



Franks, B. (2007) Postanarchisms: a critical assessment. *Journal of Political Ideologies* 12(2):pp. 127-145.

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/4472/>

4th July 2008

Postanarchism: A critical assessment¹

Introduction

Anarchism was not a major concern for political theory/philosophy² from the 1930s to the fall of the Berlin Wall.³ It was only with the disintegration of the Soviet Union, and the corresponding decline in the hegemonic primacy of orthodox Marxism, that other radical socialist movements, including anarchism, were (re-)discovered by academia.⁴ Alongside this renewed interest in anarchism, there has also been a small, but significant departure, with the development of an identifiable ‘postanarchist’ movement, which includes most prominently Lewis Call, Todd May and Saul Newman, polemicists such as Bob Black and Hakim Bey, and many of the post-millennial contributors to the Institute for Anarchist Studies, *Perspectives on Anarchist Theory* and journals such as *Anarchist Studies*. Articles informed by postanarchism can be found in Jonathan Purkis and James Bowen’s recent collection *Changing Anarchism* and defenders of postanarchism appear on bulletin-boards and discussion groups.⁵ This ‘cottage industry in “Post-Anarchism”’⁶ is the product of artisans working individually, and collectively, through associations like the Anarchist Academic Network and the newly established Special Group for the Study of Anarchism under the auspices of the Political Studies Association.⁷ There is also a useful collation of key authors on the ‘what is postanarchism?’ website.⁸

The emphasis in postanarchism has been on a rejection of essentialism, a preference for randomness, fluidity, hybridity and a repudiation of vanguard tactics, which includes a critique of occidental assumptions in the framing of anarchism.⁹ Despite many excellent features of postanarchist writings, not least their verve, sophistication

and their opening up of new terrains for critical investigation and participant-research, there are, nonetheless, a number of concerns which this paper is designed to articulate and help to resolve. The first is to determine where postanarchism is positioned in relation to the other ‘orthodox’ or ‘classical’ versions of anarchism.

The second concern of this analysis of postanarchism is to illustrate that despite postanarchists’ commitments to non-vanguard and anti-hierarchical practices, many reconstruct a strategic supremacy to particular types of action and overlook or underemphasise certain forms of oppression and resistance. These lacunae are especially relevant in the light of the current policies of dominating powers. The argument presented is that although postanarchism does accurately identify certain deficiencies in particular types of classical anarchism, postanarchism is not a transcendence but a variant of (classical) anarchism. Postanarchism represents the particular responses of particular subjected groups in a limited historical context. The clusters of concepts (and their structures) that characterise the main strands of postanarchism are indicative of it being part of the wider ideological family of anarchism, rather than representing a substantive break,¹⁰ in the same way that environmental anarchism (also known as ‘green anarchism’) is not a surpassing of anarchism, but a re-ordering and re-emphasizing of certain principles (and de-emphasizing of others) as a result of wider cultural changes.¹¹

Anarchism

Peter McLaverty comments that the term ‘socialism’ is ‘a concept whose meaning has evolved over time and which has had a variety of practices associated with it’.¹² The observation about ‘socialism’ can apply equally to the word ‘anarchism’. Whilst few

ideologies are rigidly demarcated,¹³ anarchism has been a particularly flexible constellation of principles, theories, discourses and practices. Nevertheless, as will be discussed below, a cogent set of core concepts is identifiable, even if their emphasis alters in different contexts.

Identifying the family of anarchisms is further complicated, due to strategies from rather rival political camps to ascribe the title in a deliberately derogatory manner, (mis-)applying the term to everything from state-centred Maoist authoritarianism¹⁴ to theocratic terrorism.¹⁵ In addition, there has been from the 1840s onwards, an exceptional range of theorists activists and artists who have embraced the label ‘anarchist’. ‘Anarchism’ has been used to demarcate an area of analysis by academics, which connects, if only by shared signifier, diverse movements across the division, or ‘unbridgeable chasm’, of individualism and collectivism.¹⁶

In the individualist camp there are the egoists inspired by Max Stirner (a much admired figure for postanarchists like Newman and Call), the individualists of Benjamin Tucker and Richard Wolff and the free-market capitalists of Robert Nozick and the Libertarian Alliance. On the socialist side there are Bakuninist collectivists, the dictatorial egalitarians influenced by Michael Bakunin’s one-time collaborator Sergei Nechaev, as well as the anarcho-syndicalists and anarchist communists of the main libertarian organisations of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. In addition, there have been applications of ‘anarchism’ to strands within feminism, environmentalism and anti-colonialism, and the anarchist stances within sub-cultures, youth and otherwise, which adopt and modify the signs associated with libertarianism.

For clarity, when referring to anarchism, I shall be referring to groups and theories that largely conform to the principles identified by John Quail in his description of the early libertarian groups in Britain, namely: a rejection of the state and quasi-state forms, a rejection of capitalism, and an egalitarian concern for the interests and freedoms of others,¹⁷ usually viewed in the phrase ‘that until all are free then no one is free’.¹⁸ In addition, one can add the oft-cited principle that the means being used must prefigure the desired ends.¹⁹ Such principles are consistent with the rejection of mediation and a commitment to anti-hierarchical practices that are also hallmarks of postanarchism. These principles have a high degree of diachronic stability, as they can be identified in late nineteenth century anarchist groupings,²⁰ second-world war syndicalism²¹ as well as current collectivist libertarian movements.²²

Postanarchisms: Poststructural or postmodern?

Given the bewildering range of interpretations of ‘anarchism’ it is hardly surprising that ‘postanarchism’ is also a hotly disputed term. The prefix, ‘post’ part, of ‘postanarchism’ has referred to either, or both, ‘poststructuralism’ and ‘postmodernism’. Both ‘postmodernism’ and ‘postanarchism’ are also problematic headings: as the critical theorist Jon Simons notes, it is not easy to divide thinkers into these neatly separated categories.²³ However, Terry Eagleton’s definition of ‘postmodernism’ from *After Theory* acts as a good starting point for unravelling the multiple meanings of ‘postanarchism’. Eagleton interprets the postmodern as:

the contemporary movement of thought which rejects totalities, universal values, grand historical narratives, solid foundations to human existence and possibility of objective knowledge. Postmodernism is sceptical of truth, unity

and progress, opposes what it sees as elitism in culture, tends towards cultural relativism, and celebrates pluralism, discontinuity and heterogeneity.²⁴

Eagleton's definition is useful in its scope as well as its brevity, historically contextualising postmodernism within the wider economic and political framework of the rise of neo-liberalism without the constraints of a competing set of collectivist values. However, Eagleton's brief description collapses together the realm of (primarily) academic theory with wider social movements and phenomena.

For heuristic purposes, therefore, it might be better to disentangle 'poststructuralism' from 'postmodernism'. The first, the preferred term for many of the most prominent postanarchist theorists, Adams, May and Newman,²⁵ is one closely associated with the writings of Jean Baudrillard, Gilles Deleuze, Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, Felix Guattari, Jacques Lacan and Jean Lyotard.²⁶ The latter, 'postmodernism', can refer to the range of movements that adopt the tropes identified by Eagleton in the quotation above – and elsewhere in his book – namely a commitment to contingency, discontinuity, fluidity, hybridity and pluralism.²⁷ As such, postmodernism can be regarded as referring to wider cultural phenomena rather than just academic theory. In addition, postmodernism's championing of polymorphous sexual identities and cultural diversity was frequently viewed as a less radical alternative to resisting hegemonic power relations and challenging material inequalities; thus postmodernism can be considered more conservative than the critical theory that preceded it.²⁸

