


21st Century Dissent

Anarchism, Anti-Globalization and
Environmentalism

Giorel Curran



International Political Economy Series

General Editor: **Timothy M. Shaw**, Professor of Commonwealth Governance and Development, and Director of the Institute of Commonwealth Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London

Titles include:

Hans Abrahamsson

UNDERSTANDING WORLD ORDER AND STRUCTURAL CHANGE
Poverty, Conflict and the Global Arena

Andreas Bieler, Werner Bonefeld, Peter Burnham and Adam David Morton
GLOBAL RESTRUCTURING, STATE, CAPITAL AND LABOUR
Contesting Neo-Gramscian Perspectives

Morten Bøås, Marianne H. Marchand and Timothy M. Shaw (*editors*)
THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF REGIONS AND REGIONALISMS

Sandra Braman (*editor*)

THE EMERGENT GLOBAL INFORMATION POLICY REGIME

Giorel Curran

21st CENTURY DISSENT
Anarchism, Anti-Globalization and Environmentalism

Martin Doornbos

INSTITUTIONALIZING DEVELOPMENT POLICIES AND RESOURCE
STRATEGIES IN EASTERN AFRICA AND INDIA
Developing Winners and Losers
GLOBAL FORCES AND STATE RESTRUCTURING
Dynamics of State Formation and Collapse

Bill Dunn

GLOBAL RESTRUCTURING AND THE POWER OF LABOUR

Myron J. Frankman

WORLD DEMOCRATIC FEDERALISM
Peace and Justice Indivisible

Marieke de Goede (*editor*)

INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL ECONOMY AND POSTSTRUCTURAL POLITICS

Richard Grant and John Rennie Short (*editors*)

GLOBALIZATION AND THE MARGINS

Graham Harrison (*editor*)

GLOBAL ENCOUNTERS
International Political Economy, Development and Globalization

Patrick Hayden and Chamsy el-Ojeili (*editors*)

CONFRONTING GLOBALIZATION
Humanity, Justice and the Renewal of Politics

Axel Hülsemeyer (*editor*)
GLOBALIZATION IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY
Convergence or Divergence?

Helge Hveem and Kristen Nordhaug (*editors*)
PUBLIC POLICY IN THE AGE OF GLOBALIZATION
Responses to Environmental and Economic Crises

Takashi Inoguchi
GLOBAL CHANGE
A Japanese Perspective

Kanishka Jayasuriya
STATECRAFT, WELFARE AND THE POLITICS OF INCLUSION

Dominic Kelly and Wyn Grant (*editors*)
THE POLITICS OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN THE 21st CENTURY
Actors, Issues and Regional Dynamics

Mathias Koenig-Archibugi and Michael Zürn (*editors*)
NEW MODES OF GOVERNANCE IN THE GLOBAL SYSTEM
Exploring Publicness, Delegation and Inclusiveness

Craig N. Murphy (*editor*)
EGALITARIAN POLITICS IN THE AGE OF GLOBALIZATION

George Myconos
THE GLOBALIZATION OF ORGANIZED LABOUR
1945–2004

John Nauright and Kimberly S. Schimmel (*editors*)
THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF SPORT

Morten Ougaard
THE GLOBALIZATION OF POLITICS
Power, Social Forces and Governance

Richard Robison (*editor*)
THE NEO-LIBERAL REVOLUTION
Forging the Market State

Timothy J. Sinclair and Kenneth P. Thomas (*editors*)
STRUCTURE AND AGENCY IN INTERNATIONAL CAPITAL MOBILITY

Fredrik Söderbaum and Timothy M. Shaw (*editors*)
THEORIES OF NEW REGIONALISM

International Political Economy Series

Series Standing Order ISBN 0-333-71708-2 hardcover

Series Standing Order ISBN 0-333-71110-6 paperback

(outside North America only)

You can receive future titles in this series as they are published by placing a standing order. Please contact your bookseller or, in case of difficulty, write to us at the address below with your name and address, the title of the series and one of the ISBNs quoted above.

Customer Services Department, Macmillan Distribution Ltd, Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 6XS, England


21st Century Dissent

Anarchism, Anti-Globalization and Environmentalism

Giorel Curran

Griffith University, Australia

palgrave
macmillan



© Giorel Curran 2007

All rights reserved. No reproduction, copy or transmission of this publication may be made without written permission.

