disClosure: A Journal of Social Theory

Volume 12 *(in)Civilities* Article 7

4-15-2003

Beyond the State: The Return to Anarchy

Jeff Shantz

DOI: https://doi.org/10.13023/disclosure.12.07

Jeff Shantz

Beyond the State: The Return to Anarchy

An old and seemingly vanquished spectre is once again haunting politics—the spectre of anarchism. In the past few years striking media coverage of angry, black-clad, balaclava wearing youth demonstrating outside of the global meetings of government and corporate power-holders has stirred memories of the moral panic over anarchism which marked the beginning of the 20th century. The "uncivil" disobedience, especially where it concerns damage to corporate property, attributed to so-called "black bloc" anarchists at global capitalist summits since the 1999 World Trade Organization (W.T.O.) meetings in Seattle have returned anarchists to the headlines and landed them on the covers of *Time* and *Newsweek* in addition to a feature story on television's *Sixty Minutes II*. As well, police assaults on anarchists during economic summits—including pepper spray, tear gas, rubber bullets and mass arrests, in addition to shootings and even killings—have suggested to the general public that anarchists are something to be feared. That view has been reinforced in mainstream media depictions of anarchists as "thugs" and "hooligans."

That anarchists should run afoul of the authorities is hardly surprising. Indeed, anarchism has a long history of direct conflict with State institutions and their defenders. There is no surprise, of course, that rulers should so desire to construct anarchists as nihilistic fanatics for they question the very legitimacy of rulership itself. As the anarchist historian Peter Marshall notes, the radical implications of anarchism have not been lost on rulers (of the Left or Right) or ruled, "filling rulers with fear, since they might be made obsolete, and inspiring the dispossessed and the thoughtful with hope since they can imagine a time when they might be free to govern themselves" (x). In contrast to the violence of government, most anarchist practical initiatives have been directed towards building new communities and institutions.

While sociologists have paid little attention to such unruly movements, criminologists have recently shown some interest in taking anarchism seriously as politics. Criminologist Jeff Ferrell suggests that becoming attuned to anarchist practice and the anarchist critique of the State is especially relevant in the current context. In his view, close attention to anarchism should encourage criminologists to develop a criminology of resistance. This criminology of resistance would take seriously the criminalized activities undertaken by anarchists (and others), e.g. graffiti, squats, pirate radio, sabotage, "as means of investigating the variety of ways in which criminal or criminalized behaviours may incorporate repressed dimensions of human dignity and self-determination, and lived resistance to the authority of state law" (Ferrell 151). These behaviours should no longer be dismissed as symptomatic of an "infantile disorder,"[1] or "banditry,"[2] but taken for what they are—political acts. This, of course, requires making a break with assumptions of privileged forms of resistance and received notions about activism.

We might refer to Castells, Yazawa and Kiselyova in suggesting that autonomy movements offer "alternative visions and projects of social transformation that reject the patterns of domination, exploitation and exclusion embedded in the current forms of globalization" (22). In constructing this alternative, anarchists often develop practices that disrupt the smooth functioning of capitalist economics or liberal democratic politics. This suggests, following sociologist Leslie Sklair, that that anarchist movements exemplify a "disruption" model of social movements and resistance to capitalism which does not seek an organizational model that would allow for greater integration within mainstream political channels. Through their uncompromising rhetoric and immodest strategies anarchist movements resist attempts to divert their disruptive force into normal politics. Activists attempt to reject the entire context within which they can be either marginalized or assimilated; they occupy their own ground. Thus one must also move beyond Sklair's focus on disruptive politics to look at the constructive projects which make up so much of contemporary anarchism.

Politics, which impede the capacities of states and capital to impose their global agenda, offer possible beginnings for revolutionary politics in an age when many thought revolutionary politics had run their course. The collapse of authoritarian communism and the seeming triumph of neo-liberal capital throughout much of the world led many to lower their sights to little more than a radical democracy. Anarchism shatters such "end of history" scenarios and provides a radical vision for the renewal of struggles for a future beyond statist capitalism.

Crisis States and the Return of Anarchy

Since the early 1990s anarchism as a self-aware political force has enjoyed a rather remarkable resurgence. Global economic transformations, along with the social dislocations and ecological crises accompanying them, have impelled a rediscovery of anarchism by people seeking alternatives to both capitalism and communism. The simultaneous collapse of state capitalism in the Soviet Union and the move of Western social democratic parties to the Right have left socialism discredited as an alternative to neo-liberal capitalism. These remnants of Leninism and Social Democracy respectively, which had supposedly put anarchism to rest,

have themselves suffered deathblows recently. With the political Left in disarray, anarchism presents to many an overlooked alternative to both liberal democracy and Marxism.

Recent transformations to bring the state more in line with the needs of global capital have led to the emergence of what might be called a "crisis state"[3] which claims to be feeble in the face of global forces while flexing its muscles against the poor and disadvantaged. Ruling elites have been hard at work removing reforms won from capital, through great struggles, over the past century. Social programs continue to be dismantled with cuts to health care and public education, the introduction of anti-labour legislation, restrictions upon social assistance (and workers' compensation and unemployment insurance), and "loosened" environmental regulations among the more familiar minarchist initiatives. Rather than offering a "safety net" or some manner of "social security," these policies create various crises within the working classes of Western industrial nations, crises which undermine attempts to expand demands for services or to resist transformations which favour capital.

