



Franks, B. (2016) Ideological hybrids: the contrary case of Tory anarchism.
Journal of Political Ideologies, 21(2), pp. 160-180.
(doi:[10.1080/13569317.2016.1150142](https://doi.org/10.1080/13569317.2016.1150142))

This is the author's final accepted version.

There may be differences between this version and the published version.
You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from
it.

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/117261/>

Deposited on: 11 March 2016

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of Glasgow
<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

Ideological Hybrids: The contrary case of Tory anarchism

Abstract

This paper provides an account of ideological hybridity. It describes and categorises four main types of ideological hybrid in order to examine a range of sub-ideologies and crossbreeds but concentrates on identifying and assessing the particular phenomena described as conservative (or ‘Tory’) anarchisms. The paper demonstrates how an ideological hybrid’s morphological relationship to its parent ideologies can alter in different geographical or historical contexts. Using this model it argues that some differences between conservatism and anarchism are over-stressed (such as those over the role of the state and individual rights) whilst some important similarities are often overlooked, namely those surrounding their political epistemologies. However, because apparently shared concepts are structured next to radically different core principles (defence/rejection of hierarchies and prioritising/negation of dominant economic institutions), these shared principles are interpreted in radically different ways. As a result, conservative anarchism is a deeply unstable hybrid rather than an innovative new ideological form. It is one which, in most contexts, stabilises into a form of conservatism rather than a form of anarchism.

Ideological Hybrids: The contrary case of Tory anarchism

1. Introduction

This paper explores the notion of ideological crossbreeds and develops a taxonomy of different types of hybrids, demonstrating how these hybrid forms alter in different geographical or historical contexts. It then demonstrates the pertinence of this analysis, by applying it to the strange and often contrary example of conservative anarchism (sometimes referred to as ‘Tory anarchism’ for largely British, ‘primarily English’ manifestations).¹ The taxonomy of ideology hybrids shows that Tory anarchism’s contrariness is exhibited in its contradictory core principles. It is further argued that, although ‘Tory anarchism’ is a term that describes a significant class of cultural phenomena, the central tensions in its social forms means that it fails as a distinctive or new type of ideology, neither is it a distinctive sub-ideology of anarchism, but, where it is stable enough to operate it is largely a variant of contemporary conservatism.

There have been a number of analyses of different cross-breeds or hybrids of the main ideologies. These include Terrell Carver revisiting the strained relationship between Marxism and feminism², Bruce Pilbeam’s comparison of conservatism and environmentalism,³ and Graham Purchase⁴ and Jeff Shantz⁵ examining the intersection of ecologism with syndicalism. Amongst the more unusual and problematic ideological crossbreeds has been the conceptual constellation

¹ Peter Wilkin, ‘George Orwell: the English dissident as Tory anarchist’, *Political Studies* 61.1 (2013), 197-214: 198.

² Terrell Carver, ‘Marxism and feminism: Living with your “ex”’, *Studies in Marxism*, No. 10, (pp. 67-83), 2004.

³ Bruce Pilbeam, ‘Natural allies? Mapping the relationship between conservatism and environmentalism’, *Political Studies* Vol. 51 (2003), 490-508.

⁴ Graham Purchase, ‘Anarcho-syndicalism, technology and ecology’, *Kick It Over* No. 35 (1995), available online at: < <http://ecowobbly.blogspot.co.uk/2011/02/anarcho-syndicalism-technology-and.html>> last accessed 14 January 2015.

⁵ Jeff Shantz, *Green Syndicalism: An Alternative Red/Green Vision* (Syracuse University Press, 2012).

‘conservative anarchism’, a classification applied to a range of writers such as the satirist Auberon Waugh,⁶⁷ promoters of environmental direct action like novelist Edward Abbey,⁸ and contemporary, populist irritants such as the television presenter and newspaper columnist Jeremy Clarkson.⁹ The historians of anarchism, George Woodcock and Peter Marshall, have also included conservative-minded thinkers in their canons of libertarian thinkers. For instance, both commentators include Jonathan Swift,^{10, 11} whilst the latter also adds Edmund Burke.¹²

Peter Wilkin is one of the few contemporary researchers to have carried out a sustained analysis of Tory anarchism. He identifies it with a particular set of English 20th Century cultural producers: Auberon Waugh and his father Evelyn, columnist Michael Wharton, novelist and essayist George Orwell and comic writer-performers Peter Cook and Chris Morris. For Wilkin, Tory anarchism shares a historic era: that of Imperial decline.¹³ Occasionally he extends the category to include agrarians William Cobbett and Swift.^{14,15}

Wilkin’s studies are exceptional, in that in the main they concentrate on Orwell and include more explicit socialist criteria and forebears.¹⁶ As Wilkin

⁶ D. McCarthy, ‘The Waugh at home’, *The American Conservative* 8 October 2007
<<http://www.theamericanconservative.com/articles/the-waugh-at-home/>> last accessed 15 January 2015.

⁷ G. Wheatcroft, ‘Auberon Waugh’, *The Guardian* 18 January 2001,
<<http://www.guardian.co.uk/news/2001/jan/18/guardianobituaries.booksnews> > last accessed 15 January 2015.

⁸ Bill Croke, ‘Edward Abbey, conservative anarchist’, *The American Spectator* 13 March 2009,
<<http://spectator.org/archives/2009/03/13/edward-abbey-conservative-anar>> last accessed 15 January 2015.

⁹ Joe Moran ‘The myth of *Top Gear*’, *The Guardian* Tuesday 10 June 2008,
<<http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/jun/10/automotive.bbc>> last accessed 15 January 2015. Clarkson has been described by the comedian and social commentator Stewart Lee as sincerely expressing ‘outrageously politically incorrect opinions [...] for money.’

¹⁰ George Woodcock, *Anarchism* (Penguin: Harmondsworth, 1975), p. 36.

¹¹ Peter Marshall *Demanding the Impossible* (London: HarperCollins, 1992), 129-31

¹² Marshall, *ibid.*, pp. 133-34.

¹³ Peter Wilkin, ‘(Tory) Anarchism in the UK: The very particular practice of Tory anarchism’, *Anarchist Studies* 17.1 (2009), pp. 48-72: 49 and 65.

¹⁴ Peter Wilkin, *The Strange Case of Tory Anarchism* (Faringdon: Libri, 2010), 25

¹⁵ Wilkin, *op. cit.*, Ref 1, p. 198.

¹⁶ Wilkin, *op. cit.*, Ref 13, 49.

acknowledges, his version of Tory anarchism is distinct from the main Tory anarchisms which ‘accept capitalism’.¹⁷ Wilkin instead identifies his ‘Tory anarchism’ with individual criticism and artistic production rather than wider ranges of socio-political action. His version has little in common with ‘anarchists in the traditional sense of the term’¹⁸ and he recognises that it makes no attempt at being a practical guide for action, which is a necessary feature of a stable ideology. Instead, Wilkin focuses on social satire where core contradictions can be useful as prompts for imaginative scenarios even if such radical inconsistencies are damaging for policy-formation or strategy.¹⁹ As Noël O’Sullivan notes in his monograph *Conservatism*, ‘satirical scepticism’ of the type associated with the cultural producers studied by Wilkin, is inadequate to shape thought and action outside of particular aesthetic practices.²⁰ Indeed, it is possible to argue that because it equally lampoons any challenge to dominant social arrangements, as well as to current practices, its failure to assist in promoting alternatives assists the status quo. However, for the most part, Wilkin’s perceptive and often witty account of ‘Tory anarchism’ falls outside the scope of ideological study, though some of his broader insights and examples are used here to illustrate wider points in the argument.

Instead of Wilkin’s satirical antagonists, the conservative anarchism discussed here includes texts and practices with more explicit political goals, and is investigated using a model based on Freedman’s conceptual analysis. In doing so this study raises – and attempts to answer – three main questions: First, what constitute the particular conceptual arrangements, organisations, resources and tactics that distinguish the particular hybrid of conservative anarchism? Second, what is meant by

¹⁷ Wilkin *op cit.* Ref 14, p.16.

¹⁸ Wilkin, *ibid.*, p. 32

¹⁹ Wilkin, *op. cit.* Ref 13, pp. 49-50;

²⁰ N. Sullivan, *Conservatism* (London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1976), p.120.

‘hybridization’ in relation to ideology? Third, what hybrid-type does conservative anarchism take?

2. The Conceptual Morphologies of Conservatism, Anarchism and Conservative Anarchism

One of the reasons why Wilkin does not consider Tory anarchism to be an ideology is that it is ‘not... a coherent system of principles and beliefs.’²¹ However, as Freeden argues, this is insufficient to exclude it from the realm of political ideology.

