

The Anarchist Library
Anti-Copyright



Social Histories of Anarchism

Carl Levy

Carl Levy
Social Histories of Anarchism
2010

Journal for the Study of Radicalism , FALL 2010, Vol. 4, No. 2
(FALL 2010), pp. 1-44

theanarchistlibrary.org

2010

Contents

Introduction: Overview	5
Overview of the Project	7
Classical Anarchism: Definition and Periodization	10
Cycles within Classical Anarchism and the Varieties of Anarchism	21
The Dissemination and Reception of Anarchism from the 1880s to 1914: Introduction	25
Dissemination before 1914: Labor Movements, Anar- chism, and Syndicalism	35
Intelligentsias, Bohemia, and Anarchism	37
Anarchism and the Global South	41
Conclusion	51
Notes	56

and global histories, and in turn these fields will enrich the historiography of anarchism.

Notes

Previous versions of this paper were given at the Seventh European Social Science History Conference, University of Lisbon (26 February-1 March 2008); the German Historical Institute, Rome, 7 July 2008; Anarchist Studies Network, Political Studies Association, Loughborough University, 7-6 September 2008; School of History, Welsh History and Archaeology, University of Bangor, 6 October 2008; Political Ideologies Research Seminar, Department of Politics and International Relations, University of Oxford, 3 February 2009; and the Department of Politics Seminar, Goldsmiths, University of London, 17 March 2009. I would like to thank various members of the audience at these conferences and seminars. The editorial board of the *Journal for the Study of Radicalism* and their anonymous reviewers supplied useful and supportive criticism to an earlier version of this paper, and they should be thanked. The usual caveats apply.

Introduction: Overview

This article is a synoptic overview of a larger project on the social histories of anarchism from the eighteenth century to the present. The specific themes of this article are a discussion of the periodization of anarchism as an ism, an ideology originating in nineteenth-century Europe, and its relationship to and differences with more general libertarian or noncoercive modes of behavior and organization found in all human societies. Secondly, the dissemination of anarchism (and syndicalism) throughout the globe and thus the role of the Global South in the history of anarchism will be surveyed. This article focuses on the period of classical anarchism (1860s to 1940s) and therefore discusses the differences between preanarchism and classical anarchism on the one hand, and classical anarchism and postanarchism on the other.

Once that is established, which in turn sets the context for the ideology of classical anarchism, the article proceeds to examine the dissemination and reception of anarchism from the 1880s to 1914—in many ways the heyday of anarchism as a global movement, in which it competed with, and at times challenged, the hegemony of social democracy. This challenge was most successfully mounted where anarchism merged with or lived under the protective cover of the syndicalist movement. Thus, a discussion of the relationships among anarchism, syndicalism, and the globalization of the labor movement in the period 1880–1914 is pursued. But anarchism also “punched over its weight” by having the best tunes: anarchist culture and anarchist practices seeped into the broader socialist and labor movements through popular forms of sociability on the one hand and the close relationship of avant-garde literature and the figurative arts on the other. Thus the sociology and social history of patterns of neighborhood and recreational embeddedness of anarchist subcultures are discussed in tandem with a review of the literature on the relationships among the intelligentsia, an-

archism, and bohemia. The article concludes with a review of the growing literature on the dissemination and reception of classical anarchism in the Global South.

Standard accounts of anarchism (Max Nettlau, James Joli, George Woodcock, and Peter Marshall) combine renditions of histories of ideas, political biography, and accounts of political and social movements. But my project seeks to collate and employ the outpouring of published and unpublished academic writing on the social history of anarchism, a product of the explosive growth of higher education since the 1960s and the accompanying innovations in historiography, the social sciences, and the humanities. By employing similar methodologies and asking similar questions about anarchism that have been posed in kindred fields of social, socialist, and labor histories, anarchism is no longer approached as a context-less, ahistorical study in social pathology. In their recent magisterial account, Michael Schmidt and Lucien van der Walt have been inspired by this method. However they limit their project to “class struggle anarchism,” essentially variations on syndicalist and peasant forms of anarchism.¹ Although they have produced an impressive global mapping of aspects of classical anarchism, their terms of reference are too limited and sectarian for my tastes. I will return to their important contribution to the mapping of classical anarchism in the Global South later in this article. In any case, full engagement with other disciplines in the social

¹ For the standard accounts, see Max Nettlau, *A Short History of Anarchism* (London: Freedom, 1996); George Woodcock, *Anarchism: a History of Libertarian Ideas and Movements* (Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin, 1986, 2nd ed.); James Joli, *The Anarchists* (London: RKP, 1979, 2nd ed.); Peter Marshall, *Demanding the Impossible: A History of Anarchism* (London: HarperPerennial, 2007, 2nd ed.). For Michael Schmidt and Lucien van der Walt, see *Black Flame: The Revolutionary Class Politics of Anarchism and Syndicalism* (Edinburgh, UK: AK Press, 2009).

Much of what has been discussed in this article shares the first premises of the transnational turn in global history and its subset, transnational labor history; and to complete a circle of reciprocal influences, the study of anarchist and labor cosmopolitanism during the era of globalization before 1914 has been an inspiration for historians and sociologists seeking to make sense of the new order of labor militancy in the industrialized Global South, which has arisen since the 1960s.¹³⁰ In turn models taken from the study of cultural diasporas have been helpful to historians of classical anarchism. José Moya promises a study of the migratory patterns of Italian, Spanish, and Russian Jewish anarchists who plied back and forth across the Atlantic, an “Anarchist Atlantic” directly inspired by Paul Gilroy’s “Black Atlantic.”¹³¹ Thus the social history of anarchism offers much to the burgeoning fields of transnational

tions, see A. Hurrell, *On Global Order: Power, Values, and the Constitution of International Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), and M. Frost, *Global Ethics: Anarchy Freedom and International Relations* (London: Routledge, 2009). For the relationship of classical anarchism, particularly Proudhon’s extensive ruminations on the balance of power, supranationality, and other themes, see A. Prichard, “Justice, Order and Anarchy: The International Political Theory of Pierre-Joseph Proudhon (1809–1865),” *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 35, 3 (2007): 623–45. I draw together classical anarchism and contemporary studies of cosmopolitanism in “Anarchism and Cosmopolitanism,” *Journal of Political Ideologies*, forthcoming.

