

TIMOTHY SCOTT BROWN

The Sixties in the City: Avant-gardes and Urban Rebels in New York, London, and West Berlin

Abstract

This essay examines a heretofore under-studied aspect of the sixties revolution: the interplay between avant-garde artists and countercultural anarchists in the spaces of the city. Arguing that the focus on student organizations and the Marxist-Leninist and Maoist Third Worldism with which they were often associated obscures as much as it reveals about the radicalism of the 1960s, the essay examines the revival of anarchist ideas, examining how these dovetailed with the activist conceptions of artistic-political avant-gardes and the counterculture with which they were linked. Comparative in focus, the essay focuses on radical groupings in three key cities of the global 1960s: Black Mask/Up Against the Wall Motherfucker in New York City; King Mob and the Angry Brigade in London; and the Hash Rebels/Blues in West Berlin. Transnational in orientation, the essay shows how countercultural and anarchist publications and networks (e.g., the Rebel Worker group, the Situationist International) helped synergize local rebellions inspired by the intersection of the arts, anarchism, and the counterculture, thereby opening a new perspective on the rebellion of the 1960s.

Introduction

A specter haunts contemporary scholarship on the “global sixties”—the specter of students and student organizations. Students were of course key actors in the uprisings of 1968, and student organizations were prominent vehicles of youth insurgency in the West European and North American metropolises, behind the Iron Curtain, and also in the Third World.¹ Overlooked in its importance, however, is the extent to which this insurgency was driven by actors—and in places and in ways—frequently neglected in the scholarship. This essay will examine a heretofore overlooked site of synergy in the sixties revolution: the interplay between avant-garde artists and countercultural anarchists in the spaces of the city; and rather than focus on the Marxist-Leninist/Trotskyist/Maoist concerns that fueled the student left and its successor formations, it will focus on the revival and reinvention of anarchist ideas, examining how these dovetailed with the activist conceptions of artistic-political avant-gardes and the counterculture with which they were inextricably linked.

Attention to the revival of anarchism has the potential to illuminate key features of the “global sixties.” In broad terms, the renewal of anarchism in the 1960s must be seen as one significant feature of a revolutionary surge marked by

the revival of suppressed knowledges and lost traditions. It bears attention in its own right for this reason alone. But aside from its importance as one of the salient “recovery projects” of the 1960s, anarchism is significant as a site at which main features of the broader 1968 movement came together and overlapped. Anarchism was, to begin with, a key point of articulation between the politics of the New Left and the lifestyle radicalism of the international counterculture. Indeed, one of the things that was new about “neo”-anarchism was the way that traditional anarchist themes dovetailed with the politics of personal lifestyle, drawing as much from popular culture as from shop-floor militance. At the same time, anarchism provided an avenue of contact between the counterculture and the artistic avant-garde, paving the way for avant-garde theorists and theories to work their influence on the wider political movement of 1968. Anarchism's centrality in this set of relationships made it a flash-point in conflicts between the more mainstream and/or Marxist-dogmatic left and the anti-authoritarian lifestyle revolt of the radicalized wing of the counterculture. At the same time, in serving as a link between specific political contexts and international currents of popular culture and avant-garde theory, anarchism played a major role in the transnationalism of 1968.

One of the most important bearers of anarchist ideas, especially where the avant-gardes and urban rebels of this essay are concerned, was the Situationist International (SI). Founded at the end of the 1950s as a successor to the Lettrist International—the latter infamous for the stunt in which one of its members dressed as a priest to proclaim the death of God from the pulpit of Notre Dame cathedral during Easter mass—the Situationist International sought to use provocation to blur the boundaries between art, politics, and daily life. Beyond its occasional deployment of the iconography of classical anarchism—the famous image in which a sunbathing nude dreams of “fucking an Asturian miner!”² is a memorable entry—the SI contributed to the revival of anarchist ideas by helping to create an alternative conceptual space between dogmatic state socialism and western capitalist consumerism. Situationist concepts like the “spectacle” (referring to the consumer capitalist dream world of mediated desires substituted for real life); “unitary urbanism” (with its the emphasis on the liberatory potential of the urban environment); and “détournement” (the practice by which the signs of consumer capitalism are recontextualized to produce the opposite of their intended meaning), proved attractive both to artists seeking to disrupt the staid world of the museum and activists searching for new tactics and avenues of political engagement. Equally important, the international network created by Situationism spread these ideas across the capitals of the west, spurring the formation of local avant-garde groups using techniques of direct action to disrupt power relations within the spaces of the city.

Alongside anarchist currents drawn from the artistic avant-garde were those derived from the traditions of political anarchism stretching back to the earliest decades of the 20th century. Surviving anarchist individuals or organizations, whether veteran Spanish revolutionary exiles in Great Britain or groups like the IWW (Industrial Workers of the World) in the United States played a role in passing along the history and ideas of anarchism to a younger generation; but even more important was the attempt of New Left protagonists themselves to update anarchism for the hippie era, combining intransigent political militancy with a countercultural politics of personal freedom. The latter maneuver often

met with disapproval from “Old Left” anarchists, but it was precisely this hybridization that made anarchism a relevant force in the left-wing urban underground of the 1960s on both sides of the Atlantic. Strongly linked to the assertion of the right to “do one’s own thing” in the spaces of the city in general, and to the defense of countercultural enclaves in particular, this current of anarchism, like that derived from the international artistic avant-garde, was inseparable from the spaces of the city.

Thus, if anarchism was an important bearer of the global in 1968, it was also one of the key faces of the local, for its claims unfolded in relationship with the urban environment, becoming a major element in the contest with authority at the level of daily life. As recent scholarship of the “spatial turn” has highlighted, space, far from being value neutral, is invested with a multitude of meanings.³ The questions surrounding its use—who can use it, who can not, for which purposes and under which conditions—are fundamental. Manuel Castells, one of the foremost theorists of the modern city, has highlighted the link between the rise of social movements and “the tendency toward state centralism and domination of the state over the city.”⁴ The squatter and other urban movements that began in the 1960s and flowered in the 1970s, points out Castells, are to be seen in larger terms as part of a “massive popular appeal for local autonomy and urban self-management.”⁵ At the same time, as scholars have more recently argued, the city is the place where conflicts between youth and authority in the 1960s took shape.⁶ Anarchism, in both its artistic avant-garde and militant countercultural iterations, came into its own at precisely the intersection of these two broader developments, making the study of anarchism in the city a worthwhile endeavor for scholars interested in tracing the concrete outlines of the struggle between youth and authority around 1968.

This essay will examine the activities of avant-gardes and urban rebels in three key cities of the global sixties: New York, London, and West Berlin. Linked together both conceptually (via the membership of the protagonists in the international counterculture) and concretely (via transnational exchanges along Situationist and other avant-garde networks), they represent sites of intersection where the global imaginings and transnational exchanges that shaped sixties radicalism found concrete form. It was not the cities *as such* that were important, however, but the underground enclaves, liminal zones, and “liberated territories” of the urban environment that were key; for it was here that transnational lines of influence coalesced in response to unique local conditions, and here that they became imbricated in debates—about the relationship between art and politics; about the validity of countercultural lifestyle as a means of political struggle; about independent cultural production and the dangers of capitalist recuperation—with both a global and a local valence.

West Berlin: “Smash the State with a Joint in your Hand”

Nowhere did urban topography more profoundly shape the prospects of youth radicalism than in West Berlin. The shattered city, divided from 1961 by a wall protected by guard-posts, minefields, and barbed wire, physically embodied the Cold War divide. Cut off from West Germany, its residents exempted from military service, the city became a haven for draft-dodgers and other non-conformists. The population, perpetually on edge from years of living under the

threat of Soviet invasion, easily embraced a hard-headed, sometimes almost hysterical anti-Communism in which youth non-conformism appeared an even greater threat than usual. In this environment, the first appearance of shaggy-haired *Gammler*—a German term denoting something of a cross between a beatnik and a hippy—produced dirty looks, catcalls, and occasional physical assaults.⁷ In the early-mid sixties, young working class non-conformists were acutely aware of being a hunted species, and for many of them, the hassles of daily life around issues such as long hair became key factors in their later politicization.⁸

While the protests of the student movement tended to take place in the Charlottenburg district, typically on or in the vicinity of West Berlin's main shopping avenue, the Kurfürstendamm, the countercultural enclaves that became home to the radical anarchist scene in West Berlin—above all the Kreuzberg district—sprung up in the liminal zones where the erection of the Berlin wall had cut the city in half, streets coming absurdly to an end against the concrete barrier, buildings fallen into disrepair, margins created out of what had once been the center. Home to a large population of Turkish immigrant “Guest Workers,” German retirees unable or unwilling to move out of the district's crumbling tenements, and students in search of cheap rent, Kreuzberg, and later neighboring Schöneberg, became natural havens for bohemians and countercultural radicals.

