son roman *Batouala*, dont la préface dénonce les abus du fait colonial. Fonctionnaire de l'administration coloniale, il en démissionne pour se consacrer à la littérature. Considéré par les Noirs

Western countries are faced with two options: either use "mainstream media and politics against those who represent us, or continue to silently accept our lot and truly live in hell." It seems to the author that most Muslims living in the West have chosen one of these options, but that a few are resisting this false choice and are creating an alternative, "*becoming* Muslim anarchists.", i.e. revolutionary subjects "in a Deleuzian and Guattarian sense", rejecting dichotomous representations of themselves.

These Muslims, "many of whom identify as anarchists" (*sic*), take it upon themselves to reconstruct a new understanding of what it is to "identify and be identified as a Muslim in the West". "And it is because of anarchism's anti-authoritarian and anti-capitalist orientations that these Muslims are particularly drawn to it" (*sic*).

I don't know about Canada, or Sweden, both countries where Veneuse seems to have studied, but I haven't noticed that Muslims in France are massively interested in the "anti-authoritarian and anti-capitalist orientations of anarchism". This statement seems somewhat exaggerated to me. Veneuse is convinced, however, that "Anarchism offers Muslims new avenues for their identity's reformulation." The attraction of Muslims to anarchism, and their presentation as a socio-political force, "allows us to see Muslim anarchism as an example of what J.F. Day has called the "newest social movements".[5]

The "newest social movements" emerged in the 1960s and 1970s – roughly at the end of the "Trente Glorieuses"[6] – in opposition to traditional "party" or "trade union" type militant action. These movements responded to a mutation of the forms of class struggle, to the progressive increase in unemployment which gave the initiative to Capital in the class struggle, to the irruption of a multiplicity of social strata with a way of life that broke with that of previous generations and with desires and demands that the traditional structures (parties, unions) were incapable of understanding and taking on: feminists, environmentalists, LGTB movements, etc. These movements were not concerned with the seizure of state power; they wanted to explore new forms of action and resistance. Their opposition to the centralised "party form" led them to develop horizontal and transversal forms of action.

---

comme un précurseur de la *négritude*, il avouait qu'il la comprenait mal et avait tendance à y voir un racisme plus qu'une nouvelle forme d'humanisme.

5 DAY, Richard J. F., *Gramsci is Dead: Anarchist Currents in the Newest Social Movements*, London/Toronto, Pluto Press/Between the Lines, 2005.

6 The "Trente Glorieuses" (thirty glorious years) were the period of strong economic growth and rising living standards experienced by the vast majority of developed countries between 1945 and 1975.

The people involved in the "newest social movements" were very heterogeneous compared to the previous period when we still spoke of the "working class". It can be said that the core business of these movements was the irruption of children from the middle strata of society, with no prospects; people whose demands consisted above all of finding a way of integrating into society (immigrants), or those who had definitively stopped looking for a way of integrating into society, those for whom "class struggle" in a wage-earner/employer relationship made no sense at all.

It is within this framework that Muslims living in the "West" would be situated; anarchism would constitute for them a "safe space" in which they could resist. It is within the "new social movements" that Veneuse sees hope, "not only for Muslim anarchists, but also for all Muslims" (*sic*). It is in the "safe space" provided by the anarchist movement that Muslims can recreate their socio-political identity.

> "It is in this critical space where I can see a place for Muslims and Muslim anarchists to be able to begin again and again the radical recreation of their socio-political identities in a way that is conducive to Islam's present confrontations with contemporary Western societies." (Veneuse)

I don't know how it works in the country where Veneuse lives, but in the French anarchist movement there are activists of Muslim culture, men and women; these comrades do not disavow the culture from which they come, but they do not come with a purpose of "radical recreation of their socio-political identities" and, above all, they abandon their religious roots and simply cease to be identified as "Muslims": they are anarchist activists who, incidentally, are of Muslim culture. And as far as I have seen, this does not provoke any neurosis in them. On the contrary, having got rid of their religious garments, they feel much freer.