No paragraph of this publication may be reproduced, copied or transmitted save with written permission or in accordance with the provisions of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, or under the terms of any licence permitting limited copying issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency, 90 Tottenham Court Road, London W1T 4LP.

Any person who does any unauthorized act in relation to this publication may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.

The author has asserted her right to be identified as the author of this work in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

First published 2007 by
PALGRAVE MACMILLAN
Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 6XS and
175 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10010
Companies and representatives throughout the world

PALGRAVE MACMILLAN is the global academic imprint of the Palgrave Macmillan division of St. Martin's Press, LLC and of Palgrave Macmillan Ltd. Macmillan® is a registered trademark in the United States, United Kingdom and other countries. Palgrave is a registered trademark in the European Union and other countries.

ISBN 13: 978-1-4039-4881-6 hardback
ISBN 10: 1-4039-4881-X hardback

This book is printed on paper suitable for recycling and made from fully managed and sustained forest sources.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Curran, Giorel.

21st century dissent : anarchism, anti-globalization and environmentalism /
Giorel Curran.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 1-4039-4881-X (cloth)

1. Dissenters. 2. Opposition (Political science) 3. Anarchism.

4. Anti-globalization movement. 5. Environmentalism. I. Title.

II. Title: Twenty-first century dissent.

JC328.3.C87 2007

303.48'4-dc22

2006047639

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
16 15 14 13 12 11 10 09 08 07

Printed and bound in Great Britain by
Antony Rowe Ltd, Chippenham and Eastbourne

For Tess

This page intentionally left blank

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	ix
Introduction	1
Background	2
A post-ideological anarchism for the 21 st century	6
The chapters	13
Part I Theorizing Contemporary Anarchism	17
1 Anarchism Old and New	19
Old anarchism: classical debates	21
Social 'versus' individual anarchism	23
Anarchism, the New Left and beyond	29
New anarchism: post-leftism	32
Anarchism and poststructuralism: recent developments	34
Anarcho-primitivism	39
Temporary autonomous zones	43
Old tensions revisited	45
Conclusion	48
2 Movements of Anti-Globalization	49
Naming the movement	51
Old, new and newest social movements	53
The development of the AGM	56
Understanding the AGM	60
The World Social Forum	67
Space 'versus' movement	71
Conclusion	74
3 Technologies of Dissent	75
Politics, technology and the internet	77
The libertarian internet	79
The tools of dissent	86
The limits of technological dissent	92
Conclusion	96
4 Ecology and Anarchy	98
Green politics in the 21 st century	100
Greening postmodernism	103

From mainstream environmentalism to radical ecology	105
Deep ecology	110
Eco-feminism	114
Eco-socialism	120
Conclusion	125
Part II Practising Contemporary Anarchism	127
5 The Politics of Zapatismo	129
Land struggles and the rise of the Zapatistas	132
The Zapatista National Liberation Army	137
Zapatismo	145
Zapatismo and the anarchist impulse	148
Zapatismo and power	151
Conclusion	155
6 Greening Anarchy: Social Ecology	157
Social ecology as eco-anarchism	160
The development of hierarchy	163
Dialectical naturalism	166
Nature as a grounding for ethics	170
Municipalism: the communalist project	174
Conclusion	178
7 Reclaim the Streets	180
The origins of RTS	181
The street party	184
Carnival and the politics of pleasure	189
Situationism, the spectacle and culture jamming	192
RTS and the anarchist temperament	197
Conclusion	200
8 Earth First!	202
The development of Earth First!	204
The splitting of Earth First!	209
Earth First! in Britain	213
The Earth Liberation Front	218
Conclusion	222
Conclusion: Towards 21 st Century Dissent	224
A radical democracy for the 21 st century	226
Closing remarks	229
<i>Bibliography</i>	232
<i>Index</i>	246

Preface

This book represents a coming together of several of my main research interests. My interest in environmentalism, particularly green political philosophy, goes back a long way, as does my interest in political theory and political movements in general. That quirky political philosophy anarchism had grabbed my attention right from the start, perhaps because it had been marginalized for so long, but probably because it had some very insightful political stories and ideas to tell. In the last few years it seemed that all these research areas came together in a very interesting form – the politics of anti-globalization. But my interest in the book's themes also goes beyond this. For those of us engrossed in the frequently chaotic and quickly changeable world of global politics, the early 21st century is already proving an immensely interesting, if increasingly worrisome, one. Not only are environmental risks reaching alarming levels, but so too are realignments in global power relations. Despite some significant improvements, 'old' problems of inequality and injustice remain. This is well illustrated in the increasingly inequitable distribution of environmental risks and the justice considerations they raise.

