



Immediatism

Peter Lamborn Wilson , Freddie Baer (Illustrator) , Hakim Bey (pseud.)

Download now

Read Online ➔

Immediatism

Peter Lamborn Wilson , Freddie Baer (Illustrator) , Hakim Bey (pseud.)

Immediatism Peter Lamborn Wilson , Freddie Baer (Illustrator) , Hakim Bey (pseud.)

An irresistible tome from the insurrectionist theoretician, Hakim Bey. His incendiary words are beautifully illustrated by the renowned collage artist Freddie Baer. The result is a delightful compilation by two talented artists. A must read for those who have followed their work for years. In this collection of essays, Bey expounds upon his ideas concerning radical social reorganization and the liberation of desire. *Immediatism* is another lyrical romp through intellectual corridors of spirituality and politics originally set forth in his groundbreaking book, *TAZ*. A stunning achievement from this prodigious author and scholar.

"A Blake Angel on Acid."—Robert Anton Wilson

"Fascinating..."—William S. Burroughs

"Exquisite..."—Allen Ginsberg

Immediatism Details

Date : Published July 1st 2001 by AK Press (first published October 1st 1994)

ISBN : 9781873176429

Author : Peter Lamborn Wilson , Freddie Baer (Illustrator) , Hakim Bey (pseud.)

Format : Paperback 60 pages

Genre : Philosophy, Nonfiction, Writing, Essays, Theory, Politics



[Download Immediatism ...pdf](#)



[Read Online Immediatism ...pdf](#)

Download and Read Free Online Immediatism Peter Lamborn Wilson , Freddie Baer (Illustrator) , Hakim Bey (pseud.)

From Reader Review Immediatism for online ebook

Matthew says

get over yr alienation from yr own body and touch yr Self.

influences: Nietzsche; Artaud; shamanism; Hassan I Sabbah and heretical Islamicists

Zack says

very interesting little book of essays about art anarchy community secrecy media...some really beautiful visual art in here too by a guy named freddie baer...i say read it if it finds you. it's that kind of book

Joel Robert Ferguson says

Boring and reductive.

Dana Jerman says

an important piece in the debate concerning call to action(s) to relieve ourselves of mediated culture.

David says

I know I read this because it's sitting on my night-table, and I remember liking it, but I have no idea what it was about other than aesthetic theory.

Steve says

Smash the TV, drown the cell-phone, garrotte the DJ and go make your own goddamned fun/ life/ utopia. Now! Quit reading this.

Cobertizo says

En el 'teatro ritual' vudú y la santería, todos los presentes deben participar visualizando las loas u Orishas y convocándolos mediante cantos y ritmos para que se manifiesten. Cualquier presente puede convertirse en un caballo o medium, cuyas acciones y palabras asumen entonces para todos los celebrantes el aspecto de la presencia del espíritu (esto es, la persona poseída no representa, sino que presenta). Frente a este 'chamanismo democrático' del teatro vudú, el teatro europeo del siglo XVIII en adelante, nada de la visión o

del 'espíritu' está presente. Los actores únicamente representan, 'están disfrazados'. No se espera que ningún miembro de la compañía o del público sea poseído repentinamente (o si quiera inspirado en alto grado) por las imágenes del autor. El auditorio permanece pasivo, sin implicación, se está haciendo demasiado para el público (compuesto por personas 'profanas') que no cabe duda que está encerrado en un lugar en medio de la oscuridad y el silencio, inmovilizado por el dinero que ha pagado por dicha experiencia del todo ajena. "

Trey Lane says

highly recommended, if you can handle heady essays

Jamie Watts says

Hakim Bey gives practical ideas for how to begin things 'now', and stop beating around the bush, while linking actions directly to consciousness in the process.

Neil P says

So glad to finally find this. Great for secret society starters. beautiful ideas for establishing dissent in the era of networked interconnected (though definitely a historicised document). yes its poetic essays. yes we can have our cake and eat it. I'd been reading all this smug 'we own the world' talk from social media entrepreneur s in Andrew Keen's excellent digital vertigo, and I thought I'd find some early internet utopianism. what i actually found was ideas about reshaping groups societies in the networked age. Really great. not just for free partiers, professional anarchists or interonauts.

Carolee Wheeler says

I can't say I fully followed all of it, but what I did get was fantastically inspiring--an intellectual and ideological jump-start.

Adam Azeris says

Heat.