¹³⁰ D. Stevis, “International Labor Organizations, 1863–1997: The Weight of History and Challenges of the Present,” *Journal of World-Systems Research* 4,1 (1998): 52–75; B. J. Silver, *Forces of Labor: Workers* Movement and Globalization since 1870* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); V. Burgmann, “From Syndicalism to Seattle: Class and the Politics of Identity,” *International Labor and Working-Class History* 67 (2005): 1–21; N. Kirk, D. R. MacRaild, and M. Nolan, “Transnational Ideas, Activities and Organization in Labour History 1860s to 1920s,” *Labour History Review* 74,3 (2009): 221–32.

¹³¹ J. Moya, personal correspondence; J. Moya, “Modernizing Modernity and the Trans/ formation of the Atlantic World in the Nineteenth Century,” in *The Atlantic in Global History, 1500–2000* (New York: Prentice-Hall, 2006); P. Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993).

the twenty-first century, in response to the unstoppable migratory flow of forced and economic migrants, nation-states of the Global North, and increasingly others, are more likely to fit their “borders” around the ceaseless and spontaneous flow of people rather than be bound by border posts or lines drawn in the sand or on maps.¹²⁸

A comparative global social history of anarchism helps us define the parameters of anarchism as ideology, but it might also serve histories of the rise and development of the state. The anarchist imagination inspires approaches that transcend the constraints of both Marxist and realist accounts of global and international histories because it highlights the role of the unintended effects of subaltern movements, such as students or migrants, for setting the tempo of major historical change. This anarchist take on methodological individualism counterbalances the circular functionalist reasoning that one finds all too often in studies that overemphasize rigid social class and competitive state elite analyses or depend too much on determinist political economy and geopolitics.¹²⁹

¹²⁸ By the twenty-first century, to stem the flow of forced migrants into their territories, liberal democracies have excised parts of their own sovereign territories (islands off their coast and airports zones); mounted naval patrols and exercised illegal sovereign powers over covering refugees on the high seas, and deported them to third countries; placed immigration officials in foreign airports to check the credentials of would-be asylum seekers; and compelled airline and employees of other transport firms to act as surrogate immigration officials at ports of embarkation. For a good discussion of this “Elastic State,” see Elsbeth Guild’s *Security and Migration in the 21st Century* (Cambridge, UK: Polity, 2009). Georg Menz has another take on this “Elastic State,” using the concept of the “Competition State,” where the state manages migration (more economic migrants, fewer refugees and asylum seekers) in tandem with nationally based objectives for a flourishing national economy, which relies on intrusion of global forces to succeed; see Georg Menz, *The Political Economy of Managed Migration: Nonstate Actors, Europeanization, and the Politics of Designing Migration Policies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

¹²⁹ See Turcato, “Introduction: Making Sense of Anarchism.” For the uses of a cosmopolitan libertarian approach in contemporary international rela-

sciences, as recently suggested by Davide Turcato, is still to be carried out on a global scale.²

Overview of the Project

Thus this article is about historical periodization and definitional boundaries, the dissemination of modes of organization and the intersections of ideas and cultures, played out within the imperial carve-out of the globe and through the circuits of capital and labor that embraced it by 1914. Anarchism was an alternative form of modernity, which mounted in the most thorough way a criticism of empire and nation-state but simultaneously was part and parcel of the processes of modernization and globalization, which swept the globe before 1914. In a broader project, which this article reviews, I cover individual fields of study that help one situate anarchism in this larger framework, some of which I published earlier in my career, while others await publication:

- The notions of “primitive” society in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Europe and the origins of the ism, anarchism
- A social history of anarchist ideology
- The dissemination and reception of anarchism³

² Davide Turcato, “Making Sense of Anarchism: The Experiments with Revolution of Errico Malatesta, Italian Exile in London, 1889–1900” (Ph.D. diss., Simon Fraser University, 2009); and Davide Turcato, “Introduction, Making Sense of Anarchism,” in *History of Libertarian Ideas*, vol. 2, *The Emergence of the New Anarchism (1939–1977)*, ed. Robert Graham (Montréal: Black Rose Press, 2009), xv–xxiv.

³ Carl Levy, “Malatesta in Exile,” *Annali della Fondazione Luigi Einaudi* 15 (1981): 245–70; Carl Levy, “Malatesta in London: The Era of Dynamite,” *The Italianist*, ed. L. Sponza and A. Tosi, “A Century of Italian Emigration in Britain 1880 to 1980s,” (special supplement) 13 (1993): 25–42.

- Labor movements, anarchism, and syndicalism⁴
- Internationalism, nationalism, and anarchism⁵
- The Global South and anarchism
- Peasant radicalism and anarchism
- The intelligentsia, artists, bohemian urban quarters, and anarchism⁶
- The social and cultural history of anarchist terrorism⁷
- The self-educated and anarchism⁸
- Feminism, antifeminism, and anarchism
- The social origins of communism: the anarchist roots⁹
- Spanish exceptionalism¹⁰
- Anarchism after 1945: the educated middle classes, new social movements, and varieties of counterculture

⁴ Carl Levy, "Currents of Italian Syndicalism before 1926," *International Review of Social History* 45 (2000): 209–50.

⁵ Carl Levy, "Anarchism, Internationalism and Nationalism in Europe, 1860–1939," *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 50, 3 (2004): 330–42.

⁶ Carl Levy, "Max Weber, Anarchism and Libertarian Culture: Personality and Power Politics," in *Max Weber and the Culture of Anarchy*, ed. Sam Whimster (Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan, 1999), 83–109.

⁷ Carl Levy, "The Anarchist Assassin in Italian History: 1870s to 1930s," in *Assassinations and Murder in Modern Italy: Transformations in Society and Culture*, eds. Stephen Gundle and Lucia Rinaldi (New York: Macmillan Paigrove, 2007), 207–21.

⁸ Carl Levy, *Gramsci and the Anarchists* (New York: NYU/Berg Press, 1999).

⁹ Carl Levy, *Gramsci and the Anarchists*.

