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A NOTE ON SCHOLARSHIP

Revolutions are brought about
by those who think as people
of action and act as people of thought.
- Emma Goldman

This paper is not written for journal submission, nor for mandatory assignment (and as of present, not for dissertation fodder—although that may change), but rather for a decidedly political purpose. Further, this paper has a two-fold objective. One, to interject a consciousness and analysis of present-day anarchist movement into sociological thought. Two, to aid the anarchist movement in providing an academic context to its activism. It is this author's opinion that so-called “disinterested scholarship” is one of the most disposable commodities around, a practice that feeds the Spectacle without a desire to engage it. “The Spectacle” is an idea coined by the Situationist theorist Guy Debord:

In societies where modern conditions of production prevail, all of life presents itself as an immense accumulation of spectacles. Everything that was directly lived has moved away into a representation.... The spectacle is not a collection of images, but a social relation among people, mediated by images. The spectacle cannot be understood as an abuse of the world of vision, as a product of the techniques of mass dissemination of images. It is, rather, a Weltanschauung which has become actual, materially translated. It is a world vision which has become objectified. (Debord year, p. x)

Honest and inspired scholarship is the desired approach of this author, and every attempt to make the subject matter relevant to reality—and not the dusty shelves of library archives—has been made. As such, it should be stated from the outset that I am a strong sympathizer with anarchism in many of its formations, yet this “allegiance” has not discolored my objectivity.

Herein anarchism is dealt with in its vast diversity and is channeled through my own personal interpretations and understandings. As a result, the anarchism presented herein is a blend of the various trends I admire most. But, I have attempted to fairly include aspects that I strongly disagree with.

Presently, this piece is a mind-numbing collection of insights, musings, history, impressions, personal theories, etc. that are not properly formatted for either academic or public consumption. Thus, if you are reading this, you will likely notice a disjointed flow to the subject matter. This not only unintentional, but utterly predictable considering how this is being patched together from a broad and intimidating skeleton. I will [hopefully] have the humility and compassion to cut enthusiastically when the time arrives.
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Whenever possible, further information is given to aid the reader in exploring foreign concepts within anarchist thought and movement. Footnotes and references are as complete as possible—yet due to the less-than-mainstream nature of anarchism, some of these materials are not as accessible as would be desired. If further assistance is required in obtaining these resources, please contact the author. I apologize for the nauseating over-use of footnotes. This will hopefully be remedied in the future.

I feel somewhat unoriginal writing about anarchism, especially in a sociological context. It seems to me that these two frameworks/world-views are highly compatible and that this has been hinted at for quite a long time without being said forthrightly. Also, many people have written about anarchism – favorably and very unfavorably – for many years within many disciplines (although not sociology, in my humble opinion), and as such I am not uncovering anything radically new. All the same, I think the link needs to be formalized and thrust out for all to see. That is what I attempt in the pages to follow.

In the following literature reviews, I try to stay away from “radical” journals, especially the otherwise very useful Anarchist Studies and Social Anarchism (and even the more or less recognized Peace Review). They are obvious examples of scholarly anarchist literature, frequently presented in a sociological context. However, using them to construct a literature review on anarchism would be as creative as analyzing sports via Sports Illustrated.

Think about it. Or don't. **No one** is going to force you, ya know?

Thanks for understanding,
Dana

[Include a Ursula K. LeGuin quote from "The Dispossessed" for section header quotes]
INTRODUCTION

We make the world significant by
the courage of our questions and
the depths of our answers.
- Carl Sagan

There are more than a few ways to slice anarchism. There is no right way to do it, either. I try to present in the pages that follow a few different approaches to slice anarchism in a sociological fashion. To do so involves a number of contrasting views.

One approach is to deal with anarchism as a philosophy or anarchists as people – or rather, to study the theory as opposed to the practice. A second approach is to analyze explicitly (and intentionally) anarchist organizations and organizations that behave “anarchistically”, but do not describe or intend themselves as such. A third and final way is to explore anarchism via qualitative, quantitative, case studies, historical, and anecdotal studies and analysis.

I have opted to try all the above.

Anarchism has a long history, some argue a history that dates back to the inceptions of humanity, others at least since the mid-19th Century. Regardless of how one dates anarchist history, it clearly has a wide, varied, and confusing history. It is an ideal, a philosophy, a utopia, a stepping-stone, a yard-stick, and a lifestyle. It is also known to much of the world as an unmentionable word, a social disease, a state of societal decay, and a violent and chaotic thing. Anarchism has many champions and many enemies, ranging from assembly line workers, indigenous guerrillas, high school teachers, college students, artists and musicians, community organizers, and transients to heads-of-state, business press editors, police chiefs, and word-smiths everywhere who equate it with disorder.

A library could be filled with all the world's anarchist literature, yet unless the average person were searching for it, such literature might never be encountered in life. Anarchists surely live in every city throughout the world, but most people never know of their existence (or as with homosexual people, one never knows if their next door neighbor or co-workers might be one). An anarchist utopia is “no where”, but elements and tendencies of an anarchist society exist all around us. Indeed, many anarchists argue that anarchism is in all of us, it just takes a bully to bring it out of us and provoke us to resist.

Academically, the concepts and values of anarchism have been studied since the founding of sociology. They exist in Weber's theories of authority, Marx's notion of class and imperialism, the symbolic interactionist theory of spontaneous order, feminist analysis of gender and sexuality, Durkheim's organic and mechanical solidarity, and within the theories of organizations and democracy. Every now and again, sociologists have written about anarchism; sometimes accurately, other times not. But, more often they have
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indirectly wrote about the values it shares or the tools it uses to analyze society or bring about change. It is not surprising that the best anarchist writing has taken place well-outside the university, within the ranks of activists and practitioners.

**About me**

I should remark somewhere – and here is as good a place as any – that my own anarchism has grown over time to be influenced from many sources. I am not sure when I realized that I was an anarchist, but it was probably somewhere around 21 or 22, when my view of communism/socialism was so tainted by the deplorable actions of Bolsheviks, Maoists, Stalinists, and their correspondingly drone political parties, that I realized that the communism/socialism I had always believed in was really one grounded in anarchism—a complete rejection of a centralized, authoritarian power structure. I have always believed in democracy and self-determination too much for the aforementioned communist/socialist slime that has destroyed the Left's reputation.

I have been greatly influenced by anarchist writers and activists, by feminists, by liberals and conservatives (who push not enough or in the wrong direction). And I have always been conscious on some level my own rejection of authority. It is refreshing to recall all the authority figures who have gotten so under my skin in just minor ways that they provoked my usually calm self (or my sharp tongue) into action—from my first grade teacher to school bouncers to local thugs to cops on the beat. Thus, I have always had a strong feeling of dislike for being ordered around by individuals or “the system”.

I am appalled at the micro- and macro-level violence that plays out around me, whether through bullies or abusive spouses, or through the military or corporations. My own few and minor acts of oppressive and violent behavior have personally repulsed me so much that I shiver at their memory, although it is nothing comparable to what is done by the state, capitalism, and patriarchy, day-in and day-out.

In other respects, I have tried to shrug off all the privileges I have been given in my life, the privilege of White, straight male privilege. The privilege that one enjoys when coming from a middle-class, college-educated family. And the privilege that stems from living in the modern-day Roman Empire, where daily “struggle” is nothing like the struggle in a dictatorship propped up by the US government. All these privileges could allow me to live a successful life as a government technocrat or mid-level corporate manager. In that respect, my belief in anarchism (as a tool and a better world) is perverse to many, given my privileged disposition. A raving, dirty anarchist with dreadlocks is far easier for the media and elite to marginalize. For that very reason, I have decided to use my privilege against the system, to exploit cracks in the facade of elites, and to organize with those who are under the system's boot.

Some days, I hope (naïvely perhaps) that my altruism will not lead to a bigger ego or bank account, but a r/evolution that a Columbus, Ohio anarchist refers to as his “retirement plan”.
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RESEARCH ISSUES

The power to think
and the desire to rebel.
- Mikhail Bakunin

Problems with studying anarchists
● Small in number—super-minority of population
● Secretive / paranoid (trust issues)
● Decentralized—tough to locate/detect
● Radical—lacking access to mainstream communication channels
● Resistance to self-identifying
● Marginalized politically—polls re: politics/parties leave them out

Problems with studying anarchism
● Confusion / mis-information about definition
● Competition with others (ultra-right) over “ownership” of term
● Fear re: “radical” things

Alternative sources of information
● Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)
● Labadie Special Collections Library at U. Michigan (Ann Arbor)
● AK Press

Research of Anarchist Problems

One way to study anarchism and anarchists from a sociological vantage point is via theory (as done in the Sociological Theory chapter). A second vantage point is to identify and analyze the problems within anarchism in a sociological perspective. What follows is a short list of “problems” faced by the North American anarchist movement.

Anarchist movement problems
● burnout / “stickiness”
● green vs. red debate (see “Geographical” section in Organizations chapter)
● police surveillance and security culture
● creation of “dual power” institutions
● becoming more working class-focused
● question of organizational scope: affinity groups to continental federations
SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY

Are you ready for the real revolution, which is the evolution of the mind?
- Public Enemy

The Study of Anarchism Within the Academy

It would be relatively accurate to say that sociology has steered clear of present-day anarchism. As Gordon Marshall plainly puts it, “Sociologists have largely ignored or been critical of anarchist philosophy, yet it harbours a whole tradition of social organization, and a systematic theory of how societies work” (Marshall 1998, p. 20).

Marshall's entry in his “Dictionary of Sociology” fares better than the account in Johnson's (2000) dictionary. Marshall at least attempts to recount a few of the main anarchist theorists and activists (Godwin, Proudhon, Bakunin, Kropotkin), but fails as most do to realize that major expansions of thought to encompass other considerations. Marshall's oversights may not be deliberate, since the dictionary's parameters do not include entries of contemporary theorists. Thus, it follows the usual description of anarchism—in a purely historical context. To his credit, however, Marshall does mention Bookchin's social ecology. Johnson's text does not mention a single anarchist.

Creagh (2001) notes the distance between anarchism and academics:

> Universities have consistently overlooked anarchism. Despite some remarkable but scattered studies in various fields, academics have never tried to form a school of thought based on anarchist paradigms... Most research on anarchism – and the best – is done outside academia. (p. 19)

This may seem curious or surprising to some, but remember that the academy is a very hierarchical system with built-in mechanisms that make change and adaptation to the rest of society a slow process. Built in socialization of academics—to aspire to tenure and higher rank, and to avoid conflict with ideological opponents—brings about a culture in which so-called “deviant” ideas are scorned, particularly any semblance of favor or advocacy of such ideas.

Although some scholars do discuss anarchism, their representation often appears to be pre-figuratively biased. Also, scholarship has yet to really tackle the most recent incarnation of the anarchist movement, now more than a decade in the making. A gap of quantitative research has particularly been evident.

---

4 For a comprehensive, multi-faceted look at what anarchism is please see the appendix. There the reader will find a number of explanations/definitions that approach the question “what is anarchism?” from a variety of useful vantage points.
The increased focus upon anarchism may be attributed to, in part, the recent boom, especially in the West, to punk music subculture and the proliferation of the Internet. Politically, recent anarchist organizing internationally may be explained by the decline and subsequent failure of the authoritarian socialist states of the USSR and Eastern Europe. Since they represent a failed attempt to oppose capitalism, anarchism has once again risen to fill the void on the radical, anti-capitalist Left.

Although frequently overlooked in the academy, anarchism has been of sharp focus by the western media for a number of years now (again). Since the late 1990s, and especially after the anti-WTO meetings in Seattle, anarchists have been a fashionable target for media speculation and exaggeration. Reporters and popular writers have mused about anarchism, usually looking for a sensationalist hook for a story. The New York Times referred to anarchism—perhaps with dismay—as “the creed that won't stay dead” (Kahn 2000). Newsweek showed its surprise: “Anarchists... where did they come from?” (12/13/99, p. 4) Of course, most of this news coverage treats anarchism as merely another spectacle in our crazy society, and usually divorces anarchists from their politics. Also curious is the frequent usage of the phrase “self-styled” to describe anarchists, as if so-called anarchists are just “pretending” to be anarchists—sort of how maybe Democrats pretend to be Democrats or how baseball players are just pretending to be baseball players. Funny how we never hear of “self-styled Democrats” or “self-styled baseball players”!! [Do a Lexis-Nexis search on this phrase to show if it is being used more often now.] This is apparently another attempt to convince the public that anarchists are merely confused and ill-informed trouble-makers.

Anarchism fits into sociological theory in the following two ways: 1) it offers a critique of the problems in contemporary society and 2) it offers a vision of a better society and ideas on how to move towards it. Thus, anarchism is neither only an “anti” movement against society, nor is it an arrogantly Utopian fantasy disconnected from reality. Rather, it offers both critique and proposal on society and its issues. Sociology (particularly an activist sociology) would benefit, I think, from considering these two perspectives.

Anarchist scholarship in the social sciences is typically conducted in non-sociology fields, such as History or Political Science. In these disciplines, the emphasis is on the past movements and figures of anarchism or the actions of non-state political actors (or worse, the process of political chaos). It also has relevancy within economics as a non-market/capitalist version of goods/exchange. Anthropologically, it is akin to sociobiology and the development of human societies in a pre-state period.

After a strenuous overview of the various traditions within sociology, one is almost drawn to a post-modernist analysis of the inter-plays with anarchism. All four of the traditions studied below (conflict, utilitarian, functionalism, and symbolic interaction)
have many points of contact, and no one theory can even begin to address anarchism as it is understood and practiced today in North America. Whether in the general thinkers of the traditions or in the details ascertained from their conclusions, anarchism remains elusive to all four traditions. However, as a broad discipline, sociology's various traditions can together be used to understand anarchism. This is entirely logical, since sociology studies society, a thing that anarchists are intent on critiquing and influencing.

Burawoy (1979), in his neo-Marxist text “Manufacturing Consent”, writes:

The political implications of sociology stem from the adoption of a particular philosophy of history in which the future is the perfection of the present, and the present is the inevitable culmination of the past. From this all else follows. By taking the particular experiences of capitalist society and shaping them into universal experiences, sociology becomes incapable of conceiving of a fundamentally different type of society in the future; history is endowed with a teleology whose realization is the present. The sociological imagination is riveted in the present. What exists in natural, inevitable, and unavoidable.

(p. 13, my emphasis)

In contrast to such a self-replicating society and sociology, I wish to shave off and emphasize interesting parallels from sociology's periphery to suggest and build a case that – as the World Social Forum proclaims – another world is possible.

[From Sociological Theory: (Fenwick Soc 560/U. Of Akron; 8/28/03 thru 12/2/03)]

Using the “models of society” theory, we see two primary models, the conflict model and the order model. Marx and Weber can be considered founders of the conflict model which sees society as a collection of individuals and groups with conflicting interests, changing throughout time. Durkheim was a founder of the order model which views society as primarily stable, with multiple interests that are working for the good of all society. In the model theory, anarchists would fall neatly into the conflict model, seeing perhaps more conflict than Marx and Weber did at the time (which present-day Marxists largely acknowledge), such as racial, gender, sexual, and class oppression as integral parts of the prevailing order. However, anarchists are not only critics of the present system, they are (like Marxists) also envisioners of a new system, an organic system that would have order, but of a non-hierarchical nature (far different from the average order-model adherent).

Sociologists wholly fall into the Enlightenment-era camps of Liberal or Radical, terms that Collins (1994, 38-39) distinguishes from present-day labels by “Big L Liberals” or “Little L liberals” and “Big C Conservatives” or “Little C conservatives” (which in sociology only someone like Thomas Carlisle might be considered a Conservative). According to these value assumptions, anarchists may be located in the Radical (critical)
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camps of both the conflict and order models. Marx falls best in the Radical conflict model camp, Weber in the Liberal (non-conflict) conflict model, and Durkheim, Mead, and others in the Liberal order model. Marx's view of communism was somewhat in the same camp as the anarchists in that he envisioned a future order that was Radical, but he was primarily a critic nor a visionary. Additionally, Marxists continued Marx and Engels' initial ideas in a direction that was less Radical and more Liberal by employing elitist "revolutionary" vanguards, the deceptive "dictatorship of the proletariat" concept, and more individualistic (and thus Liberal).

Anarchists are Radical critics of the existent order, but envisioners of a better, more liberatory order. Although claiming anarchists believe in "order" may conflict (no pun intended) with many people's views of anarchism, it is, in fact, a widely accepted reality in anarchist literature—they believe in order, but an order that is liberatory and non-oppressive/non-authoritarian. Anarchists may be studied in the order camp in smaller capacities than the rest of society, which likely suits many anarchists fine. Small-scale, local programs of mutual aid and solidarity are often integrated into communities as "dual power" projects (see Social Movement section for more on dual power). Thus, unlike most Marxist activists who have pre-planned the perfect society, anarchists work towards it, sometimes in small steps, thus allowing sociologists to study these steps within the order model.

[Restivo (1993); Jaworski (1993); Welsh (1997): general academic/sociology theory]

Conflict

Marx

A major difference between Marxist and anarchist thought and research is very basic, yet very relevant to academics. Most Marxist thought currently takes place in universities, while most anarchist thought takes place outside of universities—in zines, on the Internet, in meetings, and in the streets. This is perhaps the major reason why there is such a deficit of "academic" anarchist thinking—practitioners are doing it as opposed to intellectuals. In essence, the practicing anarchists are the "academics" of anarchism. And, due to the tendency for direct action and anti-authoritarianism (such as in regards to the authoritarianism of the academy), this trend is unlikely to reverse.

According to Collins (1994, pre p. 80), Marx was not so much a sociologist as he was an economist, while his comrade Engels was the greater sociologist. There were definite schisms between Marx and the anarchists, who also came into influence at the same time as Marx. Proudhon and Bakunin were two pivotal anarchist theorists and activists who came into contact with Marx during his lifetime. In both cases there was a mixture of

7 This distinction is further brought out in what I call the “Etymology Model” of anarchism (see Appendix).
8 For a nice summary of the disagreements anarchists have and had with Marx and Marxism, please see the excellent “Anarchy FAQ” (Frequently Asked Questions) at http://www.anarchistfaq.org, specifically Section H and Appendix: Anarchism and Marxism (in v9.8).
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friendship and later animosity. In Bakunin's case, it could be termed as a personal animosity between the two, with Marx expelling Bakunin from the International Workingman's Association (aka “The First International”). These schisms and differences aside, there are many overlaps in Marx's sociology and that of the anarchists. Further, many anarchists would likely agree with Marx's (and Marxists') general conception of a conflict model; they would sharply differ in the theoretically and practical transition to a just and liberatory order model.

As a primarily atheistic political philosophy, anarchists likewise rejected the Hegelian idealism which proposed a spiritual, quasi-religious explanation to society. Present-day anarchists would also largely agree with Marx's dialectical materialism, insofar as his critique rests on the economical creation of class. Anarchists, however, view economic class as only one of a number of oppressive relationships within society. Also to be considered, anarchists submit, are patriarchy, White supremacy, homophobia, and general authoritarianism. Chomsky and others would likely partially agree with the Marxian claim of economic determinism as a primary factor in a material society, but broaden it to include other forms of production (social, cultural, political production). The existence of unequal and oppressive gender relations had little to do with bourgeoisie or proletariat interests, but more to do the influence of patriarchy. Similarly, the way in which the Western Hemisphere was cleared of its indigenous population and how Africans were stolen from their homelands to become slaves in the “new world” does not say much about the transition of feudalism to capitalism, but rather shows how racist Europeans were in their quest to justify the repression or “barbarous” peoples due to their “scientifically-proven” sub-humanity. Finally, subsequent Marxist thinkers placed the role of the State as the primary organ of political power to seize in order to evolve capitalism into socialism (and then communism). This naïve application of political dictatorship would rear its ugly head in numerous countries, and prove the Marxist strain known as Bolshevism as a sham to the ideas of socialism. Leninist and Stalinist Soviet Union, Castroist Cuba, and Maoist China stand as incredible examples of this insult. See Fernandez (2001) for more on Castro's oppression in Cuba.

Mbah (1997) notes similar things in Marx's “undeveloped” stage of economic development in a study of African tribes. He does not provide much in the way of research, but his claims support Marx's general thesis, although Mbah's portrayal of these societies is a more explicitly anarcho-communist society than the one Marx paints. (Marx did view the State as “withering away” after communist revolution, something that definitely did not happen after the Bolshevik revolution of 1917 in Russia. Even though his process was mis-ordered in respect to anarchists and the fact that he incorrectly predicted the future, his end-value was the same as the anarchists. This, of course, is large sector of disagreement within the socialists camps between Marxists and anarchists—do the means justify the ends? The anarchists would claim the means determine the ends.

---

9 Bakunin wasn't the only anarchist who came into conflict with Marx. The philosopher Joseph Pierre Proudhon (the first person to call themselves an anarchist) butted heads with Uncle Karl as well. CITE

10 Leo Tolstoy is an anarchist of major exception as a Christian, although one excommunicated from the Church for refusing to respect Church hierarchy (“Christianity in its true meaning destroys the state”) However, some disagree with the characterization of Tolstoy as an anarchist comparable to others of his era (Goehlert 1981). Also, the contemporary Catholic Worker movement is a vital example of religious anarchism (Boehrer 2003).
See the Models appendix for more on means and ends.)

Still, anarchists differed (and differ) much more within the “order model” of sociology with Marx, than within the “conflict model”. That is to say, that they agree with a great deal of Marx's analysis (conflict), but just not his solution (order). Or, it could be said, they agree with much of his sociology, but not his ideology. Much of Marxist thinking is, however, added on to Marx's writing long after he died. Thus, Marxian thinking more closely represents what Marx actually did say, as opposed to what his followers interpolated.

Revolutionary anarchists would agree with Marx in the dialectic; overthrowing capitalism to transition to the next epoch: socialism/communism. Some anarchists do not think that it has to take such a route, but rather could include an evolutionary change. This is sometimes called a “r/evolutionary” attitude.\textsuperscript{11}

The Marxian notion of property seems rather influenced by anarchists, specifically Proudhon, who famously observed that property is theft.\textsuperscript{12} Property is not just a thing, Marx said, but a relationship, and anarchists would agree (and maybe add that property is also a weapon). When some have property, it means others cannot have it, thus there is a deficit of equality and power. Anarchists further agree with the assertion that the state acts to protect economic power by way of property laws.

Marx's notion of alienation is shared by anarchists: the division of labor and distancing of workers from their own productive capacity and means can even be seen today. Workers in firms (blue or white collar) do not own what they produce, but rather must sell their labor in the market as a commodity. Anarchists (and many Marxists) call this, none to complimentary, wage slavery. Anarchists believe in self-determination, and the worker-management relationship is in direct conflict with this value. Incidentally, Marx was an astute anti-feminist and rather sexist: “[Marx] ran an authoritarian, Victorian home, regarded his wife as little more than housekeeper and mother of his children, and referred to her ... as merely a harried, 'silly' creature” (Collins 1994, p. 119, note 2).

Once getting beyond Marx's class simplification of only bourgeoisie and proletariat, we see he also used many other classes, including petite bourgeoisie, managers, and lumpen proletariat. All the same, much of Marx's theory rest upon only the first two classes. In fact, Marx claimed that the advance of capitalism would dither out these middle and lower classes, pulling some into the bourgeoisie and pushing most into the proletariat. Many bourgeoisie would be kicked out of the their high class during economic swings (caused by crises of overproduction), as well. With the introduction of Weber into sociology, the understanding of societal divisions becomes richer.

\textit{Weber}

Marx, often referred to as a single-cause theorist, had his ideas built upon by Weber, who

\textsuperscript{11} Graham Purchase, an Australian academic, takes this approach, specifically as he combines anarchism with an ecological understanding.
\textsuperscript{12} See Proudhon ?.
perceived multi-dimensional causes—something anarchists agree with. Although economic power is important to consider, so is political power. Anarchists would point to the USSR as a perfect illustration of this: political power created economic power.

Weber broadens his view of inequality to three dimensions: class, status groups, and [political] parties. Anarchist thinking is shared in all three of these. It should be noted, however, that while discussing Weber's positive intersections with anarchism that he was not, by any means, an anarchist, or even a socialist. According to Collins (1994, p. 82): “he truly did believe that capitalism was a superior social system”. That aside, Weber's contributions to conflict theory are still important to the anarchist critique.

Class is a group of people with the same life chances (education, health care, protection, etc.), and the better one's income, the better one's life chances, and thus the higher one's class. Anarchists view this as the operating component in capitalism, or as Chaz Bufe sarcastically puts it: a “self-made man” is “a businessman with a fortune of $10 million who began life under the handicap of inheriting a mere $1 million” (Bierce & Bufe 1995, p. 123).

Status groups are based upon cultural interests, consumption patterns, values, similar styles of dress, ethnicity, religion, and so forth. A number of these categories lend themselves to current anarchist theory, particularly ethnic and religious differences, such as they play out in racism and xenophobia. The selective interaction amongst only one's own status group when compounded with the fact that some status groups have more prestige than others, creates a society of apartheid or caste. Anarchist writers such as Crass (2001) note that White privilege in America can create a reality where a wealthy Black's status group is below a poor White's.

Finally, parties are groups organized on behalf of class or status groups. This can be taken to mean “political parties” or a generic “party”/organization. A colleague of Weber, Robert Michels, wrote that even within parties, power is not always evenly distributed, thus leading to inequality. Anarchists confirm this, insisting on the creation of organizations without hierarchy, while much of the Left operates within organizations that have hierarchical leadership structures. Further, most anarchists reject outright electoral politics (if not on principle, at least as the only answer to political change), and thus do not form political parties in the modern sense of the term, that interact with the political system in the hopes of electing candidates to the existing State.

Weber sees three kinds of authority (something that anarchists take very seriously): traditional, charismatic, and legal-rational. Traditional authority is the stuff of monarchies, priesthoods, and so forth, which places this “somewhat” at odds with anarchism, especially in regards to how these authorities are often inherited, derived from “divine” right, or are closed.

Charismatic authority is based upon the perceived extraordinary characteristics of an individual, for better or for worse. Anarchists have a similar uneasy relationship to this

---

13 For more on Weber's three authority types applied to the anarchist movement, please see the Social Movement chapter.
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type of authority (particularly when it is *practiced as an authority*); the concept of leadership has been challenging for contemporary North American anarchists, many of whom assert “we have no leaders”; others, like Jo Freeman\(^\text{14}\), who say this is little but a way to avoid accountability, and in the chaos allow an informal hierarchy to form. Thus, some anarchists say that leaders themselves are not the problem, but the centralized of leadership is. Therefore group-centered leadership is more desirable.\(^\text{15}\) Weber notes, and anarchists would probably agree, that charisma can be revolutionary, but leaders are mortal. The untimely deaths of Ghandi and King led to a leadership vacuum in the Indian and Afro-American liberation movements, vacuums that anarchists might ascribe to individual-centered leadership and not group-centered leadership.