The radical scene in these districts from the end of the 1960s owed its existence to developments in the West German student movement, which had spearheaded the attempt to recover lost revolutionary ideas, perspectives, and texts, not least those associated with anarchism. One of the chief goals of the leaders of the anti-authoritarian wing of the key West German student organization—Socialist German Students League (SDS)—was to locate new radical source material that would allow the movement to find a revolutionary way forward. A key to this effort was the attempt to affect an anti-authoritarian revision of Marxism. This revision was both a product of a new emphasis on personal subjectivity (a concern that resonated with the writings of the early Marx on alienation) and part of an attempt to break out of an ossified Cold War situation in which Marxism had become the property of the bureaucratic state socialist regimes of the East bloc. In West Germany, the latter impulse took on particular poignancy in light of the fact that key figures of the anti-authoritarian faction in the SDS (e.g., Rudi Dutschke and Bernd Rabehl) were refugees from Communist East Germany. Although opposed to throwing out the Marxist baby with the bureaucratic bathwater, both had seen enough of the authoritarian face of daily life in the Eastern bloc to have few illusions about the negative potential of an unreformed Marxism.⁹

For activists and thinkers like Dutschke and Rabehl, the revision of Marxism necessarily entailed a reassessment of anarchism. In his *Ausgewählte und kommentierte Bibliographie des revolutionären Sozialismus von Karl Marx bis in die Gegenwart* (1966), Dutschke emphasized the inadequacy of an orthodox reliance on the thought of Marx and Engels for solving the revolutionary problems of the day, stressing instead “the contribution of . . . Proudhon, Blanqui, Bakunin” alongside those of “the German revisionists, French syndicalists, and Russian Bolsheviks. . . .”¹⁰ In reference to the disputes between Marx and Bakunin in the First International in the 19th century, Dutschke asked

rhetorically “cannot anarchism still mean something for us, has it not been confuted by Marx for all time?”¹¹ The direct action practiced by the anti-authoritarian faction in the SDS, which continually strained at the boundaries of the procedural and leadership principles typical of a democratic student organization, was marked by a voluntarism and spontaneity of pronouncedly anarchist stripe. The “Viva Maria Group” co-founded by Dutschke in the winter of 1966 explicitly aimed at combining Marxism and Anarchism in an explosive new mixture. “Marxist theory,” wrote Dutschke’s close collaborator Rabehl, “would make fruitful anarchism’s will to revolt, its spontaneity, fantasy, and passion.”¹²

Much more important in the revival of anarchism and anarchist perspectives in West Germany, was the influence of avant-gardist groups inspired by both Situationism and the Provo movement in the Netherlands. Provo affected a countercultural update of anarchism that simultaneously engaged with the ideas and personnel of pre-war anarcho-syndicalism. Provo’s politics of public outrage—most famously in disruption of the marriage of Princess Beatrix in March 1966—was enormously influential. The relationship between Situationism and anarchism came to spectacular expression in the May events of 1968 in Paris, which saw anarchist perspectives and action forms—for example, the rejection of the bureaucratic-reformist Socialist and Communist parties, direct action from below, the general strike—come into play in Europe in the most forceful way since the Spanish Revolution of the 1930s.¹³

One of Dutschke’s collaborators in the Viva Maria Group, the bohemian provocateur Dieter Kunzelmann, was heavily inspired by the efforts of the Provos and Situationists to fuse art, politics, and daily life. As chief theorist to the *Gruppe Spur*, a group of Munich painters affiliated with the Situationist International, Kunzelmann played a major role in transmitting Situationism’s emphasis on the revolutionization of daily life into the West German student movement.¹⁴ A successor organization to the *Gruppe Spur*, *Subversive Aktion*, brought Kunzelmann together with Rudi Dutschke and Bernd Rabehl to instigate some of the earliest protests of the extra-parliamentary opposition.¹⁵ Later, in West Berlin, Dutschke and Kunzelmann helped found the working group within the SDS that gave rise to the creation of two communes, the *Kommune I* and the *Kommune II*. The former, in particular, played a major role in radicalizing the West German student movement with its use of satire, pranks, and public outrages.¹⁶ It also emphasized the importance of lifestyle, appearance, and interpersonal psychology, concerns which resonated both with the wider New Left emphasis on personal subjectivity and with some of the historic preoccupations of anarchism. The *Kommune I* is notable for pioneering the practice of bootleg publishing, in which classics of Marxism and Psychoanalysis (Wilhelm Reich’s *The Function of the Orgasm* was a popular title) appeared alongside long-unavailable works of anarchism by Bakunin and Kropotkin. *Raubdruckerei* was an expression of a key feature of the West German 1968, the attempt to recover the lost knowledges and traditions of Germany’s left-wing past erased by the experience of fascism and war.

The founding of the *Kommune I* represented a push for a radical new autonomy in the urban environment of West Berlin. Serving as a space for new experimental forms of living, the commune also became a strong-point for spectacular forays into the public sphere. The new fields of personal and political

expression opened up by the *Kommune I* from 1967 helped prepare the way for the development of a radicalized countercultural scene in West Berlin from the end of the decade. It was here, more than in the highly-theoretical councils of the SDS, that neo-anarchism in West Germany really came into its own. The flowering of the radical counterculture was in part a product of the decline of the SDS. After the assassination attempt against Rudi Dutschke in April 1968, the youth rebellion in West Germany was carried forward by new actors motivated by new concerns. A salient feature of the new political landscape were the dozens of new Marxist-Leninist and/or Maoist cadre parties, the so-called *K-Gruppen*. Alongside these were the *Basisgruppen* ("rank and file groups"), which represented a sort of "going to the people" on the part of the young left-wing intelligentsia, linked with a new focus on mobilizing working class youth. At the same time, the countercultural stream of the 68er movement which had begun to crystallize around the *Kommune I* and other communes in 1968-9 became increasingly autonomous and radical.

Out of this radicalization arose the West Berlin "Blues," a proto-terrorist scene of anarchist hippies blending countercultural style with militant opposition to the state. Its members tended to be self-consciously working class, dope smokers, and rock fans rather than student theorists able to cite chapter and verse from the Marxist classics.¹⁷ The Blues scene represents the intersection of two radical forms of autonomy: one represented by the emancipatory claims of the student movement, the other by those of the counterculture (i.e., those relating to lifestyle, appearance, the body, and so on). But also characteristic of the scene was a militant rejection of the pacifist strain in the sixties counterculture. The core group of the nascent Blues scene, the self-styled "Hash Rebels," were notable for the strong connection they sought to forge between militant lifestyle and militant politics. "In Berlin," began a flier they distributed in the summer of 1969,

there has existed for a short time the Central Committee of the Wandering Hash Rebels. The Hash Rebels have introduced active struggle against the terror of the police and the government. They have organized smoke-ins, demonstrations in front of lockups, retaliation attacks against the police, a legal aid for persecuted hash smokers, and a medical team for drug casualties [Ausgeflippte]. The Hash Rebels are the militant core of the Berlin subculture. They fight against the slave-system of late-capitalism. They fight for their own right of decision about the body and lifestyle. . . . Fuck this society [and its taboos]. Become wild and do beautiful things. Have a joint ["Have a joint" appears in English in the flier - TSB]. Everything that you see that doesn't please you, destroy it. . . . With anarchist greetings, Central Committee of the Wandering Hash Rebels"¹⁸

Rather than seeing themselves as part of a broader "counterculture" defined as much by consumer capitalism and the media as by the participants themselves, the Hash Rebels defined themselves as a distinct subculture with the right to full autonomy within the urban environment.

Their political *raison d'être* was direct action in defense of the perceived prerogatives of this subculture. The founding event of the group was the "smoke-in" held in Berlin's Tiergarten in July 1969. The smoke-in was a response to police raids against scene hangouts like the "Zodiac" on the Halleschen Ufer in Berlin

Kreuzberg, “Park” in Halensee, “Sun” in the Joachim-Friedrichstraße, and “Mr. Go” in the Yorckstraße in Berlin Schöneberg. The hangouts themselves became the sites of pitched battles with police dispatched to combat drug sales and consumption. The July 1969 “smoke-in” was only the first of a number demonstrations in which members of the Blues scene fought with the police. “We came one night to ‘Park’ [to find it] totally surrounded by cops,” remember former Hash Rebel Ralf Reinders;

They were rousting people out with raised hands, something they had never resorted to before. We screwed the cap off the gas tank of a car, stuck a rag in it, and tried to set it on fire. It didn't really work, but it had the effect of causing a whole bunch of cops, scared to death, to come running out [into] the parking area to try to get us. And that led in turn to other people gaining courage and beginning a street battle. I believe that was the first time they really fought back like that.¹⁹

Further battles took place around the “Zodiac” and “Mr. Go.” In the former case a police car was overturned in protest against the police taking photographs of traffic into and out of the club. In the latter case, militants fought police with Molotov Cocktails.²⁰

These attempts to defend the autonomy of radical enclaves like Kreuzberg and Schöneberg and individual establishments like “Mr. Go” and “Zodiac” against the claims of authority may be seen as an extreme example of a larger conflict over youth “place roles” in the urban environment highlighted in recent scholarship.²¹ This attempt at “liberating” parts of the urban cityscape reached its ultimate expression in the campaign of squatting empty buildings in Berlin, which began around 1970 and picked up steam in the following two decades.²² But conflicts over the disposition of urban space were also linked with attempts to defend the meaning of the subculture against recuperation by consumer capitalism. This impulse reached spectacular expression in an attack staged by members of the Blues scene on the West Berlin premier of the musical *Hair*. “We are well aware,” read a flier distributed in connection with the action, “that ‘Hair’ only appears in the guise of the subculture in order to gratify capitalist demands.”²³ The flier went on to link the protest against *Hair* with resistance to the pressure of the authorities on meeting places like the “Zodiac,” thereby juxtaposing the make-believe counterculture of peace, love, and inclusiveness with the reality of police raids and arrests: “The performance of ‘Hair,’ this Pseudo-Subcultural troupe, attempts to demonstrate the outward impression: West Berlin, the ‘free city,’ has a place for everyone! We demand the giving over of the Beautyfull [sic] balloons to the real subculture.”²⁴