¹⁰ Carl Levy, "Italian and Spanish Anarchism Compared: Nation, Region and Patriotism, 1860–1945," forthcoming.

such as Zomia are gradually digested by empowered adjacent states.¹²⁵

But it would also be possible to envisage a history of modernity that emphasizes a dialectical movement between the post-Westphalian state and waves of worldwide cosmopolitan protest manifested through the periodic collective breakdown of the international condominium of such sovereign bodies. Thus since the eighteenth century, global history has recorded waves of civil or industrial unrest, popular antimilitarism or war weariness, and acute interconnected civil wars¹²⁶ that have blindsided the putative panoptical predictive capacities of the early modern, capitalist, or communist States (1789–1793, 1820–21, 1830, 1848, 1871: the era of the French Revolution and its aftermath; 1905–1914: the Syndicalist revolt and the first Russian Revolution; 1917–1924: World War and revolution; 1944–1947: the Resistance and World War; 1968: student, citizens, and workers revolts; even 1989–1991: the fall of communism). But here too, the same backlash response Cohn detected in early modern Europe is writ large in international society, so that challenges to the state form and the international state system itself are followed by innovation and reinforcement of state power over contested geographical space and the human body itself. Two recent examples will suffice.

In Jeremi Suri's innovative study of the origins of the *détentes* between China and the United States and between the U.S.S.R. and the United States in the Nixon era, he argues that the great powers reacted to the eruption of grassroots public protest (East and West) by seizing the initiative, separating politics from global civil society, reasserting the power of the state, and ending the great disruptions of the 1960s.¹²⁷ By

¹²⁵ Scott, *The Art of Not Being Governed*.

¹²⁶ Schmidt and van der Walt, *Black Flame*, 211–18.

¹²⁷ J. Suri, *Power and Protest: Global Revolutions and the Rise of Détente* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003).

customary self-rule and adjudication, which preceded the presence of the modern state.

Finally there is the dissemination of anarchism in the Global South. The interaction of European ideologies (including anarchism) with native traditions has given rise to an exciting new literature that draws upon postcolonial studies. But it also draws on the transnational and diasporic turn in regional and world history. In this regard the study of the dissemination and reception of anarchism and its kindred doctrine syndicalism deserves the attention of a wider spectrum of historians and historical sociologists.

But there is also the utility of an anarchist method or sensitivity in writing global or European history itself. So, for example, Kropotkins interest in the communes and guilds of medieval Europe anticipates a recent path-breaking account of social revolts in medieval Europe. Echoing Kropotkin without acknowledging his influence, Samuel Cohn Jr. argues that, by the early fourteenth century, the growth of guild communities and peasant militias and the concomitant lowering of taxes blunted the arrogance of magnates and mitigated against regimes based on war, violence, and plunder, thus shifting the balance of power from warlord elites to more peaceful and democratic constellations of power. But these decentralized and peaceful forms of self-rule were followed by a backlash in which an ensuing growth of the early modern state revamped a more effective version of the earlier reign of warlords and witnessed the revival of hierarchical and authoritarian methods and the diminution or elimination of the powers of communes, city-states, and other shared zones of sovereignty.¹²⁴ Thus to recall James Scott, an anarchist method will help understand how constellations of political power learn to look and act like states, and how free zones

¹²⁴ Cohn, *Lust for Liberty*, 156.

My future aim is to synthesize published and forthcoming works in a summary monograph, the structure of which is anticipated in this article. As a partisan of a magpie approach, I employ the methodological tool best suited for the task at hand; in this sense the enterprise is inspired by libertarian pragmatism, there is no master theory, though a chronological and definitional bounded narrative is present. Each subfield requires a different type of methodology drawn from the social sciences, history, or the humanities. For example, Quentin Skinner's contextual approach, linguistic discourse analysis, Reinhart Koselleck's "conceptual history," or Thomas Dixon's "word history" may be appropriate for the investigation of the construction of the ism, anarchism. The flourishing fields of nationalism or diaspora studies, or aspects of global political economy are useful for the study of the theme nationalism, internationalism, and anarchism.¹¹ Indeed at the European Social Science History Conference, held in Lisbon in 2008, several panels were devoted to approaching the history of anarchism in much the same way as suggested here. Thus panellists employed social movement theory,¹² sociological theories of collective violence

¹¹ For summary of these fields, see Thomas Dixon, *The Invention of Altruism: Making Moral Meanings in Victorian Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008). I have tried my hand at realizing some of these objects in a study that is related to the social histories of anarchism; see "'Sovversivismo': The Radical Political Culture of Otherness in Liberal Italy," *Journal of Political Ideologies* 12,1 (2007): 147–61.

¹² B. Altuna, "How About the History of Anarchism as a National Social Movement?," Seventh European Social Science History Conference, University of Lisbon, 26 February-1 March 2008.

and repression,¹³ Foucauldian social theory,¹⁴ theories of geographical space,¹⁵ and network theory.¹⁶

But before we engage with these approaches, a discussion of historical periodization is in order.

Classical Anarchism: Definition and Periodization

The periodization of anarchism is a controversial subject. Thus in standard accounts, anarchist thought and anarchist-type social or political movements are variously identified in classical Greece, ancient China, medieval Europe, Civil War England, and Revolutionary Paris.¹⁷ On the other hand, another group of historians of ideas and political philosophers assert that anarchism, as a self-conscious ideology, is a product of nineteenth-century European politics and thought. George Crowder identifies the key attributes of anarchist political thought as its antistatism, its perfectionism, and its scientism.¹⁸ It is an ideology formed in the aftershock of the French Revolution and the dynamics of revolution

¹³ E. Romanos, "Analyzing Anarchist Mobilization in a Highly Repressive Context: The Spanish Case," Seventh European Social Science History Conference.

¹⁴ Davide Turcato, "Making Sense of Anarchism," Seventh European Social Science History Conference.

¹⁵ T. Goyens, "Social Space and the Practice of Anarchist History," Seventh European Social Science History Conference; and his wonderful monograph, *Beer and Revolution: The German Anarchist Movement in New York City, 1880–1914* (Urbana: University of Illinois press, 2007).

¹⁶ Turcato, "Making Sense of Anarchism."

¹⁷ Marshall, *Demanding the Impossible*. Ruth Kinna writes interestingly on the historiography of anarchism; see her *Anarchism: A Beginner's Guide* (Oxford: One World, 2005), and the incisive comments by Schmidt and van der Walt, *Black Flame* 17.