Notably these policies have been embraced by mainstream political parties of both the Left and the Right. In the U.S., for example, the Democratic Party has routinely adopted positions quite similar to the Republicans on matters such as welfare, affirmative action and NAFTA. One sees similar shifts in Britain and Australia under so-called Labour governments. In response to this convergence, anarchists refer to the "Republicrats," signifying their belief that there is no difference between these parties of the ruling classes. Anarchists mobilize against Republicrat policies which advocate building more prisons and developing tougher sentencing practices including mandatory terms. For anarchists such policies appeal only to "racist crime hysteria" (Subways 11) and sentiments which demonize the poor.

These "crisis state" transformations have given shape to an austerity politics with the conversion of the Welfare State into a penal state, the primary function of which is understood to serve as a law and order mechanism. Worthy social services now include boot camps, "workfare," changes to "Young Offenders" legislation, and violent repression of peaceful demonstrations and contravention of previously recognized rights to freedom of speech and assembly. Dismantling of the Welfare State, without simultaneously developing adequate alternatives, has meant an increase in poverty and more extreme disparities between rich and poor. These conditions have been ideologically justified through a vigorous redeployment of *laissez-faire* discourses. The broken record of *neo*-liberal policies, in harmony with manipulated debt "crises" and a chorus of pleas for competitiveness, have provided the soundtrack for the current box office smash, "Return to 19th-Century Capitalism."[4]

Politics Beyond the State

Philip McMichael suggests that market flows are becoming the dominant reality of a "New World Order." Financial capital has become the organizing principle of the world economy while nation-states are subordinated to maintaining global circuits of capital. Similarly, O Tuathail and Luke speak of dynamics of de-

territorialization and re-territorialization marking the post-Cold War order, in which previously stable territorial formations (nation-state, ideological blocs, and markets) are devolving into chaos while unstable territorial flows (communications, and cultural codes) are evolving into "coherent cohesions." McMichael concludes that the newly forming governance of flows generates unconventional counter-movements to reassert popular governance which may refuse the terms of previous protests and may create some uncertainties for capital circuits. Thus, we have anarchists running wild in the streets. As O Tuathail and Luke so succinctly put it at the end of the last century: "It is the 1990's and everything is changing" (381).

Well, perhaps not everything. Conventional analyses of social movements continue to overlook the emergence of unconventional manifestations of resistance. Such vibrant manifestations are invisible in the social movements' literature. Analyses have been constrained by a rather myopic preoccupation either with organizational structures and resources which allow for access to the state or with civil actions (including civil disobedience) by which activists might register dissent or popularize claims. Where emergent movements have been addressed, these same categories have been replicated, this time at a global scale. Thus we get a profusion of literature about "transnational social movement organizations"[5] or "global civil society"[6] focused upon attempts to access transnational decision-making bodies. In each case analyses are confined to specific movements conceptualized in relation to "single issues" or limited to readily identifiable appeals for civil redress via state means. Such approaches are ill-suited to address more obscure attempts to re-articulate identity and community emerging out of the "New World (Dis)Order." Left out of conventional theorizing are movements which want no part of world order, new or otherwise, which they view as authoritarian, hierarchical, and inevitably genocidal (or "eco-cidal"). What do they want? How do they mobilize?

Part of the problem for theorists may be related to their widespread, if unrecognized, attachment to the metaphors of civil society, citizenship and civil disobedience usually employed to understand social movements. Conventional theories of identity, community or politics attempt to contain political actors within specific institutions or practices. Chief among these is the identity "citizen" founded upon relations of the subject to a sovereign nation-state. As Richard Falk points out, the modern idea of citizenship was linked with the emergence of individuals in relation to sovereign territorial states. Such conceptions of (unitary and fixed) identity reject multiple or layered notions of identity (or sovereignty). As geographer Simon Dalby notes, the language of territoriality, with its conjoining of identity and spatial enclosure, has furnished powerful ontological categorizations for politics. Significantly, "the territorial state remains the dominant frame for containing the citizen, both physically and symbolically" (Shapiro 80).

John Ruggie identifies a tendency in mainstream political theorizing to conceptualize challenges to the system of states only in terms which suggest reproductions of the state. Within social movement theories, these categorizations have given rise to notions of the territory of movement activities. Part of this ground has been the privileging of "legitimate" or "permitted" means, "civil politics," via

state-centred politics. For Warren Magnusson, politics as "creative popular activity" is obscured by the "reification of political community as the state and political theory as the theory of the state" (55). Such thinking cannot grasp the significance of recent transformations. "Uncivil" movements which do not take as their motivation the gaining of state reforms or access to state power are overlooked, denigrated or dismissed:

> Further, in the context of progressive forms of resistance to the abusive sides of economic globalization, the strong tendency has been for individuals to bond across boundaries, which weakens in other respects traditional territorially based citizenship and its core reality of a symbiotic relationship to the state. (Falk 7)

Recent post-structuralist theorizing has attempted to move beyond "essentialist" notions of politics (identity or class) and privileged spaces for political action (the State). This is reflected in recent talk of "global citizens," "nomadic citizenship," "netizens" and similar notions. Peter Taylor suggests that we need to get beyond the "state as container" metaphor because it neglects the multiplicity of states, nations and territories, and their interrelationships. Similarly, Michael Shapiro encourages a new "understanding of politics that resists the identity-fixing effect of a state-oriented model of political space" (79). This implies, of course, re-thinking the various "identity as container" metaphors which offer stable, fixed, disconnected, "essential" identities.