But all is by no means doom and gloom. As history consistently demonstrates, with injustice comes resistance, with appropriation comes counter-appropriation, and with hegemony comes counter-hegemony. This is precisely the undercurrent in contemporary oppositional politics that this book has sought to uncover. If this sounds utopian, we have to remind ourselves that the idea of enfranchising the 'great unwashed' was long considered a pipedream. One of human society's greatest achievements is undoubtedly democracy. Certainly, it took a long time for women and many Indigenous to be counted as full members of western democratic communities, and the struggle goes on in many other parts of the world. But democracy did make it on the agenda despite the concentrated resistance from many quarters of power, even if today its operation is at best frequently faulty and at worst an empty shell. The post-ideological anarchist impulse in contemporary dissent is a deeply democratic one. What is most optimistic about this oppositional current is its determination to continue pushing the democratic impetus by ensuring it incorporates the principles and practices of freedom, autonomy and equality. Utopian perhaps but neither unrealistic nor *a*historical.

In identifying this radical impulse for social change, it has been necessary to dissect, fragment and then reassemble it. This throws us into the murky territory of typology and classification – made particularly fraught when it is ideology that one is considering. Contemporary anarchism’s ideological eclecticism, indeed intentional ideological capriciousness, has made neat classification a difficult task, even if this has not been the book’s main intention. There is no definitive marker that neatly divides ideological from post-ideological anarchism, but there are strong indicators of the post-ideological temperament. These are the ones that we have sought to identify throughout, despite the messy and blurred residues that remain. There may be puzzlement over why some anarchisms do not appear and why some others have been included in the first place, and there is certain to be considerable grumbling among anarchists and post-ideological anarchists alike that their particular ‘brand’ has not been discussed, or discussed in an unsatisfactory manner. While I regret this, the fact remains that it is impossible to include all in the space constraints of one book. Difficult decisions also had to be made about what belonged, and what belonged where – as problematic as this task proved to be.

As usual, this work would not have been possible without the support of an assortment of colleagues, family and friends. Many have guided and supported me through the process of researching and writing this book. In various ways they have all helped strengthen this book. But I take all responsibility for its weaknesses which are mine alone and probably a result of not listening to their advice as carefully as I should have. Lists of names always raise the fear of accidental omission, for which I apologize in advance. I trust most of those I am grateful to know who they are in any case and I hope that I have already expressed my gratitude to them. But I wish to give a special thanks to Tess Curran, Jamie Curran, Yvonne Hartman, Keryn Hunter, Lesley Jenkins, Paula Cowan, Daniela Di Piramo, Robyn Hollander, Daniel Franks, Cathy Howlett, John Kane, Haig Patapan, John MacKenzie, Patrick Weller, and Elizabeth van Acker for the various support and advice they have provided throughout the life of this project. A special thanks also goes to Bruno Mezzalira who organized so many useful contacts for me and who helped make my research life while travelling so rich and interesting. I am also grateful to the Centre for Governance and Public Policy, Griffith University which has helped fund various stages of this project, and which has supported it throughout, and for a Griffith University Small Grant which enabled the timely conclusion of the project. I also wish to thank Simone Tosi from the University of Milan for organizing a very

interesting and very useful seminar on the book's topic. Participants' feedback, suggestions and ideas have proved very useful, and for them I am grateful. More generally, many others were also involved with supporting and inspiring this project, and, once again, without naming them, I thank them all.

Giorel Curran
Brisbane

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction

Before the July 2005 G8 summit at Gleneagles, the Scottish media was awash with warnings of impending anarchist chaos. Determined to avoid another Genoa, the police force mounted one of its largest security operations in modern British history. They were particularly concerned with the rabble-rousing anarchists, suspected of plotting widespread disruption to the summit and elsewhere. In particular, security was trained on the 'notorious' Black Bloc who had clashed with police – and shop-fronts – in past anti-globalization events. The Clandestine Insurgent Rebel Clown Army (CIRCA) – police harassment by tickling – and the anarchist People's Golfing Association (PGA) – police harassment by golfing – probably outnumbered Black Bloc type protesters. Yet police and media focus was set on the latter. Widespread reports of violent clashes between police and various anarchist groups outside the summit did eventually emerge. As it turned out, Bob Geldolf's 200,000 strong *Make Poverty History* march in Edinburgh snatched most of the attention. But all such news was swept aside in the wake of the London underground bombings at the beginning of the summit. In this light, anarchist posturing seemed even more petulant.