Ideologies are not static, coherent, delineated philosophies constructed out of necessary and/or sufficient conditions,²² as this cannot account for general evolution and localised adaptations in ideologies. Instead they are better identified and analysed, using Freeden’s conceptual approach as relatively settled structures of mutually-defining principles.²³

Conservatism and anarchism are considered to be opposed ideologies, although they share some structural similarities. Of the main contemporary Western political ideologies identified in the standard introductory textbooks,²⁴ conservatism and anarchism are often identified as the most problematic to identify. Proponents of conservatism, such as Michael Oakeshott²⁵ and Anthony Quinton²⁶ consider that the most basic forms of conservatism are matters of disposition rather than commitment to a set of universal principles. Similarly, postanarchists Saul Newman²⁷ and Hakim

²¹ Wilkin, *op. cit.*, Ref 1, p. 198.

²² Freeden *Ideologies and Political Theory: A conceptual approach* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 28.

²³ M. Freeden, *Ideology: A short introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), p.32.

²⁴ P. Heywood, *Political Ideologies: An introduction* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2000); R. Eatwell and A. Wright, eds, *Contemporary Political Ideologies*, second edition (London: Continuum, 1999).

²⁵ M. Oakeshott, *Rationalism in Politics and Other essays* (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1991), p. 408.

²⁶ A. Quinton, ‘Conservatism’ in R. Goodin and P. Pettit, *A Companion to Contemporary Political Philosophy* (Oxford: Blackwell), p. 245.

²⁷ S. Newman, *The Politics of Post Anarchism* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010), p. 51

Bey²⁸ argue that anarchism would be revitalised by an ontological an-archy or absence of guiding principle.²⁹

Given the difficulties in identifying these major ideological families, the hybrid of ‘conservative anarchism’ (or ‘Tory anarchism’) would appear to be even more complex and slippery. David Blackburn, in a review of Wilkin’s book considers it to be an ‘oxymoron’.³⁰ Daniel McCarthy, associate editor of *The American Conservative* and amongst the more distinguished bloggers to use the term as a self-identity, also acknowledges that the description is often read as ‘a self-evident oxymoron’. He, by contrast, uses it to promote a particular set of policies and political positions.^{31, 32}

2.1. Anarchism

Analyses of anarchism frequently comment on the difficulty of finding a coherent set of principles that unify all the different groups and thinkers who have been described as ‘anarchists’.³³ This is a problem that is exacerbated by the different disciplinary approaches to studying anarchism. As Nathan Jun identifies political-historical and ideological accounts will rightly identify anarchism as a ‘tendency within

²⁸ H. Bey, *T.A.Z.: The Temporary Autonomous Zone, ontological anarchy, poetic terrorism*, second edition (Brooklyn, USA: Autonomedia, 2003), p. 3 and p. 63.

²⁹ See too, Leonard A. Williams, ‘Hakim Bey and Ontological Anarchism’, *Journal for the Study of Radicalism*, 4.2 (Fall 2010), pp. 109-137.

³⁰ David Blackburn ‘The sound of broken glass’, *The Spectator* 27 November 2010 <<http://www.spectator.co.uk/books/6488483/the-sound-of-broken-glass/>> last accessed 15 January 2015.

³¹ D. McCarthy, ‘About’, *The Tory Anarchist* <<http://toryanarchist.wordpress.com/about/>> 21st February 21st 2006, last accessed 2 August 2013. McCarthy’s blog has since moved to *The American Conservative* website <<http://www.amconmag.com/mccarthy/>> last accessed 1 August 2014.

³² E. Kain, ‘Tory Anarchism in America: An Interview with Daniel McCarthy’, *Ordinary-gentleman.com* 3 January 2011, <<http://ordinary-gentlemen.com/blog/2011/01/03/tory-anarchism-in-america-an-interview-with-daniel-mccarthy/>> last accessed 1 July 2015.

³³ The initial position of D. Miller, *Anarchism* (London: Dent, 1984), p.3 and M. Schmidt and L. van der Walt, *Black Flame: The Revolutionary Class Politics of Anarchism and Syndicalism*, (Edinburgh: AK Press, 2009).

international socialism’, whilst more analytical, philosophical approaches might draw on a wider set of intersecting ‘beliefs and opinions’.³⁴

As a label ‘anarchism’ has been applied to a diverse assemblage of thinkers: egoists like Max Stirner, anarcho-capitalists like Murray Rothbard, religiously-inspired activists such as Leo Tolstoy,³⁵ Vinoba Bhave³⁶ and even the Christian Messiah,³⁷ as well as the usual atheistic, ‘classical canon’³⁸ of Proudhon, Bakunin, Kropotkin and Emma Goldman. One strategy has been to find a common ‘anarchist minimum’, a shared principle held by all anarchists. Voline (Vsevolod Eichenbaum), for instance, felt that it was important to find, and concentrate on, the united features of anarchism, despite the differences wrought by different historical experience.³⁹ Paul Eltzbacher, whom Ruth Kinna and Sureyya Evren⁴⁰ and Michael Schmidt and Lucien van der Walt⁴¹ identify as being the origin for the diverse and problematic canon of anarchist thinkers, suggests that the unifying principle is scepticism or outright antagonism towards the state. Others suggest the primary principle is the rejection of all coercion.⁴²

³⁴ N. Jun, ‘Rethinking the Anarchist Canon: History, philosophy and interpretation’, *Anarchist Developments in Cultural Studies* 1 (2013), 82-116: 87.

³⁵ G. Woodcock, *Anarchism* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1975).

³⁶ G. Ostergaard, ‘Indian Anarchism: The curious case of Vinoba Bhave, anarchist “Saint of Government”’, D. Goodway, ed., *For Anarchism* (London: Routledge, 189), p. 204.

³⁷ Marshall *Op. Cit.*, Ref 11, pp. 75-76; A. Christoyannopoulos *Christian Anarchism: A Political Commentary on the Gospel* (Exeter: Imprint Academic, 2011).

³⁸ The term is placed in quotation marks because the construction of a ‘canon’ and the distinction between ‘classical’ anarchisms and new anarchisms is a matter of significant debate amongst anarchist theorists. See the special issue of *Anarchist Developments in Cultural Studies: Blasting the canon* 1 (2013).

³⁹ AFAQ: What kinds of organisation do anarchists build?. *An Anarchist FAQ. Section J - What do anarchists do?* <<http://anarchism.pageabode.com/afaq/secJ3.html>> 11 November 2008. Last accessed 15 January 2015; Voline ‘Proceedings of Nabat’ in D. Guerin, ed., *No Gods No Masters* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 2005), p. 487.

⁴⁰ R. Kinna and S. Evren, ‘Introduction: Blasting the canon’, *Anarchist Developments in Cultural Studies* 1 (2013), pp. 1-4: p. 2.

⁴¹ M. Schmidt and L. van der Walt, *Black Flame: The revolutionary class politics of anarchism and syndicalism*, (Edinburgh: AK Press, 2009), pp. 35-40; for a wider discussion see R. Kinna and S. Evren ‘Introduction: Blasting the Canon’, *Anarchist Developments in Cultural Studies* 1 (2013), pp. 1-6.

⁴² R. P. Wolff, *In Defence of Anarchism*. (London: Harper Torchbooks, 1976)..

There are problems with the identification of an ‘anarchist minimum’. The first, as Freeden points out, is that it makes for a very ‘thin’ ideology, with a very restrictive set of concepts. As such it only operates in a very small set of domains.⁴³ A second is, as Schmidt and van der Walt explain, the anarchist minimum of a ‘rejection of the state’ or ‘critique of coercion’ means different things when allied to free market liberal principles, as opposed to when they are applied to egalitarian one. The latter contests hierarchical, economic and social relations; the former accepts and celebrates economic inequalities.

Schmidt and van der Walt’s solution is to reject non-socialist anarchism as not properly an anarchism at all. They point to the main historical libertarian movements, based on class struggle, to illustrate how the ideological structures of non-social anarchisms are distinct from those of social anarchist tradition.⁴⁴ Schmidt and van der Walt’s solution is compelling and largely consistent with the conceptual approach, but not without its problems. They include a positivist epistemology as a core feature of social anarchism,⁴⁵ whilst anarchism has been traditionally more hostile to scientism and singular epistemologies.^{46,47} Similarly, ideological structures are much more permeable than Schmidt and van der Walt allow, so they risk overlooking the influence of certain features of individualist anarchist critiques on social anarchist movements.⁴⁸ However, Schmidt and van der Walt are right in classifying social anarchism as a separate and distinct ideological structure from economic individualism. As identified elsewhere, despite some similarities in nomenclature, the

⁴³ Freeden, *op. cit.*, Ref 23, p. 98.

⁴⁴ Schmidt and van der Walt, *op. cit.* Ref 41, pp. 71-72.

⁴⁵ Schmidt and van der Walt, *ibid.*, p. 85, p. 98.

⁴⁶ M. Bakunin, *God and the State* (New York: Dover, 1970), 33.

⁴⁷ E. Malatesta, *Life and Ideas* (London: Freedom, 1984), pp. 38-45.