Those participating in and constructing practices consistent with postmodernism need not be informed by poststructural theory. However, those identifying, explicating and

on rare occasions) (evaluating these postmodern phenomena, particularly for a largely academic audience, often apply methods, concepts and philosophical insights derived from poststructuralism. Architecture, which did much to broadcast general acceptance of the term 'postmodernism', provides a case in point. According to myth, the great public spectacle that announced the end of modernism and thus the start of the postmodern cultural era has been precisely timed to 15.32 on July 15 1972, when Minoru Yamasaki's Pruitt-Igoe Housing Project in St. Louis, Missouri, was dynamited. The city authority's highly-public demolition of this massive residential project signalled the failure of grand state-funded strategies to deal with poverty, criminality and despair.²⁹ The decision to eradicate the housing project was not based on concepts of poststructural theory, but the subsequent development of new architectural trends which challenged the modernist hegemony, through a celebration of chance, diversity, fragmentation and pastiche, was based on a critical stance towards Modernism's 'totalising' claims. Thus these architectural developments can often be best grasped using the concepts of academic, poststructural theory,³⁰ even if architects, like Charles Jencks, dismiss such theorists are dismissed as 'Kings in the Land of Tenured Scepticism'.³¹

Just as the developments of the wider postmodern culture were not necessarily directly informed by poststructural theory, although such theory has latterly helped to clarify and evaluate such recent developments, so too the wider postanarchist canon often concentrates on applying anarchist principles to the contemporary, post-Pruitt-Igoe cultural context. Postanarchism, thus, considers issues and forms of action that are thought to lie outside of traditional anarchism such as environmentalism, lesbian and gay rights and anti-nuclear campaigns.³² This therefore gives rise to some

distinctions within postanarchism, which are redolent of the differences within post-Marxism.

Positioning postanarchism

Postanarchism's relationship to anarchism shares key characteristics with post-Marxism's relations to Marxism, as Newman suggests,³³ not least a potentially bewildering mixture of dispositions, outlooks and methodologies that are present in this particular combination of prefix to the stem. Stuart Sim describes two different versions of 'post-Marxism' that could equally apply to postanarchism. For Sim, '*post-Marxism*' applies to those theories that have rejected the key concerns and methodologies of Marxism, viewing them as irrelevant, and moved beyond them, a position exemplified by Lyotard.³⁴ By contrast, '*post-Marxism*' attempts to update and renew Marxism by inclusion of new theoretical developments from such critical perspectives as feminism, poststructuralism and postcolonialism.³⁵ Both versions of post-Marxism run the risk of being considered 'ex-' or 'anti-' Marxist.³⁶ Sim, for instance, doubts whether *post-Marxism* is achievable because of a presumed 'pluralism-resistant' Marxist monism, which is ultimately authoritarian.³⁷

Both Sim and Norman Geras question the hybrid 'post-Marxism', but for different motivations: Sim preferences poststructuralism over oppressive orthodox Marxism, while Geras, by contrast, rejects the inaccurate reductivist account of Marxism that is assumed in much poststructuralist and *post-Marxist* writing.³⁸ One might, therefore, add a more limited *post-Marxism*, in which one merely adapts traditional Marxist analyses to the contemporary phenomena that Marx was unable, due to historical difference, to foresee (such as internet technology, genetic modification and gender

transformation). The ‘post-’ of ‘post-Marxism’, then, primarily denotes not the theoretical additions or replacements, but a resituating of Marxism within postmodern culture, leaving the core concepts predominantly untouched but with alterations in some of the adjacent principles or themes.³⁹

The combination of anarchism and poststructuralism is potentially less problematic than that attempted in post-Marxism. Anarchism, for the most part, has not been reduced to a single identifiable dogma with a singular strategy, in the way that orthodox Marxism has been wrongly, but popularly, condensed into a vulgar economic determinism, with the singular party-based stratagem. Libertarianism thus has a greater flexibility and pluralism⁴⁰ but by offering this analogy with post-Marxism we can identify some distinctive and potentially problematic interpretations of ‘postanarchism’.

Following the schema derived from Sim’s discussion of ‘post-Marxism’, we can therefore identify three types of post-anarchism. First, a strident, Lyotardian *Postanarchism*, that rejects traditional anarchist concerns, and instead proposes the adoption of new critical approaches and tactics that lie beyond the remit of anarchist orthodoxy, using as their basis those poststructural theorists that are antipathetic to traditional anarchism. Second, a redemptive *postanarchism* that seeks the adoption into anarchism of poststructural theory to enrich and enliven existing practices, one which sees ‘anarchism’ as it currently stands as lacking, but amenable to change. Third, and finally, a postmodern anarchism (which corresponds to the last version of post-*Marxism*), that reapplies anarchist analyses and methods to the new globalized,

post-Pruitt-Igoe political economy, and concentrates on the actions of oppressed subjects.

It is primarily within the first two interpretations that Call, Newman and May lie.

They prioritise the theoretical developments of poststructuralism over the mere reapplication of anarchist principles to postmodern cultural phenomena. Newman, for instance, refers to postanarchism as constructing an intersection between anarchist and poststructuralist discourses.⁴¹ Dewitt, in conversation with May, regards postanarchism as a ‘grafting [of] French poststructuralist thought onto anarchism’.⁴²

By contrast, sociological papers, from for instance, Karen Goaman, tend towards the third, ‘postmodern’ account of postanarchism, by concentrating on the anarchist features of relatively recent phenomena, such as the alternative globalisation movements which coalesced to form anti-capitalist carnivals. Others, such as Graeme Chesters, Ian Welsh and Purkis, combine the different versions. They present a theoretical reappraisal of anarchism through an analysis of contemporary cultural movements.⁴³ In addition, some commentators slip from one presentation of postanarchism to another – presenting it at one point as a reapplication and clarification of longstanding anarchist principles, whilst at others as a development of anarchism and at others as a transformation and negation – within a single paper.⁴⁴

However, another prominent postanarchist, Jason Adams, offers an alternative perspective. He sees poststructuralism as having ‘emerged out of a much larger anti-authoritarian milieu’, one which was actively involved in applying anti-authoritarian theory to the political movements of the 1970s and ’80s. Thus, poststructuralism did

not require ‘grafting onto’ radical social theories or reapplication to radical movements; it was always part of poststructuralism’s orientation.

‘Postanarchism’ has emerged recently as a term that could be used to describe the phenomenon whereby this radically anti-authoritarian poststructuralist theory has developed and mutated and split off into dozens of hybrid critical theories over the past three decades, finally coming back to inform and extend the theory and practice of one of its primary roots.⁴⁵

For Adams, however, this transformed radical theory is still a surpassing over the past, ‘more closed and ideological anarchisms’, which Adams identifies as anarcho-syndicalism and anarchist-communism.⁴⁶ But, one can still accept Adams’ initial premise that poststructuralism and, consequently, postanarchism are part of a progression from earlier anti-authoritarian theories and practices, without accepting his conclusion regarding its ultimate superiority to all previous anarchisms.

An alternative position to that of Adams, and Lyotardian postanarchists, is feasible and consistent. This approach to postanarchism is much more modest and contextual. It regards certain forms of postanarchism as being consistent with the most coherent forms of practical ‘classical’ anarchism. Whilst postanarchism has highlighted some weaknesses in certain forms and traditions within anarchism, and reapplied anarchism to new social forms, it is often less adequate at developing a cogent account of oppression, prioritising its own post-Pruitt-Igoe institutional outlook and discourse over that of other, equally contemporary, subject identities. In different environments alternative forms of anarchism might be more appropriate in providing a discourse

and repertoire of identities than postanarchism. Thus, the transcendent versions of postanarchism are guilty of universalizing a particular set of radical identities and discursive tactics. It is better, therefore, to regard postanarchism as another modification of anarchist principles and discourses as part of a wider anarchist ‘family’, not a superior new form, which replaces all before it.