Bakunin gives us a reflection that could be applied to the case of Veneuse. Every people, like every individual, he says, has the right to be themselves: "But it does not follow that a people, an individual, has the right or the interest to make their nationality, their individuality, a matter of principle and that they must drag this ball and chain all their lives" ... "On the contrary, the less they think of themselves, the more they become impregnated with the substance common to all humanity, the more the nationality of one and the individuality of the other take on significance and meaning."[7]

---

7   Bakounine, *Etatisme et Anarchie*, édition Champ libre, t. IV, p. 238.

It is again in this space that Veneuse sees the possibility of Muslim resistance to the "horrors and neuroses of a Muslim's daily life". It is in the "new social movements" that anarchists can learn by interacting with Muslims. Veneuse argues that anarchists will benefit from their contact with Muslims by learning to dialogue instead of "tearing each other apart over ideological or personal differences", because Islam, he says, has developed this kind of ethics through *Usul Al-ikhtilaf*, or the ethic of disagreements. Veneuse suggests that there is a tradition and practice of tolerance in the Muslim tradition that does not exist in Western cultures.

"Ikhtilaf" means "disagreement", "difference of opinion", but it is a concept for Islamic law scholars. It is a concept for internal use in Islam and only applies to differences in interpretation of the Qur'an:

> "In the words of the Prophet Muhammad, diversity *among the Muslim people [my emphasis]* is a blessing (ikhtilafu ummati rahma). The Islamic tradition is proud of the sciences developed for the study of differences in the recitation and interpretation of the Qur'an, and of the differences in the transmission of the Hadiths, the testimonies of the quotations of the Prophet Muhammad and the Sunnah, his practice.[8]"

Far be it from me to deny that Muslim thought has developed an "ethic of disagreement", although this ethic does not seem to apply to disagreements with non-Muslims: but the empirical evidence of the lived reality in Muslim societies does not show that this ethic is particularly applied. All cultures, not just Muslim ones, develop principles that are often admirable and which real people are quick to disregard.

Veneuse makes an extremely interesting point: "Anarchists, in the new social movements, as well as Muslims, have everything to gain culturally, aesthetically, politically and ethically, provided that anarchists accept that those who are not exactly like them can join them in their anti-authoritarian and anti-capitalist revolt."

Much is said in this simple sentence.

---

8   Muhammad Khalid Masud, "Khtilaf al-fuqaha: La diversité dans le fiqh en tant que construction sociale".
     https://arabic.musawah.org/sites/default/files/Wanted-MKM-FR.pdf

1. There is a lot of talk about the "new social movements" in Veneuse, as they would be the place where Muslims are considered "safe" and where the meeting between them and anarchists could take place.

2. Insofar as Veneuse demands that anarchists "accept" those who are not like them, one can assume that in the country where he lives this is not the case. This seems surprising to me. In the social protest movements in France – trade unions, parties, associations and other structures formed spontaneously according to circumstances – Muslims are actors in the activity of these organisations. It cannot be denied, however, that there is an ambient racism in society, but the presence of Muslims as actors in social struggles alongside with anarchists is something perfectly commonplace.

There seems to be a confusion between two cases: a) The joint participation of anarchists and Muslims in social struggles; b) The adhesion of Muslims to anarchist organisations. Veneuse, like some anarchists in the United States, does not seem to make the distinction. There is no reason why the joint participation of anarchists and Muslims in social struggles should be problematic; but on the other hand, the membership of Muslims, as well as any other believer, in an anarchist organisation, which is by definition atheist, is problematic.

Yet Veneuse tells us that "Muslims and Muslim anarchists still have a long way to go in terms of being made to feel welcome and comfortable by anarchists." Again, Veneuse implies that there is a relatively large amount of "Muslim anarchists", at least in numbers large enough to make their presence worth mentioning. Canada or Sweden are probably privileged in this respect because in France the presence of "Muslim anarchists" is not particularly notable, although activists *of Muslim culture*, but who are atheists, have joined the various anarchist organisations.

To say that "Muslims and Muslim anarchists still have a long way to go before they feel welcome and comfortable with anarchists" makes absolutely no sense. In mass organisations – trade unions in particular – anarchists and Muslims struggle side by side without any problem. But in anarchist organisations activists of Muslim culture are simply not identified as "Muslims", in the same way that activists of Christian or Jewish culture are not identified as Christians or Jews: they are anarchist activists.

If the "new social movements" are the space where anarchists and "Muslim anarchists" can meet, there are, according to Veneuse, misunderstandings that prevent collaboration between the two groups – misunderstandings that are aggravated by the fact that Muslim anarchists

have to deal with the difficulties of being sidelined by anarchists on the one hand, and sidelined by Muslim communities on the other.