⁴⁸ See for instance the influence of Stirner and Nietzsche on social libertarians (D. Colson, ‘Nietzsche and the libertarian workers’ movement’, in J. Moore, ed., *I am Not a Man, I am Dynamite! Friedrich Nietzsche and the anarchist tradition* (Williamsburgh Station: Autonomedia, 2004).

main forms of individualist anarchisms (anarcho-capitalism and egoism) have significantly different core concepts, ideological structures, organisational forms and identities from social anarchism.⁴⁹ As a result, ‘anarchism’ here will be reserved for the social versions, unless there is an additional qualifier (such as ‘Tory anarchism’), in order to distinguish the term from variants of right-libertarianism and anarcho-capitalism (sometimes referred to as ‘propertarianism’).

It should be stressed that a commitment to the socialist, historical tradition of anarchism does not necessarily imply a single ideological construction. Sébastien Faure indicates that there is a healthy diversity within this broad tradition.⁵⁰ These differences can occasionally lead to conflict, but more commonly are recognised as necessary variants to deal with distinctive, local forms of oppression and thus can assist, rather than undermine, efforts at mutual aid. The morphological differences between social anarchisms and propertarian forms are more extreme, leading to significant differences in interpretation of core concepts like ‘the state’ and ‘liberty’. They also differ in their identification of goals (or utopias), the development of institutions (the stable norm following organisations that generate shared goods and meanings), and accounts of political agency.

The core principles of social anarchism occasionally appear in other variants of socialism, for instance autonomous Marxisms.^{51,52} These central principles are: (i) the contestation of hierarchical forms of power, which social anarchism associates with the state and economic systems like capitalism, but also includes rejecting gender or ethnic hierarchies; (ii) a social view of the self, in which identities change

⁴⁹ B. Franks, ‘Anarchism’, in M. Freeden, L. Towers and M. Stears, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Political Ideologies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 385-404: 400.

⁵⁰ AFAQ: *op. cit.*, Ref 39; Voline ‘Proceedings of Nabat’ in D. Guerin, ed., *No Gods no Masters* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 2005), p. 487.

⁵¹ See for instance H. Cleaver, ‘Kropotkin, Self-valorization And The Crisis Of Marxism’, Libcom.org <<http://libcom.org/library/kropotkin-self-valorization-crisis-marxism>>, last accessed 15 January 2015.

⁵² H. Gautney, ‘Between anarchism and autonomism’, *WorkingUSA*, 12 (2009): pp. 467-87.

depending on relationships with others, and that liberation cannot be purely individual. This distinguishes anarchism from egoism. Finally, (iii) there is a commitment to prefiguration, a belief that the means must be in accordance with, or a minor example of, the desired goal. Such principles can be found as a stable feature of social anarchist groups for well over a century.⁵³

2.2. Conservatism

Whilst Oakeshott and Quinton doubt whether there are core principles to conservatism, other proponents of, and commentators on, conservatism disagree. Ted Honderich identifies a number of core features that adapt over time. However he argues that conservatism lacks a coherent rationale that justifies its principles to make conservatism a sustainable or coherent political philosophy.⁵⁴ Freeden is less interested in validity, conceptual coherence and ethical justifiability,⁵⁵ but like Honderich recognises a number of core, though evolving, features of conservatism, including the preservation of the social order.⁵⁶ Similarly, John Kekes in his survey of the differences within conservatism considers the fundamental features of conservatism to be the protection of the longstanding nation-state aligned to preservation of social arrangements that have been stable over time, based on the belief that persistence is an indication of their quality.⁵⁷

⁵³ See for instance the account of pre-first world war British anarchism in J. Quail, *The Slow Burning Fuse* (London: Paladin 1978), esp. p. x to more recently Class War 'This is Class War' in *Class War* No. 93 (Winter 2007), pp. 12-13 and the Anarchist Federation 'Aims and Principles', <<http://www.afed.org.uk/aims.html>> last accessed 15 January 2015; Solidarity Federation, 'The aims of the Solidarity Federation', <<http://www.solfed.org.uk/the-aims-of-the-solidarity-federation>> last accessed 15 January 2015.

⁵⁴ Ted Honderich, *Conservatism* (Harmonsworth: Penguin, 1990), pp. 208-39.

⁵⁵ Freeden, *op. cit.*, Ref 22, 1-2 and pp. 6-7.

⁵⁶ Freeden, *ibid.*, pp. 388-89.

⁵⁷ J. Kekes, 'What is Conservatism?', *Philosophy* Vol. 72, No. 281 (July 1997), pp. 351-74: 351

Kekes argues that it is through respecting traditions that individuals are best able to satisfy and develop their intrinsic qualities.⁵⁸ Alongside this is a recognition that humans are necessarily imperfect and imperfectable, which is why a strong state and other disciplining institutions are required.⁵⁹ Many of these core principles are also cited in introductory works by Andrew Heywood and Quinton, who identify: tradition, human imperfection, respect for authority, an ‘organic’ view of society as constituted by overlapping, mutually supporting institutions and property rights, as helping to preserve stability.⁶⁰

Property rights and free markets within conservatism have a contentious position in conservatism. O’Sullivan includes the libertarian New Right as a form of conservatism,⁶¹ and Freedman too regards conservatism as compatible with *laissez-faire* economic principles. However, Quinton complains that such an association is mistaken. He points out that F. A. Hayek, a key propertarian thinker,⁶² concluded the *Constitution of Liberty* with a chapter called ‘Why I am not a conservative’.⁶³

Hayek’s argument is that, whilst there is plenty to admire in the conservative tradition, especially its opposition to socialism, it is nevertheless inadequate compared to economic liberalism. As one of conservatism’s weaknesses is a lack of a fundamental principle or grand plan, it sometimes acquiesces with socialist movements to ensure stability. By contrast, Hayek’s liberalism offers a vision of true autonomy and freedom, and rejects illegitimate compromise.

⁵⁸ Kekes, *ibid.*, pp.351-52 and pp. 365-67.

⁵⁹ Kekes, *ibid.*, pp. 368-71.

⁶⁰ Heywood, *op. cit.* Ref 24, pp. 66-102; Quinton, *op. cit.*, Ref 26: p.249 and pp.253-59.

⁶¹ N. Sullivan, ‘Conservatism’ in R. Eatwell and a. Wright, *Contemporary Political ideologies*, second edition (London: Continuum), p. 69.

⁶² See for instance the contributors to A. Seldon, ed., *The New Right Enlightenment* (London: Economic and Literary Books, 1985).

⁶³ Quinton, *op. cit.*, Ref 26, p.246.

Hayek claims that his liberalism (often referred to as ‘libertarianism’)⁶⁴ in contrast to conservatism, is internationalist rather than narrow-minded and nationalist. His liberalism embraces, rather than fears, new ideas. It embraces radical economic development and change, and is critical of coercive government or state action rather than allowing the ‘self-regulating force of markets’.⁶⁵ Hayek rejects faith in established authority, especially if it conflicts with the economic demands of the market. The influential conservative theorist Russell Kirk provides the conservative flipside. As well as offering some rather idiosyncratic differences between libertarianism and conservatism based on psycho-sexual readings of libertarian personalities,⁶⁶ Kirk argues that Hayekian liberalism is different from, and inferior to, conservatism. Hayekian liberalism, he argues, destroys important traditions based on transcendental belief that help unify society.⁶⁷ It is also antipathetic to the state upon which a thriving economy depends.⁶⁸

However, the division between the two has in more recent times collapsed. As Freedman explains, whilst in previous epochs conservatism was antipathetic to economic liberalism because it was a disruption of traditional practice, now property rights provide the dominant norms and social power-structures rather than tenets based on time-honoured beliefs.⁶⁹ As *laissez-faire* becomes increasingly accepted into the conservative ideological frame, the latter’s commitment to maintaining law and order becomes an absolute commitment to maintaining the laws that govern private property rights and contractual obligations.⁷⁰ Similarly conservative principles of

⁶⁴ See for instance, A. Selden, ed., *The ‘New Right’ Enlightenment: The spectres that haunt the left* (Sevenoaks: Economic and Literary Books, 1985). The collection is introduced by Hayek.

⁶⁵ F. Hayek, *The Constitution of Liberty* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1978), p. 400.

⁶⁶ Russell Kirk, ‘A Dispassionate assessment of Libertarians’, *The Heritage Foundation*, <http://thf_media.s3.amazonaws.com/1988/pdf/hl158.pdf> last accessed 15 January 2015, p.4 and p.5.

⁶⁷ Kirk, *ibid.*, p.6.

⁶⁸ Kirk, *ibid.*, p.3., p. 6 and p.8.

⁶⁹ Freedman, *op. cit.*, Ref 22, pp. 373-74.