¹⁸ G. Crowder, *Classical Anarchism. The Political Thought of Godwin, Proudhon, Bakunin and Kropotkin* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991). A good account of the political economy of classical anarchism is found in Robert

indeed pointedly ignored large swathes of the informally colonized and colonial worlds.¹²²

Conclusion

In this article I have focussed on the questions of the definition of anarchism, its periodization, and its geographical dissemination. I have adopted a restrictive definition of anarchism, thus emphasizing the ism of anarchism. I have not employed anarchism to mean a general libertarian trend or sensibility in all human societies for all historical epochs. I have adopted a definition of anarchism advanced by an historian of political thought, but I realize that such a definition always needs to be more nuanced when one confronts the messy boundaries of social history.

Several themes in this overview require further study. Thus the boundaries between preanarchism and classical anarchism need more research, particularly the relationship between the legacies of revealed religion on lapsed believers who had turned to anarchism. How did the thought and mental habits of revealed religion affect the formation of classical anarchism itself? Thus a good start is Michael Löwy's sensitive treatment of the precise roles of millenarianism and anarchism in peasant movements during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. For him the millenarian tradition is transmuted in modern anarchist movements by rationalist, literate, and calculating social actors, in which faith is translated into a secular passion.¹²³ We also need a good deal more investigation of the origins of modern antistatism, that is to say, the linkages between traditions of decentralized forms of governance and

¹²² Schmidt and van der Walt, *Black Flame*, 311.

¹²³ M. Löwy, "From Captain Swing to Pancho Villa: Instances of Peasant Resistance in the Historiography of Eric Hobsbawm," *Diogenes* 48,1 (2000): 1–29.

In the Manchurian-Korean case, the “Korean Makhno,” Kim Chua-Chin, was able to take advantage of the breakdown of the state order in Manchuria in the period before its invasion by Imperial Japanese forces in 1931. A large Korean population straddling the Manchurian- Korean border, anti-Japanese feeling, pan-Koreanism, and social radicalism influenced by anarcho-communism allowed his army temporarily to seize large swathes of territory between 1929 and 1931.¹¹⁹

Giving the Global South its due weight in the history of classical anarchism will therefore revolutionize our understanding of its geographical morphology and indeed, deepen our knowledge of the origins of key aspects of the ideology itself. Thus Spain does not look so exceptional if we view the entire globe rather than only its northern half. The largest “anarchist” city in the world in 1910 was not Barcelona but Buenos Aires¹²⁰; a tier of cities in the Global South possessed noticeable anarchist and syndicalist political subcultures (Canton, Havana, Lima, Montevideo, Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo, Shanghai, and Tokyo); in the first three decades of the twentieth century, anarchist-dominated trade unions in Argentina, Brazil, Peru, and Mexico were proportionally more dominant in their respective countries overall labor movements than their famous cousin, the Spanish CNT.¹²¹ More generally, one of the major differences between the socialist Second International and the global anarchist and syndicalist movements before 1914 was this: whereas the anarchist and syndicalists had a mass base in the Global South, the socialists of the Second International lacked one and

del 1917–1921,” *Rivista storica dell’Anarchismo*, 7, 1 (2000): 9–46; A. Skirda, *Nestor Makhno, Anarchy’s Cossock: The Struggle for Free Soviets in the Ukraine, 1917–1922* (Edinburgh, UK: AK Press, 2004).

¹¹⁹ Schmidt and van der Walt, *Black Flame*, 284–85.

¹²⁰ J. Moya, *Cousins and Strangers. Spanish Immigrants in Buenos Aires, 1850–1930* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998); and Moya, “The Positive Side of a Stereotype.”

¹²¹ Schmidt and van der Walt, *Black Flame*, 20–21, 291.

and restoration that consumed French politics until 1871. It is also shaped by the emergent global economy and the combined and uneven development of capitalism in Europe. Anarchism is the cumulative reworking of Rousseau, Comte, and Hegel through the lenses of Godwin, Proudhon, Bakunin, and Kropotkin. By the late nineteenth century the classical anarchist canon and its associated practices were embedded in a self-consciously anarchist movement with variations on the central theme (Individualism, Collectivism, Communism, and Syndicalism). One can also situate anarchism externally on a continuum between liberalism and state socialism. In turn, types of anarchism are situated internally by differing attitudes toward the economy and organization.¹⁹

But all types of anarchism had a common drive for a future without the state, a commitment to the autonomy of the individual, and a quest for voluntary consensus: anarchists might be children of Rousseau in their perfectionism and their emphasis on education to teach human beings to behave in a libertarian manner, but at least in theory anarchists did not force us to be free. Undoubtedly in really existing social movements (except those composed of pacifists), anarchists behaved more like libertarian socialists, in that violence, even the surgical violence advocated by Errico Malatesta, for example, involved coercion and/or killing. Thus anarchists active in social movements in the classical phase were in theory philosophical anarchists, but in practice libertarian socialists: indeed this was acknowledged by Malatesta at several occasions and by worthy adversaries such as Louis Post, an American official involved in freeing imprisoned anarchists in the wake of Americas Red

Knowles, *Political Economy from Below: Economic Thought in Communitarian Anarchism, 1840–1914* (London: Routledge, 2004).

¹⁹ A. Skirda, *Facing the Enemy: A History of Anarchist Organization from Proudhon to May 1968* (Edinburgh, UK: AK Press, 2002).

Scare of 1919.²⁰ As abstract ideology, anarchism may have as its thesis liberalism and as its antithesis socialism, while awaiting a satisfactory synthesis. Yet as applied ideology, it is socialisms spurned, abused, and ignored loyal opposition, maintaining a vigilant weather eye for the emergence of new forms of hierarchy, centralization, and monopolies of power, property, or other intangible advantages within the Left itself and in any postrevolutionary government.²¹

Classical anarchism was no longer viable or attractive after the Spanish Civil War and the Second World War, in the context of the Cold War or the welfare state and a mass consumer society. Here the student, the student dropout, and the university lecturer replaced the anarchist peasant, the anarchist artisan, and the mobile semiskilled anarchist worker. The anarchist movement was transformed from being a movement disproportionately composed of the self-educated to one composed of those in possession of a considerable amount of social and cultural capital. Industrial or agrarian anarchism was replaced by postmaterialist, ecological, or postmodern anarchism. The celebration of science was replaced by a jaundiced or dismissive attitude toward science and technology. Anarchism was no longer a revolutionary project but a series of provocative reformist acts—whether of a practical bent (as in the example of the work of Colin Ward²²) or as part of student and new social movements from the 1960s onward, and more recently since the 1980s the symbolic or guerrilla actions of green anarchists and antiglobalization activists, or in the intellectual disputations of postmodern

²⁰ For a good overview of Malatesta, see Paul Nursey-Bray, “Malatesta and the Anarchist Revolution,” *Anarchist Studies* 3,1 (1995): 25–44.