The New World in the Shell of the Old

Historically, anarchists have sought to create a society without government or State, free from coercive, hierarchical and authoritarian relations, in which people associate voluntarily. Anarchists emphasize freedom from imposed authorities. They envision a society based upon autonomy, self-organization and voluntary federation which they oppose to "the State as a particular body intended to maintain a compulsory scheme of legal order" (Marshall 12). Contemporary anarchists focus much of their efforts on transforming everyday life through the development of alternative social arrangements and organizations. Thus, they are not content to wait either for elite-initiated reforms or for future "post-revolutionary" utopias. If social and individual freedoms are to be expanded the time to start is today.

In order to bring their ideas to life, anarchists create working examples. To borrow the phrase from the revolutionary unionists, the Industrial Workers of the World (Wobblies), anarchists are "forming the structure of the new world in the shell of the old."[7] These experiments in living, popularly referred to as "DIY" (Do-It-Yourself), are the means by which contemporary anarchists withdraw their consent and begin "contracting other relationships. DIY releases counter-forces, based upon notions of autonomy and self-organization as motivating principles, against the normative political and cultural discourses of neo-liberalism. Anarchists create autonomous spaces which are not about access (e.g. nationalism) but about refusal of the terms of entry.

The "Do-it-Yourself" ethos has a long and rich association with anarchism. One sees it as far back as the anarchist Pierre-Joseph Proudhon's notions of

People's Banks and local currencies[8] which have returned in the form of LETS (Local Exchange and Trade Systems). In North America, nineteenth-century anarchist communes, such as those of Benjamin Tucker, find echoes in the A-zones and squat communities of the present day. In the recent past, Situationists (heterodox Marxists who inspired the 1968 uprisings in Paris), Kabouters[9] (countercultural urban activists in the Netherlands) and the British punk movements have encouraged DIY activities as means to overcome alienating consumption practices and the authority and control of work. Punks turned to DIY to record and distribute music outside of the record industry.

At the forefront of contemporary DIY are the "Autonomous Zones," or more simply "A-Zones." A-Zones are community centres based upon anarchist principles, often providing meals, clothing and shelter for those in need. These sites, sometimes but not always squats, provide gathering places for exploring and learning about anti-authoritarian histories and traditions. Self-education is an important aspect of anarchist politics. A-Zones are important as sites of re-skilling. DIY and participatory democracy are important precisely because they encourage the processes of learning and independence necessary for self-determined communities.

An interesting example of an anarchist community centre is the Anarchist Free Space (AFS), a project begun in April 1999 in the multi-ethnic Kensington Market neighborhood in Toronto. The Free Space provided a venue for long-time anarchists, novices and non-anarchists alike to come together and share ideas about the prospects, difficulties and strategies for creating new, anti-authoritarian social relations. The primary vehicle for this was an ambitious Free Skool which offered a variety of classes on diverse issues. Courses, reflecting the desire for openness, included "Love Songs of the 20s and 30s," "Street Art," "Understanding Violence Against Women" and "Alternative Economics." Not just the mind but the body was taken care of in a yoga class and in shiatsu workshops. The most successful and long-running courses were "Introduction to Anarchism" and "Class Struggle Anarchism, Syndicalism and Libertarian Socialism."[10] The openness of the project was expressed in a statement on the front page of its course calendar:

> Education is a political act. By deepening our knowledge of ourselves and the world around us, sharing skills and exchanging experiences in an egalitarian, non-hierarchical setting free of prejudice, we challenge disempowering habits and broaden our awareness of alternatives to the inequalities of a capitalist society. The Anarchist Free School is a counter-community dedicated to effecting social change through the application of anarchist principles in every sphere of life. This Space represents and opportunity for the community at large to come together and explore these alternatives. The Anarchist Free Space welcomes all applications for use of the Space.

The AFS also provided space for activist groups in Toronto. Anti-Racist Action (ARA) and the Toronto Video Activist Collective (TVAC) made use of the space for meetings and video showings. A Books to Prisoners program was started and became quite successful. Before long the first shipments went out from the Free Space to inmates in both a women's and men's prison.Other connections were made with activist groups in the city. The Ontario Coalition Against Poverty

(OCAP) was invited to hold their movie nights at the space every Saturday and held several successful large "screenings." Several members of the space participated in the OCAP-initiated protest at Queen's Park on June 15 which ended in a full-scale police riot. AFS members also worked with OCAP to defend homeless people who were being harassed by the City as part of attempts to gentrify the Market area.

These examples speak to anarchist concerns with transcending cultural barriers. The participants of A-Zones try to build linkages with residents of the neighbourhoods in which they are staying in order to create autonomous free zones which may be extended as resources and conditions permit. Communication across these diasporic communities is made possible, in part, by recent technological innovations (e.g. Xerox, videocameras, internet and micro-transmitters).[11] While remaining highly suspicious of the impacts of technology—its class-exclusivity and its possible uses as means of social control—anarchists have become proficient in wielding these technological products as tools for active resistance.