Anarchism has seldom had good press. Usually dismissed as either bomb throwing fanatics, eccentric utopians or idle scoundrels, anarchists have always struggled to have their political philosophy taken seriously. Unlike most of the other ideologies, anarchism's refusal to subscribe to vanguards, political parties or parliamentary politics denies it the traditional strategies for political success. Some historical examples have vindicated it, but this has not been enough to see it enjoy the authority of the major ideologies. Despite its relative marginalization as a political philosophy, anarchism has still exerted considerable influence in shaping the modern political landscape. More recently, a

particular mixture of socio-economic, cultural and political developments, and major technological advances, has created a political opportunity space for anarchism to both reassert and reinvent itself into its influential 21st century incarnation. This has been achieved through the medium of a largely anti-capitalist, anti-globalization and pro-green global movement.

Despite anarchism's renewal, its contemporary influence has only been cursorily acknowledged. The main objective of this book is thus to explore the scope and tenor of this anarchist renewal, especially as expressed in the radical ecology and anti-globalization movements. It contends that the politics of globalization has propelled an invigorated anarchism into the heart of 21st century dissent. But the anarchism that it has unleashed is a considerably reconfigured one. The term *post-ideological anarchism* is used to describe it. Post-ideological anarchism informs the impulse, culture and organization of oppositional politics today. It refers to the looser and more flexible embrace of anarchist ideas and strategies in the armoury of radical dissent. Post-ideological anarchists are inspired by anarchism's principles and ideas, drawing from them freely and openly to construct their own autonomous politics. They reject doctrinaire positions and sectarian politics, preferring to mix their anarchism with an eclectic assortment of other political ideas and traditions. Post-ideological anarchism is also primarily green.

Background

Anarchism's influence has evolved slowly, peaking and waning at different historical points. Refusing to be trampled under the weight of a dominant Marxism, anarchists honed their alternative views as they awaited what they saw as Marxism's inevitable implosion. The Spanish anarcho-syndicalist experiments briefly showcased it, before Paris 1968 launched it as a serious contender in radical oppositional politics. Anarchism then rode on the coat tails of the new social movements, before poststructuralism and radical ecology sharpened its relevance to contemporary politics. But it is in the early 21st century that anarchism has come into its own, crystallizing in the anti-globalization politics of the late 20th century.

Globalization has significantly transformed economics, politics and culture across the globe. It is thus no surprise that the politics of globalization has framed and inspired anarchism's contemporary revival. Globalization is, of course, a highly contentious and contested term,

described and understood very differently by a plethora of those affected by it. It encapsulates and describes important changes to global economic structures and the significant impact these changes have had on national and global economies, cultures and politics. The large numbers who feel passionately about globalization tend to identify as either its supporters or opponents. But it is globalization's opponents that have been considerably more vocal, and who have articulated their opposition in more visible, expressive and combative ways. This helps explain the high visibility of the anti-globalization movement – or more aptly the global justice movement or 'movement of movements' – with its diversity of participants and forms of dissent. The anti-globalization movement represents a highly visible and active constellation of resistance against the ills of globalization, especially a globalization underpinned by neo-liberal values. It is in this antagonism to neo-liberal globalization that anarchist ideas have found much resonance, in turn helping drive the angst of the anti-globalization movement.

Globalization is an important explanation, but the factors driving this quasi anarcho-renaissance are in reality complex and varied, and precede the 'formal' advent of globalization. Several main factors have helped launch modern anarchism. First, while anarchism has a long historical pedigree, the crises of the communist experiment, both pre- and post-1989, and the consequent fracturing of the left, reawakened an interest in anarchist thought. The contest between anarchism and Marxism goes back a long way, but the fracturing of the socialist alternative has opportunely re-positioned contemporary anarchism. While Fukuyama's (1992) 'end of history' claim is problematic in a number of ways – not least in the claims it makes for a triumphant liberalism – it does correctly identify a significant destabilization of the major political alternative – communism, and the considerable fragmentation of the left that resulted. Disillusioned and disappointed with the problems of communism, some on the left readily embraced an anarchist analysis that had consistently cautioned against the authoritarian and vanguardist trappings of socialism. This disillusionment was reinforced by the vigour of capitalism's latest stage – neo-liberal globalization – and the seeming impotence of the 'old' left in its wake.