²¹ David Morland, *Demanding the Impossible: Human Nature and Politics in Nineteenth-Century Social Anarchism* (London: Cassell, 1997), 199.

²² Colin Ward, *Anarchy in Action* (London: Freedom Press, 1973); Stuart White, “Making Anarchism Respectable? The Social Philosophy of Colin Ward,” *Journal of Political Ideologies* 12,1 (2007): 11–28.

The anarchists of Ukraine were a variation on the rural ‘Green radicalism of Civil War Russia (1918–1921), found particularly in the lower Volga valley. Since the late nineteenth century, Ukraine had become a major global breadbasket, and the hard currency earned by the Ukrainian grain trade helped fund the expansion and modernization of the Russian armed forces. Thus Ukrainian lands were not marginal to the fate of the Russian Empire or to the rhythms of global political economy. But after years of world and civil war, the breakdown of the central state, and the disappearance of the larger landowners, Ukrainian anarchists (like the Greens) gained support from a distressed populace by advocating the usage of the mir (the local community) as a vehicle to free themselves from the international marketplace, from foreign, nationalist, and White armies, and equally from the Bolshevik Red Army, whose forced grain requisitions were feared and detested. However in this case, unlike Mexico, anarchist and local hero Nestor Makhno was a conduit of urban political culture, which was filtered through a circle of urban anarchist advisors, so that the division between countryside and radical city was less obvious than in Mexico. Although the urban-based Red Army was detested, it was also an ally against the Whites. In turn, Makhnos decisive victories over the White armies saved Bolshevik Moscow twice from conquest by counterrevolutionaries.¹¹⁸

are discussed by Daniela Spenser in “Radical Mexico. Limits to the Impact of Soviet Communism,” *Latin American Perspectives* 35,2 (2008): 57–70.

¹¹⁸ Paul Avrich, *The Russian Anarchists* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1967); M. Palij, *The Anarchism of Nestor Makhno, 1918–1921: An Aspect of the Ukrainian Revolution* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1976); M. Malet, *Nestor Makhno in the Russian Civil War in the Russian Civil War* (Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan, 1982); Dahlmann, *Land und Freiheit*; O. Figes, *Peasant Russia, Civil War: The Volga Countryside in Revolution (1917–1921)* (Oxford, UK: Clarendon, 1989); S. Cipko, “Nestor Makhno: A Mini-Historiography of the Anarchist Revolution,” *The Raven, Anarchist Quarterly* 4,1 (1991): 57–75; E. Cinella, “Makhno nella rivoluzione ucraina

artisans and intellectuals in nearby towns, how disruptive marketplace relations were important in shaping the world views of small cultivators who were dominated by commercial monopolists, so that at first Bakuninist collectivism (rather than outright anarcho-communism) meshed nicely with these rural anarchists.¹¹⁶

During the revolutionary era in Mexico (1910–1920), the followers of Emiliano Zapata in the south of the country lived in tension with syndicalist-oriented anarchists in Mexico City who had cast their lot with the revolutionary central government, and thus urban anarchist worker battalions fought the peasant radicals of the south. The peasant anarchist movements of Mexico were composed of a coalition of Indian communities, small rancheros, and displaced peasants whose demands could not be reconciled with urban anarchist workers. The latter had staked out their political space within the national capital in which Mexico City's revolutionary government afforded them a political opportunity structure. And thus urban worker anarchists were frightened by the rumors of looting in other cities, which had followed the triumph of some peasant armies elsewhere in Mexico.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁶ T. Kaplan, *Anarchists in Andalusia 1868–1903* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1977). Also see the very persuasive arguments of James Casey, "The Spanish Anarchist Peasant: How Primitive a Rebel?," *Journal of European Studies* 8 (1978): 34–43.

¹¹⁷ J. A. Hart, *Anarchism and the Mexican Working Class, 1889–1931* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1978); Paul Avrich, *Anarchist Portraits* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988); C. M. MacLachlin, *Anarchism and the Mexican Revolution: The Political Trials of Ricardo Flores Magon in the United States* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991); W. S. Albro, *Always a Rebel: Ricardo Flores Magon and the Mexican Revolution* (Forth Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1992); J. A. Sandos, *Rebellion in the Borderlands: Anarchism and the Plan of San Diego* (Tulsa: University of Oklahoma Press, 1992); D. Hodges, *Mexican Anarchism after the Revolution* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1995). The limitations of the Bolshevik model in Mexico due to earlier forms of anarchism radicalism

anarchists in the academy. For post-modern anarchists, a progressive teleological narrative was discounted. Nevertheless, curiously, these same advocates of a postmodernist take on anarchism demonstrated surprising reverence for the past by claiming linkages with the classical anarchist legacy (Stimer and Bakunin), while other anarchists since the 1950s had been inspired by classical anarchisms anarcho-feminism, its forays into ecology, most notable in the work of Murray Bookchin, and attempts at establishing urban and rural communal experiments.²³

²³ I give a summary in "Anarchism," *Encarta Encyclopedia* (London: Webster's International, Microsoft Encarta, <http://encarta.msn.com/encyclopedia> 2004). There is a vast literature on postwar anarchism and postanarchism. See David Apter and James Joli, eds., *Anarchism Today* (London: Macmillan, 1971); Richard Gombin, *The Origins of Modern Leftism* (Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin, 1975); H. J. Ehrlich, ed., *Re-inventing Anarchy: What are the Anarchists Thinking These Days?* (London: RKP, 1979); Murray Bookchin, "New Social Movements: The Anarchic Dimension," in *For Anarchism: History; Theory and Practice* ed. David Goodway (London: Routledge, 1989), 259–74; Todd May, *The Political Philosophy of Poststructural Anarchism* (College Station: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994); J. Purkis and J. Bowen, eds., *Twenty-First Century Anarchism: Unorthodox Ideas for a New Millennium* (London: Cassell, 1997); Saul Newman, *From Bakunin to Lacan: Anti-Authoritarianism and the Dislocation of Power* (Lanham: Lexington, 2001); Lewis Call, *Postmodern Anarchism* (Lanham: Lexington, 2002); David Graeber, "The New Anarchists," *New Left Review* 13 (2002): 61–73; S. M. Sheehan, *Anarchism* (London: Reaktion Books, 2003); J. Purkis and J. Bowen, eds., *Changing Anarchism: Anarchist Theory and Practice in a Global Age* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2004); J. F. Day, *Gramsci is Dead: Anarchist Currents in the Newest Social Movements* (London: Pluto Press, 2005); Benjamin Franks, "Postanarchism: A Critical Assessment," *Journal of Political Ideologies* 12,2 (2007): 127–46; G. Katsiaficas, *The Subversion of Politics: European Autonomous Social Movements and the Decolonialization of Everyday Life* (Edinburgh, UK: AK Press, new ed., 2007); Uri Gordon, *Anarchy Alive! Anti-Authoritarian Politics from Practice to Theory* (London: Pluto Press, 2008); R. Amster et al., *Contemporary Anarchist Studies: An Introductory Anthology of Anarchy in the Academic* (London: Routledge, 2009); Graham, *History of Libertarian Ideas*, vol. 2; Saul Newman, *The Politics of Post-Anarchism* (Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press, 2010).