Anarchy has developed a busy presence on the internet. Among the most important anarchist groups working on the internet is TAO Communications. Since the 1990s TAO has fought against the corporate enclosure of the internet by opening sourcecode and access thereby allowing people to host their own websites or build their own mailing lists, securing worker-owned and operated access, and cultivating an internationalist network based on mutual aid rather than profit. As secretaries and coders for student, labor and environmental groups the emphasis is on social struggle, on bodies in the streets, rather than on so-called "virtual" reality. Travelling organizers downplay the internet and talk instead about ownership of the means of production, about social relations, and other material conditions. TAO maintains e-mail accounts, web pages, and mailing lists which are made available only to activists and organizers.

TAO also helps to maintain A-infos, a daily multi-language international anarchist news service produced by tireless activist groups in five countries. A-infos is carried on its own server within the TAO matrix, and its multiple lists and digests distribute news "by, for, and about" anarchists to over 1200 subscribers in 12 languages, with substantial daily traffic as well as print and radio reproduction around the world.

Other projects supported by TAO have included: The Student Activist Network, the Direct Action Media Network (a defunct precursor to the Indymedia conglomerate), and PIRG.CA. Recent solidarity projects include work with the Ontario Coalition Against Poverty, Esgenoopetitj (colonial name: Burnt Church) First Nations, CUPE 3903 (strike-winning workers at York University), and numerous groups formed to oppose Bush's wars. TAO now operates at least eight boxes, serving the needs of thousands of members, a spread of organizations and individuals, who self-manage over 500 lists and hundreds of web pages. Besides basic shell without advertisements or space quotas, organized TAO workers are able to offer secure access to web-based e-mail, Internet Relay Chat and databases.

These various practices are all part of complex networks which are transnational, transboundary and transmovement.[12] They encourage us to think

about writing against the movement as movement. Movement processes involve complex networks outside of and alongside of the State (transnational and transboundary). Through the deployment of such creative practices, participants attempt to disrupt the efforts to circumscribe their activities and limit their critique of capitalist social relations.[13] Anarchist autonomy exerts a moment of cleavage against the prevalence of accommodation. Anarchist actions suggest a smashing and re-plotting of the frontiers of politics. These actions should be understood as counter-articulations within a context in which activists have little material strength.

Autonomy movements in abandoned or impoverished inner-city areas are movements involving individuals, social groups or territories excluded or made irrelevant by the "new world order." This distinguishes them somewhat from institutional global social movements which seek increased participation by members who are not yet rendered irrelevant (and who thus have something with which to bargain). In any event, how does one ask a global (or national) body to grant the "subversion of the dominant paradigm" or the "liberation of desire"?

Anarchy Is Order

The word "anarchy" comes from the ancient Greek word "anarchos" and means "without a ruler."[14] While rulers, quite expectedly, claim that the end of rule will inevitably lead to a descent into chaos and turmoil, anarchists maintain that rule is unnecessary for the preservation of order. Rather than a descent into Hobbes' war of all against all, a society without government suggests to anarchists the very possibility for creative and peaceful human relations. Proudhon neatly summed up the anarchist position in his famous slogan: "Anarchy is Order."[15]

Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, the first to call his social philosophy "anarchist," argued that vice and crime, rather than being the cause of social antagonisms and poverty as popularly believed, are caused by social antagonisms and poverty. He considered State order to be "artificial, contradictory and ineffective," thereby engendering "oppression, poverty and crime" (53). In his view, the constitution of societies under States was strictly anomalous. Furthermore, "public and international law, together with all the varieties of representative government, must likewise be false, since they are based upon the principle of individual ownership of property" (54). For Proudhon, jurisprudence, far from representing "codified reason" is nothing more than "simply a compilation of legal and official titles for robbery, that is for property" (54). Authority is incapable of serving as a proper basis for constituting social relations.[16] The citizen must be governed by reason alone, and only those "unworthy and lacking in self-respect" would accept any rule beyond their own free will (94). In place of political institutions Proudhon advocated economic organizations based upon principles of mutualism in labour and exchange, through co-operatives and "People's Banks," as means towards that end.[17] The consequences of this re-organization of social life include the limiting of constraint, the reduction of repressive methods, and the convergence of individual and collective interests. This Proudhon calls "the state of total liberty" or anarchy, and suggests that it is the only context in which "laws" operate spontaneously without invoking command and control.[18]

Michael Bakunin, who popularized the term "anarchy" and whose work was instrumental in the early development of the anarchist movement, argues in his scattered writings that external legislation and authority "both tend toward the enslavement of society" (240). In his view, all civic and political organizations are founded upon violence exercised from the top downward as systematized exploitation. Any political law emerging from those organizations is an expression of privilege. Bakunin rejects all legislation, convinced that it must turn to the advantage of powerful minorities against the interests of subjected majorities. Laws, inasmuch as they impose an external will, must be despotic in character. For Bakunin, political rights and "democratic States" are flagrant contradictions in terms. States and laws only denote power and domination, presupposing inequality: "Where all govern, no one is governed, and the State as such does not exist. Where all equally enjoy human rights, all political rights automatically are dissolved" (Bakunin 240). Bakunin distinguishes between the authority of example and knowledge, "the influence of fact," and the authority of right. While he is willing to accept the former, situationally and voluntarily, he rejects the latter unconditionally. "When it is a question of houses, canals, or railroads, I consult the authority of the architect or engineer . . . though always reserving my indisputable right of criticism and control. . . . Accordingly there is no fixed and constant authority, but a continual exchange of mutual, temporary, and, above all, voluntary authority and subordination" (Bakunin 253-254). The influence of right, an official imposition, he terms a "falsehood and an oppression" which inevitably leads to absurdity (Bakunin 241). Like Proudhon, Bakunin envisions future social organizations as economic rather than political. He sees society as organized around free federations of producers, both rural and urban. Any co-ordination of efforts must be voluntary and reasoned.