Michael Palkowski says

Wilson is a man of ideas but this book is theoretically thin and ultimately defeatist. He states that there is no such thing as art for arts sake, the maxim of course implying a political meaning but what politics are we discussing, is there a univocal dimension of art as understood and appropriated in a specific context or discourse? I would argue that art is often without interpretation and is constructed for such a purpose. The

symbolism inherent in pop art is the symbol of no meaning, it lacks a substance because its frame is the prop which is being deterritorialized, the image is undone and the politics are reconfigured and contextualized often in radical or critical ways. The mode of production and consumption of art is not an end all in determining its radical potential either. It assumes and uses a really outdated assumption of a mimetic conceptualization of art, reality is mimicked in the art itself, which is basically part of Wilson's fear in being commodified. His solution is not serious or interesting, The clandestine consumer still consumes a reified product which is usually a symbol, simulation or picture, not mimesis of course and the meaning is contingent on the person who created the work and the person who is viewing it. Thus Wilson relies on a very one dimensional assumption of meaning. To valorize is to be radical in my opinion whereas for Wilson to be radical is to engage in secrecy and not give any value to anything. Hence the quote:

"We offer the chance for art which is immediately present by virtue of the fact that it can exist only in our presence"

If its not secrecy, its an assimilation of art into a collective shaman like cultural norm whereby art is innocuous and present basically in non presence. He cites the Bali culture and others who do not have words for art and it is understood that everyone is an artist and that imagination is merely a normal tool. Thus there is no commodity. However this assumes a collective one dimensional meaning as stated and assumes that meaning can be possessed, whereas its actually enacted. This is why meaning is inextricably linked with power. This is why in my opinion to give meaning is to give power; Something Wilson doesn't seem to appreciate or give much time to here. This is the key problem Sontag tackles in her work "Against Interpretation". Wilson in his project should seek to emphasize the differences and potential of his thesis alongside the current.

His discussion of Chinese Tongs is fascinating and his discussion is always wonderfully insightful and creatively put. His use of Charybdis and Scylla in narratives about the state are just fantastic creative writing. This book however attempts to be radical by cutting off and to be reductionist, to refuse to participate and refuse to engage. It is solipsism covered up by anarchist theory. Tongs as societies do not provide potential for future organization or even organization in the present and merely provide a way of counteracting the current heterogeneous culture which already exists. Should the Quiddity of Will Self by Sam Mills be read as an anarchist allusion or fable to this notion of tonga in secret cult like societies doing illegal things? Shouldn't we instead try to push for community rights which act as a synecdochal representation of a larger collective whereby people are free and decide collectively decisions based on democratic principles?

The idea of a temporary autonomous zone alongside spaces of resistance, the scream et al merely act as a way of providing short term, ephemeral solutions to problems which need to change instead of being bandaged up. 'The Totality' is not truly a totality when considering the fact that I can desist from many of the examples mentioned such as MTV, PBS and watching advertisements. I can engage in counter culture adjamming practices, I can engage in freeganism which disavows the consumerist praxis etc. These appear to be autonomous projects which allow us to act as a rhizome, to no longer ascribe to the tree like linearity of societal impulse. There is no totality for if there was, spaces of resistance wouldn't exist. The Dominant culture (instead of 'Totality') can re-appropriate and banalize reactionary narratives as the Situationists showed (he uses there term actually in 'recuperation') but to assume this renders the narrative banal itself as a narrative is to engage in defeatism. The revolutionary praxis of revolutionary praxis is still alive and well despite the endless codification and reductionist mockery within the mainstream hegemonic press.

Furthermore, the art within the book is totally out of place and seems to merely act as filler, despite its 'nicety'. It also is ostensibly a pamphlet that could act as a way of educating, a method of pedagogy even for academics in showing how to organize. This however is destroyed by the repeated assertions that his movement cannot be used, it has no consensus, it does not represent 'everyday life'. Instead of presenting a Lefebvre style rumination of existence, it is inaugurated as 'chaos'. Part of his argument also centers on the disavow of any organization whatsoever, in critiquing anarchists who hold that anarchism is a structured

society. Why is this lamentable and why resort to edifying the stereotype of your own position merely to make a reactionary point which is not even made? He seems totally unaware that his methodology may ultimately be appropriated as a totality, which is why he must distrust organization for otherwise his thesis could be shown as elitist. How are societies of seven billion people to co-exist in a non-linear world constructed by nothing in particular except the immediacy of their own environment without exterior links and networks of resistance. He does not disavow technology in quite the same way as Zerzan does, but this does not mean that techne would feature much if at all.