Employing Crowder's approach, one can create an ideal typical model of classical anarchism. Thus antistatism, perfectionism, and scientism are useful ideological discriminators, although one might question, as Ruth Kinna does, the exact dosages of these three ingredients in the anarchist brew and the pigeonholing of the well-known and more obscure figures of "classical anarchism."²⁴ The analytical philosopher Paul McLaughlin suggests that classical anarchism's essence is found in its scepticism about authority.²⁵ But Samuel Clark notes that classical anarchists were not radical sceptics of all authority, and they sought an ethical justifiable form of authority.

The classical anarchists should not be confused with the so-called utopian socialists of the first third of the nineteenth century. For the most part classical anarchists shared with Marx a critical view of socialist or communitarian utopias.²⁶ Kropotkin's utopia was based on engagement in the mundane world of fields, factories, and workshops, coupled with a sober appreciation of the inductive-deductive scientific method and not the Marxian Hegelian dialectic, which he felt was utopian in the pejorative sense of the word. His anarcho-communist politics, which by the late nineteenth century had become the mainstream anarchist view, was founded on small acts of libertarian mutualism played out in civil society, underlining his belief that revolution was possible because institutions of present-day, everyday life harbored the seeds of an anarchist future. Thus Kropotkin combined the reformist scepticism of

²⁴ Ruth Kinna, "The Anarchist Canon," *Anarchist Studies* 5,1 (1997): 67–71.

²⁵ Paul McLaughlin, *Anarchism and Authority: A Philosophical Introduction to Classical Anarchism* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2007).

²⁶ Samuel Clark, *Living without Domination* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2007).

Another approach to studying the Global South employs comparative studies of peasant radicalism.¹¹⁴ The most useful case study might be the peasant movements in Spain, Mexico, Korea-Manchuria, and Ukraine, where extensive primary research has been done. Here the image of the Global South elides into the binomial, periphery, and semiperiphery, so perhaps we travel from Edward Said to Barrington Moore and Immanuel Wallerstein; that is, we travel from postcolonialism to comparative rural sociology and global political economy. In these four cases, rural peasant society lies on a contested frontier in which the effects of closer integration to the global capitalist market, though part of daily life, were concurrently resisted through communal quests for self-sufficient alternatives. Older bonds of paternal obligation were collapsing, but newer, more powerful forms of state rule were stymied or compromised by the effects of civil and/or international war.

Structural causes, however, do not explain why radical peasant movements turn toward anarchism; peasant movements chose nationalist, religious, or socialist alternatives in many other cases. Therefore, to explain the emergence of openly anarchist movements, agency is a key variable, but not only agency in the form of anarchist leadership at the head of a given movement, but rather an embedded stratum of anarchist activists in the countryside urging their less politicized neighbors in times of distress and disruption.¹¹⁵ The exact relationship leaders and cadres have to each other, the overall relationship between city and countryside, and the urban and rural cultural codes of radicalism vary in each of these cases. Thus many years ago Temma Kaplan demonstrated how the peasant anarchists of Andalusia were closely connected to

¹¹⁴ D. Dahlmann, *Land und Freiheit: Macnovscina und Zapatismo als Beispiele agrarrevolution Bewegungen* (Stuttgart, DE: F. Steiner Verlag Weisbaden, 1986); and V. V. Magagna, *Communities of Grain: Rural Rebellions in Comparative Perspective* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991).

¹¹⁵ Schmidt and van der Walt, *Black Flame*, 286–91.

lar and anarchist radicals, nevertheless trade union solidarity, cemented by a struggle against entrepot capitalists, dissolved some of the sectarian boundaries between Muslim and non-Muslim and overcame other mental boundaries that separated the denizens of the European quarters from the rest of the population.

If there was an “anarchist Levant,” there was surely also an “anarchist Pacific” as Benedict Anderson has shown us.¹¹² Anderson’s biography of José Rizal, the martyred Filipino revolutionary and novelist, charts his close contacts with Spanish and other European anarchists in the 1890s and how he combined Tagalog, Spanish, other European cultures with Filipino nationalism. Anderson presents us with a series of cartographies of anarchism and radical nationalism that stretch from East Asia to the Mediterranean and are bound together by the logic and logistics of Spanish and other European imperialisms.

Rizal and the Chinese anarchist novelist Ba Jin (whose adopted name spells out the first letters of Bakunin and Kropotkin) are archetypal liminal intellectuals whose lives are case studies of hybridity.¹¹³ On the other hand, it must be asked to what extent anarchism was just another Eurocentric or Orientalist ideology in which, consciously or unconsciously, the first premises of the dominant global racial hierarchy were reproduced by European comrades themselves? Thus themes from postcolonial literature may be fruitfully applied to the study of anarchism in the Global South.

¹¹² Anderson, *Under Three Flags*.

¹¹³ On Ba Jin, see O. Lang, *Ba Jin and His Writings: Chinese Youth between Two Revolutions* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1967); N. Mao, *Ba Jin* (New York: Twayne, 1978); N. Kaldis, “Ba Jin,” in *Encyclopedia of Modern Asia*, vol. 1, eds. Karen Christensen and David Levinson (New York: Scribner’s, 2002), 209a-b. We await the English translation of Chen Sihe’s biography of Ba Jin and Mamoru Yamaguchi’s extensive work on Ba Jin’s correspondence with the global anarchist movement.