In their demands for authenticity and autonomy, the Hash Rebels expressed many of the key impulses motivating the radical scene in West Berlin and West Germany during the moment of transition from the student movement proper to the era of armed struggle in the 1970s. Many of these impulses were common both to the student movement and to the counterculture. Yet there also existed a pronounced tension between the sort of countercultural rebellion represented by the *Kommune I* and the *Haschrebelln* and the more sober considerations of the SDS and the *K-Gruppen*. The latter tended to look on the former as loose cannons pursuing personal rebellion at the expense of wider social

transformation; the former saw the latter as boring would-be bureaucrats. The tension between the two tendencies was encoded in the very name of the Hash Rebels with its sardonic “Central Committee.” The “Central Committee of the Wandering Hash Rebels,” writes Ralf Reinders, “was mainly about pissing off the students.”²⁵

The broad distinction between the highly-theoretical, dogmatic, organization- and worker-centric approach (e.g., of the *K-Gruppen*) on the one hand, and the separatist, lifestyle-oriented, anarchist scene on the other, was a notable feature of the period of realignment and uncertainty after the attempted assassination of Rudi Dutschke and the decline and self-dissolution of the SDS. Wherever they might come down in the extreme-left wing spectrum, even some sympathizers were skeptical of the Hash Rebels' emphasis on the revolutionary imperative represented by drugs and the drug trade. Peter Paul Zahl, the editor of *Agit 883*, the flagship underground newspaper of the West German radical scene (notable, among other things, for publishing the first communiqué of the Red Army Faction) went on record to question the political value of the hash campaign. “Let's take a look around us,” he wrote; “we see the cheery remnant of the KI [Kommune I]—pseudo-cheery dream dancers. We look in the pubs where hash is dealt in grand style—happy year's-end profit figures. And this does not prove that with hash one is better able to communicate. . . .”²⁶ Zahl's skepticism about the value of drugs as a focus of revolutionary activity was shared by others. In a piece entitled “Kiff und Revolution” (“Pot and Revolution”), also printed in *Agit 883*, Werner Olles argued:

It is clear beyond a doubt that where pot is smoked, where flower power is practiced, that there Marx's *Kapital* and Guevara's *Guerilla—Theory and Method* are probably seldom read, and it has likewise been shown that the radicalism of the *Hascher* and the members of hippie-like subcultures never go beyond a non-committal pacifism containing thoroughly bourgeois elements.²⁷

The problem with the Hash Rebels, the piece continued, was one of “general resignation. ‘Nesting in the cracks of power’ and ‘living in the gaps’ means nothing concrete other than integration into a [repressive] society. . . .”²⁸ Such complaints were met with contempt by the Hash Rebels, who accused Olles of trying to enforce a code by which “a socialist must look like a *Speißer*.” They continued: “In his eagerness he totally overlooks that the Central Committee does indeed smoke pot, but has never propagated flower power or any other “hippie ideology.” We also do not “nest” in the “cracks of power” and we do not live in “gaps.” We live in communes, wander about, and fight together against state power in the street.”²⁹

New York: “Up Against the Wall Motherfucker!”

The militantly intransigent Hash Rebels, although in many ways *sui generis*, had a significant counterpart across the Atlantic. In New York City, the birthplace of key currents of the international counterculture and artistic avant-garde, another collective, similarly motivated by a dream of radical autonomy in the urban environment, took root from the mid-sixties. The memorably-named Up against the Wall Motherfucker!, a radical collective founded in the late-Sixties in Manhattan's Lower East Side, quickly developed a fearsome reputation for

provocations aimed simultaneously against the New York art scene, city authorities, and elements of the student movement and counterculture of which it was nominally a part. Up against the Wall Motherfucker!—hereafter UAW/MF (after the wry acronym used in some of the group's communications), or simply, as it was colloquially known, the Motherfuckers—was an outgrowth of a group called Black Mask, founded by Ben Morea, Dan Georgakas, and Ron Hahne.³⁰ Publishing a magazine of the same name beginning in 1966, Black Mask made its name through aggressive interventions against the Manhattan art scene, disrupting art events and—most famously—intimidating the Museum of Modern Art into closing its doors for a day.³¹ “We are neither artists or anti-artists,” read one manifesto; “[w]e are creative men—revolutionaries. As creative men we are dedicated to building a new society, but we must also destroy the existing travesty. What art will replace the burning bodies and dead minds this society is creating?”³²

The anti-art orientation of Black Mask should have made it a natural for inclusion in the Situationist International, but the prickly continental salonists of the SI were rubbed decidedly the wrong way by the “hippieness” of the group around Morea. When the Belgian philosopher Raoul Vaneigem visited New York City in 1967, he refused to meet with Morea after learning that Morea's associate in Black Mask, Allan Hoffman, had committed the grievous and apparently unforgivable error of interpreting Vaneigem's *The Totality for Kids* (aka *The Revolution of Everyday Life*) in “mystical” terms (Hoffman appears to have earned Vaneigem's wrath for asking him if *The Totality for Kids* applied to kids on other planets).³³ Morea afterward became the target of one of the SI's notorious “exclusions.” “Vaneigem told you that he did not want to see your weird . . . mug . . .,” read a letter to Morea; “You have been quite stupid to insist. The Situationists, you piece of shit, shit on top of you. You will never meet us. If one day you see ex-Situationists, they will have been—excluded—thrown down to your level, you wimp.”³⁴

Morea defended himself against this attack by emphasizing the importance of action over theory, a response that further enraged the SI.³⁵ While Black Mask's critique of the recuperation of the counterculture certainly resonated with Situationism—“The hippies have become victims of their own ideology. In their rejection of the grand spectacle 'Hollywood/Madison Ave./America' they have accepted a spectacle no less destructive, one which substitutes synthetic play for real life, while at the same time they have become tools of those against whom they have supposedly rebelled”—its emphasis on action and confrontation came out of a different world altogether.³⁶ Indeed, although a critique of art was central to its ethos, Black Mask understood itself in explicitly anarchist terms. Ben Morea was strongly influenced in this regard by his friendship with Judith Malina and Julian Beck of the Living Theater. He also spent time with the anarchist theorist and writer Murray Bookchin, from whom he adopted the concept of the “affinity group” drawn from the Spanish anarchists of the *Federacion Anarquista Iberica* (FAI).³⁷ Like the FAI, which was not a political party, but functioned as the theoretical and moral compass of the much larger anarcho-syndicalist trade union, the *Confederacion Nacional del Trabajo* (CNT), Black Mask and its successors liked to style themselves as a non-hierarchical, non-party vanguard ready to fight against authority in whichever way the moment demanded.³⁸ As Black Mask morphed into a larger group known as

“the Family”—which in turn came to be known, after the slogan in one of its posters, as *Up against the Wall Motherfucker!*—its version of anarchist-inspired affinity group politics would play out on several current fronts of cultural-political struggle.

In contrast to West Germany, the revival of Anarchism in America in the 1960s derived less from the revision of Marxism—historically less important both in the USA generally and in the American SDS—but from a combination of European avant-gardism (e.g., Surrealism, Situationism) and indigenous American traditions. Chief among the latter was the anarcho-syndicalism of the Industrial Workers of the World (the I.W.W. or Wobblies). Founded in 1905, with a membership of some 100,000 by 1923, the I.W.W. was a direct action-oriented labor organization closely resembling European unions like the Spanish CNT. From its inception, the union faced a brutal reception from employers and government agencies. The I.W.W.'s opposition to American involvement in the First World War had especially ruinous consequences. Many union leaders who were not imprisoned on trumped-up charges or murdered outright by jingoistic mobs ended up fleeing abroad. Decimated by government repression and employer-funded vigilantism, the union was effectively marginalized by the 1930s. In this sense, although America had a stronger indigenous anarchist tradition than Germany—at least as far as the presence of a sizable anarchist-inspired labor union was concerned—the situation in the United States mirrored that in West Germany: just as National Socialism had decimated the left in Germany, erasing not only the structures but much of the cultural memory of the radicalism of the Weimar era, so in the US, the Red Scare of the 1920s, the depression, and the Second World War erased the history of working class resistance to capitalism, anarchist or otherwise.

The Wobbly tradition did have a resurgence in the 1960s however, and characteristically, it came from the underground, from young people inspired by radical art and radical lifestyle. The *Rebel Worker* was an I.W.W. newspaper published in Chicago by Frank and Penelope Rosemont. The Rosemonts, both veterans of the Chicago Beatnik movement, joined the I.W.W. in 1962 because, in the words of a friend, it was “the only group that [was] not boring!” Like the Hash Rebels in West Berlin a few years later, the Rosemonts were turned off by the dogmatism of the other left-wing groups on offer. “[T]he many varieties of social-democratic, Stalinist, Trotskyist, and Maoist organizations . . .,” writes Franklin Rosemont, “were repulsively middle-class, authoritarian, dogmatic, narrow-minded, sectarian, humorless, and utterly incapable of even the smallest original idea.”³⁹ Embracing I.W.W. traditions of direct action and mutual aid, the *Rebel Worker* group took part in or organized numerous protest actions and helped found the Solidarity Bookshop in Chicago.