Ironically, in a review of Weber's theory of authority, Blau (1963) states:

> There is also an anarchistic streak in charismatic movements, a disdain for routine tasks and problems of organization or administration, since the leader's inspiration and the sacred mission must not be profaned by mundane considerations. (Blau 1963, p. 308)

Although Blau may be incidentally correct that there is a “disdain for routine tasks” in some interpretations of anarchism, the whole premise is faulty. Using anarchism (which he does not do, explicitly) to describe charismatic authority (or even vice-versa) is rather contradictory, since anarchism refutes the charisma of individual leaders and does not, per se, reject organization. Indeed, two of the most well-known North American anarchist theorists, Noam Chomsky and John Zerzan, wholly reject the suggestion that they are charismatic leaders or idols of the anarchist movement.\(^\text{16}\)

Finally, legal-rational authority is the embodiment of authority in predictable standards. Authority derives from the position of the individual, not the individual itself—“President” Bush is not powerful because he is George Bush, but because he is [conventionally, at least, not by merit of actually winning the 2000 election] President of the United States. Thus, in theory, those in power are under the auspice of laws and rules, unlike charismatic or traditional authority where leaders are not beholden to anything except themselves or traditional institutions (which they can interpret). Charismatic authority can become institutionalized (especially after the passing of a leader—such as Jesus Christ) into a legal-rational form. Anarchists are also at odds with this brand of authority, since it lends itself to slow change, monolithic behavior, a lack of local autonomy, and a strong tendency towards bureaucratization (which anarchists view as a main, anti-social component in present-day capitalist states). As Blau (1963) notes:

> Democracy is subsumed under the legal order, although Weber makes it clear that a legal order is not necessarily democratic. On the contrary, the prototype of the legal order is autocratic bureaucracy. (Blau 1963, p. 314)

\(^\text{14}\) Freeman c.1970.  
\(^\text{15}\) Crass (2001) writes favorably of SNCC's Ella Baker in this regard. 
\(^\text{16}\) Yet, as with charismatic leaders, Chomsky and Zerzan still do get devoted followers.
Weber's conception of authority fits within his three primary modes of conflict: traditional authority within status groups, charismatic authority within class, and legal-rational authority within party organizations. Weber apparently had a soft spot for charismatic authority, and thought that legal-rational authority was a move into “an iron cage”. He said that if a society went socialist it would be very bureaucratic by taking over many businesses and nationalizing them. Although he never said this was bound to happen, it is an impressive insight into the Marxist-Leninist “revolutions” of the 20th century.

It would be safe to say that anarchists would likely reject all three of Weber's conceptions of authority, in favor of a fourth variety, which might be termed “respectful self-authority”. Rather than placing authority in institutions or a small number of individuals, anarchists think that people should have a strong sense of self-determination. Or, as some anarchists have stated: there is no authority but yourself. Yet, one's freedom ought to extend only as far as to not intrude upon the freedom of another. Thus, individuals should have a say in decisions to the extent that there are affected by them.17

Weber's theory on the state is especially lucid for anarchists. He defined (1922/1968) the state as an organization “claiming a monopoly over the legitimate use of violence upon a given territory” (Collins 1988, p. 131). Thus, the three essential elements of the state are (a) violence, (b) legitimacy, and (c) territory. States aspire to control the violence within their area. As such, they maintain militaries, police forces, prisons, and law-making ability to control those living in the state by violence. Other sources of non-state violence are marginalized and usually fought by the state because they challenge the its monopoly. The state is also “legitimate” in its use of violence. When the state and its violence are perceived as “legitimate”, citizens will often accept this violence and are more likely to obey the state's orders. In a sense, the more legitimate a state is, the less raw violence is necessary, although it still maintains the monopoly on violence (CITE HERMAN & CHOMSKY, “MANUF. CONSENT”). Finally, a state exists within a certain territory—once that territory is slowly ceded or lost, the state loses its power and authority inside it. The state apparatus has the ultimate authority within its territory, but loses that authority outside its boundaries. Only the most powerful states can exert authority into other states – as the US commonly does – which shows the weakness of those states infringed upon relative to the powerful states. It is unclear how economic violence (structural adjustment, corporate globalization, embargoes, etc.) play into this theory, since they are non-military (even though often backed by military threat). See Collins' (1988) summary of Weber's theory of politics and the state, pp. 131-135.

Other conflict

Modern conflict theorists, writing most intensely during the middle part of the 20th century, recognized that social structures are coercive, focused on the primacy of the economy in class struggle, and that there was a relative autonomy of political authority from economic interests. Contemporary North American anarchists might likely agree

---

17 For a few basic definitions of these concepts, see the Appendix's “Power model”, “Individual/Collective model”, and “Decision-Making model”.
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with much of this thinking, particularly that conventional social structures are coercive. Out of the consensus that there are things such as racism and sexism in society, this is logical. However, there has been acknowledgment from some sectors of anarchism that say that these cultural oppressions have somehow usurped class oppression, to the point that it is easier to gain support over issues of racial and gender discrimination than it is for issues of class oppression... a sentiment that would seem apparent in contemporary conflict theory. Lastly, anarchists agree that political and economic authorities are usually different people and organizations, but would disagree that they do not have a symbiotic relationship most of the time. The capitalist State functions in-tandem fashion with many forms of authority; whether they are truly independent (and at what level) is questionable.

The classic study of the American elite, done by C. Wright Mills in *The Power Elite* (1956) showed the “cohesive interpersonal network composed of top leaders in business, the federal executive branch of the government, and the military, who successfully controlled key national decisions” (Moore, et al. 2002, p. 726). In Moore's recent study, it was discovered that there was also a sizable connection with major nonprofit organizations to this elite network.

Dahrendorf argued in *Class and Class Conflict in Modern Societies* (1959) that Marx's assumption of class deriving from property was only partially correct. He states that authority actually supersedes property in power—an incredibly anarchist idea. Of course, economic power can be derived from property, but that property is attained and retained through the authority of economic laws and the State. Authority indicates control more surely than property does. Dahrendorf's definition of authority (the probability that a command will be obeyed) hinges upon the legitimacy given to the authority. From an anarchist standpoint, even though power may still exist, the authority of someone/organization can be simply revoked by refusing to respect its position of legitimacy. Thus, they(it can still force someone's actions, but the command itself is not being respected (therefore authority is lost).

Thus in modern society, most conflict plays itself out in organizations, primarily bureaucracies (intensely hierarchical organizations where orders flow from those above to those below). In any given conflict, there are order-givers and order-takers (in this sense Dahrendorf is reducing class struggle to a binary conception, like Marx). These two groups have latent interests that become manifest, i.e. class consciousness. Unlike Marx, Dahrendorf did not believe that manifest interests was inevitable, and that certain things could enhance or impede the process of interest group formation (groups that act upon their interests in a class-conscious manner). Anarchists have historically approached the question of “manifestation” differently than Marxists. Lenin specifically advocated a vanguard that would lead the people into revolution, while anarchists claim that only the people can lead themselves in to revolution. Any other process would be a subversion of goals and needs by anarchist “leaders”, divorced from the people/workers/proletariat themselves.

---

18 Semantically, the word “order” is here more synonymous with “command” rather than with “organization”. Anarchists are frequently libeled as being pro-disorder. They are, in fact, usually opposed to disorder and are pro-order, just not a hierarchical form of social organization.
Lenski wrote “Power and Privilege” (BOOK or ARTICLE?) in 1966, stating that the technological history of humanity can be viewed through the opposites of subsistence and surplus. As a new technology comes along to a stable, subsistence economy/society, it allows for greater surplus. Subsistence is based upon altruism (Kropotkin might have called it “mutual aid”), while surplus is based upon power—who controls the surplus. Lenski argues that as surplus increases, so does inequality. The ecology movement, and especially the anarchist influenced wings (such as deep ecology, social ecology, even primitivism) have advocated a more sustainable society, in balance with the natural world (upon which surplus is extracted), and the reduction of surplus for this very reason. Some “anarchists”, such as “Miss Ann Thrope”, asserted in an early issue of the Earth First! Journal (May 1, 1987) that things like the AIDS virus would in fact be good for the earth, because it would wipe out large numbers of humans, thus lessening humankind's ecological imprint upon the planet. Bufe (year?) in “Listen Anarchist!” attacks this notion, just as Bookchin does with his theory of social ecology (which says neither humans nor the earth need be sacrificed to preserve the planet, and that hierarchy is actually at the root of both natural and human exploitation).

Lenski sees a decrease in relative inequality since industrialization—which anarchists would likely argue is true in a certain sense. More people do own property than during feudalism and standards of living are higher (at least in the West). One view anarchists have is that this represents the continual throwing-off of oppressions (feudalism, slavery, etc.) and that hopefully society is being compelled towards a great equilibrium. Other views may agree with Lenski's explanation of this phenomenon as resulting from the democratic revolutions, technological advances that aid in sharing, technological specialization forcing greater wealth sharing, and the exploitation of non-industrial society. Obviously, this “reduction” in inequality in the West is a mixed-bag. Regardless, anarchist still criticize the gaps within the privileged countries and the gaps between privileged and non-privileged nations as scandalous and view State-capitalism as the primary economic engine of maintaining this relationship.

Wallerstein proposes a theory of capitalism in his series The Modern World System (1975). He takes a more Marxist (and more geographical) approach to explaining why certain countries were able to amass power over others. Core countries are the economically dominant ones (which geographically-speaking are not really the center of anything, but rather at the periphery of others). Periphery countries are those who are exploited by the core countries. The periphery finds itself often in the midst of geographically hostile locations, such as the Middle East. Inner-European countries did not excel as much in industrial capitalism (initially, at least) as much as England or the US did, because they have many shared borders and hostile neighbors (especially each other). The conflict between core and periphery countries is essentially as class conflict of countries—something that anarchists would whole-heartedly agree with. The core countries today could be viewed as the G8 states, while the periphery would include much of the underdeveloped or developing world, i.e. a neo-colonialist relationship. Modern anarchists have clearly understood this, as evidenced by the large number of those who work on anti-corporate globalization efforts against international economic institutions, such as the World Trade Organization (WTO), World Bank, and the

19 See the Appendix’s “Historical Tendency” model.
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Critical theory says that conflict is not in the realm of resources, but in the realm of culture and ideas. Anarchism appears to be somewhat sympathetic to this view, too, since the quest to overcome oppressive ideologies (and replace them with freedom) is a battle of ideas, i.e. is socialism more just than capitalism, can egalitarian families be constructed minus patriarchy, etc.? The “oppression” of rationalization kills our creativity, says critical theory, and anarchist would likely say similar things (the Machiavellian quest for economic efficiency is detrimental to creative and liberating social relations).

Georg Simmel's conflict theory of sociation does not address inequality, but abstract forms. He says society is patterned interactions, in which humans interact with each other in patterns that exist on the level of individuals or nations. Simmel focused on the patterns of interactions not the content itself. This can be applied to network theory (where parties interact with each other in huge spiderwebs of connections). There is a distinction between strong and weak ties. A close tie is an intimate or family connection, while weak ties are acquaintance connections. This difference would be useful for anarchists (and other leftists) to understand why the same people get recycled through their movements (via only strong connections). Weak connections (ties to outside groups) gives access to more information and thus more possibility for movement building—a fancy way of repeating the old adage: “don't preach to the choir”. Thus, each sociation has both positive and negative aspects: fighting and arguing over something (such as political views or values) is negative, but the fact that it is important enough to fight over is positive (according to Simmel's thinking).

Simmel also distinguishes between conflict and competition: conflict requires the defeat of an opponent to achieve a goal, while competition is parallel efforts by opponents to achieve the same goal, but the defeat of the opponent does not mean you are successful in completing your goal. This is a useful lens for the direct action movement to consider: does locking down a street for an hour or two accomplish a goal, even though the opponent (police, the city, conference delegates, “the system”) is temporarily beat? According to Simmel, such things are not true conflict, but rather competition (in this example, competition for control over city streets or access, but not conflict that challenges/changes existing power relations). Perhaps a corollary to this theory might be to say that competition can be channeled into conflict (via social revolution)?

Concepts of conflict resolution can be derived from Simmel. First, inter-group conflict between group members can lead to factions, something all anarchists know about due to the strong feelings many anarchists have about things. In recent years, there has been much contention within anarchist organizations about issues of racism, sexism, homophobia, etc. The “APOC” (anarchist people of color) movement has been very encouraging in one of these respects—collectives and conferences are occurring in many parts of the US now.

External threats, in the form of common enemies can unify factions and reduce internal

---

20 Including other neo-colonist organizations and schemes: TABD, APEC, WEF, NAFTA, FTAA, MAI, and other alphabet soup acronyms.
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conflicts. This can be seen by anarchists and radical organizing against recent institutions where people converge to take direct action in spokes-councils and black blocs—even Marxists organizations take part and ignore their disagreements for the purpose of confronting their common foe.

Another concept of conflict resolution says that highly centralized and highly decentralized organizations are the most successful in conflicts. Nothing illustrates this more clearly than how highly centralized and hierarchical organizations such as police forces are sometimes comparably matched with incredibly decentralized formations of anarchist protesters. As Naomi Klein states that the anti-globalization movement is “a movement whose greatest tactical strength so far has been its similarity to a swarm of mosquitoes” (Klein 2000b). Centralized groups are successful because they can mobilize rapidly and efficiently. Decentralized groups are successful because they must be fought one-at-a-time. Simmel (?) believes, however, the tendency is towards centralization, thus indicating to anarchists that they must work hard to keep autonomy of organizations and keep power decentralized.

Finally, conflict resolution theory regarding multiple group affiliations shows how conflict can decrease with overlapping affiliations. To continue to example of street conflict, when anarchists and police both shop at the same grocery store, visit the same museums, belong to the same block club, take their kids to the same parks, etc., the potential for conflict in other situations (direct actions) is reduced. More complex societies have more organizations and thus more overlap like this, thus reducing the intensity of societal conflict. This perhaps is evidence of lessened racial and labor conflict in recent years (more integrated neighborhoods and more blurring of class distinctions).

Collins (1994), however, is highly critical of Simmel's “conflict theory”, which posits a rather individualistic and bourgeoisie version of that theory. All the same, an interesting analysis that intersects with anarchism can be found in Simmel's “Essays in Sociology, Philosophy and Aesthetics” (1965). In a chapter called “The Sociological Error of Socialism and Anarchism” he states that these philosophies' quest for freedom are doomed because they “always bring about domination because large groups must always be hierarchical” (discussed in Collins 1994, pp. 113-115). Interestingly, many anarchists also claim that broad, monolithic political movements and institutions are crushing of human freedom (i.e. Bolshevism, Maoism, bureaucracy), and thus advocate a localization of decision-making and a federalization for larger-scale organization. Whether or not Simmel understands this reality of anarchist organization is questionable.21

Collins cites the similarities of Simmel's views to his contemporary Friedrich Nietzsche, who was, incidentally, popular reading amongst some anarchists of his time.22 This point illustrates the importance that anarchist place not only upon socialism, but also individual freedom. The criticism lobbied by Simmel against anarchism—that it must be done in large groups—is inaccurate, but his general point is important in reference to democracy. Anarchists believe that democracy is best (and most easily) done in smaller groups, where

---

21 For what it's worth, my guess is “no”.
22 The Russian-American anarchist Emma Goldman wrote positively of Nietzsche's writing in her autobiography Living My Life (pp?). Yet, some also opposed Nietzsche—see Kinna (1995) regarding Kropotkin's opposition.
a non-coercive consensus can actually emerge. This practice is well illustrated by the affinity groups of the Spanish anarchists during the Spanish Civil War, whose federation in the CNT and FAI was a powerful and flexible method for organizing during that social revolution. The most colorful recent exploration of these concepts can be found in *Anarchy in the Age of Dinosaurs* by the Curious George Brigade (2003).

**Utilitarian/Rational**

John Locke, the godfather of utilitarianism, believed in the expansion of individual rights and the idea of the social contract. In society, each person has contractual rights and obligations to each other. While anarchists would agree with the general sentiment of Locke's beliefs, they would reject the notion that such rights and obligations would have to be codified in a “contract” or in the laws of a government. As Utah Phillips stated: “the state can't give you free speech, and the state can't take it away; you're born with it, like you eyes and ears (exact quote?)” (DiFranco & Phillips 1996, “Anarchy”). Although Locke stated that the state should not rule, but govern, the distinction is a marginal one for anarchists.

Jeremy Bentham argued against the penal system and debtor prisons—a sentiment that anarchists have always aligned themselves with. Many “golden era” anarchists/radicals tended to spend long years in prison (like Bakunin and Berkman) for their political beliefs, writings, and activities.25

However, general utilitarian thinking asserts that pursuit of individual interests lead to a better society. Although anarchists believe strongly in personal freedom, they would wholly reject the idea that simply pursuing individual interests (as if in a vacuum) would lead to a better society. In fact, most would argue that the self-centered drive of capitalism has lead to the depersonalization and alienation of humans from each other. As xxxBakunin?xxx stated, “all anarchists are socialists, but not all socialists are anarchists”, there is a general understanding that humans are social creatures and they need each other both for the continuation and protection of the species, but also for emotional and psychological reasons.26

That is not to say that anarchists would disagree with that being the effective way that modern capitalism operates (or wishes people to act). Anarchists have repeatedly remarked upon the push of capitalism to demand intense consumers, hand-over-fist barterers, and strong self-salesperson-ship. This push for ever increased efficiency is a numbing one. (In fact, Sheppard (2003a) argues that rather than being efficient, capitalism is actually incredibly inefficient!) The reduction of personal interactions (be

23 Find more about affinity groups, the CNT-FAI, and the Spanish Civil War in the chapter entitled “Organization”.
24 This book is published under the auspice of the well-known (or perhaps notorious) moniker “CrimethInc.”, whose inclinations have consistently been towards a more self-empowerment anarchism, than a social movement anarchism.
25 See Berkman 1999 and the Anarchist Black Cross ?? for more information about anti-prison beliefs of anarchists.
26 See Kropotkin's *Mutual Aid* and Glassman's excellent article (2000) on Kropotkin's sociobiology.
they economic of not) to cost-benefit arithmetic is not only an inaccurate of typical human behavior, but offensive to anarchists. Emma Goldman proclaimed: “I believe in freedom, the right to self-expression; everyone's right to beautiful, radiant things”. Her remark eloquently located the anarchist priority in life: an inspired and creative existence—not a cutthroat one. Put perhaps another way, anarchists have historically tended to be dreamers more often than accountants.

Anarchists would, however, agree with the critique offered by March & Simon (1957) when they said that people do not attempt to maximize utility, but to satisfy it. Thus, rational choice theory gave birth to “bounded rationality”. Anarchists understand this to mean that the poor do not usually either rise-up or pull themselves from poverty into suites because they are simply trying to survive. It is next to impossible to expect a homeless person—or someone one paycheck away from the streets—to spend their time attempting to maximize their utility (if that were even possible with incomplete knowledge of all their options). Thus, people try to get by, and even to numb themselves after long days of work with pleasant distractions like sports, drugs, TV, sex, and such. This approach could be viewed as a “minimization” instead of a “maximization”. The closer one gets to the top, the more crucial it is to maximize one's utility, but the further to the bottom of the class pyramid, the more likely it is for to feel continually defeated.

Again, March & Simon's idea that knowledge is limited extends to the realm of organizations. Since no one person can conceivably have all relevant knowledge for all situations, all the time, organizations allow for a distribution of responsibilities and skills. Formal organizations, especially corporations, delegate roles and employees, thus overcoming the limitations of knowledge. Thus, Oliver E. Williamson argues, corporations and government replace the idea of the truly free market approach (that everyone competing equally produces the best overall results) by this specialization. Anarchists would counter that this intense specialization (whether on a factory floor or in a white-collar cubicle) tends to bore the shit out of the worker, thus reducing their joy in doing rewarding and creative work. Even though the values of corporations and government ought to be avoided by anarchists (specialization ad naseum, bureaucratization, large hierarchies), the initial assumptions should be taken to heart—they are institutions founded on the premise that completely free market/utilitarian people cannot make the best choices all the time, thus they unite under organizations for their (economic and political) benefit, respectively. Anarchists often take the same approach—with organization nearly anything can be accomplished. Also, the presence of others (especially in non-hierarchical settings) inspires great confidence and strength.

Exchange theory, developed by George Homans in the 1950s, looked at how individuals interacted with each other. “Homans Law” asserts that the more that people interact, the more they will like each other. And the more they like each other, the more they will interact. This is mainly true, Homans said, in the case of equals interacting. This is a way of understanding how those of the same class tend to interact with each other. Also, deliberate anarchists would say that organizers should attempt to break into this cycle by beginning to interact with those they might not otherwise; in doing so they will help to

27 The Industrial Workers of the World, an anarcho-syndicalist union (“One Big Union” was their slogan) lived and breathed the notion of organized solidarity and strength.
develop more empathy for them (and vice-versa). Building movements of resistance and building tolerance seems to be vital in this regards. Further, efforts at multi-cultural education and unity indicate the value that solidarity can play in minority group protection. Take, for instance, the threats that people of Muslim or Arab descent faced in the US following the attacks on September 11, 2001. Years of multi-culturalism helped non-Muslims and non-Arabs to realize that those facing attacks in the US were their brothers and sisters, and they should stand with them against racist and xenophobic behaviors. Thus, the country saw wide-spread solidarity with Muslims and Arabs, including anarchists standing guard outside of Mosques and neighbor visiting neighbor telling them to come to them if they felt unsafe. Yet Hartung (1983) states that:

Homan's human exchange theory, offer[s] barely concealed rationales for the continuation of things-as-they-are in an exercise of politicalization by omission... [T]he competition of the marketplace, and the notion of profit maximization, lie at the base of human relations according to Homans... social order is contingent upon either the distribution of goods and services based on a paucity of talented and trained individuals hierarchically channeled; or upon a tacit social contract between “buyer” and “seller”. (Hartung 1983, pp. 85 & 87)

Thus, although at a basic level the ideas of solidarity seem to flow from Homans—people interacting increasingly in a pleasurable and positive way—anarchists would argue that the commodification of humans deeply insults the needs and vision of a free people.

Peter Blau developed exchange theory to explain society in general. He said that social structure is based upon exchange and had three components: 1) behavior is determined by expected reward, 2) norm of reciprocity, and 3) the norm of fair exchange. The third point has been an interesting one to anarchists recently, whether in terms of supporting campaigns of “fair exchange” goods and services, or in the theory of “participatory economics” (aka “ParEcon”) developed by Michael Albert and Robin Hahnel. Albert writes (2000) that a fair remuneration (in a workplace, at least) should be based upon effort and sacrifice of the worker.

But, why don't the poor rebel? Marx thought it was because the methods of repression were arrayed against them (anarchists would agree with this thought). Yet, Brian DellaFare wrote in “The Meek Shall Not Inherit the Earth” (BOOK or ARTICLE?) (1980) that socialization processes devalued the work of the working class, thus convincing them that they earned what they deserved. He saw evidence of this socialization in schools, in families, and in workplaces. Lower-class schools tend to be more oriented towards discipline and place less emphasis on creative thinking and exploration. Working class families tend to be more patriarchal and order giving and taking oriented, where as middle and upper class families deviate from patriarchy in many respects. Finally, at workplaces, there are always people giving orders to the workers, while the managerial class is giving the orders (thus finding a more fulfilling existence). Thus, if people who receive the fewest rewards for their efforts believe they deserve it,
they will not rebel. This is a fiercely anarchist argument—the state, patriarchy, and capitalism working to diminish the desire for freedom in people. The other side of the coin suggests that the more say the one has in their life, the happier, more fulfilled, and more empowered they will become... an anarchist existence truly! Thus, anarchists once again accept multiple reasons as the explanation for the lack of open rebellion in the US – both subtle propaganda/socialization and less-than-subtle repression.

Anarcha-feminists would argue that many feminists are already anarchists (they tend to resist authority and seek collective liberation). According to Farrow (2002): “Feminism practices what anarchism preaches. One might go as far as to claim feminists are the only existing protest groups that can honestly be called practicing Anarchists” (p. 15). Thus, the ideas offered by Joan Huber about gender stratification come as no surprise. Huber saw that some societies had more equal rewards between genders than others. In fact, the most equal societies were those in which there was the least restriction on women working outside their homes (and away from child rearing). The ability of women to be autonomous in their actions was key to their equality in rewards, compared to men. Huber does not seem to always state this, in particular in observing the growing equality in the late industrial period and seeing various technological enhancements (she borrowed from Lenski) as the facilitators of this equality as opposed to increased political equality or the feminist movement. (BUT, I COULD BE WRONG)

If conflict theory points towards the collective side of anarchism—arguing for class war/struggle, solidarity, collective resistance, communism—then utilitarianism, in perhaps less of a strong way, points towards the individual side of anarchism. This includes the need for self-determination, the free will of individuals, and personal freedoms. Yet, the coldness of utilitarianism is usually predicated on the notion of an economic exchange, devoid of deeper concerns. Not to say that all things being exchanged are economic in nature, but that the exchange is conducted as if it were in a market place.

However, it needs to be restated that anarchists do not share the assumption of utilitarian thinking that says that individuals in pursuit of personal interests and utility will create a better society. They do however accept (in part) the classic Liberal desire to expand individual liberties (but place that expansion within the confines of collective unity and freedom). How humans choose to act collectively is based on the idea of voluntary association, not coercion.

Given that individuals are self-interested, how do they behave socially/collectively? According to utilitarian thinking, they act only insofar as their interests lead them to. Why do [some] people give up some of their autonomy and sovereignty? The answer offered is usually that this allows people some control over others’ autonomy.

Mancur Olson points to the “free rider problem” as a case where some enjoy public goods with no personal cost. The paradox is why would people contribute to a public cost when

---

28 See the Appendix’s “Individual/Collective” model for more on this premise.
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they could get it for free? Of course, if everyone thought and acted so, the public good would not be paid for (and not just talking in economic terms), and no one would be able to enjoy it. Thus, how do social and political movements start and gain power when people can enjoy the gains of these movements without even participating in them? Olson says that “selective incentives” are what keep people involved: the addition and subtraction of public goods. For example, why do people contribute money to public radio or television, while they could still listen and watch them without contributing? (Put aside, temporarily, the fact that these services are paid for substantially through public tax dollars already...) Because they are offered incentives for doing so, like t-shirts, CDs, coffee mugs, and so forth. The anarchist reaction to “selective incentives” might be that, yes, everyone needs to feel that they are personally getting something out of contributing to such things (like NPR or PBS), but that they do not (or rather should not) need to be based in the form of some material commodity.

Olson writes (quoted in Collins, p. 169), “the larger the group, the farther it will fall short of providing an optimal amount of a collective good”. Anarchists, of course, agree and feel that society itself (not only activist organizations) must be scaled down to a smaller, personal level. He also refers to a latent group which is a very large organization. Anarchists see latent groups as the overly large liberal organizations, such as the Sierra Club, National Organization of Women, and such—that have decent values, but are so top-heavy that individual participation in them is almost meaningless.

The anarchist understanding of why people contribute to movements, especially things like the anarchist movement is better explained by James Coleman.

Coleman, in explaining his “second order free rider problem”, thought that zeal was a primary motivator for those who are passionate and willing to pay any cost. This conception points towards the acts of suicide bombers, Navy SEALS, and radical activists. Why would they be willing to pay such high costs for a public good? Including Navy SEALS in this example along with radical activists shows the difference in their power position targets: SEALS either participate because a) they truly believe that military violence is necessary to protect American freedom or b) they are mislead in the real purpose they play in geopolitics. Thus, are SEALS really expanding the public good by their actions, or are they involved in war crimes? SEALS are usually involved in reducing the power of the already powerless. Activists, on the other hand, also feel they expand the public good, although they usually target the powerful (and try to reduce their power). Thus, both SEALS and activists both try to reduce others' power, but in opposite ways, for divergent reasons.

It is, in essence, altruistic behavior versus free riders, for those who enjoy public goods. Anarchists, of course, believe that all have a right to public goods, but that they ought to be involved in securing and supporting those goods, and that the goods should be rewarded distributed to those who need them most. (??) The emergence of norms is where the zeal comes from, Coleman says.