Peter Kropotkin divided all laws into three main categories: protection of property, protection of persons and protection of government. Kropotkin saw that all laws and governments are the possession of privileged elites and serve only to maintain and enhance privilege, and he argued that most laws serve either to defend the appropriation of labour or to maintain the authority of the State. Speaking on the protection of property, Kropotkin noted that property laws are not made to guarantee producers the products of their labour but rather to justify the taking of a portion of the producer's product and placing it into the hands of a non-producer. For Kropotkin, it is precisely because this appropriation of labour (and its products) is a glaring injustice that "a whole arsenal of laws and a whole army of soldiers, policemen and judges are needed to maintain it" (213). In addition, many laws serve only to keep workers in positions subordinate to their employers. Other laws (those regarding taxes, duties, the organization of ministerial departments, the army and police) serve no other end than to "maintain, patch up, and develop the administrative machine," which is organized "almost entirely to protect the privileges of the possessing classes" (Kropotkin 214). With regard to "crimes against persons" he viewed this as the most important category because it is the reason the law enjoys any amount of consideration and because it has the most prejudices associated with it. Kropotkin's response is twofold. First, because most crimes are crimes against property their removal is predicated upon

the disappearance of property itself. Second, punishment does not reduce crime. His reflections led him to conclude that not only is law useless, it is actually hurtful—engendering a "depravity of mind" through obedience, and stoking "evil passions" through the performance of atrocity. Because punishment does not reduce the amount of crime, Kropotkin also called for the abolition of prisons. The best available response, he argued, is sympathy.

Twentieth-century anarchists have developed these readings of State/society relations in more nuanced ways. Of much significance for contemporary anarchist analysis is the work of Gustav Landauer who, more than a half century before Foucault offered a vision of power as de-centred and situationally enacted. Landauer conceptualized the State not as a fixed entity outside of extraneous to society but as specific relations between people dispersed throughout society.

> The state is a condition, a certain relationship among human beings, a mode of behaviour between them; we destroy it by contracting other relationships, by behaving differently toward one another...We are the state, and we shall continue to be the state until we have created the institutions that form a real community and society of men (sic).[19]

In a recent work Murray Bookchin speaks of the State as "an instilled mentality" rather than a collection of institutions. In the liberal democracies of the 20th Century power is exercised less through displays of naked force and more through the nurturing of what La Boetie called "voluntary servitude." Contemporary practices of governance lead Bookchin to characterize the State as "a hybridization of political with social institutions, of coercive with distributive functions, of highly punitive with regulatory procedures, and finally of class with administrative needs."[20]

With the profusion of laws and regulations governing everything from smoking to the baring of breasts the line dividing State and society has certainly blurred if not disappeared entirely. As laws and legal surveillance extend into ever-increasing realms of human behaviour everyone stands accused, subject to the judgements of state authority. While respecting the gains won from the State through centuries of social struggle, and not wishing to see these gains unilaterally and callously removed, anarchists nonetheless refuse to follow social democrats in embracing the Welfare State. For anarchists, the regulatory and supervisory mechanisms of the Welfare State are especially suited to producing docile and dependent subjects. Through institutions like social work and public education authorities extend the practices of ruling from control over bodies to influence over minds. Moral regulation provides a subtle means for nurturing repression and conformity. "By undermining voluntary associations and the practice of mutual aid [the Welfare State] eventually turns society into a lonely crowd buttressed by the social worker and the policeman" (Marshall 24).

Where defenders of the State appeal to its protective functions as a justification for its continued existence, anarchists respond that the coercive character of the State, as exemplified in the proliferation of regulations, police and prisons, far exceeds whatever protection it might extend. Furthermore, States are, in practice, incapable of providing equal protection for all members of society, typically protecting the interests of more privileged members against the less fortunate. Laws

which overwhelmingly emphasize property protection, the restricted and elite character of legal knowledge, guarded by law schools with their exorbitant tuition fees and exclusionary entrance requirements, and racist overtones in the exercise of "law and order," provide anarchists with evidence enough of the injustices of State "justice." For anarchists, the State with its vast and complex array of law, prisons, courts and armies stands not as the defender of social justice against inequality but as a primary cause of injustice and oppression.

Additionally, and this is the uniquely anarchist critique, State practices actually *undermine* social relations within communities, even when not exhibiting a specific bias against the less powerful. This occurs through the substitution of State networks for mutual aid networks in ever-spreading realms of human activity. It results, in relations of dependence rather than self-determination as the external practices of the State increasingly come to be viewed as the only legitimate mechanisms for solving disputes or addressing social needs. For anarchists the "rule of law" administered through the institutions of the State is not the guarantor of freedom, but, rather, freedom's enemy, closing off alternative avenues for human interaction, creativity and community while corralling more and more people within its own bounds.