Edward Bernstein, the caution of the empirical scientist, and the zeal of the revolutionary.²⁷

But whatever form of future societal arrangement stimulated the anarchists’ imaginations, no anarchist could deny the need to do away with the state. If this is the case, the concept of anarchism as a context-less and timeless ideology causes problems if one wants to embrace the family tree approach to studying the origins, evolution, and dissemination of a self-conscious doctrine called “anarchism.” It is very difficult to be antistatist if the modern state form does not exist and the concept is alien to the prevailing culture. The modern state as the most effective and compact engine of power devised by humankind was a product of feudal Europe. Recent research has argued that ancient pristine states (Minoan, Sumerian, Egyptian, Indus Valley, Yellow river, Mesoamerican, and Peruvian states) were generally succeeded by a variety of other forms of rule; and thus for thousands of years, once the pristine state declined, empire without a central modern nation-state core, guilds, city-state communes, religious fraternities, overseas trading companies, and universal religious organization constituted most forms of governance in Eurasia and vast areas of Africa and the Americas before Europe’s early modern period.²⁸

If we turn to so-called primitive societies, when Harold Barclay, Pierre Clastres, or David Graeber²⁹ discuss stateless

²⁷ Ruth Kinna, “Anarchism and the Politics of Utopia,” in *Anarchism and Utopianism*, eds. Laurence Davis and Ruth Kinna (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2009), 221–40.

²⁸ Samuel Clark has a very useful summary of the literature on the evolution of the state and the state system from the fourteenth to the twentieth centuries. See Clark, *Living without Domination*, 75–106; Michel Mann, *The Sources of Social Power*, vols. 1 and 2 (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1993); and John Darwin, *After Tamerlaine: The Global History of Empire* (London: Penguin, Allen Lane, 2007).

²⁹ Pierre Clastres, *Society against the State* (Boston: MIT Press, 1989); David Graeber, *Fragments of an Anarchist Anthropology* (Chicago: Prickly

societies or “people without government,” these anthropologists are at their most interesting when they situate these societies on a scale from coercion to consensus, not on a scale which measures the degree to which they have approximated a “stateless society”—nonsensical in the given contexts, albeit recently Samuel Clark provided us with food for thought through an interesting philosophical discussion of the juxtaposition of rules and methods that govern “stateless” Sudanese Nuer society with that of Spanish anarchists.³⁰

To repeat: classical anarchism was a critique of the modern state, a critique of the most effective constellation of power human beings have ever constructed.³¹ The legacies of classical anarchism may have influenced postmodern theories of informal micropower, and such insights can indeed be recycled to their source by social historians of classical anarchism to analyze its political economy, its forms of conviviality,³² the roles of gender and sexuality,³³ and the hidden informal power structures of the movement itself, but a focused analysis of classical anarchism within its historical context needs to stick to antistatism as one of the key discriminators, even if classical anarchists did not ignore other forms of hierarchy and power (slavery, the patriarchal family, the Church, among others).³⁴

Paradigm Press, 2004); Harold Barclay, *People without Government: An Anthropology of Anarchy* (London: Freedom Press, new ed., 2006).

³⁰ Clark, *Living without Domination*, 109–38.

³¹ See the life’s work of Michel Mann on the origins and development of the state and the concept of infrastructural reach.

³² S. Gemie, “Counter-Community: An Aspect of Anarchist Political Culture,” *Journal of Contemporary History* 29 (1994): 349–67.

³³ S. Gemie, “Anarchism and Feminism: A Historical Survey,” *Women’s History Review* 5, 3 (1996): 414–44; M. Nash, *Defying Male Civilization: Women and the Spanish Civil War* (Denver: Arden Press, 1995); Richard Cleminson, *Anarchism, Science and Sex: Eugenics in Eastern Spain* (Bern: Peter Laing, 2000); M. Ackelsberg, *Free Women of Spain: Anarchism and the Struggle for the Emancipation of Women* (Edinburgh, UK: AK Press, new ed., 2004).

³⁴ Clark, *Living without Domination*, 97.

Errico Malatesta raised a group of ex-Garibaldian volunteers to fight alongside Urabi and his Egyptian insurgents against the British in 1882, but he realized that the Egyptian *fellah* (peasant) had little in common with anarchists in the European quarters of Alexandria.¹⁰⁹ The modernization of Egypt with the rise of the cotton cash crop, factories, and the building of the Suez Canal stimulated an exodus from the countryside into Egyptian cities, even as employment opportunities attracted artisans, laborers, shopkeepers, and the educated middle classes from the rest of the Ottoman Empire, Italy, France, and the Iberian peninsula, as well as from the Hapsburg and Russian Empires. Here, too, globalization led to the growth of pockets of anarchist and protosyndicalist activity, which has long been overshadowed in the historiography of the origins of local and pan-Arab nationalism, and in teleological fashion has ignored these episodes of cosmopolitan and internationalist currents of radicalism that jar with nationalist, pan-Arabist, or Islamist historical narratives.

Thus we have the pioneering work of Anthony Gorman on the Popular University of Alexandria.¹¹⁰ But we now know a great deal more since the landmark publication of Ilham Khuri-Makdisi’s astonishing comparative account of three nodal cities (Beirut, Cairo, and Alexandria), a study of varieties of secular radicalism in the Eastern Mediterranean in the period 1860–1914, in which anarchist rationalist culture, and particularly the Spanish anarchist educationalist Francisco Ferrer, played an important role.¹¹¹ She demonstrates how Italian, Greek, or Eastern European Jewish radical artisans and intellectuals interacted with indigenous anti-imperialist and social radicals. Whereas Christian minorities tended to be closer to these secu-

¹⁰⁹ Berti, Errico Malatesta, 99.

¹¹⁰ Gorman, “Anarchists and Education”; and Gorman, “Anarchists on the Nile.”

¹¹¹ I. Khuri-Makdisi, *The Eastern Mediterranean and the Making of Global Radicalism, 1860–1914* (Berkeley: University of California, 2010).

