

Griffith Research Online

<https://research-repository.griffith.edu.au>

21st Century Dissent: Anarchism, Anti-Globalization and Environmentalism

Author

Curran, Giorel

Published

2006

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230800847>

Copyright Statement

Copyright 2006 Palgrave Macmillan Please refer to the book link for access to the definitive, published version. Reproduced by permission of Palgrave Macmillan .

Downloaded from

<http://hdl.handle.net/10072/12679>

Introduction

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

Anarchism has seldom had good press. Usually dismissed as either bomb throwing fanatics, eccentric utopians or idle scoundrels, anarchists have always struggled to have their political philosophy taken seriously. Unlike most of the other ideologies, anarchism’s refusal to subscribe to vanguards, political parties or parliamentary politics denies it the traditional strategies for political success.

Some historical examples have vindicated it, but this has not been enough to see it enjoy the authority of the major ideologies. Despite its relative marginalisation as a political philosophy, anarchism has still exerted considerable influence in shaping the modern political landscape. More recently, a particular mixture of socio-economic, cultural and political developments, and major technological advances, has created a political opportunity space for anarchism to both reassert and reinvent itself into its influential 21st century incarnation. This has been achieved through the medium of a largely anti-capitalist, anti-globalisation and pro-green global movement.

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

Background

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

Globalisation has significantly transformed economics, politics and culture across the globe. It is no thus no surprise that the politics of globalisation has framed and inspired anarchism's contemporary revival. Globalisation is of course a highly contentious and contested term, described and understood very differently by a plethora of those affected by it. It encapsulates and describes important changes to global economic structures and the significant impact these changes have had on national and global economies, cultures and politics. The large numbers who feel passionately about globalisation tend to identify as either its supporters or opponents. But it is globalisation's opponents that have been considerably more vocal, and who have articulated their opposition in more visible, expressive and combative ways. This helps explain the high visibility of the anti-globalisation movement – or more aptly the global justice movement or 'movement of movements' – with its diversity of participants and forms of dissent. The anti-globalisation movement represents a highly visible and active constellation of resistance against the ills

of globalisation, especially a globalisation underpinned by neo-liberal values. It is in this antagonism to neo-liberal globalisation that anarchist ideas have found much resonance, in turn helping drive the angst of the anti-globalisation movement.

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

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

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

The New Left had already paved the way for this rechantment with anarchism. New Left analyses, and the discourses of postmodernism and poststructuralism, resonated anarchist sensibilities. In challenging the Marxist orthodoxy – its historical materialism, economic determinism and class politics – and in promoting an expanded account of the practice of domination, the New Left won itself numerous oppositional friends, including anarchists. While still acknowledging the structural underpinnings of capitalism, the New Left was equally interested in the cultural, psychological and aesthetic patterns of domination, patterns a narrowly-focused Marxism neglected to address. In broadening the conceptualisation of domination, the New Left helped identify a more extensive range of ‘disciplinary’ practices that together maintained

oppression. They hence challenged the limitations of Marx's economic determinism and working class praxis as the motor of social change. The New Left also influenced and informed the budding radical ecology movement. Drawing from some New Left analyses, these radical ecologists went further, condemning the androcentric, technocentric and anthropocentric underpinnings of capitalism and industrialism as well as of Marxism. The counter-culture of the 1960s embraced this expanded critique since it represented not only a liberation from the stranglehold of 'old' leftism, but also better accommodated their specific grievances. The ensuing focus on increased autonomy and lifestyle alternatives helped launch the new social movements of the 1960s and 1970s. With them came a widespread dissemination of anarchist ideas.