Norms are 1) purposefully generated and individuals see themselves as benefiting from the existence and observation of them, 2) enforced by sanctions (rewards for obeying,
punishments for violating), and 3) norms are internalized, and thus people sanction themselves. In terms of anarchism, these three points are relevant to the ideas of order and law. Since anarchists believe there can be order (even rules) without authority figures (or rulers), the idea of norms is very important. The first point, seems relevant to the example offered by Fox (quoted in Barr 2002) about obeying traffic signals; not because its the law, but because its a good idea—everyone benefits from observing them. Fox explains:

Anarchy isn’t a rebellion against all norms... I obey traffic lights, but I don’t obey them because it’s the law. I obey them because it’s a good thing to do. (p. ?)

The second point implies some kind of authority figure or body that sanctions others for their behavior. Anarchists would likely suggest that communities sanction individuals for behaviors, or, as in the third point, that they sanction themselves. Thus, one does not drive through red lights in traffic because they know the dangerous consequences to the safety of themselves and others (3), not because the police are going to arrest them for it (2).

Norms are still tenuous things. Many people disagree in society on what are problems and what to do about them. Anarchists feel that emphasizing the first and third points above would advance the idea of a norm, more than the second point, which seems to point towards an authority figure or a law. [Explain this more... think about more...] Thus people give up autonomy for these norms, in exchange for fairness, safety, and in exchange for partial control over the rights of other people's behavior. Anarchists, and other left/liberal folk would call this “the common good”.

Coleman further states that there are two ways to guarantee that norms are followed: 1) “leadership” that makes them/encourages them to follow it. Hire police, regulators, or other organizations to monitor and enforce the norms. But, in addition to being costly, anarchists feel that this infringes upon individual liberty. 2) Establish of social structures and closed social networks that allow for the internalization of norms by involved parties. Anarchists would like this attitude much more, because it seems to allow for localized norms—what is good for one local community might not be for another. But Coleman points to another problem, that the tighter a social network, the more internalization and incremental sanctioning. Studies show that homogeneous social networks are more likely to vote and that closed networks encourage zealotry. Conversely, heterogeneous social networks are less likely to vote and the less closed networks encourage free riding. For anarchists, this paradox exists: how to encourage a diversity of opinions and backgrounds and still encourage people to be active? Also, closed anarchist scenes also seem to foster zealotry, as does the anarchist movement itself—indicated by many suggestions to wholly reject reform or liberalism, and to “not compromise!”—which would indicate that “the movement” is still rather insular.

Good examples of “anarchist” zealotry can be found, in this author's opinion, in the acts of the Animal Liberation Front (ALF) and Earth Liberation Front (ELF), and for the call by some anarchists to engage in armed resistance domestically (in an already marginalized movement). It would seem plausible that if anarchists read less Bakunin and
CrimethInc\(^{29}\), and interacted more with the general population, they would find that they need to make anarchism a mainstream idea/tendency, not a separatist one. For further examples of “no compromise” with Earth First! see Lange (1990).

**Functionalism/Durkheimian**

The notion of a collective conscience is central to Emile Durkheim's writing, a form of “pre-contracted solidarity”. Durkheim uses, for instance, the work of Rousseau and his idea of a “general will” to understand solidarity and non-economic interests. Rousseau believed that society could be advanced by people talking out their differences, finding common ground, and thus uniting. Although this is considered a bit naïve by anarchists—those in power are not willing to discuss lessening their powers unless they are somehow endowed with altruism or are up against a wall—it still has relevance to the general optimism of anarchists that humans can generally be trusted to understand the problems of the world given the proper information to do so. Flowing from Rousseau's general will would be the idea and method of “consensus decision making”, which most anarchist affinity groups and collectives operate on. Consensus can be seen as the synthesis of both self-determination and solidarity, since once a general will (a common goal or politic) is accepted by a group of people, a non-hierarchical way is considered best to overcome differences in solving problems.

Another sizable French influence upon Durkheim was Montesquieu, who emphasized the inter-connectedness of all social phenomena: social, economic, religious, political, etc. This view is very compatible with anarchism, which also sees all sectors of modern society as interlocking institutions which either reinforce each other or can be modified to work against each other. For instance, anarchist believe the equalization of economic standing will bring greater political equality. The more fair our political institutions deal with the issues of race, gender, and sexuality the more fairly cultural and social institutions will reflect. And so on. (An artistic rendition of this idea can be seen in the poster created by the Federation of Revolutionary Anarchist Collectives (FRAC-GL) which shows a brick being thrown into a system of gears bearing the following labels: war, capitalism, fascism, white supremacy, government, patriarchy, and homophobia. [Insert graphic of this poster as a “figure”?] )

Herbert Spencer's monograph “The Social Organism” contrasted human societies with living organisms (the “organic analogy”) and greatly influenced Durkheim. The similarities to Kropotkin's “Mutual Aid” study should not be lost: Kropotkin demonstrated how mutual aid tendency ran through animal species and through various stages of human societies. Durkheim differs with Spencer in that he rejects the idea of “contractual solidarity”. Anarchists also echo this sentiment, saying that there is a deeper basis of society than a “market system”, one based upon morality. Durkheim says pre-contractual solidarity comes from trust. Even where there is no immediate trust between people (people who do not even know each other), anarchists suggest that there can be and often cases is a good will between people.

---

Durkheim's notion of social facts (social structure), particularly in his *Suicide* study, indicates what is essentially an anarchist tension—while group cohesion is a strong indicator of avoiding suicide in the West, too much cohesion also indicates suicide (as in Japan). This can be interpreted as saying that too much or too little group cohesion is (generally) bad. Anarchists agree with this, and emphasize both the values of individual and collective cohesion, particularly in the form of voluntary association and federation. Extending Durkheim's terminology, this would be the common ground between egoistic and altruistic suicide.

The “collective conscience” is the glue that holds together society, according to Durkheim. The basis of social solidarity is moral in nature. Since solidarity is a key value to anarchists (see the Appendix's “Values” model), there is much to say about this in anarchist context. The differences between “mechanical solidarity” and “organic solidarity” can be dealt with in an anarchist fashion—when society becomes more complex and moves towards a point where there is widespread individualism, diversity, and such, solidarity becomes less about the mechanically replicated type of solidarity offered to those of like-mind and kin, but more of a diverse kind of solidarity that respects those with differences. To an anarchist, solidarity is offered not just to those like oneself, but specifically to those who are unlike oneself, but facing oppression and authority. The diversity of modern society (and the lack of individual or collective conformity) mandates this type of solidarity, and is why anarchists have long held that a diverse, modern society is more compatible to anarchism than a primitive one (although one might think the opposite).

Durkheim rejected the utilitarian assertion that solidarity was merely contractual and rational. He thought that solidarity was, in fact, pre-contractual and that trust was the basis for solidarity. Any anarchist would tell you the same thing—trust of the common person is a defining characteristic of an anarchist. While Marxism has frequently argued that people must be *lead* to a revolution, anarchists think that common people have the ability to do it themselves, and trust in their abilities to do so. With the exception of the powerful elite, anarchists trust most of society to do what is right (in Durkheim's moral definition: non-economic self-interest) and help others. When variations (deviance, such as violent crime) occurs, anarchists still understand the ability of people to rise above these things—specifically through struggling against the dynamics that foster such problems (patriarchy, racism, homophobia, violence, injustice, intolerance, and so forth).

Functionalism asserts (and an anarchist would agree) that individuals, organizations, and institutions serve a functional purpose for that society. Thus crime, is normal, although not desirable by most. Further things such as war, poverty, racism, sexism are also serve particular functions, although not desirable by most. Anarchists argue that war enriches weapons manufacturers, allows corporations access to resources and materials from places conquered (or occupied), and serves right-wing ideologues to justify their “might is right” philosophies. Poverty serves capitalism, by allowing owners cheap labor to pull from, to create the highest profits. Racism functions for the benefit of creating tensions amongst economic and social classes, by creating media images of criminals, and by providing cheap labor. Sexism exists to fulfill the need of patriarchal family dominance, easy male access to women as sexual objects, and to serve as capitalism's unpaid
domestic workers. Of course, anarchists would like to see all these “normal” dynamics done away with, but they understand that they are not mere accidents and that they continue to exist because many people/institutions either directly benefit from them or have no desire to expend the effort to end them.

Durkheim's *Elementary Forms of Religious Life* (year?) offers anarchists insight into the reverence held for objects endowed with special meaning—for example flags, corporate logos (and the windows they appear upon), swastikas, etc.—and signify some sort of solidarity. Thus, anarchists ought to view these things as poor conclusions made by otherwise needing people. He sees two kinds of forces in society, the profane and the sacred. Inanimate (or profane) objects such as flags can be transformed from pieces of cloth to sacred objects and become part of the collective conscience. Durkheim thinks these symbols are necessary to retain society (by reminding individuals of the group). Often, they become more than mere representations of the collective conscience and become a part of it. That is why there is such strong reaction towards burning the flag or ripping up a Bible; it is as if someone were burning America or ripping up Christianity itself!

Anarchists also might see the similarities in the microcosm of the movement, such as that placed upon symbols such as the “circle-A” or the black flag. Of course, this is a generalization—and slight over-exaggeration—but a similar profane-to-sacred transformation even occurs in anarchist circles. An additional interpretation of this may be seen by action by the black bloc to smash corporate windows in order to destroy the illusion of power/ubiquitousness these symbols exert. A symbolic action against a symbolic object.

The process of giving up individualism for group solidarity should inform anarchists to the functioning of ultra-nationalism, religious fundamentalism, and corporatism. People often feel obligations to the whole, and thus sanction themselves. They give in, respect society, and gain a sort of moral/mental energy. According to Durkheim, this internalization allows people to “become” Americans or whatever. In fact, this can be extended to nearly any sector, demographic, and organization where people identify with/as something and thus must “give up” their individuality. Anarchists recognize while there is nothing inherently bad in giving up some individualism for the collective, that it should not be done naively or uncritically. Further, to identify too strongly with a group often leads to future rejection of immoral behavior by the group.

Marcel Mauss and Henry Hubert wrote of the idea of “mana”, which is a spiritual force that people all possess. They thought that individuals will sometimes expropriate collective sentiments for personal gain. Even though is often considered in a religious context, it can also be applied economically or politically. For instance, a politician can exchange their extreme patriotism (and ability to sway politics) for votes or campaign contributions, just like a televangelist exchanges their extreme religiousness (and ability to pray well) for money. Collins (1994, p?) notes that this is similar to Weber's notion of charisma. Is this where “leadership” comes from? And if so, what does this imply for anarchist organizations which claim (sometimes incorrectly) to not have leaders—or at least bosses?
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Symbolic/Micro-Interaction

[Write a lot more here about this tradition... why does Marshall view this to be the natural basis for anarchist theory?]

Sociology is largely compatible with anarchist vision, since it harbors “a view of society as spontaneous order” (Marshall 1998, p. 20), drawing from the symbolic interactionist tradition. According to Jones (1994):

Collaborative or consensus decision making is based on a theory, generally derived from the symbolic interaction school of sociology, that says the social order is a negotiated matter, continually subject to negotiation. (p. 162)

Symbolic interaction provides a beautiful justification for socialism (and, I would argue, anarchism): Mead claimed that humans talk in symbols, with shared meanings. This social interaction creates meaning for human lives. In essence, humans are social creatures, and could have no basis for “self” outside of a social community. Thus, brash individualists are incorrect, according to Mead and the micro-interactionists, because they do not acknowledge that humans need social interaction in order to function at all. Cooley argued that thinking is barely more than an inner-conversation with our “self”. He also said that people cannot see themselves without the mirror or others to reflect back meaning to them. Mead diversified Cooley's views and “looking glass self theory”, but agreed that humans are social creatures and that without society, they would not even have the ability to utilize abstract thinking – a heralded human trait.

Mead makes the argument that there are three components to the “self”: multiple “me's”, the “I”, and the “generalized other”. The generalized other is the general norms and attitudes of the whole community, and it allows us to interact with that community. He uses the example of property, saying that people's general relationship to property is the same and commonly held, and thus is respected. By such logic, if people's attitudes were generally different towards property, the “self” would approach it with different attitudes, perhaps the attitudes that Proudhon held when he posited that property was “theft”. Even in Mead's example, distinctions can be made. Most people hold up the sanctity of personal property, but have more ambivalent attitudes towards public property (for better or worse). Thus, it is possible, as the black bloc likely would argue, to change people's general attitudes towards property in order to shift them from symbolizing sacred items to tools of empowerment or oppression.30

Howard Becker from the Chicago School of Symbolic Interaction viewed the theory in terms of jazz music – there is a lot of improvisation, while you play off of others. Each musician still finds their way through each piece of music within the general framework

30 See the section on Violence for a similar discussion about property (and its destruction) from the Acme Collective's 1999 communique.
of the song, however. It is a sort of “organized chaos”. Anarchists, although often
decrying the carelessness usage of the word “chaos”, would agree with this description of
a favorable approach to society. Anarchists (usually) hold relatively compatible morals
and values, and respect (through solidarity, mutual aid, and voluntary association) the
rights of others to individually and collectively pursue these ends in their own fashion.
Recently, this has been termed in activists circles as a “diversity of tactics”. The end goal
is what is important as long as the means to get there are moral and just – and the ability
to find one's own way to that better society is more conducive to human freedom and
creativity than a master plan decided on high.31

Ward (1996) writes that

[a]n important component of the anarchist approach to organisation is what we might call the theory of
spontaneous order: the theory that, given a common need, a
collection of people will, by trial and error, by
improvisation and experiment, evolve order of the situation
– this order being more durable and more closely related to
their needs than any kind of externally imposed authority
could provide. (p. 31)

Contemporary Anarchist Sociology

Many, many activists are actively developing theory of organizations, social inequity, and
tactics. Topics such as consensus decision making, direct action, globalization, solidarity,
and [non-]violence are being developed by a legion of writers, advocates, and
practitioners.

The following author-activists are perhaps the most influential North American anarchist-theorists (as one might guess they often vehemently disagree with each other). They are
listed here as examples of the directions that modern anarchist thought has gone.

Albert's participatory economics (2000): this New Left veteran has been active in
numerous successful cooperative projects, such as the South End Press collective and Z-
Magazine. His economic writings (along with Robin Hanhel) on the subject of
“participatory economics” have been taken up by a number of anarchist collectives and
cooperatives for their financial and governing model. Albert asserts that economics (as
with culture and politics) should be value-driven. Thus, an anarchist economics would
value diversity, equity, self-management, and solidarity. It would be an economy on
“remunerating people according to effort and sacrifice, council democracy, what we call
balanced job complexes, and allocation via participatory planning” (2000, p. 2).

Bey's temporary autonomous zone (1991):

31 For more on “diversity of tactics” and its utilization in the Northeast Ohio anti-war movement, please
see Williams (2004a).
**Bookchin's social ecology (199x):**

**Chomsky's anarcho-syndicalism (1970):** sometimes identified as a “fellow-traveler” of anarchism, since he does advocate engagement with the State, Chomsky's influence upon linguists and American foreign policy cannot be understated. It is difficult to hypothesize which domain he has had the greatest impact upon, or which legacy will be the longest lasting. Born into a lively Jewish anarchist culture, Chomsky briefly participated in the Kibbutzim experiment in Israel. In his classic “For Reasons of State”, Chomsky wrote the modern historical account of anarchism in his essay “Notes on Anarchism”. A 1970 speech on “Government in the Future”, Chomsky also aligned himself with the anarcho-syndicalist, council communist, and left-Marxist tradition. Due to his vast writings on the aggressions of US empire, Chomsky has been able to attract considerable attention to his premise that those who are concerned with creating a better future, should commit themselves to searching on forms of domination, challenge them, and work to dismantle those without legitimacy (which he claims most domination lacks).

**Zerzan's primitivism (19xx):**
VALUES

Which side are you on?
- Atari Teenage Riot

What does sociology say about anarchist values? Sociologists have said quite a bit more about anarchist values than anarchism itself. This shows how sociology often considers the concepts of anarchism without referring to anarchism directly. This is likely due to the perception that sociology should be concerned with understanding society, not changing society. The inability of the educated sociologists to see that analysis creates a mandate for action, illustrates the morally vacuousness of sectors within the discipline.

Below are a number of key anarchist values (as noted in the Appendix): anti-authoritarianism, direct action, liberty, mutual aid, self-determination, solidarity, and voluntary association. Each value is discussed, in turn, via its general sociological understanding.

**Anti-authoritarianism** (hierarchy-less, egalitarianism)

Authority: If authority is the absence of coercion and if the presence of authority mean that subordinate people accept that authority, what does that imply for anti-authoritarians? Clearly, anti-authoritarians do not accept the willing self-subjugation to authority figures, and therefore leave themselves open to other forms of coercion.

If oppressive power can be embodied in both authority and coercion, anarchists reject both means of oppression, claiming neither are legitimate, since there is no such thing as legitimate authority.

Please see the section entitled Social Movements for an application of Weber's three types of authority applied to the anarchist movement.

**Direct action** (civil-disobedience)
direct action: Polletta (2001)

**Liberty** (freedom, autonomy)
autonomy: Kohn, M.L. & Slomczynski, K.M. (1990); Bates (1972); Katsiaficas (2001)

**Mutual aid** (cooperation) (mutualism?)

Kinna (1995) argues that Kropotkin's mutual aid theory was in some ways a political
response to the rise of social democracy and individualism (such as Nietzscheanism). The theory “was to serve both as a means of understanding the natural world and as the foundation of real knowledge... an instrument of human education and liberation, 'the supreme authority' and the 'expression and the revelation' of truth” (Kinna 1995, p. 270). The theory was in some ways a response to Huxley's interpretation of Darwinism, specifically, he “accused Huxley of wrongly characterizing the natural world as one of unremitting violence” (Kinna 1995, p. 275). Further, he saw two varieties of mutual aid: biological and ethical. “Biologically, mutual aid was an instinctual sense of co-operation. Ethical mutual aid... was created by the habits which result from biological practice” (Kinna 1995, p. 277). Kropotkin charged the centralized state with inhibiting the further expression of mutual aid.

Glassman's (2000) modern survey of socio-biologist (and anarchist) Peter Kropotkin's “mutual aid” theory looks favorably upon it as an alternative base for the study of human development and activity. He states, “mutual aid theory could have an impact on the way the field approaches emotional development, language development, and cognitive development.” He sees “the idea that humans are social creatures first, and that individuality emerges from sociability” as one that could open up important areas of research and potential re-interpretations of theory (Glassman 2000, p. 410).

**Self-determination** (consensus [cohesion], direct democracy [participatory democracy], self-management)


consensus: Parsons (1951); Jones (1994); Polletta (2001); Davis, et al. (1988); Mansbridge (2003).

self-management: George (1997)

participatory democracy: Pateman (1970); Milstein (2000)

In George (1997), the political economy of various left ideologies is analyzed in respect to worker self-determination. George favorably positions anarchism as an ideology compatible to self-determination (whereas he says Marxism “argues that market self-management is an unstable type of economic system which must eventually transmute into either capitalism or socialism”, George 1997, p. 61), especially for the anarcho-communists and the experiments of the Mondragón collectives in the Basque region of Spain. He also gives right-wing “anarchism” (i.e. free-market capitalism) an especially dour evaluation, observing that “radical individualists ... generally attribute any apparent failings of capitalism to meddlesome interference by the State, and are not concerned by the seemingly authoritarian character of the capitalist firm” (George 1997, p. 56).

Martin (1990) details the obvious problems with elections of representatives: voting does not work, voting disempowers the grassroots, and voting reinforces state power. He also takes stabs at other alternatives to elections, which he views as more favorable, but not without problems, including referendums, consensus, small sizes, and delegates and federations. He focuses on a theory called “demarchy” where individuals are selected at random to serve in decision-making bodies, with limited function and domain. These
members are rotated overtime to discourage the creation of “experts” and a consolidation of power. There is no ability to bid for favor since there are no election campaigns or no ability to influence a “vote” that occurs at random.

In Pateman's (1970) classic study of participatory democracy, she defines classical theory of “democracy” by way of Dahl: “democracy as polyarchy—the rule of multiple minorities... Dahl puts forward an argument about the possible dangers inherent in an increase in participation on the part of the ordinary man” (pp. 8 & 10). This view is clearly a non-radical vision, although a common one, where those who “understand” democracy practice it and the masses only validate it. She goes on to summarize the classical theory and its emphasis voting as the main method of participation, for the primary purpose of selecting leaders who carryout the process of democracy itself.

This “classical” view is antithetical to the direct democracy Milstein (2000) and anarchists hearken for.

[D]irectly democratic institutions open a public space in which everyone, if they so choose, can come together in a deliberative and decision-making body; a space where everyone has the opportunity to persuade and be persuaded; a space where no discussion or decision is ever hidden, and where it can always be returned for scrutiny, accountability, or rethinking. (p. ?)

Not surprisingly the word “vote” appears no where in Milstein's article, nor does she favorably refer to the empowerment of “leaders” on behalf of the people's interests. For her, direct democracy is a democracy that elevates the rhetoric of “democracy” far and beyond notions of elections and voting, to a place where individual people are empowered to set the terms for the debate regarding decisions, not merely picking pre-packaged options at the end of that process.

Manbridge (2003) documents the various meanings of “consensus” in an activist context. She lists the conditions under which the benefits are high and the costs are low to use consensus. She also lists the following advantages to using consensus: 1) promoting unity, 2) increasing commitment, 3) guaranteeing a form of individual liberty, 4) encouraging listening, 5) teaching transferable skills. She also says that the use of consensus is not “prefigurative”, which echoes the debates within anarchists circles about the usage and application of consensus-techniques. Consensus is distinguished from equality, participatory decentralization, and inclusion—although they often overlap with the use of consensus. Finally, she explores the many ways that consensus is utilized in social movements (many of which anarchists have used): “unanimous consensus”, “Quaker consensus”, “modified consensus”, “consensus through sidepayments”, etc.

**Solidarity** (cohesion, decentralization)

cohesion: Durkheim, E. (1893/1933); Parsons, T. (1951); Tonnies, F. (1887/1963)
decentralization: Winthrop (year?); Foldvary (2001)
Durkheim argued that human groupings are held together via solidarity. This functionalist view—that society functions are an organic organism and the antithesis to the conflict viewpoint—uses solidarity to explain why society does not merely collapse into struggling individual interests. [altruistic, anomie, and egoistic suicide] The anarchist view of solidarity is a bit different.

**Voluntary Association** (spontaneous order?)
voluntary association: Harrison (1960)
spontaneous order: Jacobs (2000); Davis (year?)

There is, of course, incredible overlap with these ideas: direct action is an assertion of self-determination, which stems from liberty. Egalitarianism requires mutual aid. Autonomy and anti-authoritarianism also requires solidarity with others. So forth, blah blah blah. Voluntary association is the arrangement of and consensus is the process/language of the synthesis of (or compromise between) self-determination and solidarity. Solidarity is more political or personal, compared to the more substantive and physical mutual aid.

According to Milstein (?), however, direct democracy and direct action are not necessarily the same thing—“there's something authoritarian about a small group of people shutting down a city street” (get exact quote—in Reclaim the Cities). Likewise, liberty only extends so far until it also becomes authoritarian when wielded by stronger folk. [other contradictions here?]

[Would diagrams/figures be useful here? I think so!]

[Williams 38] [this is a draft. do not cite.]
Perhaps due to the academy's resistance to the liberatory notions of true anarchism—and the fact that as “academics” they might lose their treasured roles as intellectual guardians and vanguards if the rabble learned that knowledge did not have to matriculate from universities—scholars have repeatedly misconstrued the basic principles of anarchism and humorously applied them to bizarre and contradictory fields of study. Do a simple database abstract search or literature review, and you will find more examples of these “wannabes” than examples of actual social movement, left-wing anarchism. What follows is an attempt to explore, explain, and challenge these wannabes.

“Philosophical anarchism” This theory is most commonly found in philosophy and the “humanities”. Sometimes, this is seen as an attempt to say there are “no rules” or that every idea is merely flailing away at every other idea. (look at more in-depthly) To be fair, this theory is the most analogous of the wannabes.

International state anarchism holds that states operate “anarchistically” on the global level, since there is no world government. Of course, this belies the fact that nearly all of these individual units are themselves states and governments. This theory is most commonly found in political science. Many a political scientists view “anarchism” as a stateless form of international government, as opposed to a natural order of human beings. As such, they discuss how nation-states can interact with each other, minus the coercion of an overarching government. To anarchists, this defies belief, since it is clearly the most powerful states that can exert themselves upon less powerful states. But, it is overlooked that anarchists do not view a dog-eat-dog world where the more powerful crush the others, but rather a society in which the powerful actually restrict their dominance to the aid of the less powerful, working together not against each other.

“Anarcho-capitalism” is not only found in academics, but in outside world, too, as ill-informed people use it to explain philosophies that are tantamount to anti-government, pro-capitalism sentiments—essentially ultra-free-marketism. The US’s “Libertarian Party” espouses this line of thinking rather well. The Libertarian Party is a source of frustration to some anarchists, since the word “libertarian” used to a synonym for a left-wing anarchist, before its recent abduction. Of course, as a “party” it is particularly repugnant to anarchists.

This is also perceived as the “right-wing” of anarchism. This theory is most commonly found in economics. Economists refers to the “anarchy” of the pure marketplace, where there is no governmental control; yet, “anarcho-capitalists” do not seem incredibly
concerned with other forms of hierarchy and authority, such as found in the modern corporation or other financial/economic institutions.

Of course, there are also all the scholars who merely get anarchism wrong. They see a philosophy based upon chaos, violence, bombs, assassination, naïveté, and foolishness. Many view it as all action and no theory, just something that people irrationally do without thinking about beforehand. This is tied to my earlier argument that anarchists are first and foremost activists, and operate on both a deep sense of theory and practicality.

Thus, it is only common sense that anarchism's theory is most commonly written by activists and is not found in the academy. It is frequently anarchism's fellow-traveler in revolution, Marxism, that distorts the most, asserting that anarchism is a disorganized revolution, impossible to obtain, irrational, ill-informed, lacking in theory, too spontaneous, and very uncontrollable. They are correct at least in the latter case.
SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

When spiders unite,
they can tie down a lion.
- African proverb

A core component of sociology is how and why people work together in groups and organizations, specifically within social movements. If collective behavior is viewed as the random and unintentional result of people interacting together, social movements are the result of deliberate and intentional interactions. Even though anarchism has long been identified as a movement (although to some a dead one), it is rarely written about as such.

Jeff Shantz (2003) writes:

Conventional analyses of social movements continue to overlook the emergence of unconventional manifestations of resistance... Analyses have been constrained by a rather myopic preoccupation either with organizational structures and resources which allow for access to the state or with civil actions (including civil disobedience) by which activists might register dissent or popularize claims... Left out of conventional theorizing are movements which want no part of world order, new or otherwise, which they view as authoritarian, hierarchical, and inevitably genocidal (or “eco-cidal”). (p. 90)

Anarchism has been given a decent treatment in the field of history. But, to leave anarchism within the academy's History Departments misleads one to think that anarchism is merely a historical relic. In doing so, the vast leaps in theory and practice that have been made by successive waves of the anarchist movement are overlooked.

I think the most appropriate and useful (although perhaps not as entertaining) way in which to study anarchism is via sociology's sub-discipline of “social movement” theory. Some of the more well-known texts on social movements have commented on anarchism.

Critiques of Social Movement Theorists

[List texts here. Then respond to their handling of anarchism.]