Those who adopt the more strident, transcendent postanarchist position have been subject to numerous critiques. These criticisms of postanarchism fall into two main groups. The first type of critical assessment of postanarchism, from Sasha K. Villon, Jesse Cohn and Shawn P. Wilbur,⁴⁷ is that, in adopting a separate demarcation, it is merely claiming for itself a distinction without a difference: that anarchism and postanarchism are identical in all major respects, and in order to maintain a differentiation, postanarchists misrepresent classical anarchism, either as an essentialist philosophy or one corresponding to Leninist economic reductivism. The second, from South Africa’s Zabalaza Anarchist Communist Federation (ZACF),⁴⁸ takes a different approach. It maintains that there are substantial differences between anarchism and postanarchism, in which the latter is inferior, as it either recreates liberalism, or, by being so wedded to postmodern cultural assumptions, is incapable of responding to changes in the current political climate.

Criticism 1. Distinction without difference

One set of replies to postanarchists is that they misrepresent both the epistemological and programmatic features of classical anarchism. Critics such as Villon and Cohn highlight how postanarchists reduce classical anarchism, regarding it as promoting an essentialist view of the individual (as fundamentally good), and thus advancing a

simplistic and highly regressive political strategy. These critics, consequently, argue that there is a rejection of essentialism present in ‘classical’ anarchism, and that the diversity of tactics, characteristic of postanarchism, was already an existing feature of anarchism.

1.1. Postanarchisms’ flawed accounts of ‘classical’ anarchism’s epistemologies

In a review of Newman’s influential postanarchist book *From Bakunin to Lacan*, Villon identifies Newman’s text with the type of postanarchism that corresponds to the *post*-Marxism described by Sim, with a surpassing of anarchism (a transcendence), rather than its mere reapplication or updating. Newman’s account of his own position is more complex and potentially more perplexing; he claims that anarchism would ‘greatly benefit’ from the adoption of poststructuralism, and argues that postanarchism also actually represents a “new paradigm”, one that is no-longer wedded to a ‘limited [...] Enlightenment humanism’.⁴⁹ This is resolved by claiming that postanarchism is an attempt to salvage the ‘central insight’ of classical anarchism, expressed as: ‘the autonomy of the political’, that is to say a continuous resistance to hierarchical control in its irreducible, myriad forms.⁵⁰ These forms of opposition are nevertheless distinguished from classical anarchism, because, according to Newman, this earlier form of libertarian struggle is wedded to a limited epistemology that concentrates on only limited domains of power. In other words, Newman posits that classical anarchism has a core, absolute commitment to a humanist essentialism, and that postanarchism, which rejects this principle, represents a wholly different morphology of concepts and practices.

Classical anarchism is, then, for Newman an inherently authoritarian movement, because of its epistemological weakness. This deficiency – namely that there is an ideal form of the individual, which grounds the classical anarchist project – is, he argues, one common to other Enlightenment political theories.⁵¹ This is a view also shared by May.⁵² By viewing the individual as *naturally* rebellious (Bakunin) or *essentially* co-operative (Kropotkin), this predetermined trait limits freedom, fixing the ideal for all humanity, and restricts legitimate political action to opposing power in order to allow the expression of ‘natural goodness’. It recreates, as Villon notes, a strategic ‘Manichean’ battle between the forces of good (nature) and those unnatural powers (state or capitalism) seeking to subvert it.⁵³ Thus, the old conflicts, as identified by Newman, of state versus individual (Bakunin) or proletariat against capitalism (Marx), are not only outmoded but also recreate hierarchies, in which only certain, specific subject identities take priority in the battle for liberation.⁵⁴

Villon’s contention is that Newman, and by implication Call and May, has misrepresented classical anarchism as wedded to a primitive essentialism. Villon argues such a position is not common, nor critical to all classical anarchisms, and as a result postanarchism is not distinct from them. Villon’s contention is that Newman’s choice of the quotations from Kropotkin, Bakunin and Godwin is too selective and de-historicized and that there are interpretations of Kropotkin that view him as ‘break[ing] human nature open with his critique’.⁵⁵ William Godwin too is quoted by Cohn and Wilbur as explicitly rejecting an essentialist account of agency and that ‘ontologically [...] all that Proudhon, Bakunin and Kropotkin really require [is]: the *possibility* of free co-operation’.⁵⁶ Anarchism does not require a metaphysical fixed

certainty, which postanarchism assigns it – and therefore postanarchism’s anti-essentialist critique of anarchism is redundant.

Whilst there are examples of essentialism in anarchism, which are worthy of criticism, these do not represent the whole of the non-postanarchist libertarian canon.

Concentrating on just these aspects risks overlooking the varied politics of ‘classical’ anarchism. Indeed, one can equally find essentialisms reappearing in certain postanarchist texts. For instance, in Purkis and Bowen’s collection there are references to both ‘inherent creative’ and ‘critical’ defining human traits,⁵⁷ ‘natural curiosity’ and ‘natural concern’ that underpins children’s behaviour,⁵⁸ or appeals to a shared ‘humanity’ that inspires anti-capitalist resistance.⁵⁹

1.2. Postanarchisms’ account of ‘classical’ anarchisms’ agents and strategies

Most postanarchists are united in a rejection of the strategic thinking and political action that they identify in classical anarchism. Postanarchists concentrate on fluid political alliances and changeable social identities that come into conflict with hierarchical power. Here Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari’s rhizome metaphor from *A Thousand Plateaus* is particularly popular.⁶⁰ Like a rhizome, power works through ‘connection and heterogeneity’ (difference). Its roots intersect and sometimes merge.⁶¹ Consequently, as multiple forms of power do not operate uniformly, or to the same degree at different points, different political identities develop. Thus, postanarchists argue that social terrain is constructed out of a multitude of intersecting hierarchical practices rather than a single root of oppressive power. In addition, the rhizomic analysis proposes that there is no central political struggle, nor a universal group that represents all struggles. Thus, strategies based on a group with a singular

identity contesting a single source of heteronomous power, such as Leninist accounts of the proletariat challenging bourgeois rule, are bound to be incomplete as they ignore other oppressions, or recreate forms of domination.⁶²

This rejection of a single sphere of conflict and consequent denial of a single universal vanguard identity of resistance, postanarchists claim, distinguishes their transcendent theory from classical anarchism. Classical anarchism, they argue, regards one set of oppression as the major origin of all types of domination, and thus prioritises one type of oppressed agent's struggle over other forms of oppression. In the eyes of postanarchists, classical anarchism privileges singular oppositions, either the fight against the state or workers' opposition to capitalism.⁶³

Again, following the critical route of Villon, Cohn and Wilbur, one could point to those aspects of classical anarchism which do not identify a singular source to all oppressions, nor place strategic centrality on a sole agent of change. Emma Goldman, for instance, on some occasions prioritised sexual dynamics and at others the class struggle. Other examples of a multiplicity of vectors and domains of struggle include the early Jewish immigrant anarchists, *Der Arbeiter Freund* (The Workers' Friend), who set up cultural and self-educational groups and confronted religious hierarchies as well as creating radical trade unions to contest economic hierarchies.⁶⁴ In addition, there is a significant environmental disposition, which characterises works of advocates of syndicalism, such as Kropotkin, an outlook that remained central to the 'workerist' Murray Bookchin.⁶⁵ As Jean Grave suggested well before the First World War:

Society teems with abuses; against each abuse, there must rise up that group of those who suffer most from it in order to combat it.... Not only groups struggling against that which exists, but attempts to group together along the lines of the future, with a view to producing faith, well-being, solidarity, among like-minded individuals.⁶⁶

The earlier 'class-struggle' classical anarchists tended not to be the economic determinists portrayed by many of the postanarchists, nor indeed are their contemporaries, but instead they see a multitude of interacting, irreducible oppressions.⁶⁷ As such, Newman's 'salvaging' of anarchism is not only unnecessary, but also potentially misleading. However, anarchists, both classical and contemporary, were (and are) often centrally concerned with economic conflict for good reason: class domination, in the domains they operated within, was (and is) one of the major forms of control. This awareness of the importance of the economic struggle leads to the second category of criticism of postanarchism, that rather than representing a transcendence, it is rather an inappropriate reformulation of anarchism. Transcendent postanarchism is consequently condemned for re-establishing the hierarchies of liberalism.