Yet the interests of the *Rebel Worker* group extended far beyond the traditional concerns of labor militancy. “Our critique,” writes Franklin Rosemont, “focused not only on Capital, work and the workplace, but also and above all on everyday life. Our aim . . . was to be ‘revolutionary in everything.’”⁴⁰ The Rosemonts' trip to London and Paris in 1964, during which they met famous Surrealist André Breton, solidified their interest in creating a new sort of radical politics, influenced as much by psychoanalysis and the work of Wilhelm Reich as by Marx and Bakunin.⁴¹ The *Rebel Worker*, which began publication in May 1964, proved a fruitful meeting ground of I.W.W. shop floor militance, the

humor and wordplay of Wobbly tradition, and neo-Marxist theory drawn from European sources. One of the first New Left groups in the United States to embrace the link between radical politics and popular culture—one of their early pamphlets was called “Mods, Rockers, and the Revolution”—the Rebel Worker group prefigured many of the concerns both of the SDS and of the nascent counterculture.⁴²

The Rebel Worker group was widely connected to radical cells elsewhere, including the Solidarity group in London and Black Mask in New York City. The members of Black Mask were seen as kindred spirits, despite their more artistic-aesthetic focus; but as Black Mask turned into The Family-UAW/MF, the nature of the two groups diverged dramatically. Whereas the Rebel Worker group represented a countercultural update of the anarcho-syndicalist aspect of the Wobblies, The Family-UAW/MF represented a lumpen-bohemian anarchism, frequently stepping over the line into outright criminality, with an ethos well captured in the group's famous self-depiction as “a street gang with analysis.”⁴³ With its emphasis on violent confrontation and intransigent opposition to authority of any kind, Up against the Wall Motherfucker became, as the authors of a contemporary countercultural document collection put it, “the sore thumb of the New Left.”⁴⁴ In this sense, they came very close in spirit to West Berlin's Hash Rebels, and indeed, the concerns and action forms of the two groups exhibited striking parallels.

The “Family” evolved out of Black Mask as the latter grew larger and began to engage in more overtly political actions. Dwelling communally in squatted apartments, in the mean and dirty streets of the Lower East Side, the Family was an armed urban tribe. A writer for London's countercultural *International Times* who visited New York in the summer of 1968 wrote of the Lower East Side as “a ghetto of mixed Puerto Rican, Afro & Hippie-population, an area where there have been several uprisings. The Motherfuckers are under constant threat of arrest and of being wiped out.”⁴⁵ For Osha Neumann, a Motherfucker whose memoirs represents one of the most important sources on the group, the Lower East Side was “the anti-suburb” where [w]eeds sprouted between middens of mattress springs, rusting car parts, old clothes and beer cans.”⁴⁶ A sanctuary for young white radicals where “the rent was cheap and no one could tell them to cut their hair or get a job,”⁴⁷ the Lower East Side was, in Neumann's words, an “exit door” from America.⁴⁸

Espousing a politics of “rage and tribal bonding,” the Motherfuckers conceived of themselves, much as did the Hash Rebels in West Berlin, as protectors of the Lower East Side countercultural scene.⁴⁹ “By the beginning of 1968,” writes Neumann, “we had become a formidable presence on the Lower East Side. We ran free stores and crash pads. We organized community feasts in the courtyard of St. Marks church. We propagandized against the merchandising of hip culture and shook the psychedelic stores down for contributions to our cause.”⁵⁰ Holding themselves aloof from rationalist politics of the student and Marxist left, the Motherfuckers enacted their rebellion at the level of daily life. “Communists took jobs in factories to be close to ‘the people,’” writes Neumann; “Motherfuckers hung out on the streets to be close to *our* people, the ‘freaks’ as we fondly called them. Communists went to work. We did as little work as possible. We roamed the streets in dirty black leather jackets, carrying [switchblades] that we practiced flipping open with one hand.”⁵¹ Cranking out a

barrage of rhetorically over-the-top fliers on its Gestetner mimeograph machine, the group turned the occupation of public space into an assault on authority. As one of its fliers put it, "Sitting on the stoop is a revolutionary act. You are Che Guevara if you stand on the corner. . . . We must become a guerilla stoned army of the streets. . . . WE WILL USE THE BUDDY SYSTEM—GANG UP."⁵²

Calling for violent conflict with the system, the Motherfuckers declared war on cultural institutions and political authority alike. In January 1968 they staged a surrealist assault on a poetry reading in St. Marks church by Columbia University professor Kenneth Koch, "assassinating" Koch with a blank-firing pistol after distributing "Poetry is Revolution" fliers bearing the likeness of the recently-arrested black radical poet Leroi Jones.⁵³ The following month, during the New York City garbage strike, the group dumped several weeks' worth of uncollected garbage at Lincoln Center and set it on fire.⁵⁴ "WE PROPOSE A CULTURE EXCHANGE," read a flier distributed at the event; "(garbage for garbage): AMERICA TURNS THE WORLD INTO GARBAGE, IT TURNS ITS GHETTOS INTO GARBAGE, IT TURNS VIETNAM INTO GARBAGE."⁵⁵ In the spring, the group took part in the occupation of buildings at Columbia University, fiercely defending one of the last buildings to be cleared by the police.⁵⁶

Ben Morea subsequently insisted that the group affiliated themselves (somewhat incongruously), as the Lower East Side chapter of the SDS, becoming the only non-student chapter in the country. Yet, like their spiritual counterparts in West Berlin, the Motherfuckers were deeply suspicious of the doctrinaire Marxist cadre groups winning increasing influence in the student movement at the end of the 1960s. "We saw that SDS was becoming a real force for change," Morea recalls, "and that all these traditional left groups and Maoists like Progressive Labor were trying to take it over and control its direction. We thought it was important for other kinds of people, like us, to get involved and show the students that there were many choices, many ways they could go." As Osha Neumann puts it: "We joined Students for a Democratic Society not to argue ideology but to disrupt and chastise suitably impressed students for their lack of daring."⁵⁷ Arguing in favor of "[t]he small group executing 'small' actions in concert with other small groups," as one manifesto expressed it, "will create a widespread climate of struggle within which all forms of rebellion can come together and forge the final form: revolution."⁵⁸

The intransigent radicalism of the Motherfuckers increasingly brought them into conflict with what they saw as the commercialized, non-authentic aspects of the counterculture. Critical of celebrity figures like Allen Ginsberg and Timothy Leary for, as Ben Morea puts it, "allowing themselves to be used as a safety valve" for the pressures building between the counterculture and the establishment, the Motherfuckers asserted the primacy of *political* struggle, defined in their own unique way. One of the most emblematic UAW/MF actions unfolded in connection with the group's demand for a free night at promoter Bill Graham's Fillmore East. Occupying the theater during a performance of the Living Theater, the Motherfuckers distributed a flier reading in part:

October 22, 1968. Tonight the people return this theater to themselves. Originally our demands were modest, one night a week free for the people of the FREE community. Bill Graham (who within the archaic legal frames was

technically in control of the theater) refused our demands. Now we take what is ours anyway. The theater now belongs to the people, including Bill Graham.

The seats belong to the people . . .

Once we asked, now we take . . .

The Fillmore is no longer onemans, but everymans . . .

WE MUST PRESERVE THIS LIBERATED TERRITORY!⁵⁹

Criticizing “Bill Graham, hippie entrepreneur, who has made money from our music, but claims the right to his property for himself,” the flier concluded threateningly: “ONE NIGHT A WEEK OR THE SKY'S THE LIMIT.”⁶⁰ Faced with the violent occupation of the theater, during which the Motherfuckers fought with security and pledged to stay as long as necessary to attain their ends, and with subsequent heated discussions in which the issue refused to go away, Bill Graham eventually gave in.⁶¹

For the Motherfuckers, as for the Hash Rebels, violence in defense of the “true” counterculture and violence against the power of the state were two sides of the same coin. Whether housing teenage runaways, going up to Boston to defend local hippies against police harassment,⁶² or smashing the equipment of the radical Detroit rock group MC-5 for the sin of departing from a concert at the Fillmore East in a limousine,⁶³ the Motherfuckers understood themselves as “the defenders and organizers of the drop-out freak counterculture.”⁶⁴ The militant pose of the Motherfuckers could be as hard on its members as it was on the group's enemies, and like the Hash Rebels, the Motherfuckers received their share of criticism from allies on the left for whom 24-hour-a-day anger and violent confrontation were singularly unappealing.⁶⁵ But however extreme the group's actions and rhetoric, the heart of its agenda—erasing the distinctions between politics and daily life—was widely shared. “Total Revolution,” as Ben Morea puts it, “was our way of saying that we weren't going to settle for political or cultural change, but that we want it all, we want everything to change.”⁶⁶

London: “How Much More Can You Take?”

Morea's claims about a “total revolution” invite skepticism from a gender-analytical perspective, as available evidence suggests that the “family” reproduced patterns of male dominance that, if anything, mirrored those in society at large.⁶⁷ “The vicissitudes of male emotional life dominated the Motherfuckers,” writes Osha Neumann;

Women played a distinctly ancillary role in all matters. . . . They did the traditional women's work of cooking for the group, helping to prepare the community feasts we organized, nursing babies, and tending to the bruised egos of the men. But they also hawked our fliers, got arrested (rarely) at our demonstrations, yelled at the cops, and stole credit cards to finance various nefarious adventures.⁶⁸

Involvement of this sort did not however admit women to the “long tense political arguments” that informed the intellectual life of the group.⁶⁹ Ben Morea's friendship with Valerie Solanis, the assassin of artist Andy Warhol, was the exception that proved the rule, as she was at least Morea's equal in her

mastery of the “the language of terror and retribution” that dominated the rhetoric of the Motherfuckers.⁷⁰

To be sure, the Motherfuckers' emphasis on physical confrontation and street combat, for all its countercultural affect, resonated with the classical postures of male warriorism associated with earlier extreme-left movements. The Hash Rebel scene in West Berlin, while it expressed a similar degree of militancy, seems to have been marked by the significant participation of women, a number of whom were radical trendsetters.⁷¹ In London, two related groups, which for purposes of this essay may be seen as analogous to the Motherfuckers and the Hash Rebels, may be taken to represent two gender poles of the radicalized counterculture. One—King Mob—openly patterned itself on Ben Morea's Black Mask, going further to dabble in overtly sexist iconography as part of its attempt to upset a complacent art world and disrupt the spectacular commodity culture; the other—the Angry Brigade—featured the prominent participation of women involved in the homosexual rights and women's movements, and became famous for unleashing a bombing campaign aimed at the intersection of Situationist disruption, countercultural self-defense, and working class politics.