⁷⁰ Freedman, *ibid.*, p.375.

human imperfection become transformed into principles of adaptability.⁷¹

Conservatism's principle of social well-being through stability melds into a faith in markets as a regulating system that provides optimal production of goods,⁷² so too, the division between conservatism's emphasis on the national and liberalism's on the international dissolves. Intra- and inter-institutional relations increasingly cross international borders and are governed by global liberal economic norms, yet nation states or state-like bodies are still centrally required to maintain and police these norms.⁷³

Some conceptual difference might still arise between conservatism and propertarianism, such as over the notion of progress which is supported by liberalism but subject to scepticism by conservatism. However, a new accommodation is found by either restricting claims to 'improvement' to specific spheres of activity (for instance scientific development) or pushing areas of conflict to the periphery. An example of the first might be Hayek's assertion, based on J. B. Bury's *The Idea of Progress*, that progress is incremental and developed distinctly and at different points, for different agents in different fields.⁷⁴ An example of the second is where conservative laments for social decay are blamed on welfarist policies rather than aggressive free-markets. Post-imperial conservatism is wedded to protecting economically liberal institutions and practices. It is sceptical of state redistributive activity, but defends state structures to protect liberal values, whilst the main constellations of anarchism reject the state, capitalism and its underlying values.

⁷¹ Freeden, *ibid.*, p. 376.

⁷² Freeden, *ibid.*, p. 377.

⁷³ S. Harper, *Beyond the Left: The Communist Critique of the Media* (London: Zero, 2012), 15; see too Saskia Sassen, *Territory, Authority, Rights: From Medieval to Global Assemblages* (Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2008).

⁷⁴ Hayek, *op. cit.*, Ref 65, pp. 39- 53, p. 429.

2.3 Conservative Anarchism

The term ‘Tory anarchism’ is usually thought to originate with Orwell’s description of Swift,⁷⁵ although there are instances that predate it.⁷⁶ The category has subsequently been applied to Orwell himself.⁷⁷ It is a descriptor that been used by a range of other critics including the literary commentator Jeffery Meyers,⁷⁸ right-libertarian Martyn Tyrrell⁷⁹ as well as Wilkin.⁸⁰ Marshall in his wide-ranging history of anarchism does not use the term directly, but by including the ‘Tory Dean Swift as a libertarian thinker’,⁸¹ alongside Burke, suggests a viable conservative anarchist tradition.⁸²

There are good grounds for considering conservative anarchism to be the unstable hybrid or the ‘oxymoron’ ascribed to it by McCarthy and Blackburn. However, it is argued that conservative anarchisms can be identified through three mutually-defining concepts: i) a sceptical attitude towards, rather than an outright rejection, of the state, such as in Marshall’s inclusion of Burke, and Judith Shklar’s interpretation of Swift.⁸³ ii) A preference for tradition (and in the British context a markedly English set of traditions), for instance in Jeffrey Meyer’s definition of Swift and Orwell’s Tory anarchism as ‘a revolutionary in love with the past.’⁸⁴ iii) An ontological belief in human imperfection⁸⁵ and thus a rejection of political goals and

⁷⁵ G. Orwell, ‘Politics vs literature: An examination of *Gulliver’s Travels*’, *Essays* (Penguin, Harmondsworth, 2000), p.380.

⁷⁶ Railway Reform Leaflet, 3 (1895), reprinted in T. Bolas, *Equitable Railway Nationalisation: Problems for the future* (London: Thomas Bolas), p.7.

⁷⁷ B. Crick, *George Orwell: A Life* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1992), p. 174.

⁷⁸ J. Meyers, ‘George Orwell and the Art of Writing’, *The Kenyon Review*, Vol. 27, No. 4 (Autumn, 2005), pp. 92-114

⁷⁹ M. Tyrrell, ‘The Politics of George Orwell (1903-1950): From Tory anarchism to national socialism and more than half way back’, *Cultural Notes* No. 36 (1997).

⁸⁰ Wilkin, *op. cit.*, Ref 1.

⁸¹ Marshall *op. cit.*, Ref 11, 130.

⁸² Marshall, *ibid.*, pp. 133-34.

⁸³ J. Shklar, ‘Nineteen Eighty-Four: Should Political Theory Care?’, *Political Theory*, Vol. 13, No. 1 (Feb., 1985), 5-18: p.8 and 18 (fn3).

⁸⁴ Meyers, *op. cit.* Ref 78, p. 110.

⁸⁵ J. Traugott ‘Swift, Our Contemporary’, *University Review*, Vol. 4, No. 1, Jonathan Swift Tercentenary Issue (Spring, 1967), pp. 11-34: 11.

structures generated by such imperfect beings.⁸⁶ This malign humanism is supposedly in contrast to an allegedly benign humanism of social anarchism. Thus, it is standardly assumed, even by those like Traugott who use the description, that the label defines a set of contrary positions incompatible with the broad socialist anarchist tradition. Similarly, where conservative anarchism operates, it is through institutions, agents and practices that are separate, and antipathetic, to the activities and organisations of social anarchism.

3. Ideology Hybridity: Four Hybrid Types

There are a number of reasons to be suspicious of allegories derived from the natural sciences being applied to the social sciences. However, the notion of ‘hybridity’ here is used solely as a metaphor to develop a heuristic taxonomy for the understanding of ideologies, and is not indicative of a determinist social epistemology. ‘Hybridity’ is a frequently used metaphor in political analysis. Comparative politics utilises notions of ‘hybrid regimes’ for those state structures that combine features of democracy and authoritarianism. Whilst as John Hutnyk notes it has been widely discussed in sociology, ethnic studies and cultural studies to cover ‘cultural exchange’, identity change and human-technology interfaces.⁸⁷ In ideological analysis the term is utilised

⁸⁶ Daniel McCarthy ‘The “Midwestern Libertarian Conservatism” of Russell Kirk’ 28 May 2008, <<http://toryanarchist.wordpress.com/2008/05/28/the-midwestern-libertarian-conservatism-of-russell-kirk/>> last accessed 15 January 2015.

⁸⁷ See for instance L. Morgenbesser, ‘Elections in hybrid regimes: conceptual Stretching Revived’, *Political Studies* 62.1. (March 2014), 21-36; M. Wigell, ‘Mapping “Hybrid Regimes”: Regime Types and Concepts in Comparative Politics’, *Democratization*, 15.2 (2008), 230–50; J. Hutnyk, ‘Hybridty’, *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28.1. (2005), 79-102.

alongside associated biological conceptions such as ‘adaption’ and ‘mutation’ for explaining the development and variation within ideologies.⁸⁸

Cross-pollination can be deliberate or the product of unintended fertilisation, and the results of such cross-breeding can fall into four broad categories: (i) unstable zygotes that fail to reach term or unproductive offspring which have little resilience or impact; (ii) a product which is largely identical (bar some superficial differences) to the dominant parent; (iii) a product that borrows distinctive features from both parents becoming recognisably a product of both; iv) a new synthesis that is distinct from the parents, and where only careful archaeology would identify its lineage.

These are not necessarily discrete categories. A cross-breed of phenotype (i) having failed to sustain itself might default back to the dominant parent’s tradition (ii). A phenotype (ii) crossbreed, which appears almost identical to the dominant parent, might include a minor difference from the other parent. However, if the characteristics from the other parent increase in significance in particular contexts, then this makes it closer to phenotype (iii). A hybrid which initially appears to have shared attributes, might generate new forms of institutional practice separate from either parent; its morphological structure might then further adapt, transforming it into hybrid (iv).

Using this typology it is possible to locate conservative anarchisms. If the ‘anarchism’ refers to social anarchism (anarchism proper), then it is likely to become an unstable hybrid operating indecisively in distinct locations. If, however, the ‘anarchism’ refers to one amenable to capitalism and economic inequalities (propertarianism), then this hybrid operates as a subset of conservatism rather than as

⁸⁸ See for instance D. Williams discussion of anarchisms adapting to local political contexts, ‘Red vs. Green: Regional variation of anarchist ideology in the United States, *Journal of Political Ideologies* Vol. 14, No. 2 (2009), pp. 189-210: 206 and M. Freedon, ‘Editorial: What Fails in Ideologies?’, *Journal of Political Ideologies* Vol. 14, No. 1 (2009): pp.1-9: 2.

an anarchism or a distinctive new type of ideology. Its contrariness lies both in its dual character of appearing to be critical of established hierarchies whilst also maintaining them, and in its tone of, often playful, abrasiveness and mischievous perversion (such as the satirists Morris, Cook and Waugh, referred to by Wilkin).