Criticism 2: Postanarchisms' critical inferiority

As ZACF indicate, significant postanarchists, in an effort to distinguish themselves from the 'classical' versions of anarchism, often ignore economic oppression and liberatory resistance to it, which by definition is class-based. Postanarchists reject the orthodox Marxists' view of the agent of change, as coming from a single economic class, the proletariat. In rightly rejecting Leninist economic reductivism, however,

some postanarchists mistakenly reject class analysis wholesale. In other words, by rejecting class as the sole determinant, they erroneously ignore its influence altogether. This risks either, as ZACF accuse them, of collapsing into naïve liberalism, or asserting an inappropriate, and often elitist, alternative agency for making social change. The shortcomings of postanarchist alternative accounts of agency are highlighted by recent changes in the political landscape. In part, the altered political terrain is the result of dominant state agencies responding oppressively to the movements endorsed by postanarchists.⁶⁸

2.1. Postanarchisms and the rejection of class

Following Bey and Black and their denunciation of ‘leftism’ within anarchism,⁶⁹ many postanarchists highlight their difference from classical anarchism by their rejection of class analysis. For instance, Bowen claims that his anarchism is not a ‘class movement’⁷⁰ and Gordon demarcates his contemporary anarchism, marked by the influence of Foucault, from ‘old-school’ working class anarchism.⁷¹ These are indicative of a trajectory in significant sections of postanarchism. So whilst oppressions of race, gender, sexuality, species or (dis-)ability are rightly highlighted in postanarchism, class is largely absent. As Call proclaims: ‘Postmodern anarchism begins with a premise: a Marxist or classical-anarchist “radical” position which insists upon the primacy of economics and class analysis lacks meaningful revolutionary potential’.⁷² Or as Sandra Jeppesen more prosaically expresses it: ‘Anarchy is not about the worker’.⁷³

Part of the reason for this denial of class as a major vector⁷⁴ lies partly in the history of Leninist, and later Stalinist hegemony, in which the discourse of ‘class oppression’

was monopolised and came to symbolise state communism's official discourse, one that played an ideological function of attempting to legitimise systematic structural oppression. As Glen Rhys, writing in the late 1980s class-conscious anarchist magazine *The Heavy Stuff*, explained: 'The more talk of class struggle the more Stalinist.'⁷⁵ Goaman similarly associates class discourse and imagery with a macho patriarchal attitude to (anti-)political struggle.⁷⁶ As a result of this patriarchal, reductivist hegemony many anarchists felt that even entering into a class-based discourse was to identify with state oppression or sexism. Another facet of the rejection of class as an explanatory category is that postanarchists are in agreement with their Leninist opponents in their interpretation of Marx, viewing him as a historicist and economic reductivist.

Whilst Call, May and Newman acknowledge that there are many different interpretations of Marx, which are distinct from economic-determinist orthodoxy, they nonetheless collapse Marxism into the authoritarian Leninist tradition,⁷⁷ a move followed by many others influenced by postanarchism.⁷⁸ However, the orthodox Marxist (Leninist) account of class based on capitalism determining class conflict (based on the highly unrepresentative 'Preface to a Contribution to a Critique of Political Economy')⁷⁹ runs counter to the main thrust of Marx's political writings. Marx's political project has more in common with the multiplicity and irreducibility associated with poststructuralism. The start point of *Capital* is an explanation of how individual subjects meet their innumerable and irreducible desires through a vast array of creative endeavours (use-values), but that the circuit of capital seeks to impose singular exchange values on these myriad diverse use-values.⁸⁰

Marx's account of capitalism is one which views it as neither a total system nor the sole determinant of social conflict.⁸¹ Indeed, the very (anti-)politics of the most bitter critics and rejectionists of 'Marxism', such as Jeppesen and Black, are actually consistent with Marx. A genuinely liberatory struggle against the imposition of work, and the category of 'worker' that it creates, requires those subject to that domination to take the lead (all else would be paternalism) in overthrowing the economic conditions that require work, namely – in the common era – capitalism. In other words, 'the emancipation of the workers must be the act of the working class itself'.⁸²

The postanarchist rejection of 'class', with its Leninist overtones, is understandable in creating an important distance from the Leninist legacy, and those sections of anarchism which followed such a totalistic discourse. However, in doing so it risks ignoring not only the extremes of economic oppression that continue in both the occidental and oriental domains, but also the more sophisticated and wide-ranging forms of economic oppressions and class dynamics which take place beyond the realm of immediate production. Deleuze and Guattari in their powerful rhizome metaphor acknowledge that in some contexts there are more powerful encoding structures. Flows are not equal in force, as their other simile of the Amsterdam canal system indicates: at some points certain stem-canals are more significant than others.⁸³

Thus, those aspects of classical anarchists' activity that appear to prioritise class struggle might do so not because they are arguing that all oppressions are reducible to those of class, but because in the contexts in which they found themselves and operated, class was the dominant form of hierarchical power. Thus, the most

significant struggles for the early Eastern European anarchists was the struggle against Tsarist serfdom,⁸⁴ in the West it was the imposition of the law of value in the form of industrial capitalism⁸⁵ and in the colonised regions, it was the struggle against imperial conquest.⁸⁶ In the post-Pruitt-Igoe West, not to identify the class struggle would be to ignore one of the major (if not the most important) vectors in constructing oppressive practices.

Rejecting class as the universal and all-encompassing characteristic should not necessarily entail ceasing to recognise its continuing importance in most contemporary social struggles. Many of the forms of creative resistance that postanarchists have participated in, reported on, and assessed, still have class as a crucial feature (even if it is not an all-determining one). After all, the movement upon which postanarchists as a whole have concentrated on, is referred to, by both activists and commentators (the two need not be distinct), under the blanket description ‘the *anti-capitalist* movement’, which suggests at least that the main identifying force of oppression is the imposition of the law of capital over labour, of exchange-value over use-value. The Zapatistas too are viewed as an inspiration to postanarchists who regard them as counter to ‘old school’ anarchism.⁸⁷ Yet the Zapatistas are equally involved in an economic struggle; the uprising in Mexico in 1994 was timed to coincide with the first day of the implementation of the North American Free Trade Agreement and was consequently against the imposition of particular types of capitalist social relations. The adopted name pays homage to Emiliano Zapata, leader of a peasant movement, who was greatly influenced by the revolutionary socialist, Ricardo Magón.⁸⁸

The failure to acknowledge class alongside other dynamics can lead to the reconstruction of hierarchies. The celebration of marginal and diverse sexual personae, or hybrid sexual identities, is not in itself a radical response to all forms of oppression. Capitalism, as Eagleton suggests, prefers fluidity and adaptability. As the libertarian socialist Maurice Brinton acknowledges, sexual liberation, on its own, seldom undermines the rule of capital. Instead it has opened up markets for new commodities.⁸⁹

2.2. Elitist agents of change

A more significant potential weakness is that, inadvertently, postanarchists start to prioritise certain elitist forms of resistance and agents of change. Having overlooked workers as potential revolutionary subjects, Bey, Call and Jeppesen, in keeping with the Deleuze and Guattari influence, promote a nomadic agent of change: one that can disappear, who is not bound by place, or past experiences.⁹⁰ Such fleeting, drifting individuals represent, for these three theorists in particular, the postanarchist ideal.⁹¹ Yet nomadic identities prioritise specific practices, namely those methods more suited to economically independent individuals. Not everyone is capable of drifting; there are those who are physically, socially, or economically restrained or have responsibilities to particular locales or to more vulnerable others.⁹²

The call to nomadic models overlooks the different socio-historical constructs that create individuals, differences in power relations, and the social nexuses of responsibility and dependence. Rosi Braidotti, in her criticism of the Deleuzian nomad, points out that this fleeting, fleeing ‘radical identity’ assumes an equivalence between classes, genders and (dis)abilities that is little different to the gender-, race-,

class and (dis)ability blind- abstract agent of liberalism.⁹³ Nomadism, rather than providing an anti-hierarchical strategy can instead, by its over-emphasis by postanarchists, recreate a vanguard elite.