Both groups, in different ways, must be seen as products of the 1960s revival of anarchism. The blend of anarchism, artistic avant-gardism, and Situationism that fueled the anarchist-countercultural revival elsewhere found its resonance in London beginning in July 1966 with the publication of the first issue of *Heatwave*. Founded by Charles Radcliffe and Diana Shelley, inspired by the visit of Franklin and Penelope Rosemont to London in the spring of that year, *Heatwave* was a proto-Situationist newspaper that sought, like the *Rebel Worker*, to come to grips from an anarchist perspective with the burgeoning youth culture of the 1960s. “If anarchism has nothing to say [to young music fans],” wrote Radcliffe in a characteristic early passage, “it has nothing to say at all.”⁷² After collaborating with the Rosemonts on an Anglo-American issue of *Rebel Worker* (*Rebel Worker* Nr. 6), which they distributed at a May Day rally in Hyde Park, Radcliffe and Shelley went on to found their own newspaper. Like the Rosemonts, Radcliffe and Shelley took for granted the subversive power of rock and roll and other forms of youth culture. Overflowing with analyses of “the countless and varied strands of autonomous post-war youth rebellion—rock'n'roll, the Beats, ban-the-bombers, Surrealism, Dada, existentialism, avant-garde artists, drugs, ‘blues’ and so much else,” the pages of *Heatwave* contained some of the earliest and most incisive attempts at subcultural analysis.⁷³

In Britain, the influence of anarchist veterans was greater than in West Berlin or New York. For young activists like Charles Radcliffe, anarchism was a living presence. London was home not only to tenacious indigenous anarchist groups like “Freedom” and “Solidarity” (the latter the English wing of the French “Socialisme ou Barbarie”) but also played host to a vigorous Spanish exile presence made up of former militants from the CNT and its affiliated Iberian Federation of Libertarian Youth (FIJL). The Spanish connection announced itself in spectacular fashion in August 1964, when the young Scottish anarchist Stuart Christie was arrested in Spain for trying to assassinate dictator Francisco Franco. Released from prison in September 1967 after an international campaign, Christie returned to London to take part in various radical initiatives, including the re-founding of the Anarchist Black Cross.⁷⁴ The year of Christie's arrest also saw the beginning of an international wave of

bombings by the First of May Group (International Revolutionary Solidarity Movement), a secret branch of the CNT recruited from the international anarchist movement.⁷⁵ The bombing campaign, alongside escalating protest against the Vietnam War, and the heating up of political struggle within the counterculture, insured that anarchism occupied a prominent position in the struggle between the British state and its critics from the mid-1960s onward.

Heatwave drew in particular on the anarchist strand in the British anti-nuclear movement, which was significant in the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) as well as in the philosopher Bertrand Russell's Committee of 100 and its offshoot, Spies for Peace. It also enjoyed close ties to Freedom Press, which on more than one occasion lent its facilities to the production of *Heatwave*. Yet theoretical and practical influences from the continent—above all Dutch Provo and French Situationism—became increasingly central to the ethos of *Heatwave*. In October 1966, Radcliffe and Shelley, along with Chris Gray, embarked on a “revolutionary grand tour” that took them to Amsterdam, Brussels, and Paris. Impressed by Provo's energy and initiative (which Radcliffe wrote about approvingly in *Heatwave* #2) the trio moved on to Brussels where they spent an evening with the Situationist theorist Raoul Vaneigem. Vaneigem spent most of the visit regaling them (to Shelley's evident discomfort) with bloodthirsty tales of anarchism's 19th century terrorist heyday.⁷⁶ In Paris, Radcliffe, Shelley and Gray were received warmly in the court of Guy Dubord, where, after much wine, tobacco, and denunciation of Situationism's theoretical competitors, Radcliffe and Gray were admitted as the “English Section” of the Situationist International.⁷⁷

Yet the notoriously fickle and excommunicative SI, while it served as an umbrella for the international transfer of radical ideas, was an uneasy fit for the eclectic, exuberant and youthful radicalism of the *Heatwave* and *Rebel Worker* groups (the latter ungenerously dismissed as “Surrealist cretins” by Dubord), let alone for the more militant and uncontrollable groups like the one around Ben Morea in New York.⁷⁸ After the excommunication of Morea in late 1967, several members of the *Heatwave* group were proscribed for their continuing support of him.⁷⁹ Charles Radcliffe had already quit a few weeks earlier out of disgust with the SI's sectarian parochialism.⁸⁰

The excommunicated Chris Gray, along with Don Nicholson-Smith, Tim (TJ) Clark, and the twins David and Stuart Wise, now formed King Mob, a group aimed at disrupting the spectacle of modern consumer society by any means necessary. “At the time,” writes David Wise, like his brother, a former student at Newcastle Art School,

Smiths, the popular newspaper and trashy mag newspaper chainstore brought out a series of attractively presented folders on various events in the history of these islands. One of them was on the Gordon riots of 1781 in London when a huge swathe of the capital's destitute population was swept up in an orgy of looting, burning and bitter revenge. . . . On the walls of a destroyed Newgate prison some insurgent had painted up: “*His Majesty King Mob*.” This seemed too good to miss as a title for a magazine cover and moreover we were connecting with a great though relatively unknown past. . . . We weren't really interested in the whys and wherefores of the riots [but in the] fact that London was put to the force of fire . . . [and] we dreamed of doing the same thing all over again!⁸¹

Drawing both on the anti-art tradition of Dada and Surrealism and the destructive impulses of 19th century Russian Nihilism, King Mob was heavily inspired by the example of Ben Morea in New York. Two of its members travelled to New York “in the summer of 1967 specifically . . . to meet Black Mask. . . . In a sense we had by-passed London and we were in fact disdainful of the London centered ‘counter culture’ promoted by *The International Times* with its wishy-washy critique of present day society. . . .”⁸² Black Mask, by contrast, offered a “no-holds-barred, risk-everything example” to place alongside “the dialectical certainties of Paris.”⁸³

Styling themselves the “gangsters of the new freedom,” King Mob moved to enact a politics of cultural provocation both weirder and arguably more violent (at least rhetorically) than that of the Motherfuckers.⁸⁴ The group’s first public intervention came, characteristically, in connection with a conflict over the disposition of urban space.⁸⁵ Chris Gray had moved to the Notting Hill area of London, a place with cheap flats and a general “air of marginality” that made it attractive to young drop-outs and bohemians.⁸⁶ A hot bed of radical community organizing, the area was home to the West London Claimants Union—a group which aimed to “challenge the whole nature and purpose of work in . . . society”⁸⁷—and the Notting Hill People’s Association, an association active in opening up previously fenced-in public squares.⁸⁸ In June 1968, dressed in gorilla suits and circus horse outfits, members of King Mob led a crowd pulling down the fences around Powis Square gardens.⁸⁹ “Together we all set off down Portobello Road shouting our heads off asking all onlookers to join us in pulling down the fences around Powis Square so that local kids could have somewhere safely to gamble about in,” writes David Wise;

Well, a lot more other things were shouted out too because this had become instantly an occasion where you could shoot your mouth off and if it was ostensibly about kids it was also much more about total revolution—for us big kids—and that came across loud and clear. Arriving at Powis Square we set about the fences, though within minutes, as expected, police vans arrived and the arrests started during some violent scuffles. The gorilla and the circus horse were arrested along with a fair number of species of homo sapiens.⁹⁰

The result of this piece of direct action was the founding of a children’s playground in an area previously closed to all but better-off residents.⁹¹

It is uncertain whether this conventionally positive result gave any genuine satisfaction to the relentlessly unpleasant members of King Mob. Their magazine *King Mob Echo*, which first appeared in April 1968, took the attempt to shock readers out of spectacular complacency to absurd heights. Praising infamous sociopaths like Jack the Ripper and John Christie, it also mooted plans for outrages such as “dynamiting a waterfall in the Lake District, with accompanying ‘Peace in Vietnam’ graffiti; blowing up Wordsworth’s house in Ambleside with accompanying ‘Coleridge Lives’ slogan; and hanging peacocks in Holland Park with ‘Peacocks is Dead’ graffiti.”⁹² The group responded approvingly to Valerie Solanis’ shooting of Andy Warhol, publishing its own hit list of countercultural luminaries which included Yoko Ono, Mick Jagger, Bob Dylan, Richard Hamilton, David Hockney, Mary Quant, Twiggy, and *IT* editors Barry Miles and Marianne Faithful.⁹³ Such attempts to blur the distinction between art,

political action and outright criminality obviously owed as much or more to the Dadaists and Futurists circa 1920 as it did to the international counterculture circa 1968. But the rhetorical nihilism and violence of King Mob was more than an attempt to 'Epater les bourgeois;' it was also both a critique of what it saw as hippie naiveté and an outcry against the commodification of the counterculture by hip capitalism. "Better to be horrible," ran a characteristic passage, "than a pleasant, altruistic hippy."⁹⁴

The desire to poke a finger in the eye of flower child optimism dovetailed neatly with the goal of recreating the "street gang with an analysis" pose of the Motherfuckers on British soil; but it was also an expression of a disgust—shared with King Mob's counterparts in New York and West Berlin—for organized left wing politics. King Mob was cheerfully contemptuous of the student movement and the Marxist-sectarian New Left. The group's shocking and bloodthirsty posters, featuring crudely sexist images of women's' bodies and, in one striking case, a depiction of the cartoon character Andy Capp shooting a police officer, did not endear them to students, who on at least one occasion tore the posters off the walls. King Mob returned the favor, disrupting student meetings during the March 1967 occupation of the London School of Economics, and mocking "Ho, Ho, Ho Chi Minh!"-chanting demonstrators at an anti-Vietnam War protest with cries of "Hot Chocolate, Drinking Chocolate!"⁹⁵ From King Mob's perspective, such interventions were imminently justifiable, not only because they were fun, but because, like good Situationists, they aimed above all at disrupting everyday normality. King Mob's most lasting claim to fame is an oft-reproduced photograph of a graffiti slogan they scrawled near the Royal Oak station on the Hammersmith and City line: "Same thing day after day - tube - work - diner [sic] - work - tube - armchair - TV - sleep - tube - work - how much more can you take? - one in ten go mad - one in five cracks up."⁹⁶