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

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

Together these political and philosophical developments represented a horizon of new opportunities for anarchists – a relatively open market for political alternatives in which they could showcase their wares. Post-1989 in particular had birthed a transformed political landscape. Many of these anarchists now believed that liberal capitalism has not yet confronted a truly formidable ideological adversary such as contemporary anarchism set out to be. But unlike an allegedly stolid socialism, anarchism would be tricky, savvy and footloose adversary. It would be 'remade' and it would be stronger. As the contemporary anarchist Bob Black contends, 'anarchists are [now] at a turning point. For the first time in history, they are the only revolutionary current' (Black 1997, 140). In making this claim, Black may have been overstating his

case. But he makes an important point. He identifies an open political space through which to (re)launch the anarchist imaginary. The politics of the past few decades had propelled the anarchist impulse, but the emergence of virulent anti-globalisation represented the opportunity to drive it home.

A post-ideological anarchism for the 21st century

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

anarchism (see Curran 2004a). But this reanimated anarchism is a differently configured one.

This book uses the term post-ideological anarchism to capture this reconfigured anarchism. Influenced by developments we described above, a post-ideological anarchism is conditioning the spirit and practice of radical dissent today. It is an anarchism freed from ideological conformity and one that borrows openly from a panorama of ideas and traditions. There remain of course many ideological anarchists who still participate as proud anarchists in oppositional protest. Some of the new anarchist schools, along with the old, continue to assume highly ideological positions. But, more importantly, there is the looser and widespread embrace of anarchist ideas and strategies within the armoury of radical oppositional politics. Here different forms of dissent are largely *inspired* by the ideas and animating principles of anarchism. In a post-ideological spirit, these radicals feel at liberty to draw from the force of anarchism's ideas flexibly and non-doctrinally, without necessarily identifying as anarchist. Instead these 'small-a anarchists' pull and pluck from the ethical force of anarchism to remake it in a manner that suits their own autonomous objectives (Neal 1997). It is this anarchist *impulse* percolating through oppositional politics today, that represents a primary way in which anarchism is influencing contemporary dissent.

Anarchism's core values remain autonomy, liberty, anti-statism and anti-authoritarianism. It continues to see hierarchy, authoritarianism and the centralisation of decision making power, both within the state and elsewhere, as inimical to the achievement of those values. And commitment to a correspondence between means and ends still underpins anarchism's strategic heart. As a libertarian and anti-authoritarian political philosophy, anarchism has

an overriding allegiance to the principles of radical democracy – preferably direct, certainly participatory and always transparent and inclusive. But to this list of core values has now been added a *green* one. Anarchism, particularly new anarchism, has enthusiastically embraced the claims of radical ecology that environmental degradation signifies the enhanced destructive power of industrialism and/or capitalism. Now most modern anarchists have incorporated, either centrally or more peripherally, the claims of ecologism, agreeing that the will to power degrades both people and nature. But in the 21st century these core values, and the strategies to achieve them, are increasingly interpreted and assembled differently. This diverse assemblage, accommodated in much of the new anarchism, draws from the classical greats, and other traditions, in a looser and less doctrinaire fashion – a development that many new radicals find appealing.

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

Neal (1997) goes closest to prefiguring important aspects of our post-ideological anarchism. He distinguishes between what he calls small ‘a’ and capital A anarchism, the former denoting a less ideological strand than the latter. More specifically, he conceptualises a capitalised Anarchism as an ideology and the lower case anarchism as a methodology. As an ideology anarchism becomes ‘a set of rules and conventions to which you must abide’

while as a methodology it is 'a way of acting, or a historical tendency against illegitimate authority' (1997). He observes that:

Sadly, what we have today are a plethora of Anarchists -- ideologues -- who focus endlessly on their dogma instead of organizing solidarity among workers. That accounts for the dismal state of the movement today, dominated by elites and factions, cliques and cadres ...

Methodology is far more open -- there is that which works, and that which doesn't, and degrees between those points. If one strategy doesn't work, you adjust until you get something that does work (1997).