The characterless, abstract nomads also provide no basis for actual solidarity and mutual support; instead, like Stirner, they appear to favour egoistic rebellion in favour of social action. This rejection of the principle of concern for the interests and freedoms of others, as Frank H. Brooks notes, leads to the elitist implication that concentrating on the individual's own self-emancipation leaves the unenlightened to remain exploited.⁹⁴ This creates a new type of social hierarchy, with liberated egoists at the top and the unenlightened, unliberated herd at the bottom.⁹⁵

2.3. The Age of Security

To return to the conceit concerning the precise start of the postmodern era: the spectacle of the demolition of the Pruitt-Igoe complex that signalled the end of the modernist era, in which, as Simon Tormey describes, the verities of welfare state were replaced by the precariousness and flexibility of the neo-liberal market economy.⁹⁶ If the conceit that an exact end to modernism can be accurately pronounced, then perhaps it is possible to equally accurately signal the end of the heroic phase of postmodernism, to 08:46 local time, September 11, 2001. This was the moment when American Airlines Flight 11 crashed, with such desperate consequences, into the north tower of the World Trade Center, a structure which, with unfortunate symmetry, was also designed by the architect of Pruitt-Igoe, Yamasaki.⁹⁷ Changes in the political and economic culture that followed the terrorist assault on America are also reflected in contemporary architecture, in which the postmodern discourse of 'freedom',

‘pluralism’ and ‘accessibility’ is replaced by one stressing ‘unified values’ and ‘security’.⁹⁸

The subsequent period has witnessed a dramatic change in the operations of power, quite to the contrary of Bey’s assumption that the state ‘must [...] continue to deliquesce’.⁹⁹ Under the pretext of fighting ‘terrorism’, anti-capitalists and radical environmentalists have been subjected to greater state and private sector surveillance,¹⁰⁰ and stronger legislative control. Thus, many of the cultural assumptions that underlie many postanarchist theories have been undermined. As Newman acknowledges, rather than dissolving, the state has, instead, switched to a more oppressive paradigm, with greater centralised control, executive power and concentrated authority in the hands of military and police.¹⁰¹ The heroic nomenclature of postmodernism, of flexibility, openness, pluralism and risk-taking, has moved towards a more politically and philosophically conservative disposition, in which the dominant political terminology stresses safety, security and fixed identity and shared ‘universal’ values. In the face of this authoritarian turn, the favoured tactic of postanarchists, seeking flight rather than contestation,¹⁰² seems inadequate, as exodus is not always possible or desirable.

The desire to escape the state also influences the reluctance, in some quarters, to engage in critical scrutiny of state practices, engagements and consequences.¹⁰³ In the more relativistic forms of postanarchism, which Gavin Grindon identifies in Bey’s works, the evasion takes the form of viewing the state as a mere simulation (a mythic model with no connection to real powers).¹⁰⁴ The consequence of Bey’s Baudrillardian analysis is that it ignores the personal and social consequences of state

power, whether they be the torture of Abu Ghraib, Guantanamo Bay, rendition flights or daisy-cutter ordinance. Thus it becomes an analysis that is indicative of a particular (rather comfortable), elite position, rather than one which seeks out alliances of the oppressed to create new, anti-hierarchical social relations.

Conclusion

Postanarchisms' great strengths have been in identifying the essentialisms and dogmatisms in classical anarchisms, opening up original areas for critical scrutiny, employing new amalgams of analysis and also reflecting on institutional research practices. However, there has been a tendency to overstress the degree of essentialism and universalism within pre-Pruitt Igoe anarchisms. In addition, whilst rightly rejecting a singular source or origin for all oppression (such as capitalism), and thus eliminating a universal agent for liberation, many postanarchists reject any reference to class. This fails to recognise not only that economic forces are relevant in almost all social contexts (alongside other disciplining forces: patriarchy, racism, disablism, ageism, heterosexism etc), but also that in many terrains, class conflict may well be the dominant factor. Because of this denigration and exclusion of dominant forms of oppression amongst many (but by no means all) postanarchists, certain grounds for social solidarity and resistance are overlooked, and thus permitted to continue. In certain forms postanarchism leads to an abstract egoism, in which only a select few are liberated, leaving the unenlightened restrained, thereby recreating the hierarchical social relations they sought to undermine.

As a result, a more modest version of postanarchism is required: one that views itself as (another) modification of anarchism, more pertinent for particular social and

cultural contexts, but less so in others, rather than a categorical supersession.

Postanarchisms embody the interests of particular radical subjects, in a particular era, in resisting (and transforming) heteronomous power relations, but the discourses, modes of organisation and types of identity that characterise postanarchisms can be less relevant, and damaging to the creation of non-hierarchical social relationships in other contexts. To universally prioritise the practices of postanarchism would be to recreate vanguards and hierarchies, structures that both postanarchism and more traditional anarchism reject.

Notes

¹ My thanks to Lesley Stevenson, Stuart Hanscomb, David Graeber and the anonymous reviewer for their careful reading and pertinent suggestions, and to the members of the SSGA and participants at the PSA Conference (2006) for their supportive advice.

² Alan Brown in *Modern Political Philosophy: Theories of the just society* (Harmondworth: Penguin, 1986), p. 14, considers political philosophy to differ from political theory, as the first concerns finding rational grounds for accepting the latter, and thus leaves open the possibility that political theories are merely irrational assemblages. This, however, mistakes the practice of political theorising, which also prioritises rational analysis, for the object being studied. Michael Freeden in *Ideologies and Political Theory: A conceptual approach* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996) argues that whilst political theory and philosophy have a large degree of overlap, the latter is primarily concerned with ‘evaluating [...] validity, and [...] offering ethical prescriptions’ (p. 6) whilst the first is more wide-ranging as it includes the study of ideologies, which involves identifying the interrelationships of core and peripheral concepts, and to locate these concepts spatially and temporally, exploring the cultural as well as rational controls on their adoption and development. However, as Freeden acknowledges, these criticisms of the absences in political philosophy are specific to the Anglo-American, analytic versions of political philosophy, rather than the canon of political philosophy as a whole. Consequently, Paul Kelly’s account is possibly more accurate; he argues that the distinction between political philosophy and political theory is ‘an institutional one: political philosophers are political theorists employed by philosophy departments and political theorists are political philosophers employed within government or political science departments (P. Kelly, ‘Political Theory – The State of the Art’, *Politics*, Volume 26, Number 1, (February 2006), p. 47).

³ For instance C. E. M. Joad’s 1924 text, *Introduction to Modern Political Theory* (Oxford: Clarendon), covers anarchism in as much detail as other forms of communism, and has a significant section on syndicalism. By the 1950s, ’60s, ’70s and ’80s, however, anarchism was either limited to free market liberalism, relegated to a few marginal remarks or entirely absent. See for instance texts such as Alan Gewirth, *Political Philosophy* (London: Collier MacMillan, 1965), Anthony Quinton, ed., *Political Philosophy* (Oxford: Clarendon 1985, [1967]), D. D. Raphael *Problems of Political Philosophy*, Revised edition (London: MacMillan, 1976) Brown, *op cit.*, Ref. 2.

⁴ The growth of more general interest in anarchism in Britain and North America, in particular, predates November 1989.

⁵ See for instance Urban 75's 'Is post-anarchism a good idea?', <<http://www.urban75.net/vbulletin/showthread.php?t=141865&highlight=postanarchism>>, last accessed, 26 March, 2006 and the debates on postmodernism and anarchism found on Libcom.org, <<http://www.libcom.org/forums/viewtopic.php?t=8814>>, last accessed 26 March, 2006 and the The Postanarchism Listserv at <<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/postanarchism>>, last accessed 26 March, 2006.

⁶ R. Creagh, 'Specialist Group for the Study of Anarchism', Research on Anarchism Forum, Institutes and Research Centers, <http://raforum.apinc.org/article.php3?id_article=3482&lang=en>, last accessed 20 March, 2006.