I don't understand what Veneuse is getting at. In mass organisations[9] such as trade unions or various associations, there are far too few anarchists to sideline Muslims even if they wanted to, which is of course not the case. In specifically anarchist organisations Muslims are only sidelined to the extent that believers are not allowed in, but this is the case for all religions. But people of Muslim culture and atheists are not rejected. You cannot accuse an organisation of discrimination if it does not allow people who do not accept its membership criteria!

Veneuse wants to show that both Muslim and anarchist identities can coexist. He self-identifies himself as a "Muslim anarchist", "in a Deleuzian and Guattarian sense". He reproaches "anti-religious anarchists" for rejecting him because what he says is religious, "whereas the anarchism you and I believe in is a commitment to rise up against the exercise of all forms of oppression". But *precisely*, for anarchists, religion *is* a form of oppression. Moreover, not sharing a person's opinion can in no way be considered as "oppression". In short, if I tell Veneuse that one of the foundations of anarchism is atheism, I am "oppressing" him; but when he tells me that anarchism must integrate religion, he is not "oppressing" me.

You reject me out of fear of Islam as an institution and an organised, authoritarian mechanism of repression, he says. "But, who is to say that Islam has to be institutional, organized, authoritarian, and repressing? I prove in this thesis it does not have to be." However, History proves the contrary. One can always say that Christianity is a tolerant religion, but one will not forget that the real history of Christianity is one of massacres, of burning at the stake.

There is no doubt that anarchists criticise Islam, but in the same way that they criticise all other religions, because religions are an alienation of the spirit and because they are all necessarily repressive when they do not have a strong public opinion to counterbalance their natural tendency to impose their views. Religions are not inherently tolerant: belief in one God excludes all others. A religion is only tolerant when it cannot do otherwise.

But anarchists only enter this debate as people who claim that God does not exist.

In systems of thought – and religions are systems of thought – there is always theory and practice. The constitution of the Soviet Union was a

9   By mass organisation I mean an organisation to which all people belong, regardless of their beliefs, in order to fight collectively for a goal.

marvel of democracy, the Soviet regime was much less so, in practice: was the nature of the Soviet Union defined by the Soviet constitution, or by the lived reality of the system?

Jesus said that you should turn the other cheek and forgive your enemy, but the Inquisition murdered thousands of people over five centuries and the Crusades were not particularly non-violent. The examples could be multiplied. One may find many angelic things in the Qur'an, but what is decisive is what Islam has been in historical reality: a religion that has, like all other religions, served to legitimise the seizure of territory, domination, oppression and slavery.

This means that anarchists are not particularly oriented towards a critique of the Muslim religion alone, but of *all religions*.

Bakunin puts it very clearly:

> "All religions, with their gods, their demigods, and their prophets, their messiahs and their saints, were created by the credulous fancy of men who had not attained the full development and full possession of their faculties. Consequently, the religious heaven is nothing but a mirage in which man, exalted by ignorance and faith, discovers his own image, but enlarged and reversed – that is, divinized."[10]

Veneuse is profoundly wrong when he says that anarchists are "dogmatic" when they say that "God is dead". Anarchists are not concerned by this Nietzschean formula simply because they do not think that God is dead at all; to die, one must have lived. They think that God has never existed. God exists only as a phantasmatic creation of man: man has created God in his own image. That millions of people believe in God is one thing, that God exists is another. Veneuse shows that he has only an extremely sketchy knowledge of anarchism when he says "there is no proof of God's life or death", as if he were talking about the neighbour next-door. *Veneuse should first start proving that God exists.*

Belief in God is not something that needs to be "proven" because it is not a matter of rational reasoning, it is a matter of faith. Faith is the fact of believing in something, whether it exists or not. The existence of God is therefore not something that can be proven. As such, God and Father Christmas are on the same level. There is objectively no more reason to believe in God than in Father Christmas. As for proving the non-existence of God, this is meaningless. It is impossible to prove the non-existence of something that does not exist[11]!