Communism's crises have thus gone a considerable way towards ideologically validating anarchism's antipathy to it. And when Soviet communism collapsed in 1989 this vindication was seemingly complete. While anarchists and Marxists have long shared their opposition to capitalism and the socio-political relations it generates, anarchists

have long contended that the Marxist conceptualization of power was short-sighted. It was in the failure to locate hierarchy and the centralization of authority as the key drivers of oppression, that the anarchists foresaw the crumbling of socialism. Bakunin had rebuked Marx and his followers long ago as ‘worshippers of the power of the State’ and as ‘the prophets of political and social discipline, champions of the social order built from the top down’ (in Marshall 1993, 303). The ruthless centralization of power exhibited in the USSR was to render prophetic the predictions of Bakunin and like-minded anarchists. Vindication lay in the anarchists’ identification of an underpinning authoritarianism as Marxism’s major blind spot. This is not to say that this vindication led to a widespread embrace of anarchism; far from it. But it did enlarge the political opportunity space within radical politics that anarchism was able to comfortably fill. With the advent of neo-liberal globalization and communism’s retreat, anarchism was well placed to rally a disenchanting left in considerable disarray.

The New Left had already paved the way for this enchantment with anarchism. New Left analyses, and the discourses of postmodernism and poststructuralism, resonated anarchist sensibilities. In challenging the Marxist orthodoxy – its historical materialism, economic determinism and class politics – and in promoting an expanded account of the practice of domination, the New Left won itself numerous oppositional friends, including anarchists. While still acknowledging the structural underpinnings of capitalism, the New Left was equally interested in the cultural, psychological and aesthetic patterns of domination, patterns a narrowly-focused Marxism neglected to address. In broadening the conceptualization of domination, the New Left helped identify a more extensive range of ‘disciplinary’ practices that together maintained oppression. They hence challenged the limitations of Marx’s economic determinism and working class praxis as the motor of social change. The New Left also influenced and informed the budding radical ecology movement. Drawing from some New Left analyses, these radical ecologists went further, condemning the androcentric, technocentric and anthropocentric underpinnings of capitalism and industrialism as well as of Marxism. The counter-culture of the 1960s embraced this expanded critique since it represented not only a liberation from the stranglehold of ‘old’ leftism, but also better accommodated their specific grievances. The ensuing focus on increased autonomy and lifestyle alternatives helped launch the new social movements of the 1960s and 1970s. With them came a widespread dissemination of anarchist ideas.

The late 1960s is thus frequently marked out as a historical turning point for oppositional politics. The poststructuralist, post-Marxist and anarchical impulses that animated the Paris revolt in 1968 were underpinned by a distaste for modernism and the Enlightenment legacy that had promised much but delivered little. Feminists, the colonized, people of colour, queer activists and advocates for the rights of nature specifically denounced the exclusive politics of both the traditional left and right, arguing instead for an inclusive practice and 'politics of difference'. Difference was celebrated in a variety of cultural expressions: a spirit of anti-authoritarianism, freer sexual politics, a celebration of different life-styles and dress codes, and a variety of Do-it-Yourself direct action politics, including political 'carnival', 'spectacle' and early forms of 'culture jamming'. With modernism increasingly challenged, Paris 1968 became 'the cultural and political harbinger of the subsequent turn to postmodernism' (Harvey 1989, 38), signifying the dawning of a new politics.

Postmodernism and poststructuralism rode, as well as drove, this wave of new politics, albeit taking it in different directions. Anarchism was heartened to see some of its ideas accommodated in the new discourses and the new politics, but it was at the same time challenged by them. While many anarchists were sceptical of what they saw as postmodernism's *a*political nature, many others embraced the insights of poststructuralism, using them to reshape and revitalize anarchist thought itself. Anarcho-communists and other collectivist anarchists, after all, borrowed considerably from an 'unreconstructed' Marxism hampered by structuralist limitations. The new anarchism that emerged – a broad and eclectic collection of new anarchist schools, theories and ideas – drove anarchism's own internal renewal. Through addressing its own modernist and ideological limitations, anarchism sought to better position itself to take advantage of the refashioning of radical politics. This refashioning included an embrace of radical greens who were also beginning to identify in modernism's instrumentalist logic, the tools used to dominate nature.