⁷ Specialist Group for the Study of Anarchism, <<http://www.sgsa.org.uk/>>, last accessed 1 June, 2006.

⁸ Anonymous₁, 'What is Post-Anarchism?', <<http://www.geocities.com/ringfingers/postanarchism2.html>>, last accessed March 20, 2006.

⁹ See J. Adams, *Non-Western Anarchisms: Rethinking the global context* (Johannesburg, South Africa: Zabalaza books nd <2004e>), see too B. Anderson, *Under Three Flags: Anarchism and the anti-colonial imagination* (London: Verso, 2005).

¹⁰ An account of 'ideology' based on Freeden, *op. cit.*, Ref. 1, p. 53-54.

¹¹ The question could arise as to whether Green anarchism is a hybrid of environmentalism and anarchism. Freeden's account of hybridity and the absence of absolute boundaries is useful here; anarchism, like other ideologies, is fluid and green anarchism shares many of the histories as well as core concepts of non-prefaced anarchism. Freeden, *ibid.*, pp. 87-88.

¹² P. McLaverty, 'Socialism and Libertarianism', *Journal of Political Ideologies* Volume 10, No. 2, (June 2005), 185-98: 186.

¹³ M. Freeden, *op. cit.*, Ref. 1, p. 4, pp.18-19.

¹⁴ E. Heathcoat Amory, 'Can you *Imagine* a more hypocritical song than this?', *Daily Mail*, March 6, 2002, p. 12.

¹⁵ T. Ali, 'Why They Happened: The London bombings', *CounterPunch*, <<http://www.counterpunch.org/tariq07082005.html>>, last accessed 21 March, 2006 and Ghannoushi, S. (2005), 'Al-Qaida: The wrong answers', Friday 29 July, 2005, Aljazeera.Net,

<<http://english.aljazeera.net/NR/exeres/25D45C98-471B-4A36-8253-F2120BEA180F.htm>>, last accessed, March 16, 2006.

¹⁶ See M. Bookchin, *Social Anarchism or Lifestyle Anarchism: An unbridgeable chasm* (Edinburgh, Scotland: AK Press, 1995) and N. Chomsky, 'Interview with Barry Pateman', B. Pateman, ed., *Chomsky on Anarchism* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 2005 [2004]), pp. 235-36.

¹⁷ J. Quail, *The Slow Burning Fuse* (London: Paladin 1978), p. x.

¹⁸ Anonymous₂ (2006), 'The Anti-Racist History of Anarchism', <recollectionbooks.com/bleed/Encyclopedia/ArchiveMirror/antiraci.pdf>, last accessed March 20, 2006. See too <www.zabalaza.net/pdfs/leafs/antiracisthistory.pdf>. The account of libertarian socialism stands in contrast to the interpretation of 'libertarian socialism' in McLaverty's article, which is based on a liberal possessive individualist account of the 'self'. McLaverty, *op. cit.* Ref 12.

¹⁹ See B. Franks, 'The Direct Action Ethic', *Anarchist Studies*, Volume 11, No. 1, 2003, 13-41: pp. 18-19 and J. Purkis, and J. Bowen, 'Conclusion: How anarchy matters', J. Purkis and J. Bowen, ed., *Changing Anarchism: Anarchist theory and practice in a global age* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), pp. 213-29: p. 220.

²⁰ See for instance W. Fishman, *East-End Jewish Radicals 1874-1914* (London: Duckworth, 1975) and R. Rocker, *Anarcho-Syndicalism* (London, Phoenix Press), nd <1990e> [1938], pp. 63-65 and pp. 75-76.

²¹ T. Brown, *Syndicalism*, (London: Phoenix Press, 1990) [1943].

²² See for instance *Class War*, No. 91, Winter 2006, p.11; *Organise! For revolutionary anarchism*, No. 64, Spring 2005, p. 28.

²³ J. Simons, 'Introduction', in J. Simons, ed., *Contemporary Critical Theorists: From Lacan to Said* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2002), p. 16.

²⁴ T. Eagleton, *After Theory* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2004), p. 13.

²⁵ See the title of May's book *The Political Philosophy of Poststructuralist Anarchism* (Pennsylvania, USA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994) and S. Newman's comments in his book, *From Bakunin to Lacan: Anti-authoritarianism and the dislocation of power* (Oxford: Lexington Books, 2001), pp. 14-15. Call's preference is for the term 'postmodernism', which he uses to stand for 'the philosophical or critical movement' as against the wider cultural 'postmodern condition', L. Call, *Postmodern Anarchism* (Oxford: Lexington Books, 2002), p. 13. See too J. Purkis, 'Towards an

Anarchist Sociology' in J. Purkis and J. Bowen, ed., *Changing Anarchism: Anarchist theory and practice in a global age* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), 39-54: pp. 50-51.

²⁶ Adams cites Foucault, Deleuze and Guattari and Paul Virilio; May prioritises Deleuze, Foucault and Lyotard; Newman stresses Derrida, Deleuze and Guattari, Foucault and Lacan; Call focuses primarily on Foucault and Baudrillard. J. Adams, 'Postanarchism in a Nutshell', Interactivist InfoExchange, <<http://info.interactivist.net/article.pl?sid=03/11/11/1642242>>, last accessed 30 May, 2006. Also called 'Postanarchism in a Bombshell', *Aporia Journal*, Issue 2, <<http://aporiajournal.tripod.com/postanarchism.htm>>, last accessed 1 June, 2006; May, *op cit.*, Ref. 25; Newman, *op cit.*, Ref. 25.

²⁷ Eagleton, *op. cit.*, Ref. 24, p. 13, p. 16, pp. 117-19.

²⁸ Simons, *op. cit.*, Ref. 23, p. 10.

²⁹ C. Jencks, *What is Post-Modernism?* (Chichester: Academy, 1996), p.30 and J. Hughes, 'After Non-Plan: retrenchment and reassertion' in J. Hughes and S. Sadler, *Non-Plan: Essays on freedom, participation and change in modern architecture and urbanism* (London: Architectural Press 2000): 166.

³⁰ D. Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996): p. 9, pp. 82-83.

³¹ Jencks, *op. cit.*, Ref. 29, p. 16.

³² J. Bowen and J. Purkis, 'Introduction: Why anarchism still matters' in J. Purkis and J. Bowen, ed., *Changing Anarchism: Anarchist theory and practice in a global age* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), pp.1-22: p. 5.

³³ S. Newman, 'The Politics of Postanarchism', Institute of Anarchist Studies (2003) <<http://www.anarchist-studies.org/article/articleprint/1/-/1/1/>>, last accessed 20, March, 2006. 2003.

³⁴ S. Sim, 'Introduction: Spectres and Nostalgia: *Post-Marxism/Post-Marxism*' in S. Sim, ed., *Post-Marxism: A reader*, (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998) p.2 and p. 6.

³⁵ Sim, *ibid.*, p. 2 and pp. 6-7.

³⁶ See for instance N. Geras, 'Post-Marxism?', in S. Sim, ed., *Post-Marxism: A reader* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998), p. 46 and p. 54.

³⁷ Sim, *op. cit.*, Ref. 34, pp. 8-9.

³⁸ Geras, *op. cit.*, Ref. 36, pp. 51-54.

³⁹ See Freeden, *op. cit.*, Ref. 1, p. 86-87.

⁴⁰ May, *op. cit.*, Ref. 25, p. 49.

⁴¹ S. Newman, 'Is There a Postanarchist Universality? A Reply to Michael Glavin', Institute of Anarchist Studies (2004), <<http://www.anarchist-studies.org/article/articleprint/87/-1/9>>, last accessed 31, March 2006.

⁴² R. Dewitt, 'Poststructuralist Anarchism: An Interview with Todd May', Institute of Anarchist Studies (2000), <<http://perspectives.anarchist-studies.org/8may.htm>>, 31 March, 2006.