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

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

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

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

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

She utilises a useful way of understanding and conceptualising contemporary anarchism that echoes our conceptualisation of post-ideological anarchism. In determining anarchism's influence she distinguishes between anarchism *per se* and anarchist sensibilities, between those who identify with anarchism as a tradition and ideology and those who simply identify with its spirit and the

force of its ideas. In short, she draws a distinction between ‘ideological’ anarchism and an inspirational anarchism that resonates post-ideological anarchism. Writing in the late 1990s, Purkis and Bowen (1997, 3) identify a similar phenomenon, arguing that the ‘terrains of theory and action have changed’ so that ‘now there are generations of activists operating in many fields of protest for whom the works of Kropotkin, Malatesta and Bakunin are as distant ... as ... Charles Dickens’. In their more recent work, they note the considerable change that anarchism has undergone, especially in its broader conceptualisation of power (Purkis & Bowen 2004).

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

... not only in abstract radical theory but also in the living practice of such [anti-globalisation] groups as the No Border movements, People’s Global Action, the Zapatistas, the Autonomes and other such groups that while clearly ‘antiauthoritarian’ in orientation, do not explicitly identify with anarchism as an ideological tradition so much as they identify with its general spirit in their own unique and varying contexts,

which are typically informed by a wide array of both contemporary and classical radical thinkers (Adams 2004).

A fellow postanarchist concurs:

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

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

The worldwide, irreversible, and long-overdue decline of the left precipitated the current crisis among anarchists... Anarchists are having an identity crisis. Are they still, or are they only, the left wing of the left wing? Or are they something more or even something else? Anarchists have always done much more for the rest of the left than the rest of the

left has ever done for them. Any anarchist debt to the left has long since been paid in full, and then some. Now, finally, the anarchists are free to be themselves (Black n.d.).

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

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

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

new forms of subjectivity; and finally, focusing on relations between these subjects, in the name of inventing new forms of community.

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

The above examples help illuminate how post-ideological anarchism separates itself from traditional, ‘ideological’ anarchism as well as traditional left politics as a whole. Within the tradition of ideological anarchism can be located specific anarchist schools that assume sectarian and doctrinaire positions: the capital A anarchists. Within the AGM we also find activists who are members of specific anarchist schools and who practice their oppositional politics accordingly. However, the contemporary face of anarchism is best represented in terms of key anarchist sensibilities that have penetrated the modern protest lexicon and helped shape visions of socio-political alternatives. Here anarchism is not necessarily swallowed ‘holus bolas’ but its considerable narrative force informs and inspires much of the AGM and the arena of radical politics as a whole, making it the ‘locus of dynamism’ that Graeber identifies. Many dissenters in the AGM do not self-consciously identify as anarchist, even if they incorporate key elements of anarchist organisation and wear its principles proudly. Importantly, removal from the demands of ideological purity permits a new eye to be cast over the offering of other ideologies, and of the

novel incorporation of some of these strands into a reworked post-ideological anarchism. The Zapatistas exemplify this autonomous, anarchical praxis well – but without needing or wishing to identify as anarchist, or socialist for that matter.

Not unexpectedly in a politics that champions diversity, there are significant tensions within post-ideological anarchism. Most of these tensions are long-standing but emerge in different ways in new anarchist thought. They also mirror some of the theoretical and strategic dilemmas that dog radical politics generally. The renewed debates about individual *versus* social anarchism raise the perennial dilemma of oppositional agency – of whether an individualist or collectivist political strategy is more likely to realise set objectives. The issue of technology is also central. Views on its usefulness ranges from anarcho-primitivist Luddites who reject it altogether, to its embrace as a key organisational and political tool by the anti-globalisation movement. Despite the influence of postmodernism and poststructuralism on contemporary anarchism, there still remains considerable caution on the value of its offerings. Finally, the issue of violence and the ‘directness’ of direct action, remains central. Anarchism has long been associated with violence and chaos. The ‘propaganda in the deed’ tactic has helped generate the association between anarchism and violence, an association now fuelled by the property violence of the Black Bloc and the Earth Liberation Front. Nonetheless, the majority of anarchists, particularly those within the anti-globalisation movement, neither practice nor sanction such tactics. We observe these tensions in the discussion of our case studies.