Countermodel” by stating: “Where the hierarchy of social democracy turned movements into parties, the anarchists' obsession with action and their allergy to organization transformed them into a sect” (Tarrow 1998, p. 127). Tarrow curiously does not apply a date to the “sect” transformation. In fact, anarchist organization was incredibly active up until the First World War in the US. And it was not an allergy to organization (quite the opposite—anarchists remain some of the most organized activists) that reduced their influence as much as it was the Palmer Raids and similar crackdown by the American establishment (the first “red scare”) that targeted anarchists, unionists, and immigrants (who were often all three). Also the ascendency of the Soviet Union as a revolutionary anti-capitalist success story helped pushed anarchism as an ideology further to the margins as the radical Left lined up to support the “Communist” and Bolshevik label. Even setting aside Tarrow's criticism and an overall fair treatment of the roots of anarchism, he fails to notice contemporary anarchist (or anarchistic) influences or movements, in the US or otherwise. Perhaps future editions of this text will bear out the impact of “Seattle” and the rise in anti-capitalist activism—which is especially high in Europe and South America at present. [Reference for this height?]

“Political Protest and Cultural Revolution”, Barbara Epstein. By far the best analysis of anarchist politics. ... She focuses heavily upon anarchist-influenced and anarcha-feminism politics in her various chapters. She works together many of the more advanced peace movements with anarchism. Most directly, there is a strong overlap with the predilection towards nonviolent direct action, affinity groups, and consensus decision making. A key example for Epstein is the Clamshell Alliance, which she points to a strong anarcha-feminist influence. Incidentally, Epstein's conclusions are reinforced by an earlier survey by Katz and List (1981) which found that half of all participants at the 1978 Seabrook action identified as feminists and nearly a quarter as anarchists (more than the 18 percent who identified as Marxists). In fact, anarchist identity out-paced both Democrat and Republican Party affiliation combined! Forty-two percent also identified as socialist, with sympathies likely conducive to radical feminism and anarchism. (p. 61)

“From Mobilization to Revolution”, Charles Tilly. Index references to anarchists, anarcho-communists, and anarcho-syndicalism. Tilly's index entry for anarchists is embarrassingly and unfortunately brief: “desertion may, of course, consist of individual acceptance of exclusive alternative claims to control of the government. It may also take the form of rejecting all claims, in good anarchist fashion” (Tilly 1978, p. 214, emphasis in the original). By not expounding on the role of anarchism in the decision to reject all governmental control, Tilly seemingly dodges the issue of where revolutionary power comes from or “must” come from (or goes). He rhetorically associates “Anarcho-Communists” with “the National Urban League, of the United Sons of Vulcan” in mentioning William Gamson's list of “challenging groups”.

32 List nice references for the Palmer Raids. (... and maybe Ward Churchill's comments from Disc 2 of “In a Pig's Eye”) For instance, the world-famous anarchists Sacco and Vanzetti were (were they?) victims of hysteria provoked by the Palmer Raids.
34 Epstein later wrote (2001) about the link between anarchism and the “anti-globalization” movement in the US.
Missing, again, is any discussion of how vastly different the vision of “challenge” is between anarcho-communists and the “National Urban League”.

Only Tilly's mention of anarcho-syndicalism shows a breath of potential for greater discussion, suggesting that the French strikes in the 1890s on May Day (International Worker's Day) contained revolutionary potential that was missing from other strikes of the decade (and had been grower tame leading up to the decade). His [brief] account of these strikes is commendable, but he leaves the impression that this period was the “heyday of anarcho-syndicalism”, a patently absurd proposition (Tilly 1978, p. 161). Syndicalism increased in popularity in many countries well in to the 20th century, clearly peaking during its successful employment in the revolutionary situation of the Spanish Civil War in the late 1930s by the Confederación Nacional del Trabajo. The same was roughly true for France, the case that Tilly is citing. Rudolph Rocker, author of the definitive text on anarcho-syndicalism, explained that revolutionary syndicalism was found in “the federations in the different countries of the revived International Workingmen's Association” and that “in the years from 1900 to 1910 [revolutionary syndicalism] experienced a marked upswing, particularly in France” (Rocker 1938/1990, p. 49). Tilly failed to notice this in perhaps the best and most influential English-language exponent's text on anarcho-syndicalism. Clark (1930) also sees active French syndicalism during the late-1920s. For Tilly to not know this (or mention it) is astonishing – but equally unsurprising.

“Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements”, ed. Doug McAdam, John D. McCarthy, Mayer N. Zald. Attempt to combine the social movement theories of political opportunities, mobilizing structures, and cultural framings. They advocate comparing and contrasting all three major approaches to best understand social movements. (See their introductory chapter for a good synthesis and comparison.)

Critiques/analysis of anarchist academic articles:
● Graeber
● Amster
● Shantz

Criteria used to analyze:
● Problem(s) identified
● Shortcomings
● Overlaps with sociological theory
● Needs for data and/or future research

[Go thru the chapter titles/glossaries/index-entries-w/lotsa-mentions for Morris & McClurg (1992), Tarrow (1998), and Tilly (1978) to get main ideas, concepts, keywords, etc. Study these, find good sociology-dictionary/glossary definitions of

35 Lots of great writings exist on the anarchistic origins of “May Day”, especially on the Internet.
l.gaylord@m.cc.utah.edu, “May Day - the Real Labor Day”,
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them, apply to anarchism in the Social Movements section. Read, also, a good primer on main social movements and SMO concepts. Is there a good intro text on these? Does UA offer a class on this, ever? How about KSU?

- resource mobilization
- collective action
- frames
- collective identity
- collective action frames
- communities of challengers
- conflict movements
- cycles of protest
- malintegration theory
- master frames
- mobilization
- mobilizing technologies
- social movement organizations
- connective structures
- contention
- networks
- opportunities
- organization
- association

From “Methods of Social Movement Research”: “Original chapters cover the range of techniques: surveys, formal models, discourse analysis, in-depth interviews, participant observation, case studies, network analysis, historical methods, protest event analysis, macro-organizational analysis, and comparative politics. Each chapter includes a methodological discussion, examples of studies employing the method, an examination of its strengths and weaknesses, and practical guidelines for its application.”

Can the “anarchist movement” be considered a movement as such? According to the prevailing definitions of social movement theory, do anarchist qualify?

[List various prominent definitions of “movements”]

Outside of the “anarchist movement”, there are many anarchists who are not active in an explicitly anarchist activities. This, of course, illustrates the fact that there can be two kinds of organizations that anarchists participate in: explicitly anarchist organizations and non-anarchist organizations. The question may be asked: Are anarchists not involved in explicitly anarchist organizations part of an anarchist movement?

I would assert “yes”, and for the following reason. (Forgive me as I take a moment to build my argument.) Since anarchism is perhaps one of the most flexible terms existing in political discourse—including its usage by anarchists themselves—an amorphous movement is formed that seems to violate conventional definitions of movements. As
Chomsky quotes Octave Mirbeau: “anarchism has a broad back, like paper it endures anything” (Chomsky, date, p). This flexibility, bleeds into action. Thus, active anarchists can be a part of an anarchist “movement” without actual participation in anarchist organizations. By applying their anarchist convictions, they are essentially being active participants in a movement that seeks the dispersion of liberation and freedom. This is especially true when viewing anarchism from the “yardstick model” (see Appendix). The yardstick model frames anarchism as a reference point to be applied to all situations and conditions, not as a pre-determined holy writ.

Inside anarchist circles, however, there is disagreement amongst themselves whether or not they are a “movement”. [List examples and references] Thus, most contention around the “movement” issue revolves around the raw number of anarchists, the idea of “critical mass”, and the effectiveness of anarchist tactics and campaigns. The reader is left to make up their own mind on these questions.

Reflect on Vasi, et al. (2003) re: the “mobilizer's dilemma”

Present academics—particularly historians—will occasionally study anarchists, yet the vast majority are long dead and gone. They study Peter Kropotkin not Noam Chomsky, Emma Goldman not Starhawk, Joseph Labadie not Murray Bookchin, or Alexander Berkman not Jaggi Singh. Anarchists scholars primarily outside of the academy are the only ones who make a studious effort to better understand the roots of what historian Howard Zinn (1997) calls “surely one of the most important political philosophies of modern times” (p. 644). George Woodcock was one of these scholars. Since Woodcock's death in 1995, the academic mantle of Anglo-anarchist historical studies has been handed off to Paul Avrich. But what of the non-historical realm of anarchist study?

What follows is an attempt to integrate North American anarchism as a social movement into the existing framework of sociology research and theory. The North American strain differs from others around the world. Still, there are many incredible examples of non-North American/Western European anarchism, including Fernandez (2001), Mbah and Igariwey (1997), and Adams (year?). Klein (2000a) observes that the majority of young Czech and Eastern European activists battling global capitalism, are disgusted with both state “socialism” and Western capitalism, thus compelling them to identify as anarchists.

Even though deceased anarchists and past anarchist organizations will be used as examples, primary focus will rest upon the present-day anarchist movement essentially invisible to contemporary sociologists.

Using David Aberle's 1966 pivotal classification of social movements, anarchism falls clearly in the “transformative movement” category. The other three categories social movements according to Aberle are reformative, redemptive, and alternative. Aberle 1966. (or “resistance/regressive movements”? -- in Kendall 1999) Tilly describes
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transformative movements as ones that seek far-reaching change, including revolution. [More about Aberle and transformative movements!]

Using the criteria devised by Charles Tilly's “From Mobilization to Revolution”, the anarchist movement has responded in varied ways to organization, mobilization, common interests, and opportunity (Tilly 1978, drawn from Giddens & Duneier 2000). Tilly used Lenin and the Russian Revolution as his example, which, unfortunately, ignores (at least on face), the large impact that anarchist principles had in fueling that revolution, not to mention the shameful crackdown on anarchists that followed or the liberatory institutions the Bolsheviks destroyed, such as the worker councils. 37

Since an anarchist revolution has not explicitly taken place in America, Tilly's theory applied to anarchism is speculative, but still informative. Anarchists are obsessive organization creators—it is often remarked that anarchists are some of the best organized activists on the political left. Even though anarchism has a strong pro-organization thrust, some self-identified left-anarchists are decidedly anti-organizational. Often “organization” is referred to in terms of a large, monolithic organization, complete with bureaucracy. Many of these individuals fall into the somewhat controversial “wing” of anarchists theory called “primitivism”. Also some identify as “anti-organizationalist”, meaning that they do not believe in excessive, non-democratic, and organization for the sake of itself. Still, whether in collectives, affinity groups, spokes-councils, networks, or federations, anarchists use non-hierarchical organizations as the basis for their varied political action.

Various “spontaneous formation of crowds” also exist in an anarchist context, in the form of “black blocs”, “smart mobs”, and feeder marches—although these are somewhat pre-organized configurations. 38 Feeder marches were used in many American cities during the recent war on Iraq (2002-2003), where anarchists wanted to lend their own politics to anti-war events organized by more liberal groups. Thus, instead of disrupting those events and marches, anarchists and other anti-imperialists organized marches that started earlier in different places and met up with the larger, more mainstream march. 39

Anarchists often speak of spontaneous self-organization of people because they do not see the need for certain people to organize others for them. 40 More on anarchist organization in the Organization section.

Anarchist mobilization (Tilly's second component) has had varied success at acquiring sufficient resources that can make collective action possible. Some American communities have better networks (or “scenes”) in place that allow for a relatively quick mobilization of resources (people, money, political lobby, infrastructure) than do others. Places such as the Bay Area (CA), Portland and Eugene (OR), Boston (MA), Washington DC, and others have established “infoshops” that are catalysts for mobilization and

37 Resources on the Bolshevik persecution of anarchists are large in number. See Rudolph Rocker, Emma Goldman, anything about the Kronstadt sailors, Nestor Makhno, and so forth.
38 See Infoshop.org for more information about smartmobs (http://www.infoshop.org/smartmobs.html) and black blocs (http://www.infoshop.org/blackbloc.html).
39 See Williams (2004a) for more on feeder marches.
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information exchange. The Independent Media Center (“Indymedia”) movement is another mechanism by which anarchists have used for mobilization.\textsuperscript{41} Tilly references the acquisition of weapons for the purpose of violent overthrow; to this point North American anarchists have not made explicit (and perhaps never have) moves towards amassing armaments.\textsuperscript{42} The Anarchist Black Cross (ABC) is an example of a group that believe in armed self-defense and could better fall under Tilly's point than most other American anarchist organizations could.

Common interest is perhaps the best thing that has propelled anarchist organizing thus far. There are two ways in which anarchists (and all other individuals of various political philosophies): a) explicitly anarchist organizations or b) non-anarchist organizations. Obviously explicitly anarchists organizations are less-relevant to Tilly's third component. Non-anarchist organizations on the left, however, frequently have anarchists involved. From the anti-corporate globalization movement to environmentalism/eco-defense, multicultural movements, GLBT movement, and feminism, active, embedded anarchists can be found. Even in what some consider to be “reform” organizations, one can find active anarchist participation, such as in union organizing, living wage campaigns, anti-police brutality organizations, campaign finance reform initiatives, and so on. Albert (2001) explores the differences between what he calls non-reformist reforms and reformism:

What's needed instead isn't to have no reforms, which would simply capitulate the playing field to elites, but to fight for reforms that are non-reformist, that is, to fight for reforms that we conceive, seek, and implement in ways leading activists to seek still more gains in a trajectory of change leading ultimately to new institutions.\textsuperscript{\textit{para.}}

When participating in non-anarchist organizations, anarchists will try to interject anti-authoritarian viewpoints and actions into both the internal structure of the organization and to the external operation and goals of the organization. This influence can be most vividly seen in the direct action movement (which is not explicitly anarchist, but heavily anarchist influenced). It utilizes many anarchists techniques: affinity groups, consensus decision-making, and (of course) direct action. These components can also be seen in other progressive/left/radical organizations.

Tilly's final component, opportunity, is very difficult to comment on; there has been no anarchist revolution to occur in the United States (and few other countries—the most commonly offered examples of anarchist revolution are 1930s Spain and present-day Chiapas, Mexico). Anarchist “evolution” has taken place in various ways. In considering such evolution, one must view social change as deeply integrated into the ideals of the Enlightenment, and very close to left-libertarianism (or anarchism).\textsuperscript{43}

\textsuperscript{41} For more information on the anarchist tendencies of the IMC movement (incidentally heavily-populated by anarchists), please see the chapter entitled “Indymedia”.

\textsuperscript{42} Which is not to say that all anarchists are opposed to the use of “violence”. Please see the chapter “Violence” for a deeper discussion.

\textsuperscript{43} For detailed description of the links between anarchism, classical Liberalism, and the Enlightenment, see Noam Chomsky's seminal essay (1970) “Notes on Anarchism”.
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In the entry-level sociology textbook “Introduction to Sociology”, the authors note four major theories of revolution and social movements: economic deprivation, resource mobilization, structural strain, and fields of action (Giddens & Duneier 2000). Each theory is now applied to anarchism.

1. Economic deprivation is based upon unresolvable societal tensions called contradictions. These contradictions stem from imbalanced economic structures, social relationships, and political system, and lead to clashes between classes. Marx saw the creation (intentional or not) of contradictions which would challenge the existing industrial capitalist system as the way to move towards socialism. According to Marx contradictions would invariably lead to revolution, but many anarchists know that things are not always as simple—why do those who are incredibly deprived economically not rebel? Things are usually more complex, and of course, involve many other forms of deprivation and contradiction will not always lead to greater clash between classes. James Davies critiques Marx's arguments by saying that people usually rebel when there is an improvement in people's living conditions—quite the opposite of Marx—and their expectations thus increase. Anarchists would criticize this view as well since many who experience increasing standards of living can often become comfortable with the ways in which such gains are obtained—usually through reform measures or economic surplus—and are probably less likely to challenge the entire system. The strains of evolutionary anarchism are probably more likely to appreciate Davies' viewpoint than revolutionary anarchism is.

2. Resource mobilization is the means to collective action which, according to Tilly is undertaken to contest or overthrow an existing social order (or for anarchists, the social, political, and economic status quo). Tilly also refers to “multiple sovereignty”, in which government lacks complete control over area it is “supposed to” administer. A good example of this is the Zapatista uprising in Chiapas, Mexico. The term “multiple sovereignty” is not different from other terms that activists use, except that it seems to be very geographically based. In similar spirit, the American Civil Rights movement referred to “counter-institutions” that fulfilled existing needs without the entrenched White power structure. Anarchist literature refers to this in a revolutionary context as “dual power”, where counter institutions can be organized that have the strength to withstand the State and literally compete with existing hierarchical institutions, with replacement being the end-goal (and thus r/evolution).

3. Structural strain

Neil Smelser's (1963) work — called “structural strain” by Giddens & Duneier and “value-added theory” by Kendall, respectively — is worthy of a deeper analysis. Its six

44 The four theories are detailed in pp. 514-519 and summarized on p. 517.
45 For more on dual power, see the essays “Dual Power In the Selva Lacandon”, “Demise of the Beehive Collective”, and “Struggle on Three Fronts” in San Filippo 2003. Also, see Mumm (1998) for a wonderful vision for anarchist dual power strategy.
Components of social movements include structural conduciveness, structural strain, generalized beliefs, precipitating factors, leadership/regular communication, and the operation of social control.

1. Structural cohesiveness. North America is incredibly free compared to the rest of the world. That said, (mostly White) anarchists are beginning to understand that radicalism is different for people of color and acknowledge that the freedoms for certain people in society differ from their own. Further, society, although rather free, is not necessarily conducive to fostering conditions of resistance—the entertainment industry plays a role in pacification as does working through the “democratic” process of the government. People are disconnected in the midst of bureaucracy. Action is predicated on awareness of problems that the mainstream media is unwilling to critically discuss. While action is frequently open to North Americans, the tendency of their concerns—especially when radical—to get distorted by this media, limit its ability to foster movement. Yet, according to Smelser, movements can be mobilized when particular classes, persons, or agencies can be singled out (i.e. the rich, George W. Bush, or the FCC/EPA/FEC/IRS/FDA/DoD/etc.), when the channels for expressing discontent fail—as they often do in bureaucracies, and when people have a chance to communicate with each other—something that is facilitated by direct action and organization.

2. Structural strain. Tensions that create conflicting interests in society, in the form of uncertainties, anxieties, ambiguities, or direct clashes. This can be seen in the form of economic recessions, layoffs, political scandals, diminishing social services, gentrification, and such. Anarchists view these tensions as subtle, slow-motion class warfare.

3. Generalized belief. Anti-war and anti-government organizing (sometimes brought about by the deployment of soldiers), union-organizing efforts, anti-police brutality efforts, and the like, derive themselves from the introduction of a general anti-authoritarian ideology which says that subjugation is wrong and unjust. This ideology addresses structural strains that people are feeling individually or collectively. Many North American anarchists are introduced to general beliefs of anti-authoritarianism via culture, such as in punk rock, hip-hop, or electronica music scenes. These scenes—especially punk rock in the case of North America—can foster sentiments of rebellion, and channel them through a belief system and tactical approach (D.I.Y. in the case of punk. D.I.Y. stands for “do it yourself”). It came to be used by punk enthusiasts who found themselves shut out of the traditional music world/industry, and had to resort to self-recording, releasing, distribution, promoting, and touring. It is logical that D.I.Y. practitioners would appreciate anarchism, since they share the values of self-determination and mutual aid in common.

4. Precipitating factors. Poverty and injustice are often the cause of urban insurrections (commonly called “riots”), as are they the cause for most left organizing, including anarchist organizing. Many anarchists believe in spontaneous revolt, whether marches that take to the streets, wildcat strikes, or general defiance—and they would claim that they precipitate not just from poverty and injustice, but also from the human desire to resist and seek positive change. It can also arise from natural disasters or technological failures, and the uncertainty that follows in its wake—which allows for the potential practice and display of mutual aid and solidarity.
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5. Leadership/regular communication. Of course, the issue of “leadership” is very dicey for anarchists, which perhaps might indicate why the anarchist movement itself is rather dicey. All anarchists clearly reject anyone “being in-charge”, but are less confident in understanding leadership. Crass (2001), for instance, asserts that leadership itself is not a problem to anarchist organizing, but instilling power within leaders. Rather, he sees everyone becoming leaders in the movement, being able to each articulate a vision and strategy for moving forward. Some anarchists, however, do not envision organizations, let alone leaders, and feel that people will somehow sort through their needs and desires – a rather individualistic approach. There is a wide, vast swath of those who fall between these two viewpoints. “Regular communication”, however, is far different a notion—the anarchist press is very diverse and encourages great dissension (some might even say too much) amongst various journals and zines, and in its letters sections. Websites, especially the Infoshop.org Newswire and the Indymedia network act as a conduit for information exchange and debate, as well as announcements. (See the section “Indymedia” for more on this subject.) Owens and Palmer (2003) refer to Infoshop.org as a “gateway” website: “the Infoshop is not an isolated site. It also acts as a gateway into the larger anarchist community online, sending a high number of links back to other anarchist sites.” (p. 354)

6. Operation of social control. Actually not a component of a movement itself, the operation of social control is how the existing power structure responds to movement. In the case of non-threatening movements, social control is barely non-existent—it is easy to ignore. Once becoming contentious, however, power will assert itself. It does so, according to an anarchist understand, by way of marginalization, increased surveillance, repression, accommodation and co-optation. Depending on how elites respond, many anarchists believe that fissures should be provoked within elite circles. The potential of a movement is thus dependent upon the response of those in power.

4. Fields of action
Alan Touraine’s analysis of social movements included four main ideas, the final one being fields of actions. But, the first part was historicity, or the reason why there are so many movements in the modern era. Anarchists might suggest that the interconnectedness of the world and the exchanged knowledge amongst people has increased the longing for greater freedom (Touraine says that individuals and groups know that activism can be used to achieve goals and reshape society in modern times).

Secondly, movements have rational objectives and are not mere irrational reactions to social division. Anarchists would generally agree with this, but clarify that rebellion frequently occurs without methodical vision or objective, but that the insurrection can be turned to a strategic revolutionary movement. For the anarchist movement in particular, there is a lot of objective and strategy thinking going on.

Third, the process of interaction shapes social movements, by defining what it is for and what it is against. Anarchists have often been accused of merely being against things (or “everything”), and not actually for anything. As absurd as this is (anarchists have a very clear vision of things they are for) it is a real mis-perception and something anarchists need to work to overcome. Anarchists are torn over which (positive or negative) views to emphasis in their political work – many stick predominantly to oppositional activities and
actions (opposing police brutality, war, corporate globalization), while others work almost exclusively on positive, community-building projects, such as free food distribution, squatting, community gardens, and free schools.

Lastly, Touraine saw “fields of actions” as the connections between a social movement and the forces aligned against it. The anarchist movement's field of action has barely changed since its origins: its relationship with authority figures and authoritarian institutions has always been one of mutual hostility. Certain “compromises” (if they can be called that) have been conceded at various points: “reforms” that do not truly relinquish freedom from constraints of authoritarian power, but small victories all the same. A classic example of this is the struggle for the eight hour day. In recent years it can be seen as the constraints placed upon nuclear power and weapon production in the US (short-lived as it may be). Accordingly, Touraine says that where there continue to be sources of conflict, social movements tend to reemerge – nothing could be truer in the reemergence of anarchism and deeper-rooted social movements in North America in recent years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Resource Mobilization</th>
<th>Political Opportunities</th>
<th>New Social Movements</th>
<th>Framing Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theorists</td>
<td>Tilly, McCarthy, Zald</td>
<td>Tilly, McAdam, Tarrow</td>
<td>Touraine</td>
<td>Snow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of study</td>
<td>Left-wing movements(^{46}) since the 1960s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance to anarchism</td>
<td>@ is somewhat a NSM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two of the most visible anti-war groups since the declaration of Bush Jr.’s “War of Terrorism” have been Act Now to Stop War and End Racism (ANSWER) and Not In Our Name (NION). Both groups are derived from the arcane left—ANSWER from the World Workers Party and NION from the Revolutionary Communist Party. The non-sectarian left—by far the largest portion of activists—has struggled to ignite similar enthusiasm, and as a result, many have flocked to ANSWER and NION for political action. ANSWER organizes large anti-war demonstrations, usually in DC and San Francisco. NION organizes other more local actions, and has been very busy in Cleveland.

\(^{46}\) Pichardo (1997) is critical of NSM for only considering the left, and not including right-wing movements.
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Max Weber wrote during a high point for anarchism, in both the US and Europe. Although he surely would have known about it – the press ran well-funded propaganda campaigns against it for decades (Hong 1992) – he doesn’t seem to have taken it into account in his scheme. Had he, it might have caused him to create another category of authority.

The anarchist reaction to various kinds of authority is fundamental. Simply, anarchism opposes any authority that is placed above the individual and collective interest. More specifically, anarchism rejects the authority of any idea or institution that supports itself merely on the merit of being “tradition”. As such, anarchists were early critics of industrial capitalism and advocates of women’s rights (including suffrage). Anarchism likewise rejects charismatic leadership as the kind that frequently leads to despotism or reformism (various “socialist” and liberal leaders are usually the primary examples offered). However, anarchism has an ambiguous understanding of “leadership” itself. For instance, Crass (2001) points towards leaders who work to create “group-centered leadership” (as SNCC’s Ella Baker did), as opposed to “individual-centered leadership”, thus circumventing the potential of manipulation and power-grab of individuals and thus diffusing power. Finally, anarchists reject legal-rational authority since its power is lodged within the confines of the State, which is bureaucratic (as Weber pointed out) and hierarchical. Anarchism claims that laws are made and enforced to protect the few and the expense of the many. Like Marx, they view the legal and political system as a tool of the bourgeoisie class.

By mere definition, the North American anarchist movement itself adheres to none of Weber’s authority types. At its core, anarchism is explicitly anti-authoritarian. According to George, “The fundamental principle of Anarchism is the rejection of authority, with the possible exception of ‘natural authority’” (George 1997, p. 55). Or, as the anarcho-punk band Crass put it: “there is no authority but yourself” – a sentiment that obviously contradicts authority, which must be over others.

Although anarchism itself does not possess any of Weber’s three authority types, it is not immune from norms. In fact, Spencer seems to suggest that norms are rather compatible to anarchism, albeit informal norms: “Norms are rules of conduct towards which actors orient their behaviour” (Spencer 1970, p. 124). As such, there are many unwritten rules or norms that anarchists follow, norms which do closely sync with Weber’s authority types.

“Traditionally-legitimated norms” – rules with historic legitimacy and precedent – are found in anarchist predilection for specific types of organizing, such as the use of affinity groups, a practice common since its popularized usage in the Spanish Civil War of the 1930s. Customs, such as the use of the “circle-A” symbol as an identifier, and parlance (terms like “liberatory”, “direct action”, and “mutual aid” in particular), have been used for a long period in anarchist culture.

---

47 This section was originally submitted as part of a paper for a course entitled “Sociological Theory” at the University of Akron, Fall 2003.
Individual anarchists also have quite a swaying power, an influence that approaches charismatic authority, but still falls short – partially due to a general repulsion of leadership and partially due to a rejection by these individuals of being used as idols. Noam Chomsky is a very influential individual to many activists on the political Left, Murray Bookchin is a political force in the New England states with his theories of social ecology and libertarian municipalism, and John Zerzan is greatly admired in the Pacific-Northwest for his writings about primitivism. Thus, it is an anarchist “norm” to read these charismatic writers, but not necessarily to be compelled to agree with all they write or advocate.48

The only sense in which Weberian authority might intersect with anarchism is with legal-rational. Although anarchists oppose the hierarchically-ordered modern state, they do practice a form of legal-rational authority within small organizations. In collectives, for instance, there are often rules or guidelines that must be followed, or else sanctions are lobbied. This is a voluntary reverence to authority, though, since any member of the collective can leave at any point. Also, it differs from most other forms of legal-rational authority in that individuals make a conscious effort to accept these rules, or even are involved in the rule formation themselves.

Even though it seems plausible to place some anarchist organizational structures within the legal-rational framework, Weber’s work suggests otherwise. He writes that although “legal rule” can be found in voluntary associations (such as anarchist collectives), it needs “an extensive and hierarchically organized staff of functionaries” (Weber 1958, p. 2). Since there is no hierarchy present in a collective, nor permanent functionaries, Weber’s own criteria discounts this possibility.