3.1. Phenotype i: Unsustainable Hybrids

Given the different hybrid forms that conservative anarchism might fall into, it is useful to give some clarification. A cross-breed of phenotype (i) is a failed or sterile hybrid. The internal contradictions of competing principles from radically different parents either requires substantial institutional support to be maintained, which are unavailable, or lacks coherence to sustain collective action.⁸⁹

Examples of patently absurd combinations are rare for two main reasons. First, ideological terms are flexible enough to avoid, at least temporarily and/or locally outright contradiction, so it is extraordinary to have an ideology that has an overt paradox at its core. Second, where there are outright internal conflicts between core principles, these hybrids rarely persist for long and fail to co-ordinate action or develop their own institutions or have significant impact on others,⁹⁰ so they are hard to notice. However, Troy Southgate's attempt to synthesize fascism and anarchism might provide an example.⁹¹

Southgate's proposal is for discrete self-contained, self-governing mini-communities or micro-states. These are often ethnically defined⁹² and structured on

⁸⁹ Freedden, *op. cit.*, Ref 88, p.3 and p.6.

⁹⁰ Freedden, *ibid*, p.2.

⁹¹ T. Southgate, 'Transcending the Beyond (sic.): From Third Position To National-Anarchism', *Pravada.Ru*, 17 January 2002 <<http://english.pravda.ru/news/russia/17-01-2002/25940-0/>>, last accessed 15 January 2015.

⁹² 'Part Five: Racial separation', National-Anarchist Movement, <<http://www.national-anarchist.net/2010/09/part-5-racial-separatism.html>>, last accessed 15 January 2015.

‘natural hierarchies’.⁹³ Whilst apparently also embracing notions of ‘mutual aid’ and concepts of social equality, Southgate supports maintaining autarkatic, self-governing communities predicated on hierarchical norms.⁹⁴ In contrast to anarchism, Southgate’s proposal rejects any cross-community organisation based on different interests. The national structure takes priority.

Consequently, Southgate’s core nationalist and hierarchical principles are unsustainable with anarchism. Southgate admits that his hybrid is in conflict with social anarchism,⁹⁵ and is not recognised as an anarchism by the main social anarchist groups. Southgate’s main contemporary anarchist reference is to Richard Hunt. Hunt was expelled from *Green Anarchist* for his advocacy of nationalism and ‘natural pecking orders’. Hunt later dropped any reference to being an anarchist, mixing with more overtly neo-fascist sympathisers.⁹⁶ Thus, Southgate’s nationalist anarchism has been unable to inspire any meaningful number of adherents, and where it persists, it is merely in the form of a minor variant of fascism. Such instability between core concepts is likely to increase where there are more than two ideological parents.⁹⁷ Even an unproductive hybrid might only be contingently so, and in future circumstances where the contradictions can be mediated by new social conditions, allowing it to develop into a different form of hybrid.

⁹³ Overt anti-semitism is also not far from the surface. ‘An elite coterie of Jews and their allies have effectively manipulated world events for their own interests.’ ‘Part One: anti-Zionism’, National-Anarchist Movement, <<http://www.national-anarchist.net/2010/09/part-one-anti-zionism.html>> last accessed 15 January 2015.

⁹⁴ ‘Part 5: racial Separation’, <<http://www.national-anarchist.net/2010/09/part-5-racial-separatism.html>> last accessed 15 January 2015.

⁹⁵ ‘Part 2: Anarchism’, National-Anarchist Movement, 18 September 2010, <<http://www.national-anarchist.net/2010/09/part-2-anarchism.html>> , last accessed 15 January 2015.

⁹⁶ See S. Booth, *Into the 1990’s* [sic.] *with Green Anarchism* (Oxford: Green Anarchist Books, 1996), p. 80 and Hunt’s magazine *Alternative Green*.

⁹⁷ The Libertarian National Socialist Green Party, which sounds like a joke, was supposedly set up as a serious attempt in the Unites States to fuse different traditions with German-style National Socialism. It had little activity associated with it except for its now defunct website, although high school shooter Jeff Weis allegedly posted on its message board (see S. Left, ‘A Neo-Nazi “Angel of Death”’, *The Guardian*, 22 March 2005, <<http://www.theguardian.com/world/2005/mar/22/usa.usgunviolence1>>

3.2. Phenotype ii: Minor Variant of Dominant Parent

As the above example of national anarchism illustrates, cross-fertilisations are more commonly simply particular minor variants of one of the dominant ideologies. The ideological membership is identifiable through the presence of the core, ineliminable principles of that dominant parent. The hybrid might develop to increase the attractiveness of one of the ideological progenitors to adherents of the other ideology, or in response to weaknesses or lacunae in the dominant parent.

In order to limit the impact of the hybrid ideology and cast doubt on the integrity of its proponents, critics may try to show that an apparently distinct hybrid is in fact a localised variant of the least attractive parent. Thus, eco-socialists are derided as ‘watermelons’, suggesting that the green outer veneer masks their true, hidden pure socialist commitments. However, type ii phenotypes are not necessarily disingenuous, nor is it necessarily prescriptive to identify a hybrid as constituting this form.

Green syndicalism, for instance, brings in certain ecological themes which are often absent from syndicalist discourse. Graham Purchase argues that a practical ecologism that can deal justly with vital human interests whilst restructuring production to respect ecological concerns requires industrial democracy, that is to say a form of revolutionary syndicalism.⁹⁸ Murray Bookchin, a critic of Purchase, argues that ecological principles are merely a subset of secondary issues for this form of socialist labour-organisation.⁹⁹

Autonome Nationalisten, a German version of the types of crossbreeding attempted by Southgate, provides an example of where a failed hybrid in one context,

⁹⁸ Purchase, *op. cit.*, Ref 4.

⁹⁹ Murray Bookchin, ‘Deep Ecology, Anarchosyndicalism and the Future of Anarchist Thought’, *Deep Ecology and Anarchism* (London: Freedom Press, 1997), pp. 48-58; see too M. Humphrey, ‘Green Ideology’ in *The Oxford Handbook of Political Ideologies*, ed. M. Freedman, L. Sargent and M. Stears (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 429-30.

operates as type ii hybrid in a different context. *Autonome Nationalisten* has adopted some of the stylistic and organisational methods of the anti-authoritarian left autonomist movement.^{100,101} It combines Strasserite anti-capitalism with contemporary anti-globalisation. However, its similarities with socialist strategies end at the superficial adoption of certain symbols, forms of dress and spectacular tactic. Like Southgate's national anarchism, its apparently 'anti-imperialist' and 'anti-chauvinist' discourse maintains hierarchical and discriminatory practices rather than challenges them. Because these apparently leftist notions are still mediated by central concepts of authentic, national essence, *Autonome Nationalisten* uses such apparently egalitarian concepts to justify rejecting pluralist societies, and those 'conspiratorial' elements that undermine national authenticity.¹⁰² Their version of anti-capitalism is structured around traditional anti-Jewish conspiracies of international financiers and banking control,¹⁰³ in which the social wrongs wrought by a whole social class are placed not just on the minority members of the social class, but that minority group as a whole.¹⁰⁴ Indeed, the Autonomous Nationalist policy remains a corporatist state protecting the ethnic privileges of relatively autonomous communities who mediate internal and external relationships largely through markets.

As such, whilst the *Autonome Nationalisten* are a significant influence in established German neo-Nazi circles, they have made no impact on the main alternative globalisation movement, nor have they significantly altered the orientation of existing neo-Nazi strategies and analyses. Thus Phenotype ii hybrids are largely structured by core concepts from an already existing stable ideology but with

¹⁰⁰ B. Sommer, 'Anti-Capitalism in the Name of Ethno-Nationalism: Ideological shifts on the German extreme right', *Patterns of Prejudice* 42:3 (2008), 305-316.

¹⁰¹ R. Schlembech, 'The Autonomous Nationalists': New developments and contradictions in the German neo-Nazi movement', *Interface* 5.2, pp.295-318.

¹⁰² Schlembech, *ibid.*, 307.

¹⁰³ Sommer *Op cit.* Ref 100, 314-15.

¹⁰⁴ Schlembech, *op cit.*, Ref 101, p. 309.

additional characteristics from the other parent which can be of local significance. Where a hybrid operates in both parent ideologies, for instance the crossbreed promoted by Purchase, where he can point to the centrality of ecological issues to syndicalism and vice-versa, the closer green syndicalism comes to phenotype iii.

3.3. Phenotype iii: Joint Attributes

Whilst phenotype ii hybrids operate to stabilise or extend one of the ideological parents, phenotype iii crossbreeds contain significant shared characteristics of both ideological parents. This type of hybrid has an ideological structure that allows it to operate within organisations associated with both parents, bringing aspects of the other parent to resolve problems or extend influence. In some contexts the crossbreed will operate more like one parent (phenotype ii), but there are other significant contexts where it assists the other parent.

Examples can be found in varieties of feminism. Marxism and Feminism has produced many hybrids and some variants end up as ideologies that are morphologically similar to one or other partner (phenotype ii). Marxist feminisms either make patriarchy an epiphenomenon of class conflict or class struggle an epiphenomenon of gender division. Where economic class takes priority it assumes an economic reductivism and omits the particular phenotypes of oppression which women suffer 'as *women*'.¹⁰⁵ However, there are forms of Marxist-Feminism that suggest a hybrid, albeit localised, which has characteristics of both ideologies, without being reduced to either one.