Together these political and philosophical developments represented a horizon of new opportunities for anarchists – a relatively open market for political alternatives in which they could showcase their wares. Post-1989 in particular had birthed a transformed political landscape. Many of these anarchists now believed that liberal capitalism has not yet confronted a truly formidable ideological adversary such as contemporary anarchism set out to be. But unlike an allegedly stolid socialism, anarchism would be a tricky, savvy and footloose adversary.

It would be 'remade' and it would be stronger. As the contemporary anarchist Bob Black contends, 'anarchists are [now] at a turning point. For the first time in history, they are the only revolutionary current' (Black 1997, 140). In making this claim, Black may have been overstating his case. But he makes an important point. He identifies an open political space through which to (re)launch the anarchist imaginary. The politics of the past few decades had propelled the anarchist impulse, but the emergence of virulent anti-globalization represented the opportunity to drive it home.

A post-ideological anarchism for the 21st century

Anarchism has embraced the reconfigured ideological landscape of the early 21st century and made it its own. Radicals disillusioned with the capacity of traditional oppositional ideologies to challenge capitalism and neo-liberalism, find its analysis increasingly appealing. These radicals observe not only the ravages of neo-liberal globalization, and socialism's weakness in stemming them, but also an environmental ruin that critically threatens both people and planet. They find particularly disturbing a new century in which one major ideology, liberalism, has morphed into an even more damaging incarnation – neo-liberalism; and the other, socialism, has proved increasingly ineffective in challenging it. As Kinna (2005, 21) points out, one of contemporary anarchism's 'striking features' is its 'conviction that political and cultural conditions have altered so radically in the course of the twentieth century that the traditional schools of thought ... have become outmoded'. This has catapulted anarchism's 'culture and forms of organization ... to the forefront rather than the margins of a transnational social movement' (Milstein 2004). In short, the contemporary combination of an anti-capitalist surge fuelled by globalization; the concerns of ecology; the left's political reflection in the face of many setbacks; and the availability of sophisticated technologies, has significantly reanimated anarchism (see Curran 2004a). But this reanimated anarchism is a differently configured one.

This book uses the term post-ideological anarchism to capture this reconfigured anarchism. Influenced by developments we described above, a post-ideological anarchism is conditioning the spirit and practice of radical dissent today. It is an anarchism freed from ideological conformity and one that borrows openly from a panorama of ideas and traditions. There remain, of course, many ideological anarchists who still participate as proud anarchists in oppositional protest. Some of the

new anarchist schools, along with the old, continue to assume highly ideological positions. But, more importantly, there is the looser and widespread embrace of anarchist ideas and strategies within the armoury of radical oppositional politics. Here different forms of dissent are largely *inspired* by the ideas and animating principles of anarchism. In a post-ideological spirit, these radicals feel at liberty to draw from the force of anarchism's ideas flexibly and non-doctrinally, without necessarily identifying as anarchist. Instead these 'small-a anarchists' pull and pluck from the ethical force of anarchism to remake it in a manner that suits their own autonomous objectives (Neal 1997). It is this anarchist *impulse* percolating through oppositional politics today, that represents a primary way in which anarchism is influencing contemporary dissent.

Anarchism's core values remain autonomy, liberty, anti-statism and anti-authoritarianism. It continues to see hierarchy, authoritarianism and the centralization of decision making power, both within the state and elsewhere, as inimical to the achievement of those values. And commitment to a correspondence between means and ends still underpins anarchism's strategic heart. As a libertarian and anti-authoritarian political philosophy, anarchism has an overriding allegiance to the principles of radical democracy – preferably direct, certainly participatory and always transparent and inclusive. But to this list of core values has now been added a *green* one. Anarchism, particularly new anarchism, has enthusiastically embraced the claims of radical ecology that environmental degradation signifies the enhanced destructive power of industrialism and/or capitalism. Now most modern anarchists have incorporated, either centrally or more peripherally, the claims of ecologism, agreeing that the will to power degrades both people and nature. But in the 21st century these core values, and the strategies to achieve them, are increasingly interpreted and assembled differently. This diverse assemblage, accommodated in much of the new anarchism, draws from the classical greats, and other traditions, in a looser and less doctrinaire fashion – a development that many new radicals find appealing.

Other commentators have made similar observations, and we quickly review some of them below. While we build on these observations, our conceptualization of post-ideological anarchism goes further. We identify and probe in considerable detail the diverse elements that constitute the mosaic of post-ideological anarchism, before tracing it in a number of illustrative case studies. We also insert a decidedly green ethos into its centre.