Yet, as Spencer points out, there is a difference between Weber’s legal-rational authority and an under-discussed fourth type, value-rational authority. The latter is “subordination to a principle” (Spencer 1970, n. 2). In this respect, anarchist frequently submit to value-rational authority, such as in consensus decision-making processes; decisions are made through a formalized process and assisted by one of more facilitators who are empowered to help the group reach a shared decision, but also enforce the rules of consensus. Thus, anarchists submit to the authority of the values of consensus and direct democracy, but not necessarily the legality of it.

**Near-Modern North American Anarchist Movement History**

Apter's (1970) account is typical of the general confusion of 1960s youth counter-culture movement with anarchism. The term “anarchism”, clearly, has been used inaccurately by opponents and those supposedly in favor of “anarchism”. He conflates anarchism with a type of self-destructive, psychologically-ridden ideology, practiced by the non-theoretical, and generally foolhardy. He makes connections with this counter-culture and past

48 Yet, it is still the case that anarchists, especially American anarchists (and feminists), incorporate the name and likeness of “Emma” (as in Emma Goldman) into their projects, infoshops, punk bands, t-shirts, speeches, propaganda, artwork, etc.
anarchist movement, but this extends little beyond curiosity. It is very likely that “anarchists” of the 1960s counter-culture were less well-versed in anarchist theory and that it was drenched in general rebelliousness than a desire to create a new world, but this still does not qualify those people as anarchists. There is some truth to these criticisms, that the youth counter-culture was reactive and making up its rebelliousness tactics and philosophy as it went along. But, concurrently, there was also radical scholarship and historical research occurring that uncovered anarchist theory of the past, and attempted to apply it today. But, to judge all rebellion as naïve and ill-informed seems a rather pompous endeavor.

Although generally dismissive, Apter does occasionally hit on some good observations:

> How can one explain this continuous preference by anarchists for spontaneous association? Behind the appearance of anti-intellectualism there lies a presumptive belief in an ultimate rationality as the common and unifying property of all men if unfettered by an inappropriate system, a rationality which, moreover, will temper relationships of people whose lives are based upon intimate and localized associations. (p. 402)

However, only paragraphs later he is denouncing any connections with socialism and organization—while at other moments seems to think that the only organizations worth considering are parties. The reader gets the feeling that Apter has forgotten his topic temporarily. Indeed, this seems a lackluster critique to be found in a journal entitled *Government and Opposition*.

Brienes (1982) notes anarchists that contributed to the New Left, who derived from the “old left”, only in a chronological sense. Further, Brienes differentiates between these activists and the “old left”, which was composed of decomposing communist/socialist political parties at the time.

> Such radical pacifists as A.J. Muste and David Dellinger, the Catholic Worker movement or anarchists such as Paul Goodman or Murray Bookchin were politically not old leftists. Their ethically oriented criticism of capitalism, emphasis on the activism of moral witness and distrust of hierarchical organizations distinguished them from the old left parties and organizations proper. Their impact on the new left may not have been extensive; nevertheless, the pacifists and anarchists are among the new left’s real forerunners. (Brienes 1982, pp. 13-14)

Anarchists have been keen lately to creating what Bey (1991) referred to as “temporary autonomous zones” called infoshops, which provide the movement with a space to hold
meetings and congregate, as well as to sell radical literature and propagate the cause. TAZs are also sometimes simply called “autonomous zones” or “a-zones”.

Feminism:

In Welsh's (1997) review of two books by Alberto Melucci, he ascertains Melucci's thought that “new social movements have to transform themselves into durable organisations in order to achieve this remain problematic in terms of anarchist and libertarian approaches... SMOs [social movement organizations] reproduce hierarchies and bureaucratic structures which are antithetical to grassroots movements” (Welsh 1997, p. 167).

Religion and Spirituality

Although many anarchists are either agnostic or atheist, a good number openly identify with some form of organized religion or unorganized spirituality. Also, there are a number of religions/philosophies that have been argued to be anarchistic in nature, or at least compatible with anarchism.

Taoism has been referenced (TAO n.d.) as having an anarchistic bent and understanding of human nature. According to TAO, Taoist philosophy argues that

Left to themselves [humans] live in natural harmony and spontaneous order. But when they are coerced and ruled, their natures become vicious. It follows that princes and rulers should not coerce their people into obeying artificial laws, but should leave them to follow their natural dispositions. To attempt to govern people with manmade laws and regulations is absurd and impossible: 'as well try to wade through the sea, to hew a passage through a river, or make a mosquito fly away with a mountain!'... Human beings are ultimately individuals but they are also social beings, part of the whole. Anticipating the findings of modern ecology, the Taoists believed that the more individuality and diversity there is, the greater the overall harmony. The spontaneous order of society does not exclude conflict but involves a dynamic interplay of opposite forces. (p.)


50 See a classical declaration of atheism by Bakunin (1916/1970). According to the 2002 Infoshop.org user survey 65 percent considered themselves not religious—including agnostic and atheist (Williams 2004b).
Snyder 1961 on Buddhism and anarchism

Still, Bufe (1995) fiendishly defines “Buddhism” as:

A philosophy which promotes compassion, respect for life, logic, and reason, and hence in no way, but for its unfortunate embrace of self-denial, deserves to be libeled as a “religion”. (p. 49)

Dewey (2004) points to Unitarian Universalism (UU) for its embrace of humanity and anarchist sympathies. The Catholic Worker are likely the most open anarchists, many of whom are prominent anarchists, such as Dorothy Day and Ammon Hennacy.

Foster (1987 and 1997) suggests that Amish-Anabaptists embody many anarchist tendencies. In his 1987 article, he contrasts the Amish with Taoism, stating that both have key values synonymous with anarchism, practice direct democracy and civil disobedience, use “appropriate technology”, rebelled against their oppressive contemporaries, and rejected “civilization”. The philosophies of Lao Tse and the Amish are akin to what Foster calls “eco-anarchism”, or similar to what activists today might call “green anarchism” or “primitivism”. He states that the Amish value:

Separation from – and non-conformity to – the secular world, in language, dress, the use of modern technologies, consumption patterns, types of residence... Value-oriented rationality, or rationality in the service of family, community and religious ideals... A preference for small-scale communities, farms and business enterprises... A reverential attitude toward nature and a respect for the benefits of manual labour... Voluntary simplicity... Christian pacifism, as embodied in the Sermon on the Mount... Adult baptism... The supremacy of the sacred community over the rights of the individual... Humility. (Foster 1987, pp. 10-11)

It would appear that the Amish practice their philosophy far better than green anarchists and primitivists, and are less ideological about it. They also seem to delve into less hypocrisy in action than current primitivists, which stems from the White middle-class.

51 As a complete aside, the Kent, Ohio UU congregation was open-minded and trusting enough to, at the last minute, host an anarchist conference on May 3, 2003 after the site reservation at Kent State University was pulled on conference organizers by a paranoid and ultra-nationalist (i.e. “patriotic”) university administration.

52 Again, see Boehrer (2000 and 2003) for more on the Catholic Worker movement. Also DiFranco and Phillips (1996) relate a story about Hennacy in the song “Anarchy”.

[Willards 56] [this is a draft. do not cite.]
North American anarchist organizations—groups that espouse an anarchist philosophy—may arguably be best understood by Fitzgerald and Rodgers’ (2000) model of radical social movement organizations (RSMOs), which differ from moderate social movement organizations in terms of organizational structure, ideology, tactics, communication, and assessment of success. RSMOs are thus nonhierarchical, participatory, egalitarian, and radical, emphasize structural change, use nonviolent action and innovative tactics, are ignored and misrepresented by the mainstream media, utilize alternative media, use limited resources, and are subject to intense opposition and surveillance. This model modifies the framework set by resource mobilization theory (McCarthy and Zald 1977) by arguing that bureaucratization and institutionalization of social movements is not always necessary or inevitable.

However, for this study, I will use the more widely-known new social movements (NSM) theory, since it offers the best vantage point to challenge the oft-claimed notion that the anarchist movement is of the middle-class or that it is not active in class-related issues. It also speaks more directly to the individual characteristics of movement participants rather than the organizational structures they utilize.

NSM theory asserts that in this era of post-industrialism, modern social movements differ from earlier movements, and focus upon less-class-oriented issues such as racial equality, feminism, peace, the environment, and localist issues. In North America, non-class-oriented franchise anarchistic organizations that fall into these categories include ACT-UP, Anti-Racist Action, Animal Liberation Front, Critical Mass, Earth First!, Earth Liberation Front, Food Not Bombs, and Reclaim the Streets. As such, Cohen (1985) argues that “Unlike the Old Left, actors involved in contemporary movements do not view themselves in terms of a socioeconomic class” (p. 667).

Offe (1985) states that NSMs differ from traditional social movements by focusing on values of autonomy and identity, organizing with decentralization, self-government, and self-help in mind, and tend to be ad hoc, egalitarian, and non-hierarchical—incidentally strong anarchist values. Because problems related to authority and domination may be found within multiple domains, anarchists are unique in their relation to NSMs. There is considerable cross-movement participation within all the aforementioned movements by anarchists and their organizations (Epstein 1991, Graeber 2002, Shantz 2003).

Sheppard (2002) claims, albeit without quantitative analysis, that anarchists are less likely to organize and belong to unions than in the past, and that they instead choose to find other work if their current job is disagreeable. Sheppard hypothesizes this is because of the aforementioned class collusion of modern unions, macho stereotypes of unions, and the punk subculture of rejection that contemporary anarchism draws heavily from. He opines that, “Young anarchists often correctly see the organized labor movement as not radical at all, but as a backwards force embodying the worst kinds of provincialism and political maneuvering” (para. 6). His generalizations appear to support classifying

53 This section is partially composed of relevant portions of a literature review from a graduate course entitled Sociology 753: Secondary Data Analysis, at the University of Akron, Summer 2004.
anarchism within the NSM framework. Cohen (1985) supports this: “Instead of forming unions or political parties… [NSMs] focus on grass-roots politics and create horizontal, directly democratic associations that are loosely federated on national levels” (p. 667).

Yet, Bagguley (1992) is critical of the NSM theory, because the above movements and organizational traits existed before the 1960s and post-industrialism, thus making a clear delineation difficult. Pichardo (1997) also criticizes NSM for a number of reasons. He points out that NSM theory focuses solely on left-wing movements, to the neglect of right-wing and reactionary movements. NSM ideas lack solid empirical evidence and as such tend to be more theoretical. Finally, Pichardo claims that NSM theory is less a brand new theory than just an addition to social movement theory.

Table 2. Geographical Distribution of Union Membership in Infoshop Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Valid Population</th>
<th>Union Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-North America</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Infoshop.org, author's analysis. Note: Twenty-nine respondents who answered a location did not answer the union question (31 total), thus the above figures may not add up properly.

Geographical

The 2002 Infoshop survey shows interesting relationships between geographic region and ideology. Although long suspected by activists, the survey provides the first true quantitative evidence supporting this. US respondents are grouped by state into four different geographic regions, including Northeast, North Central, South, and West.⁵⁴

The significant correlations between region and ideology are found between the two coasts. Northeastern US anarchists are positively correlated with an economically-focused ideology (those who identify as anarcho-syndicalists or anarcho-communists) called “red

⁵⁴ This geographical delineation follows that of the CHRR (n.d.). Although the four regions contain varying numbers of states, the total respondents for each are relatively equivalent in the Infoshop survey. The groupings are as follows. Northeast: CT, ME, MA, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, and VT. North Central: IL, IN, IA, KS, MI, MN, MO, NE, ND, OH, SD, and WI. South: AL, AR, DE, DC, FL, GA, KY, LA, MD, MS, NC, OK, SC, TN, TX, VA, and WV. West: AK, AZ, CA CO, HI, ID, MT, NV, NM, OR, UT, WA, and WY.
anarchism”. Western US anarchists are positively correlated with an environmentally-focused ideology (those who identify as eco-anarchists, primitivists, and other eco-friendly ideologies) called “green anarchism”. Also significant is the negative relationship between Northeasterners and an environmental ideology, meaning that those in the US Northeast tend to not have an environmental ideology. Westerners have a negative correlation to an economical ideology, but the relationship is not statistically significant.

This evidence supports the theory of a red-green split in the US anarchist movement. “Red” anarchists are those who traditionally focus on issues of economy and class, while “green” anarchists traditionally focus upon environmental issues. Symbolically, these various anarchists strains are displayed by varying anarchist flags: “reds” have a flag that is diagonally split between the colors black and red, while “greens” have a similar flag albeit with black and green. See Table ZZ for more detail.

### Table 3. Correlation Between “Green” and “Red” Anarchist Ideology Within U.S. Geographical Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Red</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>-0.11 **</td>
<td>0.13 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>0.17 ***</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Infoshop.org, author's analysis. Note: ** p < .01; *** p < .001*

Neither of the other two geographic regions, North Central or South, have significant relationships to either specific ideological strain. This suggests that there is no clear tendency within these areas. In fact, more respondents in these states identified simply as anarchists.

It should be noted that this does not suggest Westerners do not deal with issues of class—indeed the IWW remains active along the West Coast, especially in Oregon. Also, it should be understood that Northeasterners do not necessarily neglect issues of the environment, seen by the many Earth First! collectives throughout the region. The ideologies chosen by Infoshop respondents merely represent a primary focus, as only one answer was accepted by the survey. Far more respondents chose a generic ideology, such as “anarchist”, “anarchist without ideology”, or “anti-authoritarian”.

Outside of anarchistic organizations, the coasts also dominate in either strain of social movement industry (SMI?) (McCarthy and Zald 1977). Print magazines, journals, and publishing groups are a good measure of SMIs. There is no cross-over between the coasts.

55 Also included, but far fewer in number, are animal liberationists, deep ecologists, greens, and social ecologists.

56 *EF! Journal* notes seven collectives in the Northeast (as of late 2001). Granted, this is far fewer than the West.
in this respect; the Northeast does not publish a green publication and the West does not publish a red publication. These SMIs are listed in Table XX. There may be lesser-known periodicals that violate this norm, but they are unknown to this author.

Table 4. Green or Red North American Anarchist Journals and Presses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Ideology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anarcho-Syndicalist Review</td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth First! Journal</td>
<td>Tucson, AZ</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feral Press</td>
<td>Tucson, AZ</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Estate</td>
<td>Ferndale, MI</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Anarchy</td>
<td>Eugene, OR</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Worker</td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern Anarchist</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Various, AYP

Diffusion of political pieing as a tactic
- via newspapers and communiques (a-infos.ca, IMCs, BBB cookbook, etc.)
- a la McAdam (1983)

QUALITATIVE
- Interviews of local-area anarchists
- Research local-area anarchist history (esp. McKinley assassination-era, IWW/Rubber Workers [11 Feb 1913])

QUANTITATIVE
- Anarchy magazine survey
- Survey anarchists to rate “models” with a 1-5 rating: does this model help to explain anarchism? (very poor, poor, neutral, good, very good)
- How many (and where) are anarchist email listservs? What local groups/networks/topics do they serve?

GEOGRAPHICAL
- Map of FNB (and CM, ARA, EF!, ABC, IWW, etc.) chapters throughout US/Canada
“1913 -- IWW (Industrial Workers of the World) leads rubber strike in Akron, Ohio. The Akron Rubber Workers will do it again in 1936-37, at the General Tire Company of Akron, scene of the first sitdown strike in rubber. The first major strike, in 1913, represented an end of innocence. The action, which included workers from all of Akron's rubber shops, began after the introduction of machinery that made tires easier to build and resulted in lower piece rates for the workers. The strike was loosely directed by the Industrial Workers of the World, a radical group nicknamed the "Wobblies." It lasted more than five weeks. The workers made no gains -- they didn't even manage to shut down the rubber shops. The strike served chiefly to disillusion company executives. (http://www.infoshop.org/texts/iww.html)"

[Isaac 2002 – IWW and Akron strike]
INEQUALITY

Until now all human history has been only a perpetual and bloody immolation of millions of poor human beings in honor of some pitiless abstraction—God, country, power of State, national honor, historical rights, judicial rights...
- Mikhail Bakunin

A key – some might say fundamental – concept in sociology is that of inequality. A keen reader might say that inequality is simply the presence of difference and disproportionality when there should be similarity, be it in terms of social, economic, or political disproportionality. Yet, the sociological definition is often more economical, and thus often misses the many ways in which inequality occurs. As with your average person on the street, the anarchist views inequality as a system of interlocking oppressions, the are incredibly diverse, varied, and sometimes contradictory, but always antithetical to human freedom. Thus, the vision of the anarchist is one of actively seeking out inequality, and challenging the structures and institutions that facilitate it.

- The social reproduction of inequality (Giddens, p. 379)
- Cultural capital (Giddens, p. 379)
- Stratification systems: slavery, caste, estates, class (Giddens pp.146-148)
- Class: income, wealth, education, occupation (Giddens, pp. 149-154)
- Gender and stratification
- Social mobility (Giddens, pp. 159-164) – vertical (upward/downward), intragenerational, intergenerational, exchange, and structural mobility
- Marx: means of production and the analysis of class
- Weber: class and status
- Davis and Moore: the functions of stratification
- Erik Olin Wright: contradictory class locations
- Frank Parkin and social closure

Davis and Moore (1945, quoted in Kendall 1999) have argued that inequality is not only inevitable, but is also necessary for society. This is a misrepresentation, according to anarchists. Inequality may be necessary for a capitalist society, but is not inevitable or necessary for every society. Inequity is only essential if one likes power differentials in society. Inequality is necessary only if the existing system is to remain intact. Inequality is “mandatory” for a society with strongly hierarchical relationships (such as capitalist economies), but is not necessary in a non- (or less-) hierarchical society is possible.

[get a good “inequality” theory/text book and review, list, explore the various topics and keywords thru the @ lens]

[ Williams 62 ]  [ this is a draft. do not cite. ]
A 2002 user survey of the popular website Infoshop.org showed that at least XX percent were White males.57 This confirms the frequently offered media critique that the North American anarchist movement is predominantly a White one (and highly male). Thus, inequalities exist within the anarchist movement, as with the rest of society. Efforts have been made to deal with this, to varying degrees of success.... Anti-Racist Action, Men Against Sexism, Anarchist People of Color (APOC) conferences and collectives, Race Traitor zine, and others.

57 That number may be considerably higher since XX percent and XX percent did not answer the gender or race questions, respectively. For more on analysis on this survey, see Williams 2004b (forthcoming).
Another key sociological concept is organization. Thought by most to be oxymoronic, anarchists are in reality some of the most highly organized individuals on the Left (a label some of them resent, incidentally). Anarchists, therefore, believe in order and organization, just not of a hierarchical or authoritarian kind. Although this is pro-organization attitude is not 100 percent a part of anarchist philosophy, it has enjoyed overwhelming support in most anarchist circles. “Green anarchists” or the controversial “primitivist” factions of anarchism do not always paint a flattering portrait of organization, and some writers, such as Zerzan (cite?) are openly hostile to all organization, seeing it as a keystone of civilization (also an enemy). Such modern “anarchists” would be of the few considered “pro-chaos”.

Anarchists who totally reject any organization are in the minority. According to Graeber (2002):

in North America especially, this is a movement about reinventing democracy. It is not opposed to organization. It is about creating new forms of organization. It is not lacking in ideology. Those new forms of organization are its ideology. It is about creating and enacting horizontal networks instead of top-down structures like states, parties or corporations; networks based on principles of decentralized, non-hierarchical consensus democracy. Ultimately, it aspires to be much more than that, because ultimately it aspires to reinvent daily life as whole. (p. 70, emphasis in original)

The anarchist approach to political organization was set-in stone when Bakunin and his followers were ejected from the First International by Marx. This schism helped to clarify the many differences in tactics and philosophy between the State socialists and anti-authoritarian socialists. From Bakunin's “secret societies” to the *grupos affinidad* of the CNT-FAI, or from the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW) to the Direct Action Network (DAN)[59], anarchists have organized themselves in non-hierarchical ways for over a century.

However, anarchists differ from most leftists and socialists in that they do not form political parties (at least in an electoral sense). Some anarchists do vote, but they all recognize the severe limitations of electoral politics, and consequently form non-electoral

---

58 See Sheppard (2003b), which contrasts primitivism with anarchism.
59 See Polletta (2001) for a look into the NYC-DAN.
organizations. This differs from recent leftist efforts to create “third parties” in the US, such as the Green Party, the New Party, and the (non-candidate) Labor Party, or in the case of socialist-communist-alphabet-soup political parties—Communist Party USA, Socialists Workers Party, Revolutionary Communist Party, Socialist Labor Party, World Workers Party, Socialist Party, *ad naseum*.

**Anarchistic Organizational Forms**

Some anarchist methods and organizational formations follow. They are subsequently followed by a sociological critique of organization theory. It should be noted that non-anarchists often use these organization forms, too. Thus, they are anarchistic forms as opposed to anarchist forms of organization. These organizations are listed below in Table XXX.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Scale/Scope</th>
<th>Decision making</th>
<th>In/Out</th>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Pri./Sec.</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affinity group</td>
<td>Multi-use</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>normative</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>latent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloc</td>
<td>protest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individuals/affinity groups</td>
<td>coercive</td>
<td></td>
<td>manifest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Affinity groups</td>
<td>utilitarian</td>
<td></td>
<td>dysfunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition</td>
<td>Broad/diverse</td>
<td>DD/C</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>Organizations/individuals</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective</td>
<td></td>
<td>DD/C</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>Producer/consumer</td>
<td>DD/C</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>Individuals (producers or consumers)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>DD/C</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation</td>
<td></td>
<td>DD/C</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network</td>
<td></td>
<td>DD/C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokescouncil</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>Affinity groups/clusters</td>
<td>~S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union/Syndicate</td>
<td></td>
<td>DD</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>Individuals (workers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Author's analysis.*

*Notes: DD=direct democracy/C=consensus; P=Primary org/S=Secondary org*

Affinity groups (similar to “cells”\(^{60}\)) were devised during the Spanish Civil War, from 1936-1937, first used by the *Confederación Nacional del Trabajo* (CNT) and *Federación Anarquista Ibérica* (FAI), the two main organizations that facilitated a short-lived anarchist society in Catalonia. Respectively, they were an anarcho-syndicalist union and an anarchist federation that did the main self-defense of the revolution against Franco and the fascists, and later the Stalinist-aligned Communists.

\(^{60}\) An attempt to differentiate between a “cell” and an “affinity group” can be found in the Curious George Brigade's (2003) chapter “Clique, Cell, or Affinity Group?”, pp 50-51.
Collectives are similar to affinity groups, but are in a number of ways intended to be more permanent organizations. They frequently focus on longer-term campaigns as opposed to being active in terms of a protest. This distinction should not be over-emphasized, however. Often affinity groups and collectives do the same exact things.

Clusters are groupings of multiple affinity groups that have things in common, such as similar interests, geographical similarities, or similar purposes in direct actions—such as shutting down certain city intersections.

Spokescouncils are composed of representatives (called “spokes”/people) from affinity groups and clusters involved in a direct action event. The direct action could be taking place as part of an ongoing campaign or as part of a convergence of activists for a collective purpose in a certain location. These quasi-permanent councils have been popularized after their use by DAN in the anti-WTO demonstrations in 1999. Attempts to form a continental DAN have not thus far been successful.

Networks seek to link together other organizations who have common goals, beliefs, or interests. Networks are usually not intended as permanent organizations that are given decision making power, but they sometimes take it on regardless. They often are formed to address a specific campaign or approach to politics, to bring together somewhat like-minded groups to collaborate more directly with each other. In theory, networks do not even need to exist in name, but as the informal relationships between organizations; even so they are often given names in order to aid in the internal understanding of these relationships. Routledge (2001) says that networks are:

> greatly facilitated by the internet, enable fluid and open relationships that are more flexible that traditional hierarchies. Participation in networks has become an essential component of collect identities for activists involved, networking forming part of their common repertoire. (p. 28)

Federations are similar to networks, but differ in that they are usually composed of anarchist collectives only (and not different left-leaning or liberals organizations) and that they will intentionally label their federation with each other as such with a name. Examples of North American anarchist federations are the North Eastern Federation of Anarcho-Communists (NEFAC), Federation of Revolutionary Anarchist Collectives (FRAC), Anarchist Black Cross Federation (ABCF), the [late] Love & Rage Revolutionary Anarchist Federation, and the Southern California Anarchist Federation.

The word “federal” often makes people think of the “Federal government”; this assumption has overtime blurred what federations really are—similar organizations united on their own terms. The states in the US are federated with each other (under the

---

61 I have also personally seen the spokes model used spontaneously in street protests at the anti-FTAA demonstrations in Miami, Florida during November 2003.
62 See Ward's (1973) chapter entitled “Topless Federations” for more on the general concept of federations on a societal level.
auspice of the United States government). However, the “Federal government” has become a power unto itself, and autonomy of individual states can be over-ridden by hierarchical decisions nationally. [insert Watt's (2001) description of governmental federations here—try to adapt it to non-governmental forms] It is interesting to note that most anarchists (or, to my knowledge, social movement sociologists) have not explored this misuse of the words “federation”/“federal” and how the Articles of Confederation set-up a relatively anarchist political order (in structure, not necessarily in policy, internal composition, or morality), which was ruined/gutted by the centralization of power by the subsequent Constitution. The anarcho-syndicalist Paul Goodman seems virtually alone in pointing out this fact. Weltman (2000) cites Goodman's argument that “the American colonies originated as anarcho-syndicalist communities” and that “the colonies used government to limit the power of the individual and used participatory town meetings to limit the power of the government” (p. ??) [Also check Deleon 1973]

Black blocs are usually considered to be a tactic, not an organization. But, some sociologist might still consider it to be an organization, just not a permanent-standing one—it is similar to the popular fad of a “flash mob”. Thus, there is no “black bloc” to join or be a part of. Nor does any one person speak for the bloc. It just exists as a street demonstration phenomenon. Various local organizations will often make “a call” for a black bloc when a demonstration is happening in their community, intending that an internal unit of a march be composed of anarchists or anti-authoritarian activists. Black blocs are usually employed for some of the following reasons: to radicalize a liberal march, allow for internal anonymity in order to deter police provocation or “picking-off”, to discourage internal authority figures and manipulation, and so forth. There are also downsides to the tactic: unaccountability of “manarchists”63, marginalization by other activists and the press, and escalated danger from police engagement.64 Indeed, anarchists are not above self-criticism: Severino (2003) asserts “We are indeed opposed to the fetishization of the black bloc, which leads, among other things, to the phenomenon of black bloc spectators as well as “black bloc as fashion” (Severino 2003, PAGE?). Even though there is no “leadership” with a black bloc, it is usually understood that affinity groups are the organizational actors within, as affinity groups have discussed amongst themselves their general strategies and tactics prior to joining the bloc. During the bloc, communication occurs with others, but key decisions are made frequently amongst affinity group members.

Anarchists have also responded in recent years to protest situations by the formation of autonomous collectives of protest-oriented organizations, such as medics, legal observers, “radical cheerleaders”, who serve a specific purpose at an action (first aid, documentation of police abuses, and encouragement respectively). Such groups are spurred by the values of mutual aid and by the desire to assist in their own, unique ways to an action. This diffusion has benefited by the exchange of tactics and skills via the Internet, and by roaming “trainers” who help local groups form.

Collective action theory suggests that the divisions between gatherings, demonstrations, and riots are easily blurred and can quickly transition from one category to another.