Such hybrids might be those Marxist practices and discourses which have adapted to facilitate the legitimate concerns of feminism, and altered organisational

¹⁰⁵ R. Tong, *Feminist Thought: An introduction* (Boulder, USA: Westview Press, 1989), pp.65-66.

and structural arrangement to ensure at least minimal women's representation, and to campaign on issues that are not directly concerned with economic exploitation. Such hybrids would also include those feminist organisations that are sensitive to pre-existing differences in economic power, and are critical of liberal feminist presuppositions and practices. These Marxist-Feminist hybrids encourage a mutual interplay between the two ideologies, finding areas of commonality such as developing theories of emancipation and stimuli for radical action; encouraging distinctive forms of organisation that lie beyond constitutional politics, and challenging everyday assumptions or normalised behaviour, such as pre-existing academic practices.¹⁰⁶ They also problematise and use constructively the areas of difference for theoretical and practical reflection and development. Similarly variants of green anarchism (or eco-anarchism), such as Bookchin's social ecology or the United Kingdom's Earth First! 'revolutionary ecology',¹⁰⁷ are equally classifiable as subsets of ecologism or of anarchism. Ecological principles that are present, but marginal, in other forms of anarchism move from the periphery to the core. As a result, green anarchism provides critiques of hierarchy and prejudice within liberal environmentalism,¹⁰⁸ as well as highlighting the gaps in some libertarian socialist campaigns and priorities.¹⁰⁹

A joint hybrid might lose support or influence within one of its ideological parents and thus move closer to hybrid ii, or start to develop its own separate forms of organisation, practices and methods, which start to contest those of apparently similar ideological movements. As a joint hybrid like this develops it can become more

¹⁰⁶ See for instance T. Carver, 'Marxism and Feminism: Living with your "Ex"', *Studies in Marxism*, Vol. 10 (2004).

¹⁰⁷ *Do or Die* No. 7 (undated), p. i.

¹⁰⁸ Earth First!, 'Book Reviews:', *Do or Die* No. 7 (undated), pp. 142-43.

¹⁰⁹ Earth First!, 'No Opencast!', *Do or Die* No. 7 (undated), pp. 31-32.

autonomous and distinct from both parents and become a separate ideological form (phenotype iv).

3.4. Phenotype iv: Transcendent forms

The most significant form of hybrid is when it develops into a wholly discrete and competing ideology. According to many commentators, Benito Mussolini's deliberate cross breeding of leftist syndicalism and conservative nationalism produced a synthesis that was largely distinct from, and hostile to, both.¹¹⁰ Fascism's vitalism and celebration of violence were in conflict with conservatism's commitment to harmonious social order; whilst the authoritarian state and extreme elitism was antipathetic to syndicalism. The fascist principle of corporatism was an innovation that grew out of – but was incompatible with – the conservative search for economic harmony and syndicalism's promotion of workers' involvement in managing industry. Corporatism was, however, incompatible with syndicalism's rejection of the continuation of a managerial class instead of complete workers' control, and also in conflict with the conservative's fear of disrupting the natural hierarchy between order-giving managers and order-obeying workers.

Mauro Marsella suggests that the innovation of fascism came, not with Mussolini, but with Enrico Corradini's Italian Nationalist Association. Corradini's group were the first to shift syndicalism's disciplined, morally-motivated, general strike of class warfare, into the sacrifice and discipline of national solidarity in the cause of inter-state warfare.¹¹¹ Marsella, as a result, highlights two important points: first, how extending one cluster of concepts and arranging them next to a different set of concepts, fundamentally alters their meanings. Second, that new ideologies that are

¹¹⁰ See M. Marsella, 'Enrico Corradini's Italian Nationalism: The 'right wing' of the fascist synthesis', *Journal of Political Ideologies* Vol. 9, No. 2 (2004), pp.203-24, 204.

¹¹¹ Marsella *ibid.*, pp.207-08.

the product of hybridisation do not appear instantaneously but have a longer developmental period. Such transcendent types of crossbreeds might initially take another hybrid form.

A hybrid, depending on audience and context, can be identified as a different phenotype. This demonstrates a potential strength of these hybrids that they can appeal to different audiences, such as supporters of the individual parent ideologies and also new sympathisers. But this plurality of appearance can also be a weakness, as these differing manifestations might equally repel potential support from parent institutions. Roger Griffin gives an example of how transcendent phenotypes can alienate potential supporters. Gianfranco Fini's *Alleanza Nazionale* (AN) combines liberal democratic practice with Italian Nationalism. It thus portrays itself as post-fascist: a separate and new ideological development which breaks from the past, aiming to appeal to traditional right-wing democratic voters and its fascist core. However, some traditional democrats simply regard the AN as fascists,¹¹² whilst fascist activists distrust its liberalism.¹¹³

Whilst the classification of hybrids sketched here requires further development and refinement, it does provide a device for identifying and assessing Tory anarchism. It highlights, too, that such identifications are historically and contextually dependent. Conservative anarchism, despite some surprising areas of commonality, is a phenotype i) hybrid with social anarchism; but if anarchism is taken to be the minority propertarian constellation it is a phenotype ii) hybrid of contemporary conservatism.

4. The Case of Tory Anarchism: Which Hybrid?

¹¹² R. Griffin, 'The "Post-Fascism of the Alleanza Nazionale: A case study in ideological morphology', *Journal of Political Ideologies* Vol.1 No. 2 (1996), pp.123-45: 124-25.

¹¹³ Griffin, *ibid*, p. 125.

McCarthy argues that there is a great deal of common ground between anarchism and conservatism, not least in their shared enemy the modern liberal state. ‘Conservatism and anarchism share some historical background, as reactions against liberalism, and they share some critiques of liberalism.’¹¹⁴ He suggests that a viable hybrid is a possibility. However, such a viable hybrid based on social anarchism and conservatism, at first sight seems impossible; conservatism is committed to the state and social anarchism rejects it. Similarly, disjunctions are identified in social anarchism’s rejection of tradition in favour of radical change compared to conservatism’s preference for the familiar; and conservatism’s pushing individual rights to the periphery in contrast to social anarchism’s core commitment. As a result, these apparently fundamental disparities of core principles ensure that Tory anarchism is a class i) phenotype.

Whilst the general conclusion that Tory anarchism is too unstable to sustain as an identifiable hybrid of the main social anarchism is correct, the argument is flawed as these features are consistent with some variants of social anarchism. Instead it is the acceptance of hierarchy, and in particular norms and institutions based on economic liberal principles within conservatism and Tory anarchism, that marks it as incompatible with the main anarchist currents. As a result conservative anarchism fluctuates between a class i) and a class ii) hybrid, a minor form of contemporary conservatism.

4.1. The State

¹¹⁴ Q. McCarthy in Kain *op. cit.*, Ref 32.

Kirk proposes the key difference between right-libertarianism and conservatism is the first's rejection, compared to the latter's endorsement, of the state. The key principle of conservatism is the necessity of the state authority to prevent civil war. A view, associated with Oakeshott, is that the state as an institution should be preserved and used to stabilise society, rather than guiding the nation in any particular direction or to meet any specific social goal.¹¹⁵ By contrast, the standard philosophical account of anarchism is that, by definition, it fundamentally either regards the state as illegitimate, or rejects coercion which is a necessary part of the state.¹¹⁶

However, the picture is not as clear-cut as first thought. Anarchist rejections of the state are not absolute. Whilst all states are hierarchical and thus flawed, as Bakunin noted, not all states are equally repressive or hierarchical; democracies are better than absolute monarchies.¹¹⁷ During the Spanish civil war between a social democratic government and a military dictatorship, it was not inconsistent with anarchism's other core anti-hierarchical principles to assist the republican state, whilst still aiming for a greater social revolution. Similarly, British anarchists have supported the National Health Service over privatised medicine, where those were the only realistic options, whilst encouraging more innovative anti-hierarchical methods of healthcare provision.¹¹⁸ So where there are strong cultural restraints on developing alternatives to state or free market provision, it is not inconsistent for anarchists to support state provision as the least hierarchical option. It is not the state per se, but the

¹¹⁵ Oakeshott, op. cit., Ref 25, p. 60. The 'Tory anarchist' writer Andrew Alexander also prefers to maintain the state, albeit in a more minimal role. '[T]he label {Tory anarchist} conveys a simple message. We should maintain the institutions of the state but minimise its role.' 'We need some Tory anarchy in the UK..', *Daily Mail Online*, 15 December 2010, <<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/debate/article-1338665/Tuition-fees-protest-Are-anarchists-basic-political-beliefs-Liberal-Democrat.html#ixzz3ep0yVRXV>> last accessed 2 June 2015

¹¹⁶ See for instance Wolff, op. cit. Ref 42.

¹¹⁷ M. Bakunin, *Marxism, Freedom and the State* (London: Freedom, 1984), p.36.