Furthermore, the State is not even efficient as a mechanism for redistributing resources. In actuality the State diverts resources from those in need and channels them into itself. "Instead of paying taxes to the State which then decides who is in need, anarchists prefer to help directly the disadvantaged by voluntary acts of giving or by participating in community organizations" (Marshall 24). Anarchists propose that the social service and welfare functions of the State can be better met by voluntary mutual aid associations which involve the people affected and respond directly to their needs. Mutual aid at the face-to-face level is regarded as preferable to institutionalized programs or charity.

Once again contemporary anarchists follow Landauer in understanding anarchism not as a revolutionary establishment of something new, a leap into the unknown, or as a break with the present. Landauer regarded anarchism as "the actualisation and reconstitution of something that has always been present, which exists alongside the state, albeit buried and laid waste."[21] Similarly, Paul Goodman argued that "[a] free society cannot be the substitution of a 'new order' for the old order; it is the extension of spheres of free action until they make up most of social life.[22] Starting from this perspective contemporary anarchists seek to develop non-authoritarian and non-hierarchical relations in the here-and-now of everyday life.

Anarchists nurture loyalties other than to States through extended networks of autonomous groupings. Through "day-to-day disavowals of state legality" anarchism exists as "a secret history of resistance" which, by force or by choice, is forever "flowing under and against state and legal authority" (Ferrell 149). Simply, Colin Ward argues that

> [t]here is an order imposed by terror, there is an order enforced by bureaucracy with the policeman (sic) in the corridor and there is an order which evolves spontaneously from the fact that we are gregarious animals capable of shaping our own destiny. When the first two are absent, the third,

> as infinitely more human and humane form of order has an opportunity to emerge. Liberty, as Proudhon said, is the mother, not the daughter of order. (37)

Enemies of anarchism typically respond to this claim by claiming that anarchism rests upon a naive view of "human nature." The best response to such criticisms is simply to point to the diversity of anarchist views on the question of human nature. What commonality is there between Max Stirner's self-interested "egoist" and Kropotkin's altruistic upholder of mutual aid? Indeed, the diversity of anarchist views regarding "the individual" and its relation to "the community" may be upheld as testimony to the creativity and respect for pluralism which have sustained anarchism against enormous odds. Anarchists simply stress the capacity of humans to change themselves and the conditions in which they find themselves. Most anarchists also stress that this is a collective project which cannot be undertaken by individuals, no matter how rugged, outside of social relations. "The aim is not therefore to liberate some 'essential self' by throwing of the burden of government and the State, but to develop the self in creative and voluntary relations with others" (Marshall 642-643). Social relations, freely entered, based upon tolerance, mutual aid, and sympathy are expected to discourage the emergence of disputes and aid resolution where they do occur. There are no guarantees here; the emphasis is always on potential.

Conclusion

The non-authoritarian, non-hierarchical and pluralistic communities envisioned by anarchists have much to offer critical thinking about power, authority and the State. As Ferrell argues, anarchism serves "by standing outside the law" and through its "disavowal of legal authority and its destructive effects on social and cultural life" works "to remind us that human relations and human diversity matter—and that, in every case, they matter more than the turgid authority of regulation and law" (153). Anarchism ensures that we are never without reminders that things can be done differently than they are. It encourages us to question ingrained assumptions and to rethink habitual practices. Anarchism "offers a clear-sighted critique of existing society and a coherent range of strategies to realize its ideal both in the present and the future" (Marshall 662). Rather than rejecting "democracy," anarchists offer visions of a participatory democracy which permeates all spheres of life (including the workplace, schools, the family and sexuality). In the spirit of Hakim Bey's *Temporary Autonomous Zones*, contemporary anarchists call for a proliferation of "free" spaces, places and practices which refuse capture within the rigidly mapped territories of States and legal authority. These "autonomous"[23] realms of thought and action emphasize inclusiveness, openness, and fluidity, against the temporal and spatial confinement of States.

Contemporary anarchists are also keenly aware of the dangers of majoritarian opinion in nurturing oppressive relations. Indeed, contemporary anarchism is partly a response to the dull conformity of consumer capitalism which constrains desires in the permitted realm of market circuits. As a creative response anarchists defend pluralism and diversity in social relations encouraging experimentation in living and disdaining censorship. Not believing in the possibility of one "correct"

response to questions of authority and power, anarchists encourage people to develop multiple alternatives through consideration of the specific conditions with which they are confronted. Thus, today's anarchists identify themselves variously as punks, animal rights activists, syndicalists, social ecologists or neo-primitives "arming their desires"[24] through collage, veganism, "noise music," polysexuality and "electronic civil disobedience." As always anarchists provide an alternative to authoritarian forms of social organization, both capitalist as well as socialist.

Following Castells, Yazawa and Kiselyova, one might suggest that autonomy movements respond to the processes of social exclusion and cultural alienation currently associated with global processes of governance by challenging the global order and asserting counter-institutions. Attempts are made to (re)construct cultural meaning through specific patterns of experience in which participants create meaning against the logics of global intrusions which would render them meaningless. Radical social movement alliances are largely engaged in transforming the normative cultural and political codes of emerging global relations. The new anarchist movements confront the "enemy" through the articulation of shared values and the ironic construction of identities.

