

Response to Bill Brown's "Not Bored" Issue 42

"Bill Brown is the Fox News of Situationism" – G.-E. Debord

The following comments are a set of corrections to the record called for after the publication by Brown of some rather crudely informed outbursts on the history of our correspondence. A considerable deal of further refutation could be issued at the numerous idiocies prepared by Brown in this piece, but most of said idiocies fail to merit the effort.

In January of 2013, an issue of *Letters of Public Terror* was sent to a small listserv of figures associated, by nominal criteria, with contemporary discourses on the SI and revolution. It was prepared with an introduction taken from an issue of the Lettrist International's *Potlatch* publication. Though Brown missed this allusion, his response is rather telling, given that he would have invariably had much the same response to the Lettrist publication as well. Of course, now that a certain prestige is associated with *Potlatch*, it is 'poetic avant-garde prose', though such was presumably not the case at the time of its publication. It may still yet be said that our rendition of the excerpt was indeed pointed in tone for any style of liberal academic dressed in situ drag, however, as Brown's response is fitting enough evidence of.

Out of what can only be identified as purely unfounded pity, we decided to go through Brown's work again some time after the polemics of January, reaching the conclusion that perhaps we could have compromised with Brown's thinly-concealed liberal mentality to some extent or another, while considering the possibility that cruelty might not have as significant a place in revolution as it should. Mistakes occur in the history of the avant-garde, indulgences are made to elements not deserving of as much, steps are taken back, corrections are called for, etc. This is a basic banality any degree of basic literacy may prepare oneself with. Situationist thought remains non-existent, a rather hollow title to affix to tactical considerations, though this is lost in the spectrum of garden variety 'radical' liberalism.

If Brown has gained one lesson from the function of the spectacle, it may certainly be located in his understanding of the spectacular methodology of creating something out of nothing, of creating the impression of comment with anything of the sort having been prepared. Brown's idea of revolution is one which revolves around the notion that revolt is correlated to one's capacity to develop laughable spectacles associated with conflicting personalities in theoretically deprived polemics, nothing more. Perhaps he might offer up a muted rejection of workers councils, a statement of disdain for class struggle, a comment on his love of communal living and petit-bourgeois models of small business, but such remarks are hardly better than his aimless polemics.

Evans, the ex-member of our group in question, was purely decorative finish, maintained for further reasons related to the function of unfounded pity. He has since openly admitted to us that he did not have the slightest understanding of situationist theory upon contacting our group, despite his decision to pretend otherwise while associated with our work. This reality is on display in most anything he has prepared, despite our initial willingness to make concessions to this fact. He additionally showed himself a coward on any number of occasions, particularly so when he resigned from our group, only to return weeks later proposing work with us yet again under the screen of an entirely transparent

pseudonym. When we offered to maintain correspondence with Brown after this break with Evans, our presumption that he would follow suit with our decision was merely another example of our overestimation of his basic faculty of judgment.

Of course, it is quite amusing that the kind agreement Evans once maintained towards our work is not detrimental to his reputation, by Brown's standards of virgin purity one might expect a denunciation for his associations with the *Letters*, but alas, such is predictably not the case. Once more, Brown has displayed a stunning understanding of the function of the spectacular in the field of public relations, but the same cannot be said for his innumerable selection of theoretical inconsistencies. We could easily publish certain emails sent from Evans to us with praise for our efforts, or emails which he sent to us commenting on the mistake he made in his first resignation from our work, with the tagline "TURNS OUT EVANS LIKED THE LETTERS BEFORE HE DIDN'T", but we don't have the comparable standards of poverty in critique maintained by Brown in regard to his qualifications for 'polemic'. We needn't bother with the stunted publicity of these sensationally spectacular maneuvers, the reality that Evans' knew nothing of revolution is sufficient for our ends. It would be most amusing to see Brown make a comparable effort of comment, invariably, though such seems notably unlikely.

Former 'comrades' make the best enemies, so it goes, perhaps Brown might pay some thought to Gracian before he is met with the illusory sentiment that he actually has something to say again.