⁴³ Welsh, J. and J. Purkis, 'Redefining Anarchism for the Twenty-First Century: Some modest beginnings', *Anarchist Studies*, Vol. 11, No. 1 (2003), pp. 5-12; G. Chesters, 'Shape Shifting: Civil Society, Complexity and Social Movements', *Anarchist Studies*, Vol. 11, No. 1(2003), pp. 42-65 and G. Chesters and I. Welsh, 'Complexity and Social Movement(s): Process and emergence in planetary action', *Theory Culture & Society*, Vol. 22, No. 5 (2005), pp. 187-211.

⁴⁴ See for instance Morland, who, like Newman (*op. cit.*, Ref. 41), views 'postanarchism' as both a reapplication of key anarchist themes to the contemporary setting, but also as an 'evolution'; that is to say postanarchisms are more higher developed variants, which junk an inappropriate Marxism (D. Morland, 'Anti-capitalism and Poststructuralist Anarchism' in J. Purkis and J. Bowen, ed., *Changing Anarchism: Anarchist theory and practice in a global age* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), pp. 23-38: pp. 24-25). Such confusion may be because the main intent of the text is not to theoretically locate postanarchism, but to concentrate on describing the main features or applications of postanarchisms to assist practical struggles.

⁴⁵ Adams, *op. cit.*, Ref. 26.

⁴⁶ Adams, *ibid.*

⁴⁷ S. Villon, 'Post-Anarchism or Simply Post-Revolution' (2003) originally found at <http://www.geocities.com/kk_ab%20acus/other/postanarc%20hism.html> link no longer operative and J. Cohn and S. Wilbur, 'What's Wrong With Postanarchism?', Institute for Anarchist Studies (2003), <<http://www.anarchist-studies.org/article/articleview/26/2/1/>>, last accessed 20 March, 2006.

⁴⁸ Zabalaza Anarchist Communist Federation of Southern Africa, 'Sucking the Golden Egg: A Reply to Newman', Inter Activist Information Exchange (2003), <<http://slash.autonomeia.org/article.pl?sid=03/10/10/1220218>> also available at the Institute of Anarchist Studies, <http://www.anarchist-studies.org/forum/message/6>>, last accessed 20 March, 2006.

⁴⁹ Newman, *op. cit.*, Ref. 33.

-
- ⁵⁰ Newman, *ibid.*
- ⁵¹ Newman, *ibid* and Newman, *op cit.* Ref. 25, pp. 38-49.
- ⁵² May, *op. cit.*, Ref. 25, pp. 63-65.
- ⁵³ Newman, *op. cit.*, Ref. 25, pp. 47-48 and Villon *op. cit.* Ref. 47.
- ⁵⁴ Newman, *op. cit.* Ref. 25, pp. 23-29.
- ⁵⁵ Villon, *op. cit.*, Ref. 47; Cohn and Wilbur contribute to this critique of Newman (but also extend it to May and Call) by arguing that the selection of theorists is too narrow, omitting those authors like Gustav Laudauer and Emma Goldman who do not fit neatly into the postanarchist framework for earlier 'anarchism' (Cohn and Wilbur, *op. cit.* Ref. 47).
- ⁵⁶ Cohn and Wilbur, *ibid.*, (emphasis added).
- ⁵⁷ J. Gore, 'In the Eye of the Beholder – Child, Mad or Artist' in J. Purkis and J. Bowen, ed., *Changing Anarchism: Anarchist theory and practice in a global age* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), 145-61: p. 156 and p. 146
- ⁵⁸ D. Gribble, 'Good News for Francisco Ferrer - How Anarchist Ideals in Education Have Survived Around the World' in J. Purkis and J. Bowen, ed., *Changing Anarchism: Anarchist theory and practice in a global age* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), pp. 181-98: 183.
- ⁵⁹ Q. Graeber, K. Goaman, 'The Anarchist Travelling Circus: Reflections on contemporary anarchism, anti-capitalism and the international scene' in J. Purkis and J. Bowen, ed., *Changing Anarchism: Anarchist theory and practice in a global age* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004) 164-80: p. 165.
- ⁶⁰ Adams, *op. cit.*, Ref. 26; Bowen and Purkis, *op. cit.*, Ref. 32, p. 14; Call, *op. cit.*, Ref. 25, p. 1 and pp. 123-24; Chesters and Welsh *op. cit.*, Ref. 43, pp. 192-93 and p. 196; U. Gordon, *Anarchism and Political Theory: Contemporary problems*, Mansfield College, Oxford University, D. Phil. Thesis, 2005: May, *op. cit.*, Ref. 25, pp. 96-97; Newman, *op. cit.*, Ref. 25, pp. 105-07; Purkis, *op. cit.*, Ref. 25, p. 50.
- ⁶¹ G. Deleuze, G. and F. Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, (London: Continuum, 1998).
- ⁶² May, *op. cit.*, Ref 25, pp. 20-23.
- ⁶³ May, *op. cit.*, Ref. 25, p. 43; Morland, *op. cit.*, Ref. 44, p. 37; Newman, *op. cit.*, Ref. 25, pp. 106-09; Purkis, *op. cit.*, Ref. 25, p. 50. For an example of the state-centred approach look at Alan Carter,

'Analytical Anarchism: Some Conceptual Foundations', *Political Theory*, Vol. 28, No. 2 (2000), pp. 230-53, whilst for an example of an anarchist class-centred analysis see E. Yaroslavsky, 'History of Anarchism in Russia', [1937],

<http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/anarchist_archives/bakunin/graphicstable.htmlhttp://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/anarchist_archives/worldwidemovements/anarchisminrussia6.html>, last accessed March 28, 2006.

⁶⁴ E. Goldman, 'The Traffic in Women', in *Anarchism and Other Essays*, (New York, USA: Dover, 1969 [1911]), pp. 177-94; Fishman, *op. cit.*, Ref 20.

⁶⁵ P. Kropotkin, 'Syndicalism and Anarchism', *Black Flag*, No. 210, pp. 24-27; see for example M. Bookchin, 'Social Ecology' in *The Murray Bookchin Reader* (London: Cassell, 1997), pp. 31-36.

⁶⁶ Q. J. Grave in D. Miller, D. *Anarchism* (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1984), p. 131.

⁶⁷ See for instance the Anarchist Federation of Great Britain and Ireland's self-description 'Another important principle of the AF is that it is not just class exploitation and oppression that needs to be abolished. Though we do not necessarily use the concept of patriarchy, we believe that the oppression of women predates capitalism and will not automatically disappear with its end'. 'Thought and Struggle', *Anarkisto Debato: Magazine of IAF*, No. 0 (2006), p. 16.

⁶⁸ Zabalaza Anarchist Communist Federation of Southern Africa, *op. cit.*, Ref. 48.

⁶⁹ H. Bey, *TAZ: The Temporary Autonomous Zone, Ontological anarchy, poetic terrorism*, Second edition (Brooklyn, USA: Autonomedia., 2003 [1990]), pp. 62-63 and B. Black, *Anarchy after Leftism* (Columbia, USA: Columbia Alternative Library, 1997).

⁷⁰ J. Bowen, 'Moving Targets: Rethinking anarchist strategies', in J. Purkis and J. Bowen, ed., *Changing Anarchism: Anarchist theory and practice in a global age* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), p. 118.

⁷¹ Gordon, *op. cit.*, Ref. 60, p. 76.

⁷² Call, *op. cit.*, Ref. 25, p. 21.

⁷³ S. Jeppesen, 'Seeing Past the Outpost of Post-Anarchism. Anarchy: Axiomatic', Institute for Anarchist Studies, <<http://www.anarchist-studies.org/article/articleview/55/1/1>>, last accessed March 26, 2006. See too B. Black, 'The Abolition of Work' in *Vague*, No. 20 (1988).