Neal (1997) goes closest to prefiguring important aspects of our post-ideological anarchism. He distinguishes between what he calls small 'a' and capital 'A' anarchism, the former denoting a less ideological strand than the latter. More specifically, he conceptualizes a capitalized Anarchism as an ideology and the lower case anarchism as a methodology. As an ideology anarchism becomes 'a set of rules and conventions to which you must abide' while as a methodology it is 'a way of acting, or a historical tendency against illegitimate authority' (1997). He observes that:

Sadly, what we have today are a plethora of Anarchists – ideologues – who focus endlessly on their dogma instead of organizing solidarity among workers. That accounts for the dismal state of the movement today, dominated by elites and factions, cliques and cadres ... Methodology is far more open – there is that which works, and that which doesn't, and degrees between those points. If one strategy doesn't work, you adjust until you get something that does work (1997).

For Neal, a dogmatic Anarchism violates the true spirit of anarchism. He believes that anarchist organization cannot be proscribed, but should arise spontaneously from the autonomous community that conceives it. Nor can an 'indoctrinated people' be a free people. If the capacity to decide principles and strategies are denied them, such people are both not free and not anarchist. But writing in 1997, Neal may have been heartened by the spirited defence of his small 'a' anarchism in the subsequent politics of anti-globalization.

Graeber (2002, 72) utilizes Neal's distinction to help explain the influence of anarchism today, and agrees with him that even in 2002 there are many capital-A anarchist groups. Importantly, however, he believes that the small-a anarchists – those non-card carrying radicals in the anti-globalization movement inspired by the principles and moral force of anarchism – 'are the real locus of historical dynamism right now'. While he still contends that anarchism has an ideology, it is a non-sectarian and deeply democratic one:

A constant complaint about the globalisation movement in the progressive press is that, while tactically brilliant, it lacks any central theme or coherent ideology ... [But] this is a movement about re-inventing democracy. It is not opposed to organization. It is about creating new forms of organization. It is not lacking in ideology. These new forms of organization *are* its ideology (Graeber 2002, 70)

Epstein (2001) too notes the attraction of looser, non-doctrinaire anarchist positions for the new generation of young radicals not formally schooled, or even interested, in the radical tradition. She contends that while anarchism has always attracted many young radicals, those in the anti-globalization movement today are not necessarily interested in old dead anarchists, or in anarchism as a body of theory. But they are inspired by many of its principles and impelled by its vision. Indeed, for younger radicals:

[A]narchism means a decentralised organisational structure, based on affinity groups that work together on an ad hoc basis, and decision-making by consensus. It also means egalitarianism; opposition to all hierarchies; suspicion of authority, especially that of the state; and commitment to living according to one's values (Epstein 2001, 61).

She utilizes a useful way of understanding and conceptualizing contemporary anarchism that echoes our conceptualization of post-ideological anarchism. In determining anarchism's influence she distinguishes between anarchism *per se* and anarchist sensibilities, between those who identify with anarchism as a tradition and ideology and those who simply identify with its spirit and the force of its ideas. In short, she draws a distinction between 'ideological' anarchism and an inspirational anarchism that resonates post-ideological anarchism. Writing in the late 1990s, Purkis and Bowen (1997, 3) identify a similar phenomenon, arguing that the 'terrains of theory and action have changed' so that 'now there are generations of activists operating in many fields of protest for whom the works of Kropotkin, Malatesta and Bakunin are as distant ... as ... Charles Dickens'. In their more recent work, they note the considerable change that anarchism has undergone, especially in its broader conceptualization of power (Purkis & Bowen 2004).

In a similar vein, new anarchist theorists themselves highlight a comparable phenomenon, both as it influences internal theory and external politics. 'Postanarchist' theorists highlight similar developments. Adams (2004) for example, distinguishes between those who identify with anarchism as an 'ideological tradition' and those who identify with its 'general spirit'. He contends that postanarchism's post-ideological character is reflected in the fact that 'it is not an "ism"' nor 'another set of ideologies, doctrines or beliefs' that together act as a 'bounded totality' to which one conforms (2004). Rather than subscribing to 'ideological anarchisms such as anarchist-syndicalism, anarchist-communism, and anarchist-platformism' postanarchism manifests today:

... not only in abstract radical theory but also in the living practice of such [anti-globalisation] groups as the No Border movements, People's Global Action, the Zapatistas, the Autonomes and other such groups that while clearly 'antiauthoritarian' in orientation, do not explicitly identify with anarchism as an ideological tradition so much as they identify with its general spirit in their own unique and varying contexts, which are typically informed by a wide array of both contemporary and classical radical thinkers (Adams 2004).