¹¹⁸ Solidarity Federation 'NHS Notional Health Service - The great health and social care swindle', originally from *Direct Action* No. 38 (Spring 2007), available on line at Libcom.org <<http://libcom.org/library/nhs-notional-health-service-the-great-health-social-care-swindle>> last accessed 15 January 2015.

conception of the state as a set of hierarchical practices, that distinguishes social anarchism from conservatism. Conservatives endorse such hierarchical practices, whilst social anarchists reject them.

As a result, it is the state as understood through the defence of hierarchy – hierarchies which are increasingly economic in structure and character – that conservatives defend. It is one which tory anarchists also endorse. Criticisms of the state by contemporary tory anarchists, like Clarkson and McCarthy, focus on the redistributive state. Their radicalism lies in the demand for greater economic liberalisation, not in opposing it. Most conservative anarchists support capitalist social relations as for ‘most tory anarchists [...] the least worst choice for an economic system’.¹¹⁹ Those who are more critical of capitalism, like Cobbett, Wharton and Waugh, tend to support economic systems that are even more hierarchical and repressive, like feudalism (Waugh and Wharton) or protectionism and slavery (in the case of Corbett’s anti-emancipation) and thus tend towards a paleoconservatism.

Propertarians, like Hayek, are critical of the state as a redistributor of wealth. They are not against repressive state functions, so long as they are carried out in order to facilitate the laws of the market place (rules of just conduct).¹²⁰ Hayek’s followers go further, happy to see the coercive powers of state-like institutions, including the execution of transgressors, so long as it is carried out by private enterprise.¹²¹ Recent examples of Somalia and insurgent held regions of Afghanistan demonstrate that you do not need formal state structures to have institutions that act to protect the property

¹¹⁹ Wilkin, *op. cit.*, Ref 14, p. 16; Q. MCarthy in Kain, *op cit.* Ref 32.

¹²⁰ F. A. Hayek, *Law, Legislation and Liberty* Vol. 1 (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982), pp.137-39.

¹²¹ See for instance C. Tame, ‘On The Side of The Angels: A view of private policing’ *Libertarian Alliance* (1989) <<http://www.libertarian.co.uk/sites/default/lanotepdf/polin040.pdf>> last accessed 15 January 2015.

of the powerful, and have ways to police social norms so as to naturalise their dominance.

Conservative and social anarchism are incompatible because the central feature of the latter is the contestation of the hierarchies that constitute, and are supported by, state institutions. For conservatives and proprietarians it is the exact reverse; states are supported when they stabilise modes of domination, and anti-statism becomes more central when the state is associated with the redistribution of power. Thus Tory anarchism is a localised variant of contemporary conservatism.

4.2. The Epistemology of Tradition

The standard criticism of revolutionary movements, such as anarchism, is that they reject tradition, whilst conservatism places a high value on the maintenance of longstanding institutions and practices, even if they appear irrational. The preference in conservatism for tradition is due to its scepticism concerning the rationalist epistemological claims of liberalism. Oakeshott's is a good example. In 'Rationalism in Politics'¹²² he explains why he favours established, practice-based knowledge over the cold search for perfect, universal and dispassionate knowledge. The latter, he argues, is never achievable. Rationalists ignore the actual practical contexts that construct politics and are necessary to make it, at least minimally, effective. Critiques of rationalist political epistemology can be found in conservative thinkers like Carl Schmitt and Leo Strauss, who prefer instinctive explanations for human organisation and conflict.¹²³

¹²² Oakeshott, *op. cit.*, Ref 25, pp. 5-42.

¹²³ See for instance, H. Meier, *Carl Schmitt and Leo Strauss: The hidden dialogues* (London: University of Chicago, 1995), pp.72-3; 123-25.

By contrast anarchists are viewed as proponents of enlightenment rationalism.¹²⁴ Jun notes that many general commentators view anarchism as radically Modernist, a view he shows to be mistaken.¹²⁵ It is not just contemporary anarchists influenced by poststructuralism, like Richard Day, Todd May and Saul Newman, who reject epistemological realism. The critique of universalism, argues Jun, lies in the earliest of modern anarchism.

Bakunin, who is often portrayed as a realist even by some contemporary anarchists,¹²⁶ makes it clear that there is no unique vantage point which can take into account the subjective element to most forms of knowledge.¹²⁷ Malatesta, follows Kropotkin, in rejecting universal principles as ‘metaphysical fantasies.’¹²⁸ Anarchists in the classical tradition are often viewed as epistemological universalists because of their preference for science over the institutions of theological faith.^{129, 130} But ‘science’ did not necessarily refer to a singular positivist or hypothetic-deductive methodology, but systematic knowledge with different systems of thought being relevant to different fields of enquiry, and recognising that there was no absolute expertise across all fields of knowledge. As Bakunin argued, there is no fixed ‘universal authority’, because there is ‘no man capable of grasping [...] all the sciences, all the branches of social life.’¹³¹ This in turn leads to anarchist criticisms of a universal vanguard, a fear shared with conservatism of paternalistic meddling.

The value of tradition is not ignored by anarchists, who find attractive features of longstanding (and threatened) practices. However Kropotkin’s support for models

¹²⁴ Schmidt and van der Walt, *op. cit.* Ref 41, p. 96 and p. 99.

¹²⁵ N. Jun, *Anarchism and Political Modernity* (London: Continuum, 2012), p. 107.

¹²⁶ M. Leier, *Bakunin* (London: Seven Stories, 2006): 256-57; Newman, *op. cit.*, Ref 27, p.36.

¹²⁷ Bakunin, *op. cit.* Ref 46, p. 54. Proudhon reflects on how the abstract concepts used in analysis are not transcendental truths, but the product of specific forms of inquiry, and developed in order to share empirically derived ideas (Jun, *op. cit.*, Ref 125, p. 132).

¹²⁸ Jun, *Op. Cit.*, Ref 125, p. 129 and pp.132-33.

¹²⁹ See for instance Kropotkin, *Ethics: Origins and Development* (Montreal: Black Rose, 1992), 178.

¹³⁰ Bakunin, *Op. cit.*, Ref 46, p. 25.

¹³¹ Bakunin, *ibid.*, p. 33.

based on pre-modern rural communities,¹³² or John Zerzan's Primitivism that seeks inspiration in hunter-gather social form, have led to accusations that their anarchisms are reactionary and unrealisable. However, in Kropotkin's writings, and arguably in Zerzan's case too, it is a matter of finding inspiration in past historical examples rather than necessarily seeking a return. Many anarchists have used historical examples to illustrate the possibility of co-operative, anti-hierarchical social organisation against accusations of 'utopianism'.¹³³

As a result, conservatism and anarchism do appear to share some important principles: a shared epistemological scepticism of universalism, which leads to a recognition of the importance of tradition and a criticism of statism and cross-tradition (languages or modes) of paternalist management. This fits in with Crick's account of 'Tory anarchism' when Orwell used the term more approvingly. It stands for respect for traditional cultures, 'cynicism about the (largely liberal) civilising mission [... and a] Tory anti-imperialist: "live and let live"'.¹³⁴ This form of Tory anarchism seems to combine key features of anarchism and conservatism in equal degrees (phenotype iii). However, once the apparently shared principles are unpacked it is evident that they are placed next to distinctive, hierarchical and exclusory principles of conservatism, whilst the anarchist notion of tradition is placed next to those long-held customs of challenging privilege and hierarchy.

Swift, Burke and Scruton admire traditions that embody forms of knowledge based on a strict hierarchical order and protection of established authority. In *Gulliver's Travels* peaceful co-existence is possible because the ideal culture of the

¹³² Q. Kropotkin, in for instance S. Clark, *Living Without Domination: The Possibility of an Anarchist Utopia* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), p.31.

¹³³ See for instance Clark, *ibid.*, p. 109; Gareber *Debt: The first 5000 years* (Booklyn: Melville House, 2011).

¹³⁴ Crick, *op. cit.*, Ref 77, p. 174

Houyhnhnms is xenophobically monocultural,¹³⁵ and Scruton's admiration of fox-hunting is because its supposed virtues are embedded in a feudal power structure, though one suffused with sufficient economic liberalism that the bourgeoisie can also participate.¹³⁶ Weaknesses in established authority are highlighted but tolerated because egalitarian alternatives are worse.¹³⁷

Conservative and anarchist epistemologies, though both critical of universalism, are distinct. Anarchism's critique of rationalist epistemology does not preclude rational enquiry and challenges to authority,¹³⁸ and it acknowledges that all people have specific knowledge due to their distinctive experiences.¹³⁹ By contrast, Strauss's ideal student is a passive receiver of the knowledge from great minds. Similarly, the institutions that are respected by Burke are those which stabilise class division.¹⁴⁰ Social anarchists, by contrast, look back at the traditions of those who resist or evade subjugation and who generate social goods outside of the laws of capital and the state. Thus in terms of identifying sources of political knowledge, conservatives look to the few great minds of the hierarchs, whilst anarchists look to the multitude¹⁴¹ who have developed skills and govern social practices that are rich in social goods. Tory anarchists have a distrust of the populace, except when they are subservient to the elites.