63 For more on the “manarchists”, please see the Rock Bloc Collective 2001.
64 For more on black bloc tactics and assumptions about them, please see the section entitled “Violence”.
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McPhail and Wohlstein (1982) give an overview of this, and note that:

during gatherings, demonstrations, and riots most individuals assemble and remain with friends, family, or acquaintances. Those social units constitute sources of instructions and sanctions for the individual's behavior... [F] orms of collective behavior are repeatedly observed across a variety of gatherings, demonstrations, and some riots—e.g. milling, collective focus, queueing, collective locomotion, and collective vocalization and applause. (pp. 594-595)

Organizational theories (for anarchist organizations)---maybe make into a table??


Emma Goldman's “Syndicalism”.

For a more in-depth look at (European) historic anarchist organization (pro-platformist?), please see Skirda (2002).

From Ch5 “Interactions, Groups, and Organizations” of Curry, Jiobu, & Schwirian (2005) (pp. 124-152):
Types of interaction: exchange, cooperation, competition, conflict, coercion.
In-group—group to which people feel that they belong (out-group—group to which people feel that they do not belong).
Primary group—group characterized by intimate, warm, cooperative, and face-to-face relationships (secondary group characterized by limited participation and impersonal and formal relationships). See Table 5.1 (Kind, length, scope, purpose, and typical examples)
Reference group—group whose values, norms, and beliefs come to serve as a standard for one's own behavior.
Leadership—a person who can consistently influence the behavior of group members and the outcomes of the group. Three styles of leadership: authoritarian, democratic, laissez-faire.
Instrumental leader—a group leader whose activities are aimed at accomplishing the group's tasks.
Expressive leader—a group leader whose activities are aimed at promoting group solidarity, cohesion, and morale.
Organization—three characteristics: 1) it is deliberately constructed; that is, someone or some group of people decided to create the organization for some purpose. 2) It is structured, with well-defined roles and positions. Typically, the roles differ in prestige and power. 3) It has rules, and it has sanctions for violations of those rules.
Bureaucracies—a form of organization based on explicit rules, with a clear, impersonal,
and hierarchical authority structure. Negative consequences of bureaucracy: 1) service without a smile, 2) rules are rules, 3) goal displacement, 4) work expands to fill the time available, 5) bureaucrats rise to the level of their incompetence, 6) iron law of oligarchy, 7) invisible woman.

Organization: a large grouping of people structured upon impersonal lines and set up to achieve specific objectives.
Bureaucracy: the rule of officials.
Ideal type of bureaucracy: there is a clear-cut hierarchy of authority, written rules govern the conduct of officials at all levels of the organization, officials are full-time and salaried, there is a separation between the tasks of an official within the organization and his life outside, and no members of the organization own the material resources with which they operate.
Formal relations:
Informal relations:
Surveillance: the visibility of authority determines how easily subordinates can be subject to this.
Timetables: for regularizing activities across time and space.
Surveillance society: refers to how information about our lives and activities is maintained by organizations.
Oligarchy: rule by the few
Iron law of oligarchy: states that large organizations tend toward centralization of power, making democracy difficult, if not impossible (Robert Michels)
Clans: groups having close personal connections with one another.
Professionals: those who specialize in the development or application of technical knowledge.
Information technology: computers and electronic communication devices like the internet.
Networks: involve bottom-up decision making, rather than hierarchies.

Kendall (1999), Ch. 5: Groups and Organizations
Groups
Aggregate
Category
Primary and secondary groups
Ingroups and outgroups
Reference groups
Small grouping
Dyad
Triad
Leadership functions
Leadership styles
Conformity
Groupthink
Normative organizations
Coercive organizations
Utilitarian organizations
Bureaucracy
rationality
Ideal type

Characteristics of bureaucracy:
- Division of labor
- Hierarchy of authority
- Rules and regulations
- Qualification-based employment
- Impersonality

Shortcomings of bureaucracies
- Inefficiency and rigidity
- Resistance to change
- Perpetuation of race, class, and gender inequalities

Anarchistic Theories of Organization

Herein two theories of “ideal types” of organizations will be reviewed, which are rather anarchistic in nature. The first is from Rothschild-Whitt (1979) called “collectivist-democratic organizations” and the second is from Fitzgerald and Rodgers (2000) called “radical social movement organizations”. These two models offer a compelling look at alternatives to both bureaucratic-rational organizations and moderate social movement organizations.

Rothschild-Whitt (1979) argues that there are eight characteristics of collectivist-democratic organizations. She bases her model upon worker collectives, and generally does not imply such a structure for social movement organizations.

1. Authority: “Authority resides in the collectivity as a whole; delegated, if at all, only temporarily and subject to recall. Compliance is to the consensus of the collective which is always fluid and open to negotiation.”
2. Rules: “Minimal stipulated rules; primacy of ad hoc, individuated decisions; some calculability possible on the basis of knowing the substantive ethics involved in the situation.”
3. Social Control: “Social controls are primarily based on personalistic of moralistic appeals the election of homogeneous personnel.”
4. Social Relations: “Ideal of community. Relations are to be wholistic, personal, of value in themselves.”
5. Recruitment and Advancement: “(a) Employment based on friends, social-political values, personality attributes, and informally assessed knowledge and skills. (b) Concept of career advancement not meaningful; no
Arguably, the best pre-existing model for understanding anarchist movement organizations is the radical social movement organization (RSMO). In fact, the three examples offered by Fitzgerald and Rodgers (2000) (specifically the IWW, SNCC, and women's liberation groups) are not only anarchistic in nature, but explicitly anarcho-syndicalist in the case of the IWW. They focus on five “ideal characteristics” of RSMOs, all of which perfectly fit anarchist organizations.

1. Internal structure: “Nonhierarchical leadership; participatory democratic organization; egalitarian; “membership” based upon involvement; support indigenous leadership”.
2. Ideology: “ Radical agenda; emphasis on structural change; flexible ideology; radical networks; global consciousness and connections; antimilitaristic stance”.
3. Tactics: “Nonviolent action; mass actions; innovative tactics”.
4. Communication: “Ignored/misrepresented by media; reliance on alternative forms of communication (music, street theater, pamphlets, newsletters)”.
5. Assessment of success: “Limited resources; may be purposefully short-lived; substantive rationality; contribute to larger radical agenda; subject to intense opposition and government surveillance”. (p. 578)

In all these characteristics, anarchist values can be seen. In fact, Fitzgerald and Rodger's usage of the term “radical” can nearly be seen as a synonym for “anarchist”. However, their methodology requires that radical organizations must be studied in terms of organization, not as a collection of individuals. It of primary importance to research how organizations are structured, identify, operate, communicate, and evaluate themselves.

65 Incidentally, Farrow (2002) argues that “Feminism practices what anarchism preaches. One might go as far as to claim feminists are the only existing protest groups that can honestly be called practicing Anarchists” (p. 15).
66 North American anarchists most frequently use exclusively nonviolent tactics, but frequently do not preempt or restrict themselves to such tactics (particularly in the case of self-defense), nor do they universally criticize armed insurrection when it takes place simply for that reason. Again, see the Violence chapter for more detail.
[approach organizations are greater than the sum of their parts—\textit{not} organizations are merely collections of individuals]

\textbf{Anarchistic North American Organizations}

Finally, we look at the geographic dispersion of predominantly American-flavored anarchist organization concepts that have spread throughout the world, or what cynical might call “franchise anarchism”. I have selected four oft-found organizations, none of which are explicitly anarchist, yet owe an undeniably huge debt to anarchism: Anti-Racist Action (ARA), Critical Mass\textsuperscript{67}, Earth First! (EF!), and Food Not Bombs (FNB). There are recent books about two of these groups that are very good: “Critical Mass”, Carlsson (2002) and “Food Not Bombs”, Butler & McHenry (2000). McGowan (2003) wrote a good article on ARA\textsuperscript{68}; see Knutter (1995) for a European precursor to ARA (the “autonomen”). The best primary source for info on Earth First! is their magazine of the same name, although the organization has also had substantial academic study directed at it, particularly in the 1990s (CITE ALL).

Other examples of franchise activism/anarchism are the ACT-UP!, Anarchist Black Cross (ABC), Animal Liberation Front (ALF), CopWatch, Earth Liberation Front (ELF), Homes Not Jails, Independent Media Center (IMC; discussed in an upcoming section called “Indymedia”), Industrial Workers of the World (IWW), and Reclaim the Streets. [A FUTURE PAPER HERE??] ALF and ELF are unique franchise activist organizations, being completely underground. The only above-ground organization to these groups is the public mouthpieces and mediums that “actions” are reported through.

There is no centralized authority that determines whom is an official collective/chapter/event, but there are principles that are generally accepted for all. Although they are autonomous of each other, many interact and share information, ideas, and resources with each other, and provide solidarity in campaigns. Regional, national, and sometimes international gatherings of group members helps to spread ideas and sometimes leads to the creation of more formal links, like networks and federations.

\begin{table}
\centering
\caption{“Power fists” in the logos of anarchist and anarchistic organizations}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{67} As will be explained below, Critical Mass is actually more of an “event” than an “organization”. This distinction is important, and is interesting from a sociological view.

\textsuperscript{68} Wong (1994) also points to Lorenzo Kom’boa Ervin’s criticism of white anarchists (alluding to ARA?) for going after “obvious” (but marginal) racists like the Klan and neo-Nazis, but overlooking the more common, systemic (but perhaps less obvious) racism of society (such as the prison system, schools, courts, police, the economic system, etc).
All are based upon strong anarchist principles, a main component being direct action, in terms of either providing for/addressing a very specific need or creating visible protest of current societal problems.

It is impossible to know how many chapters/collectives of any of these groups are active throughout the world, let alone have existed. Numbers will vary based upon access to first-hand accounts, duration of the group's existence, definition of a group itself, and so forth. In fact, all that can be said about existing groups is that they must at least take to heart the general values of the group/movement, as a concept. By identifying as a Food Not Bombs group or an Earth First! collective, people are defining their own involvement and organizational mission – much like Mead's “I” is what determines which “me” a group will collectively show at any given moment.

### Table 7. Radical Social Movement Organizations (RSMOs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RSMO Characteristics</th>
<th>Anti-Racist Action</th>
<th>Critical Mass</th>
<th>Earth First!</th>
<th>Food Not Bombs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Internal Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonhierarchical leadership</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No official leadership or structure</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory democratic organization</td>
<td></td>
<td>Popular vote for routes</td>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>Consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>More or less</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Membership” based upon involvement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes; no “membership”</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support indigenous leadership</td>
<td>All-local</td>
<td>No official leadership</td>
<td>All-local</td>
<td>All-local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ideology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radical agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on structural change</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible ideology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Williams 73] [this is a draft. do not cite.]
### RSMO Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RSMO Characteristics</th>
<th>Anti-Racist Action</th>
<th>Critical Mass</th>
<th>Earth First!</th>
<th>Food Not Bombs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radical networks</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global consciousness and connections</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antimilitaristic stance</td>
<td>Indirectly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Indirectly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3. Tactics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonviolent action</th>
<th>Mass actions</th>
<th>Innovative tactics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Racist Action</td>
<td>Belief in self-defense</td>
<td>mass actions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Mass</td>
<td>Belief in nonviolence</td>
<td>mass actions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth First!</td>
<td>Belief in nonviolence</td>
<td>support mass actions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4. Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ignored/misrepresented by media</th>
<th>Reliance upon alternative forms of communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Racist Action</td>
<td>Demonized in media</td>
<td>ARA Bulletin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Mass</td>
<td>Demonized in media</td>
<td>Xerocracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth First!</td>
<td>Demonized in media</td>
<td>Earth First! magazine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5. Assessment of Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Limited resources</th>
<th>May be purposefully short-lived</th>
<th>Substantive rationality</th>
<th>Contribute to larger radical agenda</th>
<th>Subject to intense opposition and government surveillance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Racist Action</td>
<td>No organizational resources</td>
<td>Not usually</td>
<td>Absolutely</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Subject to harassment and arrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Mass</td>
<td>Absolutely</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth First!</td>
<td>Most resources donated</td>
<td>Not usually</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Fitzgerald and Rodgers (2000). Analysis by author.

Anti-Racist Action is a direct action organization that confronts racism, sexism, and homophobia in their communities. Critical Mass is a leaderless, monthly event where bicyclists take to the streets *en masse* to draw attention to issues of sprawl, oil consumption/auto-culture, and alternative transportation. Earth First! is commonly engaged in eco-defense, usually of old-growth forests by the techniques of blockades, tree-sits, tree-spiking, etc. Food Not Bombs is a vegetarian, food-sharing organization that commonly aligns itself with the homeless and anti-war organizations.

Food Not Bombs is a mutual aid organization, and – along with Critical Mass – may be seen as dual power organizations/movements.

### Table 8. Summary of Anarchist organizations

---

69 Earth First! and Anti-Racist action are not dual power organizations, but rather protest organizations.

\[\text{[ Williams 74 ] [ this is a draft. do not cite. ]}\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>ARA</strong></th>
<th><strong>CM</strong></th>
<th><strong>EF!</strong></th>
<th><strong>FNB</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Started</strong></td>
<td>Minneapolis, MN 1987</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA 1992</td>
<td><strong>LOCATION</strong> 198x</td>
<td>Boston, MA 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Slogans/mission</strong></td>
<td>1. Go where they go, 2. no cops, 3. defense of other anti-fascists, and 4. fight other discrimination</td>
<td>“We're not blocking traffic, we are traffic!”</td>
<td>“No compromise in defense of Mother Earth!”</td>
<td>1. Nonviolence, 2. consensus, 3. vegetarianism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional targets</strong></td>
<td>White supremacy</td>
<td>Car culture</td>
<td>Environmental devastation, over-consumption</td>
<td>Militarism, homelessness/hunger/poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific targets</strong></td>
<td>Racists, fascists, and police</td>
<td>Oil consumption, poor urban planning, environmental pollution, and wars for oil</td>
<td>Logging corporations, US Forest Service</td>
<td>Real estate gentrifiers, warmongers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct action</strong></td>
<td>Blocking/attacking racists and fascists</td>
<td>Exerting cyclists rights, slowing down traffic, demonstrating alternative forms of transportation</td>
<td>Impeding logging through blockades, lawsuits, etc.</td>
<td>Meeting human needs without the market system or hierarchical volunteerism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dual power</strong></td>
<td>Self-policing of communities to keep fascists out</td>
<td>Creating safe spots for cyclists, supporting alternative means of transportation</td>
<td>Creating an alternative vision of land-stewardship</td>
<td>Circumventing traditional “charity” organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mutual aid</strong></td>
<td>“Crews”</td>
<td>An event, no organizational structure</td>
<td>Closed collectives</td>
<td>Sharing food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>With oppressed communities, punk/skinhead scenes</td>
<td>With alternative transportation and environment activists</td>
<td>In the case of IWW/EF! Local 1, timber workers</td>
<td>Often transparent, operates on consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solildarity/allies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>With anti-war, homeless, and animal-rights/environment organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Voluntary association**


1. **Anti-Racist Action**

ARA has four principles that all members adhere to:

1. *We go where they go*: Whenever fascists are organizing or active in public, we're there. We don't believe in ignoring them or staying away from them. Never let the nazis have the street!
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2. *We don't rely on the cops or courts to do our work for us:* This doesn't mean we never go to court. But we must rely on ourselves to protect ourselves and stop the fascists.

3. *Non-Sectarian defense of other Anti-Fascists:* In ARA, we have lots of different groups and individuals. We don't agree about everything and we have a right to differ openly. But in this movement an attack on one is an attack on us all. We stand behind each other.

4. *We support abortion rights and reproductive freedom.* ARA intends to do the hard work necessary to build a broad, strong movement against racism, sexism, anti-Semitism, homophobia, discrimination against the disabled, the oldest, the youngest and the most oppressed people. We want a classless society. WE INTEND TO WIN! (ARA Network webpage “About”)

O'Brien (2001) compares ARA with People's Institute for Survival and Beyond (PI), another predominantly white anti-racist organization. She sees significant differences in how these two groups (one anarchistic, the other not) frame and define racism. She sees these differences as stark opposites.

ARA seems more focused on raising the sheer numbers of ARA members and is not as concerned about educating them into any particular framework, provided that they agree to the four principles... ARA members tend to be selectively race cognizant, ... [which means] ARA members recognize how “racists” use race as a way of dispensing power and privilege but strive not to notice race in their own interactions... For ARA members, colorblindness is a desired goal for all ... [and] prejudice in any form is the target, and the race of the perpetrator is of no concern... ARA members challenge institutions such as the police force which they explicitly advocate in their principles should not be considered allies, much less should ARA members consider being police officers... ARA members point to high attendance at protest events as a success. (pp. 136-139, all emphasis in the original)


2. *Critical Mass*

[Also add new Critical Mass rides, as cataloged by critical-mass.org (also check Carlsson's book for additional rides in appendix). Blickstein, Susan & Susan Hanson. 2001]
Critical Mass's only real credo is the saying: “We're not blocking traffic, we are traffic!”

Blickstein and Hanson (2001) explain that Critical Mass has been referred to as a protest, a form of street theater, a method of commuting, a party, and a social space. Difficult to pin down, CM is often easier to define by what it is not than by what it is. It is not, for example, a formal bicycle advocacy organization. It has no dues-paying members, provides no particular services, and has no stated mission... most Critical Mass groups share a number of common elements, including a decentralized network of organizers and the use of both traditional and cyber-facilitated methods of communication. Critical Mass’ open form allows movement issues to be framed in ways that encompass multiple geographic scales and that mobilize supporters with a wide range of motivations for participating in the monthly rides. (p. 352)

Table 9. Top 6 U.S. states or Canadian provinces with Critical Mass Rides

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Cities with Rides</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: criticalmassrides.info, Date accessed: ? Author's analysis.

Together these top 5 states (minus Ontario) compose over 37 percent of all U.S. rides from all 50 states, with California being far-and-away the largest practicing grounds for Critical Mass.

Critical Mass: US (127), Canada (16)

3. Earth First!

Earth First! groups adhere to their well-known slogan “No Compromise in Defense of Mother Earth!”.

As already mentioned, a fair number of articles have been written about the activities of Earth First!, likely because of their prominence (and the focus on the environmental movement generally). A number of these articles, however, look at groups based in the United Kingdom; these articles have been surveyed, but are not commented on here.
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Other anarchist/anarchistic organizations do not receive much publicity (in either academic journals or the mainstream press), which results in few things written about them. Thus, with only a few exceptions, the organizations referenced hereafter (except EF!) mainly come from activist sources.

According to Ingalsbee (1996), Earth First! may be best understood through a symbolic interactionist analysis. Unlike theories of resource mobilization, he argues Earth First! activists seek to mobilize symbolic resources that “represent socially-constructed cognitive frameworks that help to psychologically and physically organize, unify, and empower actors for collective action” (p. 264). This is done through a biocentric philosophy that identifies Earth First!ers with an “ecological self” and “the wild within”.

These symbolic resources aid in activist identification and mobilization. As such, “EF! symbolic actions are both means and ends of subverting the dominant technocratic worldview and constructing alternative ecotopian worldviews” (p. 273), or function to create and utilize “dual power”.

Shantz discusses what he calls “green syndicalism”70 (1999, 2002) and the attempts made by Earth First! To unite with exploited lumber workers in Northern California. Judi Bari71 helped to create the IWW/Earth First! Local 1, to help organize these workers, who were often without union representation (or those in the IWA72 who often found their union making concessions). Bari argued that workers themselves were in the best position to be environmentalists, but that they had to be approached first on the basis of their own workplace-based disputes and issues.

Get a recent issue of Earth First! Journal and compare “current” chapters with my list (in org_a.sxc) from a 2001 issue (maybe get the Sept 2004 to match up 3 full yrs? Mac's Back's Paperbacks in Cleveland Heights has 'em).

4. Food Not Bombs

Food Not Bombs collectives usually proclaim three or four general principles that include:

1. Nonviolence
2. Consensus decision making
3. Vegetarianism (if a fourth is declared, it is frequently akin to this principle: food-recycling)

While engaged in Akron FNB activities I have observed police surveillance of our

70 “Green syndicalism” may be yet another philosophy to create a more environmentally-sound world, perhaps complementing other “eco-city” philosophies cited by Roseland (1997), that include two anarchist-influenced theories: social ecology and bioregionalism.

71 Bari is also well-known for having survived an anonymous pipe-bomb attack and subsequent police/FBI smear-campaign. After she had died of cancer in 199x, she was exonerated (posthumously) in court for the bomb attack in 2002 (year?-- check Bay Area IMC archives).

72 IWA stands for International Woodworkers of America, not the International Workingmen's Association!
actions, cut up thousands of potatoes, peppers, and carrots, broken up fights, wheatpasted and stickered both public and private spaces, shared food at a number of political protests, scalded my eyes with jalapeño juices, cut my fingers, broken stirring spoons, composted dozens of pounds of food scraps/refuse, and had to explain at least one hundred times that we are NOT with a church.

The top 9 states account for over 57% (recalc) percent of all U.S. collectives, of 181 total.

Table 10. Top 9 States with Food Not Bombs collectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Collectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: foodnotbombs.net; Date accessed: December 12, 2003. Author’s analysis.

Interviews/questionnaires/surveys for FNB activists:
- general vision for FNB as a movement?
- positions taken and values held by FNB collectively?
- how long has FNB been operating/active?
- cross-participation in other activist organizations?
- campaigns run by FNB (homeless, gentrification, war, globalization, animal rights)?
- is FNB an anarchistic organization?
- rate of turnover?
- Ever a lull in FNB activity? (personally and overall as a group)
- food sharing locations?
- Number of times per week food is shared?
  - Ever tried sharing more times per week?
- Number of people food is shared with every week?
- ever "catered" at an activist event?
  - how many times and what events?
- primary subcultures represented (hippie, punk, activist, student)?
- how many anarchists in FNB?
- how often hold meetings?
  - use consensus?
- how well does consensus work?
- problems internal to FNB?
- police harassment?
sexism in/at FNB?

Criticalmassrides.info
foodnotbombs.net
aranet.org
earth first! (www?? -- Earth First journal!)

**anarchist organization via webpages**  -- [Lynn & Palmer (Dec 2003 Critical Studies in Mass Communication?)] The inner-connection of anarchist webpages. Facilitates the easy exchange of info about these organizations, and also allows the sharing of contact info for each collective?

It needs to be said that, although these findings are interesting, they are not a snapshot of the present anarchist organizations in North America, but rather paint a picture of the overall historic anarchist organizations that have existed on the continent. Since these are autonomous groups, there is no centralized authority for tracking active and inactive groups, although certain individuals have taken it upon themselves to attempt the task. As a result, there is no method for knowing which groups are active (and just how active) or inactive. Thus, take the following with a grain of salt. Interesting salt, of course!

**How many [estimated] chapters internationally for each?  Trying to calculate a figure for this, but many listings are out-dated, missing, or overlapping.**

Map locations of North American chapters (ARA, FNB, CM, IMC [also international - see below], maybe EF!)
Compare chapters to city populations (ratio)
Compare # of chapters per state to state population
Total population % of NA that has/had a group "serving" them... for ex. If Cincy, Columbus, Akron, Cleveland, and Dayton have had FNB chapters, then these might apply to roughly 30% of the state of Ohio (etc). Use actual cities [not metro areas] and most recent [2000 census] data.

[Get ahold of ARA Bulletin/newsletter... if can't mailorder it, maybe Labadie Library at UM, Ann Arbor]

[Insert new analysis on IWW groups -- find a way to distinguish between GNB (??), contacts, and other groups, such as workplaces]

Do regression analysis comparing IMC locations to the concentration of anarchistic franchises (or even straight-up anarchist projects?). Might have to base the IMC(s) in individual states and do the same for organizations. [But, state-based IMCs (like
Michigan for example) might skew this, since they cover the entire (rather sizable) state.
Chuck D of Public Enemy once said that rap was Black America's CNN. In a similar light, the Independent Media Center (IMC) movement could be seen as the anarchist movement's CNN. Like rap, IMCs were formed out of lack of other expressive avenues. They also are enjoyed by others outside of Black America and the anarchist movement—IMC websites are visited by other radicals, liberals, the curious, the trolling right-wing, and police agents.

There are two important intersections of anarchism with the recent Independent Media Center movement: 1) the common presence of anarchist participation in local IMCs and 2) the anarchistic nature, structure, and behavior of the Global IMC Network and of local IMCs. Although the first intersection is interesting, I will spend most time discussing the second intersection.

The IMC grew out of the anti-WTO demonstrations that took place in Seattle, Washington during late November 1999. Media activists suspected that once again the message of demonstrators (especially those with the Direct Action Network) would be blacked-out of the media or distorted beyond recognition, and thus took it upon themselves to set-up various mechanisms for distributing news about both the demonstrations themselves and the WTO itself. These mechanisms took the form of a central, clearinghouse webpage where anyone could get up to date developments from the streets, share photographs, video footage, and first-hand accounts. The IMC broadcast a 30-minute TV program each of the five days of the demonstrations and put out a newspaper each day. These TV broadcasts were carried on many independent television/cable programs, such as Paper Tiger TV and have been collected in the video “Showdown in Seattle” available from the Seattle IMC.

This model was so effective and inspiring that other anti-corporate globalization activist decided to emulate the Seattle IMC in subsequent mass mobilizations in the US, the anti-IMF/World Bank demos in Washington DC during April 2000 being the first. Since these decisions grew primarily out of the Direct Action Network and the spokescouncil model, it is predictable that many anarchists would become involved in the functioning and design of the IMCs.

---

73 Reference for Chuck D's “Black CNN” quote!! or whomever else said this...
74 See the coverage of the 1999 WTO demos from the Seattle IMC (now an independent/autonomous entity) at their webpage: http://seattle.indymedia.org/wto/ (??what is the new correct c/site??)
75 Whether in the past (Hong 1992, Cobb-Reiley 1988) or in the present (McLeod & Detenber 1999), media distortion has been a consistent dynamic during the entire history of anarchism in the United States.
76 From comments by DC anarchist organizer Chuck Munson – a.k.a. “Chuck0” – about the spokescouncil decision to emulate the success of Seattle's IMC for the "a20" demos (Radio4All.net syndicated program named “041700chuck0.mp3”).
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Since many anarchists were engaged in the construction of the early IMCs and later the Global IMC Network, it is also entirely predictable that its structure would contain many anarchist values. I will try to briefly detail these values now.

Table 11. Anarchistic Values of Local IMCs and Global IMC Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local IMCs</th>
<th>Global IMC Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Autonomy: Collectives each have their own principles of unity, missions, policies</td>
<td>● Anti-authoritarian: Software used is open source code that is transparent, and open to both criticism and improvement; no one controls the code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Consensus: Decisions are made in a cooperative and non-hierarchical fashion</td>
<td>● Autonomy: All work for the Network is done in independent committees/working groups (via open-to-the-public listserves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Direct action: Instead of asking the existing media to reform itself, IMCs do-it-themselves. Utilize and publicize direct action as a method for social/political change</td>
<td>● Cooperation: Software encourages collaboration between developers and users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Freedom: Open-publishing newswires allow for personal expression and individual empowerment to tell one's own story</td>
<td>● Decentralization and federation: the Network is a collection of dozens of independent, local collectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Solidarity: Integrated into local activist communities; they are involved, yet fair and honest</td>
<td>● Mutual aid: Share resources, such as tech skills: website set-up, web-hosting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● TAZs: Editorial policies of local collectives keep freedom on newswire, insofar as racist/sexeist/homophobic/classist/anti-Semitic/etc. speech does not appear—definitely a pro-active, anti-authoritarian practice of keeping a “safe space” for activist news [quote from the Rogue IMC’s editorial policy?]</td>
<td>● Solidarity: Network volunteers practice strong multi-lingual solidarity, bringing new IMCs through beginning (“New IMC”) process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Transparency: Users have the ability to comment on newswire posts, which encourages active dialogue, debate, discussion, information sharing (information is free; challenge/criticism is accepted)</td>
<td>● Voluntary association: Working groups must sync their decisions together—via consensus—in order to make global decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Voluntary association: IMC volunteers network themselves amongst existing alternative media—not as a centralized power, but as a conduit for collaboration, resource sharing, cross-pollination of mediums, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As further evidence of the Network's anarchist sympathies, witness the “New-Imc” working group's description of the theory and practice of the Network:

NETWORK OVERVIEW - THEORY AND PRACTICE

The strength of the IMC as a concept comes directly from its organizational structure; namely, a decentralized network of autonomous collectives whose shared resources allow for the creation of a social and digital infrastructure that is independent of state and market forces. It is our intention as a media movement to build out this structure so
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that, on the one hand, we have local IMC's throughout the world that are autonomous in their decision making while, on the other hand, we are united in a network form of organization that allows for collaboration on a level previously reserved for state and corporate interests. To the extent the network is effective in challenging abusive systems of power is directly related to our ability to create decentralized structures. It is our ability to be flexible and simultaneously united that has proven effective.