---

10   Bakunin, *God and the State.*

The anarchists' point of view is, according to Veneuse, "eurocentric", which I dispute. Half of the world's population does not believe in God, in the sense that Christians and Muslims understand it. Rather, I would say that Veneuse's argument is *Islamo-centric*, that is, coming from someone produced by a culture that considers it unimaginable not to believe in God, whereas European culture has long accepted that atheism is one option among others. In France, only 37% of the population believes in God, 34% say they are "non-religious" and 29% say they are atheists. In Western Europe as a whole, people who believe in God represent only 51% of the population. Surveys show that atheism is constantly growing. In East Asia, people who believe in God represent 16% of the population in China, and 14% in Japan. (Win-Gallup International survey, 2007 and 2012). On the whole planet, only half of the total population believes in a God. So we can see how anarchists, on the issue of atheism, are anything but isolated.

Veneuse's position goes against the world (not only European) trend. Which leaves him perfectly entitled to say that his belief in God is the strength from which he derives the reason for sharing the same ethical and political commitments as anarchists: "It is God who graced me with the gift of encountering anarchism after 9/11," he says. Better (or worse, depending), "anarchism is what is compelling me to come back to Islam to unleash the Islamic and anarchic anti-authoritarian and anti-capitalist concepts and practices that I believe exist in Islam in an attempt to bridge the proximity between the two, Islam and anarchism, me and you."

Apart from the fact that believing in an all-powerful figure to whom I have to pay homage does not seem to me to be a particularly anarchist approach, I would be *grateful* to Veneuse if he could point me to the passages in the *Qur'an* from which he draws his anarchist sources.

Veneuse then addresses Muslims: whatever interpretation you make of Islam, he says, "I can feel some of you are lost, trapped between the politics of a former corrupt native land and an adopted Western immigrant and citizen tongue. I feel you by virtue of my years of residency in the West and my prayers with and alongside you in Mosques." My intention, he says, is to "politically and ethically reorient your Islam and mine because our Islam, as I will demonstrate, has given me the Qur'anic right to do so. Know that what I write here cannot be rejected on the grounds of heresy." In other words, Veneuse wants to legitimise his "anarchism" by showing that he has the blessing of the *Qur'an*... Here we have a Muslim who calls

---

11   Signalons, pour être honnête, le cas de Sébastien Faure qui a écrit une petite brochure, « Les douze preuves de l'inexistence de Dieu », mais à mes yeux elle relève plus du canular que d'autre chose, et il est douteux qu'il ait jamais convaincu personne, et pour cause.

himself an anarchist and who wants to re-found, in a "Qur'anic" way, both Islam and anarchism!

This all seems very presumptuous to me. Veneuse acts as if one is genetically Muslim. There is no doubt that populations of Arab-Berber origin living in France may feel unease and suffer discrimination, but it is doubtful that after three or more generations the "politics of a corrupt former homeland" whose language the younger generations do not even know has any effect on their malaise, just as it is doubtful that "adopting the Western language" is perceived as a trauma. However, there is no doubt that the malaise of these "populations of immigrant origin", as they are euphemistically called in France, have a lot to do with poverty, lack of professional training, unemployment, bad housing – poverty in short –, all of which these populations share with the very many people who are not "of immigrant origin".

Veneuse's intention to re-found Islam by "anarchising" it appears implausible when he leaves the fantasy and returns to the principle of reality, that is to say when he speaks of Islam in its real practice and behaviour: "I am stunned," he says, "by the unjustified ambivalence and complacency of some of us towards patriarchy, trans-queer-phobia, racism, ageism, capitalism and authority that exists in our communities". But Veneuse has things backwards: patriarchy, racism, trans-queer-phobia, etc. are not only characteristic of Islam: by wanting to "Islamise" these behaviours he validates the idea of a separation between Muslim culture and other cultures, whereas stupidity is universal.

However, the main difficulty in Veneuse's approach stems from the sources on which he relies to display his "anarchism": Deleuze, Guattari and Foucault, whom he cites throughout his text, have nothing anarchist about them, which leads me to believe that Veneuse's anarchism remains very lacunar. What Renaud Garcia says about Foucault could be applied to all the popes of "French theory": their theses "are marred by a rather great ignorance of anarchist texts".[12]

In fact, it seems difficult to add the prefix "post" to a doctrine if one does not even know that doctrine...

April 2022

---

12 Renaud Garcia, *Le Désert de la Critique. Déconstruction et politique*, éditions L'Echappée, p. 120.