¹³⁵ Orwell, *op. cit.*, Ref 75, p.378

¹³⁶ R. Scruton, *On Hunting* (London: Yellow Jersey, 1999)

¹³⁷ Orwell, *op. cit.*, Ref 75, p. 376;

¹³⁸ Bakunin, *op. cit.*, Ref 46, p. 32.

¹³⁹ Bakunin, *ibid.*, pp. 65-66.

¹⁴⁰ See for instance E. Burke, *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 169-70.

¹⁴¹ See D. Bates on the similarities between Toni Negri and Michael Hardt autonomist account of agency and anarchists. 'Situating Hardt and Negri' in A. Prichard, R. Kinna et al., eds., *Libertarian Socialism: Politics in black and red* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).

The scepticism of authority of Tory anarchism is consistent with contemporary conservatism. It rejects planned order and allows, instead, for the spontaneous wisdom of markets.¹⁴² As Freeden observes:

While libertarians [propertarians] interpret such balance as a dynamic equilibrium, capable of producing a progressive momentum, and thus distance themselves from those conservatives whose conception of order tends to the static end of the analytic continuum, they coalesce with conservatives in warning against the consequences of human intervention in the social evolutionary process [...] By upholding the core conservative feature concerning the extra-human signification of the social order, irrespective of its quasi-contingent substantive characteristics, libertarians gained a foothold in the conservative campus as a matter of underlying ideological morphology.¹⁴³

Contemporary conservatives and Tory anarchists share the same underlying epistemological characteristic. They both support traditions of private property and the organic social outcomes that are produced, relegating the interests of economically disadvantaged persons.

4.3. Humanism and Social Organisation

The debate surrounding whether there is a benign essentialism central to anarchism has been covered elsewhere,¹⁴⁴ and what is certainly clear is that social anarchism is not as committed to a benign essentialism as is usually presented. The defence of

¹⁴² F. A. Hayek, *op. cit.*, Ref. 120, pp.137-39.

¹⁴³ Freeden, *op. cit.*, Ref 22, p. 374.

¹⁴⁴ J. Cohn and S. Wilbur, 'What's wrong with postanarchism', Institute for Anarchist studies (2003), <http://theanarchistlibrary.org/HTML/Jesse_Cohn_and_Shawn_Wilbur__What_s_Wrong_With_Postanarchism_.html> last accessed 15 January August 2015.

individual rights, which has helped mark social anarchism out from some of the more reviled forms of socialism,¹⁴⁵ is not based on a fixed benign notion of the self, but rather, like conservatism, on more pragmatic grounds. However, conservatives and anarchists differ on the best ways for humans to flourish. For anarchists, virtues flourish best when hierarchies are contested and oppression avoided; for conservatives humans flourish best when there are strong disciplinary structures based on social hierarchies.

Conservatism has traditionally had reservations about rights, preferring to place greater emphasis on security, though this too has altered over the last two decades. Contemporary conservatism endorses the discourse of rights and freedoms,¹⁴⁶ but largely limited to property rights and minimal political rights within a representative democratic, state framework. These are not the freedoms endorsed by anarchists who regard them as forms of constraint. The tension between conservatism and social anarchism is not because one rejects rights whilst the other privileges them, but is down to the type and position of rights in the ideological morphology.

Some of the discourses and epistemologies of social anarchism and conservatism appear to be more consistent than usually accepted. However, because of their different conceptual arrangement, the content of the similar sounding principles are distinct and incompatible and the institutional arrangements and social practices based on the principles endorsed by conservatives and anarchists are in opposition. Anarchists promote methods which are not legitimised by the state, which disrupt hierarchical social order, and which aim to generate anti-hierarchical social relations. Conservatives, by contrast, are suspicious of, or opposed to, social

¹⁴⁵ See for instance Bakunin, *op. cit.* Ref 117, esp. p. 30, p. 33 and p. 47.

¹⁴⁶ See 'Statement of Principles', Project for the New American Century (June 1997), <<http://www.newamericancentury.org/statementofprinciples.htm>> last accessed 1 September 2011 <no longer active>.

forms that serve the interests of – and are preserved by – the less socially powerful. In practice, where conservative anarchists make choices, they invariably endorse methods approved by conservatives rather than anarchists.

Traugott affirms that ‘Tory anarchist’ (alongside the politically charged term ‘quisling’) was a pejorative title used by Orwell to criticise Swift’s authoritarianism.¹⁴⁷ ‘He is a Tory anarchist, despising authority while disbelieving in liberty, and preserving the aristocratic outlook while seeing clearly that the existing aristocracy is degenerate and contemptible.’¹⁴⁸ More recently, like conservatism in general, Tory anarchism has moved to being strongly committed to a discourse of liberty and individual responsibility, as no collective is reliable enough as a source of political knowledge. The account of individual freedom proposed by contemporary conservative anarchists is one that sees individuals as distinct and aloof, and a view of flourishing based on proper disdain for those below the heroic free personality. Rothbard, for instance, admires the humorist H. L. Mencken as a ‘Tory Anarchist’ because of his firm individualism, even if this meant a rightful contempt for other human beings.¹⁴⁹ Whilst McCarthy is critical of the absolutism of propertarianism, he does appreciate their commitment to liberty and property.¹⁵⁰

The main features of Tory anarchism – sceptical support for the security features of the state, respect for tradition and individual freedom – are consistent with contemporary forms of conservatism, rather than social anarchism. This is because the surrounding concepts – promotion and respect for hierarchical social institutions,

¹⁴⁷ Traugott, *op. cit.* Ref 85, p.11

¹⁴⁸ Orwell, *op. cit.*, Ref 75.

¹⁴⁹ M. Rothbard, ‘H. L. Mencken: The joyous libertarian’, < <http://mises.org/library/hl-mencken-joyous-libertarian>> last accessed 15 September 2015, first published in *New Individualist Review*, 2.2 (Summer 1962), pp. 15–27.

¹⁵⁰ McCarthy, ‘Liberty Isn’t Just Property—So What Is It?’, *The American Conservative* 15 April 2013 <<http://www.theamericanconservative.com/mccarthy/liberty-isnt-just-property-so-what-is-it/>>. Last accessed 15 September 2015.

dismissal of immanent goods produced through radical action, and a view of the self that flourishes through dominating others – results in rejecting modes of organisation and types of practice endorsed by social anarchists. Instead Tory anarchism encourages the types of action and modes of address traditionally favoured by conservatives. Thus, it is no surprise that Tory anarchists, where they can be found, are largely parts of established institutions (elite colleges, military, high finance)¹⁵¹ and its main proponents operate through conservative, economically liberal organisations such as *The American Spectator*, *The American Conservative* and propertarian groups (Center for Libertarian Studies, von Mises Institute and Libertarian Alliance), rather than in the workplace organisations, community and affinity groups of social anarchism.

5. Conclusion

The paper outlines four possible models of ideological hybrids, recognising that in different locations a particular ideological cross-breed can take different hybrid forms. At best Tory anarchism can be associated with popular and perceptive cultural practice such as British satire, has only highly local and variable ideological impacts. In most contexts Tory anarchism is a failed hybrid.¹⁵² Where it upholds core anarchist principles alongside conservatives ones, it produces no sustained organisation, policy direction or coherent canon. Where it is active and sustained, it operates as a subcategory of conservatism, interpreting apparently anarchist principles in ways incompatible with the main anarchist currents.

¹⁵¹ Tory Anarchist Alliance members page:

<<https://www.facebook.com/groups/120257427995095/members/>> last accessed 15 January 2015.

¹⁵² The Tory Anarchist Alliance 'Information',

<<http://www.facebook.com/group.php?gid=120257427995095&v=info>> consistent with a weak or failing ideology it is only spasmodically active, has few adherents and appears to engage in little practical activity other than supporting activity by forms of contemporary conservatism. Last accessed 15 January 2015.

Conservative anarchisms work within hierarchical, corporate bodies, seeking to influence the already powerful, rather than empower the subjugated, and are predicated on defending existing property relationships. By contrast anarchist cultural and organisational forms are often much more overtly transgressive of manager-worker and audience-producer relations. As Wilkin notes ‘Tory anarchists are not anarchists in the traditional sense of the term... Orwell aside, the[y...] tend not to share the ideals of the anarcho-syndicalists, anarcho-communists and so on, to put it mildly. What they share is rebelliousness.’ Thus the ‘anarchism’ of Tory anarchism is an indication of attitude rather than principle. It is disposition that, contrarily, remains supportive of the main social hierarchies and institutions, which are predicated on economic liberal norms, but is critical of the social dissonance that they create.