However, it cannot be understated that in order for collaboration to occur network wide, there needs to exist a set of guidelines and a process by which we all agree to work. Quite frankly, it is necessary to resist any efforts by a local collective, for example, that wishes to develop a non-participatory, top-down structure, or would like to create a corporation out of a local IMC. To this end, we have developed guidelines for network participation in the form of two crucial documents: the Principles of Unity and the Criteria for Membership. These documents, in a sense, are a pact amongst media activists that allow for the network to exist. It is under these assumptions that we are united yet autonomous. (newimc.indymedia.org)

Usage of language such as “a decentralized network of autonomous collectives” and “we are united in a network form of organization that allows for collaboration” reinforce the increasingly obvious tendencies the network has retained.

It is clear that the success of Indymedia, particularly in revealing to thousands internationally the brutality of police in response to nonviolent protest, has brought upon additional repression. Baghdad, et al. (2001) detail some of the violence and political tricks of repression brought upon the Seattle (original), Washington D.C., Philadelphia, Los Angeles, and Cincinnati IMCs, in forms varying from macing, assault, revoked freedom of the press, raids, fake bomb threats, gag orders, and subpoenas. Since the writing of the piece, additional repression has been visited upon the Indymedia movement, particularly in Genoa, Italy during a G-8 summit (where Italian police beat dozens to a pulp in an IMC site) and in the harassment of the Bay Area IMC (San Francisco area) by the Diebold Corporation, for publishing “secret” documents showing the flaws in their electronic voting machines. [check www.indymedia.org/fbi for more news??]

Beckerman (2003) observes:

Indymedia's reporter-activists believe that no journalism is without bias... [and] that they are not afraid to admit their own bias: journalism in the service of upending the status quo. They make the argument that this unabashed
In early 2001 (check date in org_a.sxc) the idea was floated on the imc-process working group list to create a new working group that would deal exclusively with the task of assisting newly-forming IMCs to work through a formalized “new IMC” process. In creating another working group to accomplish this task, the IMC network was further decentralizing and preventing against imc-process becoming a centralized power. Soon after this decision was formalized, the admittance of new IMCs became much more streamlined (not to say there were not problems, but they were much more clearly dealt with) and the IMC expanded more internationally beyond the Euro-American domain. (cite the growth of non-Euro-American IMCs during this time period to present – a line graph of time progression would be cool (# of approved IMCs)).

[“Indymedia: Between Passion and Pragmatism”, Gal Beckerman, Columbia Journalism Review]
[Mackley 2002]
[Chuck0 2002. “The Sad Decline of Indymedia”]
[Chynoweth 2003]
[Shumway 2003]
[Morris, 2003] !!

According to Table xxx, there are roughly 121 total IMCs in the world (although new IMCs are frequently being added to the global network). It should be noted that “North America”, were is a category, would consist of 58 IMCs, nearly half of the entire world. Additionally, if one were to consider the “West” (i.e., North America and Europe), 91 of 121 (or roughly three-fourths) would be counted. Clearly the “digital divide” and Euro-centrism have a great deal to due with this imbalanced distribution.

**Table 12. Global Independent Media Centers per Region**
In addition to the IMC movement, other digital tools have facilitated the dissemination of anarchist information and news, specifically the “a-infos news service” which is a multi-language news, information, and announcement exchange service run by TAO Collective.\(^77\) Other sources of anarchist information come from the Mid-Atlantic Infoshop, the A-Infos Radio Project (Radio4All.net)\(^78\), and dozens of smaller message boards and hundreds of emailing lists.

Various North American collectives also provide electronic service free of costs (read: mutual aid) to radical activists, including email, listserves\(^79\), and web-hosting. Mutualaid.org, tao.ca, riseup.net, and resist.ca are the major North American projects providing these services. Indeed, it has been frequently noted (cite) by anarchists, that the Internet itself is structured and operates on anarchist principles. It is logical, then, that the Internet has been a useful tool for the dissemination of anarchist ideas and for anarchist communication.

Another major form of independent media that has a long North American history is the self-published pamphlet, or zine (short for “magazine”). Kucsma (2003) writes about the importance of zine culture to providing an undercurrent of resistance to social movements.

\[^{77}\] TAO = The Anarchy Organization. \\
\[^{78}\] Hosts thousands of free mp3s of speeches, debates, conferences, and radio broadcasts from all over the world, all of a Left-leaning or anarchist nature. \\
\[^{79}\] For a deeper look at the electronic methods of organizing by anarchists, the chapter Organization details the various email listserves operated by and for anarchists.
each IMCs webpage to “about” pages to find specific dates of admittance. (3) view an IMCs listserv for hints on when they were admitted. (4) last resort: contact IMC's contact email and listserv asking if anyone knows when it was first admitted.

To see rise-n-fall, compare my master list of IMCs with dates w/ the official “active” IMC list. For those who are no longer active, try to determine when they were removed. Possibly contacting people like Jay, Sheri, Boud, Bart, etc. for info on these deletions (or even additions) may be helpful.

Do regression analysis on IMC locations (at least N. American) to see what factors influence where they are. Hypothesis: IMCs are either positively correlated with or are dependent upon the concentration of anarchist/anarchistic organizations in the same city or state. Dependent variable: IMC city/state; Independent variables: cities/states containing a “franchise” anarchist organization (i.e. ABC, ARA, CM, EF!, FNB, IWW) or maybe even any anarchist organization (use Anarchist Yellow Pages for this, although it tends to be rather patchy and incomplete). ??

IMC geographical delineations - region, city, state/province, country, [etc.]: how many of each, which differs, service to each region, etc.
Chronological rise of each new IMC - use Wiki database and new-imc list [and imc-process] or cities.inc file [?] to determine [+ inactivity/death of IMC]
Line chart of IMC growth (horizontal axis = time, vertical axis = # of global IMCs)
Pie charts (each for a time period - year?) of percentage of continent for total IMCs [e.g. 2000 = 100% NA IMCs; 2001 = 80% NA, 20% = European; etc.]
Read IMC page on FBI activity/crack-downs/legal-attacks. Combine into text. Affecting large convergences or other things too?
Do left wing bibliography search for IMC movement. Integrate major findings, analysis, and theory into text. [IMC's "Indymedia in the news" page (?), Z-Net, alternet.org, commoncause.org, infoshop.org, a-infos (en), etc. Do Nexis-Lexis database search on "Independent Media Center" and "IMC" over last 5 years.
Integrate Shumway, Chuck0, Beckerman, Naomi Klein (?), et al. into text.

Almeida, et al. 2003
Kidd 2003
Van Aelst, et al. 2002
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VIOLENCE

If we speak honestly, we must admit that everyone believes in violence and practices it, however [one] may condemn it in others.
In fact, all of the institutions we support and the entire life of present society are based on violence.
- Alexander Berkman

This would indeed be a poor primer on anarchism if it failed to mention “violence”. In the modern era, anarchists have always been associated with violence. There is, of course, a good reason for this—namely the early “propaganda by the deed” movement within anarchism, which intended to incite popular uprisings by the assassination of visible political figures, such as prime ministers, czars, police chiefs, or corporate executives. This rarely happened as intended, and in fact, the closest it ever got to an “uprising” was provoking the First World War by the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand. The assassinations of railroad thug Henry Clay Frick (attempted) by Alexander Berkman and of President William McKinley by Leon Czolgosz did not bring about any great rebellion in America, just a lot of state repression. Yet, anarchists have always held that self-defense, including defense by force (often including armed defense), is a right of people resisting oppression. Of course, countless people from all over the political spectrum have carried out assassinations and advocated self-defense, including governments.

Thus, there is a more important reason why anarchists have been perceived as violent. The threat posed by their revolutionary rhetoric to the status quo is itself seen as violent—or at least has been framed as violent by elites and their lapdogs in the media. Sociologically-speaking, since the state (and capitalism) attempts to portray itself as the only sane, logical form of social order, than those opposed to the state and capitalism must be pro-disorder (or so the argument goes). Thus, to be opposed to order, one must surely be deranged, sinister, vengeful, and evil. By insinuation, anarchists have always been portrayed to the general public as people who wish to carry out their agenda by violent overthrow, to install nothing but a “system” of “chaos”.

In recent times, anarchists have been derided for their direct action against corporate property, particularly during black bloc marches (especially during 1999's anti-WTO actions in Seattle) and pro-environmental “monkey-wrenching”. Not only the establishment reacts harshly to such actions, but also organized “liberal/left” movements, who have a strong foundation in nonviolence in North America. It is indeed ironic that the similarities are not seen more often to those of people like the Plowshares movement and the Barrigan brothers—pacifists who actively destroyed property to directly and symbolically impede US war-making capacity.

80 A great article on the “construction” of the “anarchist beast in American periodical literature” may be found in Hong (1992).
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A look at the December 1999 archives of the “SOCIAL-MOVEMENTS” listserve archives bores out this academic failure to distinguish property destruction from violence. People in Seattle (and many who did not live there) posted to this academic list, repeatedly associating “graffiti”, “vandalism”, and “property destruction” with violence. Despite what one thinks of the tactic of property destruction or “trashing”, it is not inherently violent according to anarchist thinking. This is a very key component of anarchist theory, so it bears repeating: property destruction is not violence. It also illustrates a divide between radical and liberal analysis within the Left.

“brook@california.com” posted this account:

Most of the violence was caused by a vigilantee group that joined the protests after the start of the march who were anarchist. These groups also were the ones that slashed tires and spray painted. The peacefull protestors used chalk for graffiti. (date)

(This response is especially noteworthy for not assigning any responsibility for the violence to the police. It also seems to suggest that the quasi-permanency of spray-paint is violent, whereas less-than-permanent chalk is nonviolent.)

Doug Hunts [check last name] stated:

a very few whackos despite everyone's best efforts got out of line and resorted to violence, even beating down demonstrators that tried to get them to stop -- there are really a total of about 50/200 roudies (date)

Peter Bergel wrote:

Demonstrators moved immediately to quell property damage and equally determinedly to break up conflicts. Others immediately began to chant "Nonviolent protest! Nonviolent protest!" (date)

“rkmoore@iol.ie” mused:

I continue to _suspect PGA as being the instigator of the
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demonstrator-violence, but I'm not sure. (date)

Smith (2001), writing in a premiere social movement journal called *Mobilization*, mars her otherwise great article by conflating the property destruction and [police] violence in Seattle: “Anarchist groups... did not use violence first” (p. 13, my emphasis). She would have been right in saying that anarchists did not act first to provoke the police violence with property destruction.

It is, unfortunately, not just a failure of liberal scholarship to see the distinction, but of the activist Left, too. This is born out by the intense debates after “Seattle” amongst those active in the anti-corporate-globalization movement, and even those at its periphery, apparently hell-bent on sanitizing and controlling it.

Plainly put, anarchists define violence as harm caused towards people, and—unless glass windows or brick walls are actually human beings—property destruction is not (in and of itself) violent. Of course, it can be reckless, indirectly violent, a poor tactic, and so forth. But, as anarchist Chuck0 states: “[find Chuck0 quote re: property destruction]”. Thus, by associating property destruction with violence, property is elevated to the level of human beings. By such logic, smashing a window would be as violent as smashing someone's face, or spray painting a wall as violent as etching words into someone's skin with a razor blade. Proudhon, the first “anarchist”, declared that property itself was theft, thus claiming that property was in fact also a form of violence, since one can possess it to the detriment of another.

The ACME Collective (part of the Seattle “N30” black bloc), clarified this difference in a communique:

Private property should be distinguished from personal property. The latter is based upon use while the former is based upon trade. The premise of personal property is that each of us has what s/he needs. The premise of private property is that each of us has something that someone else needs or wants. In a society based on private property rights, those who are able to accrue more of what others need or want have greater power. By extension, they wield greater control over what others perceive as needs and desires, usually in the interest of increasing profit to themselves. (ACME Collective 1999)

It is also worth noting, in passing, the failure of liberals (let alone the media) to understand what the black bloc was (a group? a sect? a tribe from Eugene, Oregon?) and that it was not a new tactic, but had been used for many years in the US and in Europe.

---

strong anarchist principles, as indicated in its organizational principles, which include a rejection of capitalism/imperialism/feudalism and all other forms of domination, a belief in direct action and civil disobedience, and an organizational philosophy based on decentralization and autonomy. See Routledge (2003) for more on multi-scalar grassroots globalization networks. Also, see Ford (1999) for a pre-“Seattle” take on the PGA, contrasted with the NGO “insider” symposium on environment and sustainable development.
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Further, the focus upon anarchists after N30 centered only on the black bloc (and property
destruction), and not, as Crass (2001) noted, all the other activities anarchists were
involved in:

While the media obsessed over anarchists who destroyed property – the real story was that anarchists were simply
everywhere doing a hundred different things. Anarchists were doing jail support, media work, making meals for
thousands, doing dishes, facilitating strategy meetings, leading workshops and discussion groups. Anarchists were
doing medical support work, security at the warehouse space, communications between affinity groups and
clusters, organizing marches and blockades and lock downs and tripod sits and forming human chains. Anarchists were
making puppets, banners, signs, leaflets, press releases, stickers, and costumes (like the lovable sea turtles).
Anarchists were starting chants, designing posters and newspapers, playing music, negotiating with the police and
jailers to get our comrades out of jail. Anarchists were squatters occupying an empty building and attracting
national media to the issues of property, poverty and homelessness. Anarchists were held in solitary confinement
for being such effective organizers of mass non-violent civil disobedience that rocked Seattle and ignited the
imaginations of the world. Anarchists organized child care!!! And yes anarchists targeted corporate chainstores.
Simply put, anarchists significantly contributed to one of the most effective mass actions in recent US history. (p. 9)

Gillham and Marx (2000) detail various structural and protester-police interaction-related
ironies and ten effects which they argue helped produce them in Seattle: spill-over or fly
paper, reciprocal and neutralizing, escalation, non-enforcement, excitement, role reversal, strange bedfellows, secrecy, prior reform, and value conflict effects. They write:
“Authoritarian societies are defined by order without liberty. Yet democratic societies can
only exist with \textit{both} liberty and order” (p. 229, emphasis in the original). As such, they
suggest that not all demonstrations must end in violence or a revocation of civil liberties.
However, their general premise overlooks the fact that in Seattle DAN knowingly risked
police violence and the removal of its “rights” in order to physically stop the WTO
meetings. For example, Gillham and Marx suggest that the authorities could have
established “clearly defined (reasonably contiguous) protest and no-protest zones before
the event” (p. 227) in order to ensure the “delegate's freedom of movement”. DAN
intended to stop the meetings and in the process to \textit{deny} delegates the freedom of
movement, since they thought that allowing delegates to meet would produce a more
violent result that the revocation of their freedom of movement. Thus, Gillham and Marx
ignore that the compromises they advocate clearly conflict with the goals of DAN, just as
the goal of police is to repress dissent that endangers capital and State. The above
suggestion would benefit capital and State more than DAN.
Moving outside of the relatively easy-to-understand distinction between vandalism and violence, there is a deeper analysis present in anarchist thought: authority wields—and in fact is based upon—violence. And why the violent response from police to mere property damage? Graeber (2002) observes “governments simply do not know how to deal with an overtly revolutionary movement that refuses to fall into familiar patterns of armed resistance” (p. 66).

McLeod’s work (1992, 1995) on media-generated perception of protest (particularly in his study of anarchist protests in Minneapolis during the mid-1980s), are useful in understanding the impact that the mass media has in the perception of violence in protest. He found (1995) that TV news stories of clashes between protesters and police (already a faulty dichotomy, he claims85) caused less criticism of police and more criticism of protesters when one-sided, but the opposite result with less one-sided stories. The less one-sided story also provoked greater identification with protesters than the other. The study also showed that women viewing the news program tended to have more criticism of the police, less criticism of protesters, and more identification with protesters than men. Conservatives viewing the same TV stories were less likely to see the utility in protest and identified less with protesters than non-conservatives (in the study called “liberals”). McLeod states: “To the extent that one-sided portrayals predispose audience members to reject protesters and their ideas, the media narrow the boundaries of the marketplace of ideas” (p. 18).

Cobb-Reiley (1988) discusses the suppression of anarchist speakers, writers, and publishers in the early 20th century. In hearing legal cases against anarchists concerning “freedom of speech”, judges made it clear that belief in anarchism, was by definition, an abuse of freedom and, in all the cases, that belief was evidence enough to conclude anarchists intended to do harm and could, therefore, be punished (p. 57).

Unsurprisingly, the US government classifies anarchist and anarchistic organizations as “terrorist” groups—now a quasi-official designation for any group of people that opposes US hegemony. A 1999 FBI report (prior to “9/11” fervor) on terrorism stated that the largest domestic threats were “animal rights and environmental extremists”, specifically the ALF and ELF (FBI 1999, p. 1). Ironically, the report clearly suggests that none of these “terrorist” attacks resulted in the death of any human beings (you can guarantee the FBI would mention deaths from anarchists, were there any!). However, a number of deaths resulted from the acts of “rogue right-wing extremists”—which of course prompts the question: who are the non-rogue/establishment right-wing extremists (maybe the government itself)?86 In Congressional testimony, James Jarboe, Domestic Terrorism

---

85 When stories are framed in terms of “protesters vs. police”, the political message (and motivations) of protesters is lost or glossed-over. McLeod states that this “transference of protesters’ intended opposition is significant because a group that challenges government policy is political, while a group that challenges police is criminal” (McLeod 1995, p. 6).

86 See Gibbs (1989) for an attempt at sociologically defining “terrorism”, a definition that fails horribly—it never even mentions “state terrorism”!
Section Chief of the FBI stated that the “ALF/ELF is at the top of my list as far as domestic terrorism issues to address, and I can ensure the members here that this issue will be addressed” (Jarboe 2002, p. 49). Just prior to Jarboe's comments to the Congressional committee, Craig Rosebaugh, former press officer of the ELF was questioned. Rosebaugh not only had been subpoenaed, but also took the 5th amendment and refused to answer questions 54 times, not answering a single question directed at him regarding the ELF. It was a performance in true anarchist fashion—refusing to acknowledge the ability of the State to gather intelligence from or on “its” citizens.

To their credit, later in the FBI's report (1999), they bring up the core question: is this “vandalism or terrorism” (p. 21)? But, since these “special interest” organizations (curiously not described as “left-wing”) holds such a prominent place in the report, I will let the reader guess how the FBI answers its own rhetorical question. The report goes on to state: “Anarchists and extremist socialist groups—many of which have an international presence—also represent a latent but potential terrorist threat in the United States” (FBI 1999, p. 19). In another report, Reclaim the Streets and Carnival Against Capitalism are deemed “terrorist” organizations (CITE??). This demonstrates the inherent flexibility in the US definition for “terrorism”—or as Noam Chomsky puts it, “it's terrorism if they do it to us, but not if we do it to them” (GET EXACT QUOTE AND CITE).

US foreign policy and US military power is by far the most violent force operating in the world today. The skeptical (or the naïve), would benefit from reading Blum's startling and well-researched tome (1995) on the subject of US military and CIA interventions since WWII. By Blum's analysis, the US “intervened” militarily roughly 168 times prior to WWII (Blum 1995, pp. 444-452). Churchill (2003) also puts together a dizzying collection of US military actions (domestic and foreign) in his chapter entitled “That 'Most Peace-Loving of Nations'” (Churchill 2003, pp. 43-79). The quantity of episodes is shocking and the methods are shameful, particularly when done by a supposedly “democracy-loving” country. Anarchists, of course, argue that states (of any size) cannot be democracy-loving, since they embody the consolidation of political power in the hands of the few and obscure the rest in tides of bureaucracy. Thus, states are by their very nature violent institutions, and the romanticization of their behavior is little but self-delusion.

Thus, anarchists universally oppose militarism. (See Goldman's “Patriotism”) But not have always been opposed; Kropotkin is a key example (and one of the few) of an anarchist supporting WWI, much to the chagrin of many of his anarchist comrades (Glassgold 2001), which most termed as a war amongst imperialist powers.

Anarchists also strongly believe in self-defense, and thus supported the anarchists in the Spanish Civil War against the fascists and Stalinists. Many also vocally support the Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional (EZLN). Anarchist people of color (APOC) have argued the benefits of some kinds of nationalism for self-liberation, and see this as a form of self-defense. As such, anarchists have historically defended (despite philosophical or applied short-comings) the actions of self-defense by recent liberation movements within the US, such as the American Indian Movement (AIM), the Black Panther Party (BPP), and the Puerto Rican independence movement (the Puertoriquenos
Anti-Racist Action would seem to be partially inspired by the “autonomen” of Germany, autonomous groups of anti-fascists who would physically attack fascists, in public or private (Knutter 1995). Therefore, although most anarchists act nonviolently, some in fact do ascribe to aggressive violence. But, why hold anarchists up to higher standards than the State or capitalism?

The Burning River Collective (2002) of Cleveland stated on an anti-war flier prior to the invasion of Iraq in 2003 that they were “appalled by the blatant disregard for humanity that imperialist war, imperialism and capitalism entail. We want to see a lively, militant, creative movement emerge that paves new ground on the road to liberation”. (See Williams 2004a for more on the Northeast Ohio anti-war movement)

Thus, anarchists realize that it is the state, capitalism, patriarchy, et al. that are the most violent forces in society. The more centralized a state is, the more violent. The US has one of the largest power differentials in the world and is very centralized. It thus follows, as with all empires, that the US would conduct itself—rather, has thus far based itself—upon the presumption of violent neo-/colonialism internationally, and repressively domestically. As Chomsky observes, the place where the imperial societies may be overthrown is from within (CITE).

[Violence: reference Bleiker (2002)]
[Albertani 2002]
TEACHING

*Everywhere not only education but society as a whole needs “deschooling”.*
- Ivan Illich

**Introduction:**
I am struck by how often “exerting authority” is mentioned by the graduate students writing in Hare, et al. (1999). They accepted the same premise that many others have recommended to me about maintaining “control” and “authority” over students in class. This is fascinating to me and also pretty disturbing. Although I see the functional reasons for this power differential, I wonder if there is evidence to show that this translates into a conducive learning environment. I wonder because I know from my own student experiences that teachers who pushed us around brought out more rebellious tendencies in myself and other students; we would spend more time battling with the instructor than learning from them.

There might also be an important distinction to make between being “authoritative” (knowing your topic) and being “authoritarian” (demanding submission to your rule). As someone who is almost medically-allergic to authority (ego-maniacs, presidents, and despots make my skin break out!), I am struggling with the advice I receive (“exert your authority in class”) and my preexisting ideology and leanings. I have no problem with following a syllabus and demanding adherence to it, but I have never liked lecturing as a hierarchist.

This topic bleeds into another interesting thread: gender and race. Being a white male, I am typically viewed as having less “to prove” to others and already command respect based upon my skin color and gender. Others who do not have this birth-derived privilege, may need to find other ways of exerting themselves in a classroom. Getting respect (i.e. that an instructor knows what they are talking about) and being paid attention to may be more difficult for others than for me, due to the illogical respect paid to white males. In a sense, I might have the luxury of not having to “exert my authority” because my presence may command more respect than others’.

McKeachie (2002) writes in chapter 23 of “teaching students to learn”. The process of teaching goes far beyond just conveying ideas, information, and thoughts, and asking students to regurgitate them back to the teacher. McKeachie emphasizes the importance of active agency on the part of the student—increasing their “self-awareness”, defining their own learning goals, self-evaluation, wanting to learn, etc. Helping students to think through these processes (the means), instead of just providing or forcing one's own answers on them (the ends), seems to be what he encourages. And I am in agreement with those conclusions, too.

Sociology may be an easier topic than most (in some respect) because people come to most introductory courses with widely varying degrees of interest and prior knowledge. This discipline may make it easier because everyone has prior knowledge about society
and social interactions within it... no one approaches it with a blank slate or no experience. On the other hand, I imagine that there may be suitable resistance to many conclusions within sociology, due to preexisting biases that people have (“class doesn't exist”, “poor people are just lazy”, “women aren't oppressed anymore”, etc.). I am looking forward to teaching to see how people respond and react with their prior knowledge.

Values of teaching:
I cannot say I was vastly shocked by Roberts' (1986) piece on the development of intellectual development, where he notes that large numbers of college students and other adults never gain full operational thinking ability. I did appreciate his examples of how the teacher-student relationship can go awry when this is not considered, however. Primarily, I liked his focus upon the structuralist theory of teacher:

> If we view our role as one of simply transmitting knowledge, we conform to the expectations of our dualistic students by playing the role of 'Authority'. Playing this role may then serve as a barrier to the development of independent thinking, for dualistic students assimilate that role into their own cognitive structure and fail to think for themselves. (p. 214)

My own favorite classes (in retrospect, at least) were those that provoked me to think and challenge my own beliefs. When “knowledge” was handed to me on a platter I was far less likely to retain it long-term. Thus, even when I rejected the leanings or style of these more challenging instructors, I still appreciate what they did for/to me (intentionally or inadvertently): causing me to think for myself. “Cognitive Dissonance” is not only a great idea for a band name, but is a pretty damn cool thing, too.

In this same light, O'Brien and Kollock (1991) call for us (as teachers) to “empower our students by demonstrating the relevance of the sociological perspective to everyday modern life” (p. 140). I cannot think of a more on-point statement than that, in regards to making education “stick”. Probably the only reason I continue in academics is that I can still find a way to make it relevant to understanding everyday life. The day I get stuck in some abstract, arcane, and otherwise silly irrelevancy of “knowledge pursuit”, is the day I need to get out. Even for students who only take “Introduction to Sociology” as a general education requirement, making the ideas/concepts relevant to them seems like a great way to engage them and possibly interest them outside of their gen-ed needs.

I liked the application of social exchange theory (SET) to teaching, and although a bit tedious, I thought the discussion drove home the authors' point rather well—allowing students to construct for themselves just how sociology (or social psychology) is relevant to them, at the most immediate level (such as intimate relationships). SET is a decent way of bridging this personal experience with more formal knowledge.

Best, however, was how they tackled the subject of “values” in the classroom. It reaffirms
my own attitudes that we should not pretend we are “neutral” or “unbiased” about the
issues of the day. Sure, we should be fair and respectful in considering our students’
values, beliefs, and opinions. But, to pretend we ourselves do not have any is absurd, and
I think removes credibility from our presence. I think of Howard Zinn's excellent
autobiography called You Can't Be Neutral On A Moving Train (1995), which is the
statement he would use at the beginning of all his history classes at Boston University. To
inspire students to use the things they learn (whether from us teachers or from
themselves) is what higher education should be about; it ain’t a diploma factory (or at
least, that’s not its best utility). The passion we display in class is important to show
students that action is possible. For me, this last point is very important; as an activist I
am constantly confronted by the need to be critical of the dominant institutions of society
and the horror they frequently wreak upon humanity and the earth, but at the same time to
remain positive about the ability for people to organize themselves in a way that allows
for both resistance to these problems and for the creation of more positive ways of
organizing society. Their article brought this point out well, in my opinion.