Given the generally sexist nature of the counterculture in the period before the onset of the women's movement, it is not entirely surprising that King Mob's visual style displayed distinctly misogynistic touches. Yet what appear to be quite retrograde gender politics may also be seen as an outcome of King Mob's avant-garde bad-boy pose. The artist-hero in the tradition of Futurism and Surrealism, for whom all is allowed, including violence, and for whom the opposite sex are at best a muse and at worst a despised distraction, seems to be—for reasons that future research and analysis might attempt to uncover—a male-gendered type.⁹⁷ Yet it would be a mistake, in placing King Mob in the avant-garde tradition to which they clearly belong and in which they explicitly placed themselves, to ignore the connection between their activities and the general revival of anarchist ideas and action forms in the 1960s. Their emphasis on direct action, countercultural self-defense in the urban environment, and Situationist theory—the latter itself a major influence on the anarchist revival, as we have seen—clearly place King Mob within the broader neo-anarchist complex outlined in this article.

Yet it is also noteworthy that the Angry Brigade—a group arising out of the same London countercultural circles as King Mob and possessing individual connections with some of its members—not only pursued a very different sort of gender politics, but displayed an even closer relationship with anarchism in both theoretical and organizational terms. A loosely-knit collection of anti-authoritarian socialists who unleashed a campaign of bombings in London

beginning in October 1967, the Angry Brigade was comprised of a roughly equal number of men and women.⁹⁸ Unlike clandestine urban guerilla groups like the Red Army Faction in West Germany or the Weathermen in the USA, the Angry Brigade was less a clandestine urban guerilla group than a multifaceted, *ad hoc* initiative of the increasingly militant London counterculture.⁹⁹ Members of the Brigade were heavily involved in community organizing and in the London squatting scene.¹⁰⁰ John Barker, an early associate of King Mob, was a radical organizer in Notting Hill and a member of the West London Claimant's Union.¹⁰¹ Angie Weir, another member, was active in the Gay Liberation Front, while Eva Mendelson and Hillary Creek were active in the nascent women's movement.¹⁰²

Given their interests and background, it is little surprise that the members of the Angry Brigade launched attacks against both "political" and "cultural" targets. Alongside bombs aimed at official installations and personages (in which, it should be pointed out, only property was attacked) the Angry Brigade targeted a BBC news van outside the Miss World pageant,¹⁰³ and the fashionable Biba boutique in Kensington, an epicenter of "swinging London" countercultural cooptation.¹⁰⁴ The latter of these "Situationist-feminist bombings,"¹⁰⁵ as Stuart Christie calls them, were accompanied by a communiqué that perfectly captured the Angry Brigade's distinctive blend of countercultural self-awareness, Situationist vocabulary, and anarchist propaganda-of-the-deed: "Life is so boring there is nothing to do except spend all our wages on the latest skirt or shirt," read a communiqué released in connection with the bombing; "Brothers and Sisters what are your real desires? Sit in the drugstore, look distant, empty, bored, drinking some tasteless coffee? Or perhaps BLOW IT UP OR BURN IT DOWN."¹⁰⁶

Conclusion: "Be High, Be Free, Terror's Gotta Be"?

It is hardly surprising that members of English counterculture, facing increased pressure from the authorities and influenced both by the Situationist critique of the spectacular society and anarchist doctrines of direct action, turned to violent resistance against the state. In New York, the radicalism of the Motherfuckers influenced some members of the Weather Underground terrorist group, and in West Germany, militants of the Hash Rebel/Blues scene became founding members of the terrorist *Bewegung 2. Juni* (Movement 2nd June). Like so much else in "1968," the rhetoric of violent confrontation—whether in the Motherfuckers' slogan "we're looking for people who like to draw" (accompanied by an image of the armed Indian chief Geronimo), or in the Hash Rebel's cheeky "High sein, frei sein, Terror muss dabei sein!! ("Be high, be free, terror's gotta be")—transformed itself slowly from irony to reality. Yet the turn to armed struggle was more than a matter of talk becoming action. The denial of the authority of the state present in the attempt to defend personal and spatial autonomy, whether in the Lower East Side of Manhattan, the Notting Hill district of London, or the narrow confines of Cold War Berlin Kreuzberg, carried its own inexorable logic.

The brief sketches of three urban milieux here are by no means meant to be the last word on the role of avant-gardes and urban rebels, nor on the resurgence of anarchism, in the global sixties. Certainly, key broader aspects of 1968—

efforts at self-management from below; the uncovering and overcoming of authoritarian relationships in the home/school/workplace; attempts at the democratization of daily life; the challenging of Cold War boundaries and categories; skepticism about classical Marxist/working class politics—resonated powerfully with traditional anarchist concerns. And certainly, also, the broader libertarian-socialist content of 1968 has aged rather better than either the dogmatic-sectarian support for the national liberation struggles of the Third World—which in its anxiousness to support the struggle against US imperialism, often overlooked the authoritarian communist politics to which these struggles were attached—or the avant-gardist politics of shock, disruption, and personal anger represented by groups like the Motherfuckers and King Mob.

But attention to concrete expressions of anarchist politics in the urban environment like those examined in this article is important for several reasons. First, a focus on urban avant-gardes and subcultures that were the driving force of anarchist perspectives and action forms is a much-needed corrective to casual associations of 1968 with student organizations. To be sure, students were involved in the counterculture, and it would be inaccurate to draw too-stark a line of separation between students on the one hand and “freaks” on the other; yet, because urban rebels and avant-gardes typically set themselves up in explicit opposition to student politics, which they regarded as politically dogmatic and culturally “straight,” and because they tended to draw for inspiration less on militarized models of Third World liberation than from groups like the Situationists oriented toward the intersection of art, politics, and daily life, it seems fair to posit them as representing an alternative sphere of sixties activism that ran in parallel, sometimes intersecting with, sometimes diverging from, student politics. In each of the countries examined here, it was arguably the counterculture, rather than the student movement, that provided the most significant vehicle for the penetration of the revolution of 1968 into society; and the counterculture, in contrast to the student movements, cut across social classes to include both bohemian dropouts and young workers. In the counterculture, as we have seen, anarchist ideas, either explicit or implicit, were much more influential than the dogmatic, jargon-laden pronouncements of the various Marxist-Leninist, Trotskyist, and Maoist alignments.

Second, thinking about the urban enclaves and liminal zones in which countercultural politics unfolded opens a fresh perspective on the transnational connections that helped drive the uprisings of the 1960s. Just as neighborhoods like Berlin-Kreuzberg, Notting Hill in London, and the Lower East Side of New York City represent concrete sites of the sixties in the city, the actors at work in these locations represented the living faces of the transnational; the networks along which they moved—corresponding partially but not entirely to those of the Situationist International—helped construct an international rebellion that nevertheless unfolded in distinctive locations. Publications such as *Heatwave*, *Rebel Worker*, and *Black Mask*, disseminated along the same networks, helped link these urban enclaves to each other, and to the larger “global” field of ideas fueling the sixties rebellion.

Finally, as we have seen, conflicts with authority in the urban environment were much more than the pet projects of self-styled radicals bent on protecting dubious freedoms against all comers; they intersected with concrete issues having to do with the right to autonomy for young people in the urban

cityscape, and with broader issues of community self-determination in the face of the prerogatives of property and the pressure of city authorities, police, and media.¹⁰⁷ From this perspective, avant-gardes and urban rebels in New York, London, and West Berlin operated at a site where fault lines in the movements of the global sixties became readily visible; a place where the artistic and the political came together and overlapped; and a place where struggles between the movements of 1968 and the establishment took concrete shape at the level of daily life.

Endnotes

Address correspondence to Timothy Brown, Department of History, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115. Email: ti.brown@neu.edu.

1. On the global sixties, see Jeremy Suri, *Power and Protest: Global Revolution and the Rise of Détente* (Cambridge, MA, and London, 2003); Samantha Christiansen and Zachary Scarlett, *The Third World in the Global 1960s* (New York and Oxford, 2012); Martin Klimke, *The "Other Alliance": Global Protest and Student Unrest in West Germany and the U.S., 1962–72* (Princeton, NJ, 2010); Martin Klimke and Joachim Scharloth, eds., *1968 in Europe: A History of Protest and Activism, 1956–1977*. Transnational History Series (New York, 2008); Gerd-Rainer Horn, *The Spirit of '68: Rebellion in Western Europe and North America, 1956-1976* (Oxford, UK, 2006).

2. A reference to the anarchist minors who had fought against Franco in the Spanish Civil War and continued to rebel periodically into the 1950s and '60s; *Internationale Situationniste*, July 1964.

3. See, for example, the essays in Axel Schildt and Detlef Siegfried, eds., *European Cities, Youth, and the Public Sphere in the Twentieth Century* (Hampshire, UK, 2005).

4. Manuel Castells, *The City and the Grassroots: A Cross-Cultural Theory of Urban Social Movements* (Berkeley, CA, and Los Angeles, 1983), 318.

5. Ibid.

6. See Hans-Liudger Dienel and Malte Schophaus, "Urban Wastelands and the Development of Youth Cultures in Berlin since 1945, with Comparative Perspectives on Amsterdam and Naples," in Schildt and Siegfried, *European Cities*, 111–33.