Anarchy encourages a critical re-conceptualization of politics as currently constituted. It offers a glimpse of politics which refuse containment by any of the usual containers such as protest, "civil disobedience" or the state. Thus, it may further challenge the meanings of sovereignty in the current context. Such manifestations may open spaces for a (re)constitution of politics by destabilizing tendencies towards enclosure of any totalizing discourse, be it one of state, class or identity. Just as global transformations de-stabilize "state-as-container" metaphors, re-formulations of identity and community as in anarchism de-stabilize "identity-as-container" notions. Political spaces are created in defiance of political containers.

Theory requires a more sophisticated understanding of those struggles which allow for the (re)production of categories, which inhibit or encourage the forging of community, and which prevent alternatives from emerging. Conventional social theories have failed to recognize alternatives, in part due to their uncritical acceptance of dubious metaphors. Studies of social movements have under-theorized the significance of "unrealistic" aspects of movement behaviour. The present work offers an attempt to understand such "unreal" discursive strategies, beyond condemnation (or rejection) as illegitimate or impractical. "Interests and groups defined as marginal because they have become 'disturbances' in the system of social integration are precisely the struggles which may be the *most* significant from the point of view of historical emancipation from social hierarchy and domination" (Aronowitz 111, emphasis original). Anarchy asks us why we should assume that a "global civil society" will be any better than the civil society that brought poverty, homelessness, racism, and ecological annihilation in the first place.

Notes

1. This characterization comes famously from Lenin (1965), *"Left-Wing" Communism, An Infantile Disorder.*
2. See Plekhanov's (1912) confused polemic in *Anarchism and Socialism.*
3. See Negri (1989).
4. Anarchists are respectful of the reforms which oppressed people have been able to secure and especially of the struggles it has taken to win those reforms. Anarchists actively defend those reforms against neo-liberal governments and their capitalist backers who seek to dismantle them. At the same time anarchists do not privilege reforms as ends but view them as reified moments of struggle.
5. For examples of the "TSMO" literature see recent works by Jackie Smith, Ron Pagnucco, and Winnie Romeril (1994) and John McCarthy (1996).
6. See Laura MacDonald (1994) or Martin Shaw (1994).
7. This phrase is found in the "Preamble" to the Constitution of the Industrial Workers of the World (I.W.W.).
8. See Proudhon (1969).
9. Kabouters ("elfs") were active in Amsterdam in the late-1960s and early-1970s. See Roel van Duyn (1972), *Message of a Wise Kabouter*, an interesting mix of Kropotkin and cybernetics.
10. The course outline for the most popular course at the Anarchist Free Space: CLASS STRUGGLE ANARCHISM, SYNDICALISM AND LIBERTARIAN SOCIALISM. Anarchism, as a political movement, emerged as part of broader workers' struggles for socialism and communism and contributed greatly to those struggles. Contemporary anarchists in North America, however, have generally forgotten this important connection as anarchism has become a largely subcultural phenomenon. Similarly distinctions between authoritarian and anti-authoritarian traditions within the diverse history of socialism have been obliterated by the horrors of state capitalist regimes calling themselves "socialist." This course seeks to reconnect anarchism with the struggles of working people to build a better world beyond capitalism of any type. The course is initiated by activists concerned with class analysis and day-to-day organizing and is not intended simply as a study group.
11. There is also a lively anarchist press. Longstanding publications include *Freedom*, *Fifth Estate*, *Anarchy*, and *Kick it Over.* At the local level DIY zines such as *The Match*, *Anarchives*, *Demolition Derby*, and *Agent 2771* have kept anarchist thought alive while expanding the range of anarchist politics to include new participants.
12. The violation of boundaries is literal, not simply metaphoric. Contemporary anarchist networks extend, significantly, through the walls of prisons. Most anarchist publications are made available to prisoners through free subscription. Tireless work is done on behalf of prisoners by organizations such as Anarchist Black Cross (ABC), a prisoners' aid group, founded by Albert Melzer (1920-1996).
13. Consumer culture is also disrupted or subverted in a number of ways: exposing commodity fetishism, resisting capitalist development, occupations of sites of consumption such as shopping malls, boycotts or "steal something days" in addition to do-it-yourself production and exchange outside of capitalist markets. Underground activities may also be deployed such as graffiti, billboard vandalism or sabotage.

14. See Woodcock (1962), Horowitz (1964), Joll (1964) and Marshall (1993).
15. The actual quote, in *What is Property?,* is: "As man seeks justice in equality, so society seeks order in anarchy" (qtd. in Berman, 1972). Graffiti artists have neatly symbolized the slogan as the famous "circle-A" (@).
16. Far from it for Proudhon. He refers to authority as "the curse of society" (94).
17. This emphasis made Proudhon's work an important early influence in the emergence of syndicalism.
18. Proudhon emphatically rejected communism: "[I]f society moves closer and closer toward communism instead of toward anarchy or the government of man by himself (in English: *self-government*)—then the social organization itself will be an abuse of man's (sic) faculties" (94).
19. Landauer quoted in Lunn (1973).
20. Bookchin quoted in Marshall (1993).
21. Landauer quoted in Ward (1973).
22. Goodman quoted in Ward (1973).
23. Discourses of autonomy serve both as a "fuel" for mobilization and as what Dallmayr (1987) terms an "antidote to co-optation."
24. *Anarchy* magazine is identified in its subtitle as "A Journal of Desire Armed."