Preparing for class:
Some of McKeachie's (2002) suggestions seem useful and appropriate. I particularly
appreciate things that encourage greater student participation in the process of learning—
and somehow he managed to mention two suggestions linked in with pre-course
planning. First, the idea of democratically selecting a textbook never dawned on me, but
it’s a fascinating idea! For some reason we (the well/over-educated few) seem to think
we've got the best humdinger of a book/assignment/whatever in mind, and don't often
consider consulting with those who will be reading or doing that task. Not sure how it
would work in practice, but I'd be intrigued by the process. I suspect-- and it's been my
experience with non-academic, activist work-- that people generate more enthusiasm
about things when they have an active role in determining the outcomes of a certain group
(or in this case, a class).

Secondly, I appreciate the suggestion McKeachie made (almost in passing) that we try to
create alternative assignments (or at least alternative readings) that will allow students to
pursue their interests more closely. My experience very much matches his thought that
“students who have options and a sense of personal control are likely to be more highly
motivated for learning.” (p.17) The clearest example of this is where instructors give
students the choice on a variety of topics to do a report on, opposed to assigning everyone
to do it on the same damn thing. Sure, a homogeneous assignment might make it easier to
grade, but it doesn't allow students to pursue their particular interests in a subject, nor
empower them a sense of ownership over their learning processes.

First day of class:
I appreciate McKeachie's suggestions about the first day of class, and how it makes sense
to use the time productively. It's a great chance to deal with non-content stuff like getting
to know the class, their expectations, develop some trust, etc. Although I sometimes
dreaded it, instructors who kept my classes longer on the first day of class actually helped
to calm me about the course and its expectations. When everyone is kicked out after 15
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minutes, you're left with a bunch of uneasy questions and get the feeling that the instructor is nervous or unprepared, too.

I agree that [seemingly] straight white males get on-sight respect and trust from students. I have continuously received this treatment (from both men and women), and I often felt undeserving of it, particularly when contrasted with female or colleagues of color. I have also, regrettably, seen the academic flip-side of this coin: I’ve seen lecturers repeatedly prefer calling on students who are of the aforementioned privileged background and taking their opinions more seriously (the same goes for the “older” students, sometimes). I’ve even seen professors pass-up women holding their hands up for long periods of time while they wait for the varying male opinions to be expressed.

The issue of dressing professionally and not wearing revealing clothes is interesting. I personally prefer to dress-down (not to look grubby, but to not look snazzy). I think I’d have a hard time trying to dress revealingly or provocatively. Any attempts to wear clothes that showed off my body figure would likely be met with relative indifference (although I’m told I look good in dresses), mainly because female body image is objectified in ways that male bodies aren’t. So, in a way, I have the benefit of not being judged upon the clothing I wear, or being taken less seriously for them (within some reason—I’ve got a few t-shirts in my dresser that would and have raised some eyebrows and angry fists).

Just being yourself seems crucial. Students can totally tell when instructors are uncomfortable or putting on an act. I think being professional yet approachable, honest yet knowledgeable, respectful, interested in students, and comfortable are the keys to putting the students in a like frame of mind. Playing the role of teacher doesn’t mean becoming superwo/man or becoming a boring cinder block.

“Active learning”:
I read the Atwater (1991) piece first, and I was mainly struck by the pronouncement that: “My role has been transformed from 'lecturing professor' to 'group facilitator’” (p. 484). It was reaffirming to hear this value stated by a teacher. I think we far too often get stuck in the frame of mind that WE know more than others about the things we teach; sometimes we do, but often that knowledge is merely latent in the “student” or can be developed by group and individual reflection. It reminds me very much of how the various radical political organizations I’ve been part of (S.T.A.N.D. at UA mainly, but also Akron Food Not Bombs or the American Friends Service Committee), the emphasis is upon group-centered leadership, learning, and decision-making—as opposed to individual-centered leadership.87 We have a person or persons who play the role of “facilitator” in meetings, not to lead or dictate the direction of discussion or decision-making, but to make sure that everyone can participate equally, keep things on track, and otherwise facilitate the group in its goals. In no way is the facilitator “in charge” of the meeting or group. In a similar way, I think Atwater is asserting that the instructor ought to view their role as helping the class (both collectively and individually) acquire the skills and understandings necessary to learn the topical matter of a given class.

87 Crass (2001) discusses Ella Baker as a theorist and practitioner of “group-centered leadership”.
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The methods elaborated by McKeachie, such as “learning cells” and team learning, also bolster my conviction that there should not be blatant learning hierarchies. I think it IS true that we can learn just as much from each other as we can from an instructor. This makes sense in a mathematical/probability sense (more people exchange ideas, discussing and sharing thoughts), but also in terms of equity. I think most people who have been at universities for long enough to enter graduate school can learn the subject matter in most texts if we are interested in it, and then teach it to others (thus reinforcing that knowledge). There's no reason to assume that students are not just as capable of doing that for others as we are. “Learning cells” as McKeachie describes would seem to be a good partnering tool when done by pre-class question writing and random formations (it would help students learn to ask and answer questions of what interests them, and to meet and engage with others they normally wouldn't, and thus to learn and teach from varying viewpoints/styles).

I think that class size if very important. We all know that there can be more discussion in smaller classes (not to mention individual instructor attention), but that doesn't mean that large classes will be incompatible with this type of learning. I've seen a sociology professor (John Zipp) use small groups in a very positive way that I think helps a great deal. That said it's important to note that the primary issue is the size of the learning unit itself—in large classes, the size of groups must not be larger than those within smaller classes. (In many ways, it reminds me of “affinity groups”—another activist configuration —how there is an ideal size that should not be superceded, or else the ability of the group to function will be rendered useless).

I appreciate that “active learning” and group work is not offered as a panacea to all other types of learning and instruction, but also how it is not a way to avoid for class preparation. Much deliberation and thought needs to go in how to use these varying group structures to make them useful, otherwise they could be a total waste of time. Also, combining smaller groups with large groups (like “clusters”, which are what anarchists call collections of affinity groups) or a whole class, will require our adept facilitation of the discussion (and of course a mastery of the material in order to help focus discussion on what appears to be important to the class). It's sometimes claimed that group learning requires student participation and interest in order for it to work. On the other hand, individual learning (being lectured to) also requires active student participation and interest, yet it is far more difficult to convince students to dedicate themselves to learning in such a passive environment and mode of learning.

Dealing with controversial topics and despair:
Moore's (1997) piece echoed what I and others have already noted in our own experiences in classes. Personally, it annoys the shit outta me when I get more “respect” for equally “radical” ideas than female colleagues or colleagues of color, just b/c I'm a white man. I loved the experiment she did with her classes and how it was able to provoke a discussion about her student's preconceptions of what she was teaching and why they might be considering it less valid due to the source. (Just to toss out the offer: I'd be happy to do the same for my female colleagues who will be teaching in the near future, particularly
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when teaching about gender.) I love the idea of comparing/contrast ing the speakers' positions and forcing listeners to reconcile why we see some as more important than others.

Moulder (1997) confirms many of my apprehensions about how many things are taught—not just sociology—and how things are set-up beforehand for debilitating results for students. Whenever I open intro sociology texts, I find just the LAST chapter deals with “social movements and collective behavior”. While, I'm glad that the chapter exists and that it does make sense in a way for it to be at the end (“now that you know this, here's what people have and can do about it”). I think that it still sets people up for depressing failure. How can we expect students to sit through nearly 14 weeks of “downer” sociology, and then be picked up by one measly chapter at the end?

I've been considering for the duration of this course to insert at the end of each lecture suggestions, ideas, antidotes, or webpages about movements and social change related to the topic discussed. I appreciate the focus upon exploring and learning the problems within society, but without providing a form of counter-expression or hope (as Moulder puts it) we guarantee depression, apathy, avoidance, or rejection.

Also, I know a social work professor at UA who commonly invites in local activists to her community organizing classes to discuss what they do, why, how, etc. I've spoken in her class about half a dozen times, and my impression is that the students WANT to know how to do things locally that will have an impact about things they care about. (And that such learning is just as valid as anything they learn from textbooks.) I've been invited to present in “Intro to Sociology” classes on social movements, because teachers know I'm active and might have some personal impressions to contribute. Afterward I've been told that a teacher was very pleased and surprised that some students who had not spoken for nearly four months spoke up in class for the first time and were interested in the subject. It seemed to me that if we can find ways to make every lecture/class period more relevant and useful to students, the more they'll want to learn and engage in class. From my own experiences in activist organizations, things start to stagnate—or people who are concerned about various issues move away from the group—when too much time is spent on complaining and debating the problems of an issue/society, and less time is spent in action. To counter this, I and others have tried focusing discussion on particular problems (that are more “bite-sized”) and then direct the group toward discussion about how to resist these problems actively (and to create alternative, counter-actions that behave in ways more egalitarian, democratically, and liberating than the problems themselves). In this respect, I liked Moulder’s suggestion for “action steps”.

In many ways, my experiences in activist groups (particularly those with a radical focus/objective) have been the driving force toward sociology in my life. Activists often have a very equivalent interpretation of society that is shared by sociology as a discipline. And during the last 10 years of my life (much of which has been spent in or around colleges), I've been surprised that there isn't a higher degree of participation in social movements by sociologists. It seems a very logical avenue for expressing dissent for those who have a very good understanding of what requires dissent. That said, I'm planning on speaking in Jean Anne (and Michelle's) intro classes later this semester; and
I'd be happy to do the same for others. I’m hoping to be able to invite other outside “experts” and activists in to speak during lectures of related topics when I teach, too.

Lecturing

Lecturing seems very akin to “presenting”, but the audience and reason are a bit different. This is a big distinction to me since most of my “lecturing” experience has been in the form of giving “lectures” to other classes at the request of other instructors and professors. In that sense, I was more likely giving a “presentation” on the topic and I was usually offering a specific viewpoint and approach. Also, most of my activist speaking involves “presenting” (and sometimes debating), more than lecturing. At one point, I was also tempted to transcribe entire lectures. But nowadays I'm CONVINCED that if I do it I'll at some point try to read it, and get hopelessly lost. As a result, I only draft an outline with a few comments or lists of examples. For me, the most important thing is the order of the subjects. If I get out of order or discuss something before something that should come precede it, I get all trapped up in back-pedaling. Whenever I do this, I'm nearly positive I confuse part of my audience.

Regarding using current examples during lectures, things like the My Lai 4 massacre are (unfortunately) out of the knowledge of today's students' backgrounds. (Of course, this is deliberate on part of the media and education system, and is why some institutional behaviors can continue without much problem from generation-to-generation.) Using contemporary examples (perhaps BACKED-UP by previous ones) is more useful. Still, I sometimes get the feeling that I talk “over” or “beyond” audiences, even when using contemporary examples. Everything about our society tries to convince people that they are learning things, or keeping up with “the news”, or have information/facts... but in fact are being deceived and distracted. As such, I often assume that my audience knows what I'm talking about or knows how things that I think are very simple to understand work. I've got to continually remind myself that I am (and we all are) much more in touch with rigorous research and analytical tools than the general population—and therefore I have to slow-down and take the time to explain things.

Keeping things relevant is super important to do. McKeachie's comment that he can’t be as good a teacher because he can’t keep up with current trends/media makes a lot of sense. I'm completely frickin' worthless in all conversations around TV. Also, even though I'm really into music, I couldn't probably name a single musical act on the Top 40 charts at the moment. I also have no clue about current sports athletes or teams. Like McKeachie, I've got to realize that this is a true deficit on my part. Even though I know more about sociological stuff, I'm a dummy when it comes to popular culture. However, that's how most people our age are socialized or symbolically transmit values. These mediums also have huge sociological implications and dynamics at work that are incredible useful for picking apart—if only I knew what was on the tube!! Therefore, I often speak very abstractly about popular culture and will ask the audience to fill-me-in about what's popular. I think treating the audience like experts in something helps them to feel empowered, will bring their interests into the conversation, and will allow me to make important connections with their knowledge and my knowledge.
**Discussing and writing assignments**

Focusing on facilitating discussion in addition to lecturing seems only logical from an anarchist perspective, and there's probably few teachers who'd say that discussion cannot be helpful to learning. It takes a skilled teacher to fairly, justly, and dynamically facilitate discussion, and I've been in awe of more than a few in my life. It takes skill and experience to not just talk over students and to wait for them to give feedback—it's *teachers* who usually monopolize the discussion. Keeping that in mind is important.

Finding ways to gain the trust of students, empower the quieter students, and to inspire them to find an interest in the topics taught probably takes a lot of vigilance and planning. It reminds me of McKeachie's earlier comments about how some might view group work as being lazy and an attempt to get out of lecture planning work; but that in fact it's even more work to plan group work. I imagine discussion facilitating takes just as much pre-planning and discipline. I've facilitated meetings before, and it's a lot of work—to allow for a diverse participation in discussion, to keep the discussion on-track and oriented toward the group's goals, and to help the group reach its goals. Facilitating a class discussion has to be just as much work. But, as with the organizations I've been a part of, the class would probably really benefit and feel very useful, empowered, active, and engaged as a result.

Learning student interests and finding out their opinions (possibly at the beginning of the course) seems crucial for discussion in class. For me, I think we should be tailoring a large part of our discussions and lectures to things that are either important to students (whether all of them articulate it or not—e.g. many students are political, but intentionally avoid talking about it) or things that interest them. Not to suggest that we avoid the core concepts we teach, but to make them relevant and to either integrate their interests into our lectures OR to integrate our lectures into their topics (that'd be bold, huh?).

I appreciated Bidwell's (1995) practice of not necessarily feeling the need to grade all writing assignments and that we should focus upon helping (to a limit) students improve writing skills. The informal writing students do can be really helpful, especially if there's a relationship of exchange with the instructor that is focused upon improving their ideas, but at the same time removes the pressure of students to do mediocre, acceptable, and by-the-book work. She's probably correct in arguing that an instructor might not want to outright say that such assignments won't be graded, otherwise students might not take them seriously (I imagine I might not, in certain circumstances), and view them instead as a learning opportunity.

**Teaching social movements**

I would like to (and have already) teach social movements. I feel that social movements are the one place that intersect (as Alain Touraine argues) with all the various sub-disciplines of sociology. The topic is often found at the end of introductory textbooks because it summarizes the efforts to deliberately (or inadvertently and spontaneously) address the issues of class, race, gender, sexuality, power, capitalism, et al.
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The main points I would like the students of such teaching to take from it is the belief that knowledge should lead to action, and further, that action is not only possible, but is always occurring. Many students walk away from subjects like sociology with the feeling that the world's problems are so insurmountable that we ought to lapse into depression. Rather, I would hope to inspire students into taking an optimistic (yet critical) view of change and to not assume that everything that beats-down humanity and the earth is inevitable, un-defeatable, or justified.

In such teaching I have tried to portray this positive (and pragmatic) outlook, while adding my own personal insights, stories, and motivations for participation in social movements and other forms of resistance. Informing students that there are possibilities, indeed possibilities that exist with movements and organizations within their own local areas is crucial, as to facilitate a more easy transition from apathy into action.

*In-class exercises and pop-culture:*
It's important to use various media to teach. I am pleased to see how many different ways these media may be utilized. Doing such things EVERY week (like a poetry reading every week) might be a bit much, but using them where it's useful seems practical. Or, having a general assignment for the whole class to do: like having class members each select a sociological song to share. (the ex-radio DJ in me somehow fantasizes about turning such a collection of songs into a mix CD, with liner notes detailing the sociological significance of them, that the whole class can have a copy of!)

As noted already, we have to find ways to make the material relevant, pertinent, and current for students!

I’ve experienced “role-playing” exercises such as in a global environmental politics class we had all sorts of interests, like huge insurance firms, the Union of Concerned Scientists, and British Petroleum (all apparently equal in power) trying to negotiate ways to deal with contemporary environmental problems. What you find out (obviously) is that this is impossible, even if ignoring that powerful interests (like BP and insurance firms) ain’t gonna compromise their position of privilege and profit. Same for the Palestinian-Israeli example -- clearly Arafat has zero power compared to the IDF, Sharon, and the US. But, with the “Monopoly” example, it’s very clear that not all parties are equal to begin with, which more directly simulates the real world than the environmental or Middle East exercises seem to.

I view myself as very “hip” in-terms of music, but I have NO CLUE about any of the bullshit played on the corporate radio stations (i.e. the Clear Channel Empire), which is what students primarily listen to. Thus, even if I have great examples of sociological messages in music, who in my class is going actually be able to identify with Ani DiFranco, Anti-Flag, dead prez, or Le Tigre?

A parting note: revolution is the only answer we all have to solving the world’s problems, and we can’t look for salvation from anyone but ourselves. Even though I’m not a huge poetry fan, some of it is very inspirational, and may warrant use in the classroom. Like
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the notorious Crimethinc folks say: imagine if “Henry Miller had gone to fight with the anarchists in Spain [in the Spanish Civil War] while Orwell sought the caresses of beautiful women in France... [or] if Lenin had remained in Zurich at his apartment by the Cabaret Voltaire and the Dadaists sent one of their number in his place to preside over the Russian revolution”... think of how different these things might have turned out.

Community Service Learning
McKeachie’s (2002, ch. 20) discussion of service learning does a good job explaining the benefits of experiential or service learning. I think it’s a great idea. I’m not surprised, however, that it’s not done more often. I think the overhead time of setting up such a program is probably intimidating or considered un-worthwhile to most lecturers. Additionally, I’m unsure that everyone shares the value of it, and would prefer students to have a purely academic approach to sociology.

The one professor who I’ve met who does this and does it well (or so I think) is Priscilla Smith in Social Work. Obviously Social Work is more of an “active” discipline, but Smith takes it to another level often (particularly in her community organizing classes) and has students goto the meetings of local community organizations (like block clubs, service agencies, advocacy groups, and activist organizations) and then participate with those groups. It seems—to me at least—that this would be equally as valuable to Sociology. We read about things like poverty, but how many privileged academics really live amongst it or work within it? There’s a real qualitative benefit to being able to talk with people who are actually those we study or discuss. Sure, it’s intimidating sometimes, but we need to get off our privileged asses more often anyway!

The problems that Hondagneu-Sotelo and Raskoff (1994) discuss seem very real, and for that reason alone I think that community service learning is NECESSARY. The fact that problems arise is a strong indicator that students need to have their cages rattled a bit. I’ve seen the exact same things with a community group I work with called Food Not Bombs. We’re always having new people contact us and start helping out. But, they come from a worldview where they think that the people we work with (overwhelmingly poor and homeless) are supposed to see them as saviors. Many also have unreasonable assumptions of people’s abilities (that all homeless are drunk, uneducated bums) and other stereotypes (often racist in nature) that are brought about when they are thrust into stark situations where they must deal with people who are not as privileged, wealthy, or as White as they are.

Since these problems are REAL and, I think, worthwhile challenges, I like Hondagneu-Sotelo and Raskoff’s suggestions for overcoming them. The ability to link sociological theory and concepts directly to the things they experience, the ability to re-emphasize the macro-factors at work instead of individualistic anecdotes, and giving constructive feedback on observations are great ways to help steer students (or anyone, really) towards a better, more sociological understanding of how things in the real world link to the things they learn in their classes.
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APPENDIX: GLOSSARY

What does anarchist philosophy suggest about the following?

[Note: this is one individual's perspective only! Disagreement is healthy! This is brain-candy only! Anti-Copyright 2001-2003] [This glossary previously appeared as a half-page handout]

Activism: doing things that attempt to change society; not for direct personal benefit.

Autonomy: not being under the control of any other person or thing. Drawing conclusions, making decisions, and taking action independent of outside forces.

Capitalism: a system of class stratification, unequal power, greed, and human indifference.

Coercion: the use of force to make a person do something against their will.

Collective: togetherness. Emphasizing the ability to complement others for a mutually beneficial goal.

Colonialism: a practice in which people of one state control, suppresses, and benefit at the detriment to the people of another land.

Corporations: artificial entities that have taken on the “rights” of living human beings. Non-democratic, unanswerable to the public, exploitive of class stratification, motivated by greed and profit, and largely unpunished for their widespread crimes.

Democracy: a political philosophy that suggests that all people should have an active voice and ability to control the things that affect the things in their lives.

Direct Action: personally doing something based upon a deeply held conviction, even if against the law. Not letting or demanding that others do on your behalf.

Diversity: variety of perspectives, identity, life-experience, ideas, and goals. A useful, just, worthwhile, and rewarding goal.

Egalitarianism: to be innately equal in self-worth and strive for equitable empowerment.

Environmentalism: concern, defense, and championship of all living things on the earth that are harmed by human action.

Fascism: the oppression of minorities, repeal of civil liberties, jingoistic foreign policy, and authoritarian rule. The union of the state and corporation.

[ Williams 131 ] [ this is a draft. do not cite. ]
Feminism: perspective that stands for female self-empowerment, dismantling of male-supremacy and patriarchy, and an equalization of gender power.

Freedom: the ability to do and be whatever wanted insofar as the ability for others to do what they want is not impaired.

Hierarchy: a structural method for giving some people power over others.

Humanism: considering human empathy, compassion, justice, and self-worth to take precedence over artificially contrived concerns.

Militarism: using state violence to force others to accept political and economic objectives. Usually is devoid of democratic oversight, self-restraint, humane-methods, or public honesty.

Monarchy: the practice of One having unique (often inherited) power over others an entire society. Synonym for “dictatorship”.

Mutual Aid: helping others who need and ask for help, even when there is no foreseeable self-benefit or reward, except for the knowledge that everyone at some point needs help from others.

Neo-Liberalism: attitude that champions un-restricted freedoms for individuals and entities concerned only with capital-accumulation and criticizes those who would interject human and environmental concerns.

Organization: something that is intentionally formed, structured, or decided for a specific purpose.

Patriarchy: male values take precedence over female values, leading to the subjugation, marginalization, and oppression of women. Male domination.

Power: strength (can be political, economic, cultural, physical, emotional, or mental). The least desirable kind is “power over others”. “Power from within” and “power together” are the ideal.

Presidents/Prime Ministers: useless at best, apocalyptic at worst. Kings that are voted for.

Radical: to get at the “root” of something.

Religion: structure for belief in a greater power without true knowledge and the historical tendency to use this belief as justification for oppression.

Self-Determination: the ability to decide and act for oneself, unrestricted by the desires of others.
**Sexuality:** thought, identity, and act that involve emotion, human interaction, or intercourse.

**Solidarity:** active support for others whose freedoms are at risk.

**Unionism:** forming into groups of like-minded workers to use collective power to ensure just, safe, and empowered work. To lead to worker self-management and collective-profit.

**War:** the result of militaristic attitudes that assume that conflict must be resolved with large-scale violence, usually against innocent and uninvolved persons.

**Violence:** harm caused to human beings (not “corporate beings” or property). Includes police brutality, war, poverty, domestic abuse, etc.

**Xenophobia:** hatred embodied as active discrimination against people strictly because of their ethnicity or national origin. A ludicrous idea.

**My phrases:**

Anarchistic

Franchise anarchist/ic organizations
APPENDIX: MODELS OF ANARCHISM

The word “anarchism” is used in many ways. Anarchists themselves often give varied explanations of what anarchism means to them. As such, it is commonly viewed as an adaptable and robust philosophy that includes a wide range of theory and application. Consequently, the word frequently eludes a widely-accepted definition and is frequently argued about.

What follows is an attempt to categorize the different ways “anarchism” may be explained. It by no means a perfect or comprehensive list, but merely a starting point for those interested in understanding the philosophy holistically. These categorical models sometimes overlap and could be seen as somewhat contradictory—even so, they are included here as portals into the diversity of anarchist thought.

Action model: usually a rejection of electoral politics, anarchism favors direct action to accomplish immediate goals and needs, as opposed to utilizing a “representative” structure to indirectly obtain them. Instead of authoritarian dictate as a means to mobilize social change, a “good example” of action is entrusted instead.

Anti-authoritarian model: anarchism is a refutation of all forms of domination and oppression, whether institutionalized (capitalism, patriarchy, racism, the State, etc.) or abstract. It sees the challenge and subsequent removal of authoritarian power to be of prime importance.

88 See an interesting article by The Anarchy Organization [TAO] (n.d.) called “Taoism and Anarchism”.
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**Compatibility model:** anarchism intersects directly with the theories of democracy and humanism (and in many respects feminism, ecology, and even Taoism\(^8\)) as positive affirmation of the role of people in control of their own lives and decisions. Anarchism's compatibility with these theories is not incidental—they are predominantly (Taoism excluded) outgrowths of Enlightenment thought and classical Liberalism, and subsequently, radicalism.

**Decision-making model:** anarchism asserts that “no one is more qualified to make decisions on your behalf than yourself” and that “there is no authority but yourself”. It intends to self-empower people to place the decisions that affect their lives under their own influence. Thus, people should have a say in decision-making to the extent that those decisions affect them.

**Etymology model:** the word “anarchy” taken at face value means “no authority” or “no rule”. It infers that there are no authority figures or organizations that human subservience is owed. Importantly, however, this does not indicate a rejection of “rules” *per se*, only of rulers; rules collectively/non-hierarchically agreed upon may be acceptable.

**Historical Tendency model:** anarchism may be viewed as a liberatory tendency within humankind to throw-off the chains of oppression overtime. Whether it is the rejection of slavery, feudalism, monarchism, gender inequity, etc., anarchism may be viewed as the gradual emancipation of life from dominant authority. It is thus a philosophy of movement and of optimism.
**Individual/Collective model:** anarchism is the tension between individual freedom and collective responsibility and the tension between individual responsibility and collective freedom.

**Means and Ends model:** similar to the idea of a yardstick, anarchism is primarily a proposition of the desirable means in which to carry out political and social revolution, not the ends themselves. This differs from other revolutionary movements which view the ends as the most important value (regardless of whatever atrocity and dictatorship must occur to obtain it).

**Power model:** anarchism is a theory about power, which notes three kinds of power: power over (authoritarian), power within (inner-strength), and power amongst (collectivity). Anarchism is committed to eliminating the first kind of power and equally expanding the second and third kinds.

**Pro-active vs. Reactive model:** In the vacuum of oppressive power, there is a need for non-oppressive power to exist. Anarchism thus is a reactive and pro-active philosophy, intending to react to oppressive/hierarchical power/institutions and to be pro-active for non-oppressive/non-hierarchical power/institutions.
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**Socialist model**: anarchism has traditionally been a subset of the socialist/communist tradition. It differs from classic Marxism in the sense of its anti-authoritarian nature, which rejects the State, centralized power, dictatorship, Parties, and vanguardism.

**Values model**: anarchism proposes various desirable values for a society, including (but not limited to) anti-authoritarianism, direct action, liberty, mutual aid, self-determination, solidarity, and voluntary association.

**Yardstick model**: anarchism is a “yardstick” which can be used to evaluate existing conditions and potential actions based upon the criteria of a) resisting domination and b) increasing liberty. In this respect, anarchism is a lens in which to measure and gauge things. Further, anarchism may be viewed in terms of a “spectrum”, ranging from oppression to liberty, with the ability to place given situations or dynamics upon this spectrum.

[Inter-link reference to these models?]
Freedom remains a word without meaning.
- Pope John Paul II
Index will be too huge and unwieldy to finish until much, much later...