7. See the experiences recounted by the *International Times* correspondent Alex Gross in Alex Gross, *The Untold Sixties: When Hope Was Born: An Insider's Sixties on an International Scale* (New York, 2009), 190.

8. Bommi Baumann with Christof Meueler, *Rausch und Terror: Ein politischer Erlebnisbericht* (Berlin, 2008), 26; Ralf Reinders and Ronald Fritsch, *Die Bewegung 2. Juni. Gespräche über Haschrebellen, Lorenzführung, Knast* (Berlin and Amsterdam, 1995), 13.

9. On the question of "the different mentaliteé" of refugees from the GDR, see Detlef Siegfried, *Time Is on My Side: Konsum und Politik in der westdeutschen Jugendkultur der 60er Jahre* (Hamburg, 2006), 195–99.

10. Rudi Dutschke, *Ausgewählte und kommentierte Bibliographie des revolutionären Sozialismus von Karl Marx bis in die Gegenwart* (1966), 50. One aim of the *Bibliographie*, point out Markus Henning and Rolf Raasch, was to subvert the dominant conception of Marxist theory within the SDS; see Markus Henning and Rolf Raasch, *Neoanarchismus in Deutschland. Entstehung. Verlauf. Konfliktlinien* (Berlin, 2005).

11. Ibid., 52.

12. Bernd Rabehl, "Die Provokationselite: Aufbruch und Scheitern der subversiven Rebellion in den sechziger Jahren," in Siegwald Lönnendonker, Bernd Rabehl, Jochen Staadt, eds., *Die antiautoritäre Revolte: der Sozialistische Deutsche Studentenbund nach der Trennung von der SPD*, Bd. 1: 1960–1967 (Opladen, 2002), 425.
13. See the classic account by René Viénet, *Enragés and Situationists in the Occupation Movement, France, May '68* (New York, 1992) (originally published 1968).
14. On the Gruppe Spur, see Mia Lee, "Gruppe Spur: Art as a Revolutionary Medium during the Cold War," in Timothy Brown and Lorena Anton, eds., *Between the Avant-Garde and the Everyday: Subversive Politics in Europe, 1958–2008* (New York and Oxford, 2011).
15. The most famous of these were the protests against the African strongman Moise Tshombe in Munich and Berlin on December 14 and 18, 1964. See the assessment of the significance of the protest in Uwe Bergmann, Rudi Dutschke, Wolfgang Lefevre, Bernd Rabehl, eds., *Rebellion der Studenten oder Die neue Opposition* (Hamburg, 1968), 63. See also "Der Beginn unserer Kulturrevolution.' Vor 40 Jahren: Studentischer Protest gegen den Kongolesischen Staatspräsident Moise Tschombe," *So oder So!*, Nr. 14, Fall 2004, 15.
16. On the *Kommune I*, see Timothy S. Brown, "1968 East and West: Divided Germany as a Case Study in Transnational History," *American Historical Review*, Volume 114 (February 2009).
17. The classic account is Michael Baumann, *How It All Began* (Vancouver, 1977).
18. "Scheisst auf diese Gesellschaft," flier originally distributed in West Berlin the summer of 1969, reprinted in *Gefundene Fragmente, 1967–1980*, Volume 1 (Berlin, 2003), 9.
19. Reinders and Fritsch, *Die Bewegung 2. Juni*, 24.
20. *Ibid.*, 26-7.
21. See Diemel and Schophaus, "Urban Wastelands."
22. On the squatter movement in Berlin, see Carla MacDougal, "In the Shadow of the Wall: Urban Space and Everyday Life in Berlin Kreuzberg," in Brown and Anton, eds., *Between the Avant-Garde and the Everyday*.
23. *Ist "Hair" Subkultur?*, in *Gefunde Fragmente 1967–1980*, 24.
24. *Ibid.*
25. The name appears to have been suggested by Dieter Kunzelmann of the *Kommune I*; see Reinders and Fritsch, *Die Bewegung 2. Juni*, 23.
26. Peter Paul Zahl, "Haschischkampagne oder Die Ideologie der "Glücklichen Verbraucher," *Agit 883*, Nr. 24, July 24, 1969, 4.
27. Werner Olles, "Kiff und Revolution," *Agit 883*, Nr. 28, August 21, 1969, p. 5. Olles was a member of the Frankfurt branch of the SDS Frankfurt and later became near to the *K-Gruppe KPD/ML*.
28. *Ibid.*
29. "Ein Sozialist muss aussehen wie ein Spiesser," *Gefunde Fragmente 1967–1980*, 17.
30. See Ben Morea and Ron Hahne, *Black Mask & Up Against the Wall Motherf**ker: The Incomplete Works of Ron Hahne, Ben Morea, and the Black Mask Group* (Oakland, CA, 2011).

31. On October 10, 1966, see Osha Neumann, *Up Against the Wall Motherf**ker: A Memoir of the '60s, with Notes for Next Time* (New York, 2008).
32. *Black Mask* #3, January 1967, quoted in Lain McIntyre, "A Conversation with Black Mask," in Josh MacPhee, Erik Reuland, Carlos Cortéz, eds., *Realizing the Impossible: Art Against Authority* (Oakland, CA, and Glasgow, 2007).
33. <http://www.revoltagainstplenty.com/index.php/recent/34-archivelocal/45-new-introduction-for-a-spanish-book-on-black-mask-a-the-motherfuckers.html>. Vaneigem's book was translated by the English Situationist Christopher Gray as *The Totality for Kids*.
34. "To Ben Morea, 21 December 1967, Cunt, piece of shit, liar," Guy Debord Correspondance, Vol "0": Septembre 1951 – Juillet 1957: Complete des "lettres retrouvées" et d l'index general des noms cites by Librairie Artheme Fayard, October 2010. Translated from the French by NOT BORED!, February 2011—<http://www.notbored.org/debord-21December1967b.html>.
35. See "The Latest Exclusions," *Internationale Situationniste*, Nr. 12 (September 1969), in Ken Knabb, ed., *The Situationist International Anthology* (Bureau of Public Secrets, 2002).
36. "New Introduction for a Spanish Book on Black Mask & the Motherfuckers," <http://www.revoltagainstplenty.com/index.php/recent/34-archivelocal/45-new-introduction-for-a-spanish-book-on-black-mask-a-the-motherfuckers.html>.
37. For his pains in the effort to clear Morea's name with the SI, Bookchin was proclaimed a "Confusionist cretin" by Guy Dubord. "We have seen you support the liars while you were in Paris," wrote Dubord; "Your suspicious efforts to act as mediator in New York in favor of pathetic Morea and his mystical associate have finished you off. You are only spit in the horrible communitarian soup in which everyone scorns everyone else, as you all merit. Never more hope to meet a situationist (if you see one, it will be a false one)." For the Situationist International, Guy Debord, Mustapha Khayati, Raoul Vaneigem, "To Murray Bookchin," December 21, 1967.
38. "Murray was keen on using the Spanish term *aficionado de vaires* to describe these non-hierarchical groupings of people that were happening," recalls Ben Morea; "We said 'Oh my god, can you really imagine Americans calling themselves *aficionado de vaires*?' (laughter) 'Use English, call them affinity groups.'" Ben Morea interview with Lain McIntyre (2006), published in Ret Marut, "Up Against The Wall Motherfucker!—Interview with Ben Morea," <http://libcom.org/history/against-wall-motherfucker-interview-ben-morea>.
39. Franklin Rosemont, "To be Revolutionary in Everything: The Rebel Worker Story, 1964–1968," in Franklin Rosemont and Charles Radcliffe, eds., *Dancin' in the Streets! Anarchists, IWWs, Surrealists, Situationists and Provos in the 1960s as recorded in the pages of the Rebel Worker and Heatwave* (Chicago, 2005), 1–82, 17.
40. Rosemont, "To Be Revolutionary in Everything," 38.
41. Penelope Rosemont, *Dreams & Everyday Life: Andre Breton, Surrealism, Rebel Worker, SDS & the Seven Cities of Cibola, a 1960s Notebook* (Chicago, 2008).
42. See Franklin Rosemont, "Mods, Rockers and the Revolution," reprinted in Rosemont and Radcliffe, *Dancin' in the Streets!*, 127–131.
43. See "Affinity Group: A Street Gang with an Analysis," in Peter Stansill & David Zane Mairowitz, *BAMN. By any Means Necessary. Outlaw Manifestos and Ephemera 1965–1970* (originally published 1971) (Brooklyn, NY, 1999), 144–46.
44. Stansill and Mairowitz, *BAMN*, 141.