Works Cited

Aronowitz, Stanley. The *Crisis in Historical Materialism.* Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 1990.

Bakunin, Mikhail. *The Political Philosophy of Bakunin: Scientific Anarchism.* New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1953.

Bookchin, Murray. *The Ecology of Freedom.* Palo Alto: Cheshire, 1982.

Bey, Hakim. *T.A.Z.: The Temporary Autonomous Zone, Ontological Anarchy, Poetic Terrorism.* New York: Autonomedia, 1991.

Castells, Manuel, Shujiro Yazawa, and Emma Kiselyova. "Insurgents Against the Global Order: A Comparative Analysis of the Zapatistas in Mexico, the American Militia and Japan's AUM Shinrikyo." *Berkeley Journal of Sociology* (1996): 21-59.

Dalby, Simon. "Culture Identity and Global Security: Notes on the Theme of (Post)Modernity and the 'POGO Syndrome.'" Paper presented at York University Centre for International and Strategic Studies, Toronto. 6-7 February 1997.

Dallmayr, Fred. "Hegemony and Democracy: A Review of Laclau and Mouffe." *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 13.3 (1987): 283-296.

Falk, Richard. "The Decline of Citizenship in an Era of Globalization." *Citizen-*

ship Studies 4(1) (2000): 5-17.

Ferrell, Jeff. "Against the Law: Anarchist Criminology." *Thinking Critically About Crime.* Eds. B. D. MacLean and D. Milovanovic. Vancouver: Collective P, 1997: 146-154.

Godwin, William. "On Punishment." Ed. George Woodcock. *The Anarchist Reader.* Glasgow: Fontana, 1977: 118-124.

Horowitz, Irving L ., ed. *The Anarchists.* New York: Dell, 1964.

Joll, James. *The Anarchists.* New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1964.

Kropotkin, Peter. "Law and Authority." *Kropotkin's Revolutionary Pamphlets: A Collection of Writings by Peter Kropotkin.* Ed. R. N. Baldwin. New York: Dover, 1970: 196-218.

—. "The Uselessness of Laws." *The Anarchist Reader.* Ed. G. Woodcock. Glasgow: Fontana, 1977: 111-117.

Lenin, Vladimir I. *'Left-Wing' Communism, An Infantile Disorder.* Peking: Foreign Languages P, 1965.

Lunn, Eugene. *The Prophet of Community: The Romantic Socialism of Gustav Landauer.* Berkeley: California UP, 1973.

MacDonald, Laura. "Globalizing Civil Society: Interpreting International NGO's in Central America." *Millenium* 23.2 (1994): 267-286.

Magnusson, Warren. "The Reification of Political Community." *Contending Sovereignties: Redefining Political Community.* Ed. R.B.J. Walker and Saul Mendlovitz. Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1990: 45-60.

Marshall, Peter. *Demanding the Impossible: A History of Anarchism.* London: Fontana P, 1993.

McCarthy, John. "Transnational Social Movements and Social Movement Theory." *Solidarity Beyond The State: Transnational Social Movement Organizations.* Ed. Charles Chatfield, Ron Pagnucco, and Jackie Smith. Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 1996.

McMichael, Philip. "Global Regulation or Global Governance?" American Sociological Association Paper, New York. 16-20 August 1996.

Negri, Antonio. *The Politics of Subversion.* Cambridge: Polity, 1989.

O Tuathail, Gearoid, and Timothy W. Luke. "Present at the (Dis)integration: Deterritorialization and Reterritorialization in the New Wor(l)d Order." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 84.3 (1994): 381-398.

Plekhanov, George. *Anarchism and Socialism.* Chicago: C. H. Kerr, 1912.

Proudhon, Pierre-Joseph. *Selected Writings of Pierre-Joseph Proudhon.* Garden City: Anchor Books, 1969.

Ruggie, John Gerard. "Territoriality and Beyond: Problematizing Modernity in International Relations." *International Organisation* 47.1 (1993): 130-174.

Shapiro, Michael J. "National Times and Other Times: Re-Thinking Citizenship." *Cultural Studies* 14.1 (2000): 79-98.

Shaw, Martin. "Civil Society and Global Politics: Beyond a Social Movements Approach." *Millenium* 23.3 (1994): 647-667.

Sklair, Leslie. "Social Movements and Global Capitalism." *Sociology* 29.3 (1995): 495-512.

Smith, Jackie, Ron Pagnucco, and Winnie Romeril. "Transnational SMO's in the Global Political Arena." *Voluntas* 5.2 (1994): 121-154.

Stirner, Max. 1844. *The Ego and Its Own.* London: Rebel Press, 1982.

Subways, Suzy. "Not on the Guest List or the Newscasts: Resistance at the Republicrats' Conventions." *Love and Rage* 7.5 (1996): 11.

Taylor, Peter R. "Beyond Containers: Internationality, Interstatedness, Interterritoriality." *Progress in Human Geography* 19.1 (1995): 1-15.

van Duyn, Roel. *Message of a Wise Kabouter.* London: Duckworth, 1972.

Ward, Colin. *Anarchy in Action.* New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1973.

Woodcock, George. *Anarchism: A History of Libertarian Ideas and Movements.* New York: World, 1962.