⁷⁴ A term used by Alan Carter in his account of 'analytical anarchism' to describe the influence and direction of particular forms of state interest; these vectors intersect to create 'a parallelogram of forces', Carter, *op. cit.*, Ref. 63, p. 244.

-
- ⁷⁵ G. Rhys, 'Class War's Rough Guide to the Left', *Class War: The Heavy Stuff*, No. 2, (nd <1988e>), p. 26. See too Call's comments about the symbolic importance for postmodern anarchism to avoid the language of 'bourgeois political economy', in contrast to Marxism and classical anarchism, Call, *op. cit.*, Ref. 25, p. 23).
- ⁷⁶ K. Goaman, 'Active Currents', *Anarchist Studies*, Volume 3, Number 2, (Autumn 1995), pp. 165-68.
- ⁷⁷ See for instance Newman, *op. cit.* Ref. 25, p. 33 and May, *op. cit.*, Ref. 25, p. 18n.
- ⁷⁸ See for instance Jeppesen's claims that it is an unquestioning axiom of postanarchism to reject Marxism in any and all forms., Jeppesen, *op. cit.*, Ref. 73.
- ⁷⁹ K. Marx, *Early Writings*, (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1992).
- ⁸⁰ K. Marx, *Capital Volume 1*, (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1976), pp. 126-28.
- ⁸¹ F. Shortall, *The Incomplete Marx*, (Aldershot: Avebury, 1994), available online at <<http://libcom.org/library/incomplete-marx-felton-c-shorthall>>, last accessed January 25, 2007.
- ⁸² Q. Marx and Engels, Engels, F. (1977) [1888], 'Preface to the English Edition of 1888', K. Marx and F. Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, (Moscow, Russia [USSR]: Progress. 1977 [1888]), p. 20.
- ⁸³ Deleuze and Guattari, *op. cit.*, Ref. 61, p. 15.
- ⁸⁴ Fishman, *op. cit.* Ref. 20.
- ⁸⁵ Fishman, *ibid.* and R. Rocker, translated by Joseph Leftwick, *London Years* (London: Robert Anscombe and Co. Ltd/Rudolf Rocker Book Committee, 1956).
- ⁸⁶ Anderson, *op. cit.*, Ref. 9.
- ⁸⁷ For instance in Adams, *op. cit.*, Ref., 26; Bowen and Purkis, *op. cit.*, Ref. 32, p. 2; Chesters and Welsh, *op. cit.*, Ref. 43, p. 195, Goaman, *op. cit.*, Ref. 59, p. 165; Gordon, *op. cit.*, Ref. 60, p. 82, pp. 95-96 and p. 199 and Newman in S. Evren, K. Kiziltug, and E. Kosova, 'Interview with Saul Newman', *Siyahi Interlocal Journal of Postanarchist Theory, Culture and Politics* (2005), <<http://community.livejournal.com/siyahi>>, last accessed 1 June, 2006.
- ⁸⁸ See for instance M. Verter's 'Historical Background' to C. Bufo and M. Verter, eds, *Dreams of Freedom: A Rocardo Flores Magón reader* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 2005), p. 26 and Magón's own writings, especially pp. 182-94
- ⁸⁹ M. Brinton, *For Workers Power* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 2004), 167.
- ⁹⁰ Bey, *op. cit.*, Ref. 69, p. 128; Call, *op. cit.* Ref. 25, p. 128 and Jeppesen, *op. cit.*, Ref. 73.

⁹¹ Bey, *ibid.*, 126; Call, *ibid.*, p. 24 and Jeppesen, *ibid.*

⁹² Robert Young criticises Deleuze and Guattari's idea of nomadism, because such landless existences, rather than being an indication of liberation and transgression, are often an identity forced upon people by oppression and dispossession, *Postcolonialism: A very short introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), p. 53.

⁹³ R. Braidotti, 'Discontinuous Becomings. Deleuze on the Becoming-Woman of Philosophy' in *The Journal of the British Society of Phenomenology*, Vol. 24, No. 1 (January 1993), p. 49.

⁹⁴ F. Brooks, 'American Individualist Anarchism: What it was and why it failed', *Journal of Political Ideologies* Vol. 1, No. 1 (1996), 85.

⁹⁵ One of the criticisms of postanarchism, because of its reliance on poststructural theory, has been that it privileges those already with high degrees of cultural capital (see the discussion 'Is post-anarchism a good idea?', Urban 75,

<<http://www.urban75.net/vbulletin/showthread.php?t=141865&highlight=postanarchism>>, last accessed, 26 March, 2006).

⁹⁶ S. Tormey, *Anti-Capitalism*, (Oxford: Oneworld, 2004), pp. 34-35.

⁹⁷ My thanks to my friend, the architectural historian Simon Sadler for highlighting this coincidence.

⁹⁸ See for instance the architecture journalist Marcus Binney's account of changes to the architect's (Rogers Partnership) design of the Welsh Assembly building wrought by the requirements for greater 'security' and 'safety' after September 11, 2001 (M. Binney, 'A vision of sea, sky and cedar', *The Times*, Monday 13, March 2006, p. 58) and the redesign demanded of Daniel Libeskind's Freedom Tower project, at the site of the former World Trade Center, in order to ensure that 'the buildings as finally drawn are as safe from attack as possible' (D. Osborne, 'New York divided over memorial: absolutely zero; it has been four years since the world trade centre was destroyed', *The Independent*, Thursday, June 2, 2005, pp. 24-25. Libeskind too uses a similar discourse in connection to his new structure: 'You cannot escape it because a building celebrates continuity. It's the one stability we have in an accelerating world.' Q. Libeskind, Andrew Billen, 'Every day there's a new crisis', *The Times*, Times 2, September 7, 2004, p. 6.

⁹⁹ Bey, *op. cit.* Ref. 69, p. 132.

¹⁰⁰ See for instance the discussion by Chuck Tilby of Eugene (Oregon) Police Department and academic Randy Borum, detailing appropriate state strategies to deal with anti-capitalists (R. Borum

and C. Tilby, 'Anarchist Direct Actions: A challenge for law enforcement', *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, No. 28, (2005), 201-33: pp. 218-20 and Haracio R. Trujillio's study for the Rand Corporation, which provides analysis and proposes solutions for state and corporate bodies to deal with 'threats', that places radical environmentalists and anti-capitalists alongside statist terrorist groups such as Aum Shinrikyo, Hizballah and Jemaah Islamiyah (H. Trujillio, 'The Radical Environmental Movement' in Jackson, B., Baker, J., et. al., *Aptitude for Destruction: Case studies of organizational learning in five terrorist groups*, Volume 2 (Santa Monica, USA: Rand, 2005), available online at <www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2005/RAND_MG332.pdf>, last accessed, 31 May, 2006.).

¹⁰¹ Newman, *op. cit.*, Ref. 33 and Newman, *op. cit.*, Ref. 41.

¹⁰² Bey, *op. cit.*, Ref. 69, pp. 130-32; Newman, *op. cit.*, Ref. 25, pp. 99-100.

¹⁰³ Although it should be noted that there are some examples of highly perceptive postanarchist analyses of state techniques and strategies, see for instance A. Antliff and W. Milwright, 'The Public Humiliation of Saddam Hussein', *Anarchist Studies*, Volume 13, Number 1, (2005), pp.78-82; S. Evren, 'Abu Ghraib: The spectacle of torture', *Anarchist Studies*, Volume 13, Number 1 (2005), pp.70-78 and S. Gemie, 'Occupation and Insurrection in Iraq, 2003-04', *Anarchist Studies*, Volume 13, Number 1 (2005), pp.61-70. .

¹⁰⁴ G. Grindon, 'Carnival Against Capital: A comparison of Bakhtin, Vaneigem and Bey', *Anarchist Studies*, Vol. 12, No, 2 (2004), pp. 147-61: pp. 158-59.

Benjamin Franks
Crichton Campus of the University of Glasgow
Rutherford McCowan Building
Bankend Road
Dumfries DG1 4ZL

b.franks@crichton.gla.ac.uk