45. Monica Sjöô-Trickey, "New York Trauma," *International Times*, Nr. 42, October 1968.
46. Neumann, *Up Against the Wall*, 35.
47. Osha Neumann, "Motherfuckers Then and Now: My Sixties Problem," in Marcy Darnovsky, Barbara Epstein, and Richard Flacks, eds., *Cultural Politics and Social Movements* (Philadelphia, 1995), 55–73, 55.
48. Neumann, *Up Against the Wall*, 41
49. *Ibid.*, 66.
50. *Ibid.*, 68.
51. *Ibid.*, 69.
52. Reprinted in *ibid.*, 69.
53. Neumann, *Up Against the Wall*, 55.
54. A movie of the event, appropriately entitled "Garbage," was filmed by the Newsreel Collective; see Eve Hinderer, "Ben Morea, Black Mask, and Motherfucker: A Saga of the '60s Lower East Side," in Clayton Patterson, *Resistance: A Radical Political History of the Lower East Side* (New York, 2006).
55. Neumann, "Motherfuckers Then and Now," 57.
56. See the extended discussion in Neumann, *Up Against the Wall*, 77–85.
57. Neumann, "Motherfuckers Then and Now," 62.
58. "Affinity Group: A Street Gang with an Analysis," Stansill and Mairowitz, *BAMN*, 145.
59. "Fillmore Free Theater Leaflets," in Peter Stansill & David Zane Mairowitz, *BAMN. By Any Means Necessary: Outlaw Manifestos and Ephemera 1965–1970* (originally published 1971) (Brooklyn, 1999), 150.
60. *Ibid.*
61. Ben Morea interview with Lain McIntyre (2006), published in Ret Marut, "Up Against the Wall Motherfucker!—Interview with Ben Morea," <http://libcom.org/history/against-wall-motherfucker-interview-ben-morea>.
62. "Hip Survival Bulletin. Armed Love. Love Armed," in Stansill and Mairowitz, *BAMN*, 147.
63. In December 1967, the MC-5 had previously played a benefit for Ben Morea, under arrest for violence during the group's visit to Boston; see David A. Carson, *Grit, Noise, and Revolution: The Birth of Detroit Rock 'n' Roll* (Ann Arbor, MI, 2005).
64. Neumann, "Motherfuckers Then and Now," 56.
65. Franklin Rosemont, for example, is highly critical of the Motherfuckers' turn toward violent confrontation, and especially their association with the nascent Weathermen; see Rosemont, "To Be Revolutionary in Everything," 73.
66. Ben Morea interview with Lain McIntyre (2006), published in Ret Marut, "Up Against The Wall Motherfucker!—Interview with Ben Morea," <http://libcom.org/history/against-wall-motherfucker-interview-ben-morea>.
67. See the recollections in Neumann, *Up Against the Wall*.
68. Neumann, *Up Against the Wall*, 58.

69. Ibid.

70. Neumann, *Up Against the Wall*, 98.

71. See, for example, the recollections in Rio Reiser, *König von Deutschland. Erinnerungen an Ton Steine Scherben und mehr*. Erzählt von ihm selbst und Hannes Eyber (Berlin, 2001); see also Gabriele Rollnik and Daniel Dubbe, *Keine Angst vor niemand. Über die Siebziger, die Bewegung 2. Juni und die RAF* (Hamburg, Germany, 2004).

72. Charles Radcliffe, "Pop Goes the Beatle," *Freedom*, November 16, 1963, quoted in Charles Radcliffe, "Two Fiery Flying Rolls—The Heatwave Story, 1966–1970," in Rosemont and Radcliffe, eds., *Dancin' in the Streets!*, 327-380, 344.

73. Ibid., 351.

74. Stuart Christie, *Granny Made Me an Anarchist: General Franco, the Angry Brigade, and Me* (Oakland, CA, and Edinburgh, 2007).

75. Ibid., 225.

76. "He took great delight," recalls Radcliffe, "in showing us his collection of various late-nineteenth-century anarchist terrorist artifacts . . ." Radcliffe, "Two Fiery Flying Rolls," 361.

77. Ibid., 363.

78. Despite the fact, as Radcliffe writes, that "at that point the Chicagoans were the only people in the USA actively promoting and distributing Situationist material!" Radcliffe, "Two Fiery Flying Rolls," 365.

79. "Gray now publishes a rag called *King Mob*," observed an SI publication in late 1969, "which passes, quite wrongly, for being slightly pro-situationist, and . . . [in which is made] the ludicrous contention that Morea had the merit of transferring certain radical positions 'from the situationist salon' to street fighting . . ." "Les dernières exclusions," *Internationale Situationniste*, Nr. 12 (Paris, September 1969), reprinted in Ken Knabb, ed., *Situationist International Anthology* (Berkeley, CA, 1981), 294.

80. "Ben was inevitably very upset about Vaneigem," writes Dave Wise of London's *King Mob*, "and started raving on in letters about the man of letters disposition he put across accusing him of not knowing anything about those at the bottom of the pile and street life in general"; see Dave Wise, "Jumbled Notes: A Critical Hidden History of *King Mob*," unpublished manuscript (1999–2003), posted on the Wise brothers' website at www.revoltagainstplenty.com. Writes Dick Pountain, another member of the *King Mob* scene: "They [the Paris Situationists] wouldn't tolerate any kind of tendencies or whatever and also our take was different from theirs; they were high-powered French intellectuals, we were rapidly becoming street hippies. They didn't like the street culture, they saw it even then as part of the 'Spectacle.'" Quoted in Jonathon Green, *Days in the Life: Voices from the English Underground 1961–1971* (London, 1988), 250.

81. See Wise, "Jumbled Notes."

82. <http://www.revoltagainstplenty.com/index.php/recent/34-archivelocal/45-new-introduction-for-a-spanish-book-on-black-mask-a-the-motherfuckers.html>.

83. Don Nicholson-Smith, quoted in Dick Pountain, "Chris Gray: Anarchist, Writer and Maverick Situationist," *The Guardian*, Tuesday, July 7, 2009; <http://www.guardian.co.uk/books/2009/jul/08/obituary-chris-gray>.

84. Hari Kunzru, "The Mob Who Really Shouldn't Be Here," *Tate Online: Europe's Largest Art Magazine*, <http://www.tate.org.uk/tateetc/issue13/kingmob.htm>.

85. “[C]ontrol of space and land and buildings has always been at the heart of the battle between the haves and the have-nots in Notting Hill,” writes the English anarchist Ian Bone; see Ian Bone, “Toffs Out!,” in Tom Vague, “Bash the Rich: The Class War Radical History Tour of Notting Hill,” <http://thebristolblogger.files.wordpress.com/2007/10/notting-hill-radical-history-tour.pdf>.
86. Notting Hill was the site of race riots by white “Teddy Boys” against West Indian immigrants in the 1950s; see Edward Pilkington, *Beyond the Mother Country: West Indians and the Notting Hill Riots* (London, 1988).
87. Vague, *Anarchy in the UK*, 28. On the background of Angry Brigade members see Chad Martin, *Paradise Now: Youth Politics and the British Counterculture 1958-1974*. Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University, March 2003, 255.
88. Christie, *Granny Made Me An Anarchist*, 312. See also Jan O’Malley, *The Politics of Community Action* (Nottingham, 1977).
89. A first attempt to breach the gates had been made by members of the Notting Hill People’s Association the previous year; see Vague, “Bash the Rich.”
90. Wise, “Jumbled Notes.”
91. “Although most of us had just recently moved into the West London area,” writes David Wise, “. . . we were quickly aware of local anger about the lack of play space for children which in Notting Hill had resulted in children been knocked down by cars. Finally, a child had been killed. There were green spaces around alright—big enclosed garden areas—but they were for the leisure activities of an isthmus of rich people who in a pastiche of ribbon development, extended down into the “Gate” from the rich folks on the (proper) Notting Hill. At the time they were seen as the colonizers . . .” Wise, “Jumbled Notes.”
92. Vague, *Anarchy in the UK*, 130. One very successful stunt during Christmas 1968 involved having a member dressed up in a Santa outfit distribute toys (right off the shelves) to children in the Selfridges department store, prompting employees to alert the police. This stunt, writes Greil Marcus, “accomplished Strasbourg-style détournement when the children were forced to witness the shocking sight of one of Santa’s helpers placed under arrest.” Greil Marcus, *Lipstick Traces: A Secret History of the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge, MA, 2003), 438.
93. Vague, *Anarchy in the UK*, 132; King Mob also played with the idea of harnessing the anti-establishment power of London’s skinheads, who were making the news with spectacular feats of football hooliganism in 1970–71.
94. Quoted in Vague, *Anarchy in the UK*, 130.
95. Patrick Sawyer, “The Power of King Mob,” *The First Post*, <http://www.thefirstpost.co.uk/38808,features,the-power-of-king-mob>.
96. Jonathan Green, “The urban guerrillas Britain forgot,” *New Statesman*, August 27, 2001.
97. F.T. Marinetti’s call for “contempt for women” in the Futurist Manifesto is an extreme but well-known formulation of this idea.
98. At least, as far as anyone knows; only eight people were tried for the bombings, and half of those were acquitted. See the detailed discussion of the trial and its aftermath in Christie, *Granny Made Me an Anarchist*.

99. On this point, see Samantha Christiansen, "We Are All Angry": Violence and Spectacle in the British Counterculture," in Brown and Anton, eds., *Between the Avant-Garde and the Everyday*.
100. Some members of the Brigade lived in a commune at 29 Grosvenor Avenue in Islington. The anarchist newspaper *Black Flag* was printed in the basement; Christie, *Granny Made Me an Anarchist*, 328.
101. Barker was a member of both the West London Claimants Union and the Notting Hill People's Association; Christie, *Granny Made Me an Anarchist*, 312.
102. Under the name Angela Mason, Weir became a leading member of the gay rights group Stonewall; Lucy Robinson, "Carnival of the Oppressed: The Angry Brigade and the Gay Liberation Front," *Journal of Contemporary History*, Nr. 6, August 2003.
103. On November 20, 1970. The bombing was followed the next day by a radical feminist assault on the proceedings themselves in which three women from the Grosvenor Street commune took part; Christie, *Granny Made Me an Anarchist*, 329.
104. On May 1, 1971, two warning phone calls were made to clear people from the shop. "Biba had a long tradition of exploitation of their young shop assistants," writes Stuart Christie, "who were paid miserable wages, as were their cutters, but the Angry Brigade intended it as an attack on trendy consumer capitalism." Christie, *Granny Made Me an Anarchist*, 335.
105. Christie, *Granny Made Me an Anarchist*, 335.
106. The Angry Brigade, Communiqué 8, quoted in Christiansen, "We Are All Angry."
107. See MacDougal, "In the Shadow of the Wall."