To summarise, this book contends that a post-ideological green anarchism is increasingly influencing the impulse, culture and organisation of

21st century dissent. It is an anarchism that rejects the stranglehold of ideology by discarding doctrinal purities and vanguardist politics. While still adhering to some of the insights of the ‘old greats,’ post-ideological anarchism reveals a hybridisation of a number of different influences and traditions. Its ‘post-left’ character has attracted a significant following, especially among young radicals for whom the old left and traditional ideology is a dim speck on the political horizon. Small ‘a’ anarchists inspired by anarchist values are more likely to draw from the writings of some of the new anarchists than the old. Complex philosophical tomes attract very few of them, but they will avail themselves of briefer reads on the internet, where most new anarchist material is ‘copy-lefted’ and accessible. They are largely drawn to anarchism’s spirit and the ideological freedom its staunchly autonomous, individualist ethos permits them. These radicals are particularly compelled by anarchism’s network and affinity group structure, a structure facilitated by the new technology, and widely practiced within anti-globalisation protest. In short, anarchism – post-ideological and green – has emerged as a viable force in the oppositional politics of the 21st century.

The chapters

The book is divided into two main parts. The first – Theorising Contemporary Anarchism – explores the theoretical influences and political developments that have stimulated the shape of contemporary anarchism and its post-ideological expressions. We have briefly identified some of these themes in this introduction. While neat classification of a consciously fluid, flexible and eclectic ‘position’ clearly presents its own organisational difficulties, in the

second part we nonetheless utilise a number of case studies to illustrate how this influence is expressed and enacted. The cases in this second part – Practicing Contemporary Anarchism – focus primarily on groups who participate in or support the spirit of the anti-globalisation movement.

The first chapter, *Anarchism Old and New*, traces the development of anarchist thought from its classical beginnings through to the newer anarchist schools and ideas. It identifies anarchism's core values and how their interpretation and application have altered over time. The chapter sacrifices a fuller discussion of classical anarchism to focus on some of the developments within new anarchism – developments that have thus far received relatively less attention. New anarchism remains indebted to classical anarchism, but it also draws from a broader range of sources. In undertaking a considerable remodelling, new anarchism has influenced and informed post-ideological anarchism. Not unexpectedly the new schools, along with the old, do not necessarily agree with each another and are often fragmentary and only partially developed. We devote considerable attention to the tension between individual and social anarchism, particularly since this tension re-emerges in the politics of the new anarchism.

Chapter Two – *Movements of Anti-Globalisation* – explores how and why this movement was key to propelling post-ideological anarchism into the heart of radical dissent. While 'movement of movements' or 'global justice movement' describe it better, we continue to use the term anti-globalisation to help situate radical dissent in the broader politics of globalisation that underpin today's political landscape. This chapter identifies the anti-globalisation movement's (AGM) key features before distinguishing it from the new social movements that preceded it. In the process it notes the considerable influence the green

movement has had on shaping the AGM. Signalling its focus on global justice, the AGM's gaze was trained on the link between globalisation and inequality and between the trashing of ecology and society. Neo-liberal globalisation was consequently identified as the 'enemy' and as the direct source of discontent. The movement's anarchical impulse and organisational structure are illustrated throughout, finishing with an overview of the World Social Forum's role in cohering the movement.

The role that technology plays in animating and operationalising the AGM, and contemporary oppositional politics as a whole, forms the basis of this next chapter. Chapter Three – *Technologies of Dissent* – examines how new technology enables an anarchical style of networked protest, one that is decentralised, acephalous and non-hierarchical. The chapter also uncovers some interesting synergies between anarchical sensibilities and 'anarchical' technologies such as the internet. But radicals still view technology as a two-edged sword: it is on the one hand a social control tool constructed and wielded by the powerful; on the other, oppositional politics has counter-appropriated it for radical purposes. This is a main paradox of the anti-globalisation movement. Its opposition to globalisation is reinforced by the capacity to spread its dissent globally through the very technologies of globalisation.