A fellow postanarchist concurs:

[There] are the equally if not more important, growing numbers of people who just feel dissatisfied with 'all' ideologies in general, yet who can also sense the profound resonance a nondoctrinaire anti-authoritarian analysis has within contemporary social movements (Bey in Adams 2004).

The new anarchists Bob Black, and Hakim Bey after him, talk about 'type 3 anarchism'. This is a type of 'radically non-ideological' anarchism that is 'neither Individualist nor Collectivist but in a sense both at once' (Bey 1991). For Black (n.d.), while type 3 anarchism resists categorization, he still distinguishes it from the other two types. Type 1 refers to anarcho-leftism and type 2 to anarcho-capitalists, even though he is quick to dismiss them as unrepresentative of the anarchist tradition. But it is type 3 that identifies the contemporary anarchist moment:

The worldwide, irreversible, and long-overdue decline of the left precipitated the current crisis among anarchists... Anarchists are having an identity crisis. Are they still, or are they only, the left wing of the left wing? Or are they something more or even something else? Anarchists have always done much more for the rest of the left than the rest of the left has ever done for them. Any anarchist debt to the left has long since been paid in full, and then some. Now, finally, the anarchists are free to be themselves (Black n.d.).

Black's type 3 anarchists are thus free to draw from Situationism or syndicalism, Marxism or Islamism, feminism or Christianity and a plethora of other, even contradictory, influences. The key to type 3 is its political openness, diversity, non-sectarianism and autonomy.

Finally, if in a somewhat different vein, Day (2004) identifies in contemporary radical politics a shift from the 'hegemony of hegemony' to 'non-hegemonic forms of radical social change'. By this he means that if the goal of social transformation is to be achieved, radical change has to be less hierarchical in its spirit and organization. He locates in the anti-globalization movement just such an awareness, one driven by what he calls a 'logic of affinity'. This logic resembles Hardt and Negri's (2000; 2004) constituent power of the multitude, but is strengthened by the utilization of anarchist insights. A logic of affinity built on anarchist theory and practice is discernible in the anti-globalization movement today. Day (2004, 740) articulates the key elements of this logic:

... a desire to create alternatives to state and corporate forms of social organisation, working 'alongside' the existing institutions; proceeding in this via disengagement and reconstruction rather than reform or revolution; with the end of creating not a new knowable totality (counter-hegemony), but of enabling experiments and the emergence of new forms of subjectivity; and finally, focusing on relations between these subjects, in the name of inventing new forms of community.

In short, Day identifies – albeit on the basis of supporting a different argument – some of the ingredients of post-ideological anarchism. He situates a non-hegemonic anarchist impulse, akin to our post-ideological one, at the centre of radical social change. In the process he notes, following Graeber, that 'if anarchist-influenced groups look disorganized' this is because they practice a non-hegemonic form of organization that the traditional left, still locked into hegemonic political practices, ridicule (Day 2004, 741).

The above examples help illuminate how post-ideological anarchism separates itself from traditional, 'ideological' anarchism as well as traditional left politics as a whole. Within the tradition of ideological anarchism can be located specific anarchist schools that assume sectarian and doctrinaire positions: the capital A anarchists. Within the AGM, we also find activists who are members of specific anarchist schools and who practice their oppositional politics accordingly. However, the contemporary face of anarchism is best represented in terms of key anarchist sensibilities that have penetrated the modern protest lexicon and helped shape visions of socio-political alternatives. Here anarchism is not necessarily swallowed 'holus bolas' but its considerable narrative force informs and inspires much of the AGM and the arena of radical

- [download Ghosts of James Bay for free](#)
- [**MRI in White Matter Diseases of the Brain and Spinal Cord online**](#)
- [download online Home Cooked: Modern Asian Recipes pdf, azw \(kindle\), epub](#)
- [download *Origami Essence*](#)

- <http://www.1973vision.com/?library/Ghosts-of-James-Bay.pdf>
- <http://schroff.de/books/The-Dice-Man.pdf>
- <http://junkrobots.com/ebooks/Arguably--Essays-by-Christopher-Hitchens.pdf>
- <http://dadhoc.com/lib/100-Briefe-an-Deutschland--Gedanken--W--nsche--Anregungen.pdf>