Chapter Four – *Ecology and Anarchy* – investigates the emergence of radical ecology and its links to anarchism. Anarchism's greening has been underway for some time, with the two discourses drawing from and informing each other. Utilising critical theories sympathetic to anarchism, the green movement – disillusioned and disappointed with the failures of Marxism to account for industrialism's devastating impact on nature – readily embraced an anarchism that expanded the discourse of domination beyond class. Many

radical greens were heartened by anarchism's identification of hierarchy as central to the operation of domination. At the same time, anarchists recognised in radical ecology issues and values that went to the philosophical and political heart of anarchism. This chapter explores the various synergies between anarchism and ecology in a range of radical ecology discourses.

The Zapatista uprising in Mexico in 1994 captured the world's protest imagination. This event represented an important turning point in late 20th and early 21st dissent. The Zapatistas' direct and dramatic articulation of globalisation's ills helped inspire global dissent against neo-liberal globalisation. In doing so, they were instrumental in showcasing a post-ideological 'tactical template' that helped define the political character of 21st century dissent. This fifth chapter – *The Politics of Zapatismo* – discusses the rise of the Zapatista movement and the development of its political philosophy – Zapatismo. In particular, it identifies the elements that give Zapatismo its distinctiveness and resonance as a global politics of dissent. The Zapatistas are not anarchists, nor socialists - indeed they resist such labels. But they draw from anarchism flexibly and non-doctrinally to assemble their very specific form of *autonomous* politics. In seeking to 'exercise' power rather than 'take' it, Zapatismo is clear in its refusal of vanguardist and sectarian politics. In doing so, it constructs a post-ideological politics that is autonomous, flexible and reflexive – and, for many, inspirational.

Chapter Six – *Greening Anarchy: Social Ecology* – discusses one of the most developed and influential green anarchist schools – Murray Bookchin's social ecology. Social ecology is an innovative and eclectic social theory that explores the implications of domination and hierarchy for both society and the environment. It utilises an extensive range of historical and anthropological

data in locating the social origins of ecological crisis. While social ecology is staunchly anarchist and decidedly green, Bookchin is less comfortable in a post-ideological environment than other radicals. Indeed, he caustically rebuffs contemporary anarchism's post-ideological character – referring to it perjoratively as 'lifestyle anarchism'. The chapter explores the breadth of the social ecology discourse before considering its place in a post-ideological anarchist politics.

Reclaim the Streets – the subject and title of Chapter Seven – refers to both a tactic of dissent as well to the groups who organise under its banner. Originating in the UK, it has influenced the creation of national chapters throughout the world. Strongly affiliated with Earth First!, Reclaim the Streets (RTS) situates autonomous direct action at the heart of their politics. Highly symbolic and highly visible, RTS seek to re-appropriate public space from the enclosure of globalisation. Its commitment to spontaneity, autonomy and diversity demonstrates its anarchical temperament. So too does its championing of an organisational form that practices autonomy through the (temporary) occupation of space outside state control. Drawing post-ideologically and flexibly from a range of political sources, particularly Situationism, RTS counter-appropriates dominant cultural tools for subversive – and playful – purposes.

Often viewed as direct action exemplars, Earth First! has been at the forefront of radical ecology actions across the globe. This final chapter, *Earth First!*, explores how in steadfastly refusing to negotiate with the state, Earth First! actions aim squarely at the perpetrators of ecological damage, targeting them explicitly through a range of direct actions, or through the reclamation of space in such actions as Reclaim the Streets or the anti-roads movement. The

organisational principles of Earth First! testify to its anarchist credentials: it is non-hierarchical, encourages membership diversity, rotates coordinator roles, and ensures its chapters are autonomous and independent. It contains a diverse mix, including many post-ideological anarchists practicing a flexible and individualised direct action politics under its broad banner. The Earth Liberation Front (variously accepted or rejected as an offshoot of Earth First!) represents the extreme end of a direct action politics.

Overall, this book discusses anarchism's new form and its participation in the politics of contemporary dissent. But in identifying the character of radical politics in the 21st century it raises broader implications for global politics as a whole. We speculate on some of these implications in the broader conclusions drawn in the book's closing chapter