Steven Marks reminds us how Japanese anarchists in the early twentieth century easily incorporated Tolstoy in to their forms of anarchism because his thought was congenial to a Zen Buddhist outlook. In turn, Japanese Kropotkinite anarcho-communists criticized the Japanese states program of modernization by deploying the subversive flipside of the same Western culture that the state elites were so keen on importing into Japan.¹⁰⁷

In a similar fashion in India, Gandhis anarchism employed Tolstoy, Thoreau, and the American Transcendentalists to create a form of rooted cosmopolitanism that reconciled the universal with the specificity of Indian village life. As Mustapha Kamal Pasha demonstrates, Gandhis politics of nonviolence merged Tolstoyan Christianity with *ahimsā*, a concept that lent positive connotations to nonviolence and formed the concept of good conduct, a disciplined practice of conducting ones duty, which was a mode of behavior Gandhi found absent in mainstream Western civilization.¹⁰⁸

The eastern shores of the Mediterranean provide us with another case study. Here the polyglot and cosmopolitan Ottoman Empire served as the setting in which Islam, minority religions, and modern isms experience a complex pattern of interaction. In Alexandria, a community of European anarchists lived in proximity to the Egyptian nationalist movement, which combined Mazzinian themes with a revival of Islam. The Italian

¹⁰⁷ Marks, *How Russia Shaped the Modern World*, 124–25.

¹⁰⁸ M. Kamal Pasha, “After Imperial Reason: Gandhi and the New Cosmopolitanism,” Paper presented to the Centre for Post-Colonial Studies, Goldsmiths, University of London, 3 March 2010. In general, see G. Ostergaard and M. Currell, *The Gentle Anarchists* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971); and G. Ostergaard, “Indian Anarchism: the Curious Case of Vinoba Bhave, Anarchist ‘Saint of Government,’” in Goodway, *For Anarchism*, 201–16. For an excellent survey of the Tolstoy-Gandhi connection, see Marks, *How Russia Shaped the World*, 123–30. For the context of Tolstoy’s Christian Anarchism see, A. Christoyan-nopoulos, *Christian Anarchism: A Political Commentary on the Gospel* (Exeter: Imprint Academic, 2010).

The most interesting historical anthropological work re-traces how the state came to see itself as a state and act like a state, and the process by which it then aggrandized adjacent zones in which the state form was inchoate or nonexistent. James Scott has analyzed the disastrous interaction of the high modern state and its agrarian hinterland, from the Soviet Union to Brazil—a discussion to which this article returns when it discusses comparative studies of peasant anarchism. His more recent anarchist history focuses on Zomia, an area of highlands stretching from modern northeastern India through Southeast Asia and southern China, in which Scott relates how a variety of groups (or evolving ethnicities) fled from state-controlled valleys and remained out of the reach of the infrastructural power of the modernizing state until the second half of the twentieth century.³⁵ In a similar fashion, Peter Linebaugh and Marcus Rediker describe in fascinating detail the pirate “anarchist” confederacies of the eighteenth-century Caribbean Spanish Main, whereas others have related the history of Maroon or runaway slave republics in the Caribbean and Brazil.³⁶ In all of these cases the ideology of anarchism is not present (although nearly so in the pirate confederacies);

³⁵ J. C. Scott, *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998); and J. C. Scott, *The Art of Not Being Governed: An Anarchist History of Upland Southeast Asia* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009). Also consult Fernanda Pirie’s study of Ladakh for a slightly different approach, which stresses similar ecological factors as found in Zomia, but goes on to give a fascinating description of the methods of conflict resolution, which have survived interference by both the Indian state and the Buddhist hierarchy, and brings to mind Kropotkin’s discussion of the differences between customary practices and state enforced law; *Peace and Conflict in Ladakh: The Construction of a Fragile Web of Order* (Amsterdam: Brill, 2007).

³⁶ Peter Linebaugh and Marcus Rediker, *The Many-Headed Hydra: The Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic* (London: Verso, 2000); C. Land, “Flying the Black Flag: Revolt, Revolution, and the Social Organization of Piracy in the ‘Golden Age,’” *Management & Organizational History*, 2, 2 (2007): 169–192; Clark, *Living without Domination*, 101–103.

rather, they are studies of the transition zone, where a fully fledged world system of nation-states and the global market are rapidly changing the rules of the “sovereignty game,” and in this respect these studies are interesting halfway houses. Indeed, when I discuss the social and geopolitical bases for the self-conscious ideological anarchism of Mexican or Ukrainian rural movements of the early twentieth century, the parallels to the themes of center and periphery, global market, and state power are very suggestive indeed.

Let us turn to Crowders other two discriminators, perfectionism and scientism. These two are interlinked to what has been called the “Enlightenment project.” Is it possible to associate the noncoercive philosophies, ideologies, and movements of preanarchism to these discriminators? Is classical anarchism a spunky millenarian leftover from an older era, as Gerald Brenan or Eric Hobsbawm famously argued in their accounts of Spanish anarchism?³⁷ Does an invocation of the ideology of anarchism have any purchase in either Norman Cohns portrayal of medieval Christian movements in Europe³⁸ or indeed Patricia Crones original and fascinating account of ninth-century Muslim “anarchist” thinkers in Basra?³⁹

Anarchism as ism is not only rational, as Turcato argues⁴⁰; it is *rationalist*. It is unthinkable without the popularization of the

³⁷ Eric Hobsbawm, *Primitive Rebels: Studies in Archaic Forms of Social Movements in the 19th and 20th Centuries* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 3rd ed., 1971), ch. 5; and Gerald Brenan, *The Spanish Labyrinth* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, Canto ed., 1990). For an overview of this discussion, see M. G. Duncan, “Spanish Anarchism Refracted: Themes and Images in Millenarian and Revisionist Literature,” *Journal of Contemporary History* 23,3 (1988): 323–46.

³⁸ N. Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium: Revolutionary Millenarians and Mystical Anarchists of the Middle Ages* (London: Pimlico, rev. ed., 1993).

³⁹ Patricia Crone, “Ninth-Century Muslim Anarchists,” *Past & Present* 169 (2000): 3–28; and Harold Barclay, “Islam, Muslim Societies and Anarchy,” *Anarchist Studies* 10, 2 (2003): 5–18.

⁴⁰ Turcato, “Making Sense of Anarchism..”

modernity, precisely because it was a modern European ideology, which facilitated the mobilization of the masses against local elites and “foreign devils.”¹⁰⁵ But this argument can be placed within the broader debate over the interaction of Western science and ideology with varieties of previously hegemonic codified forms of knowledge.¹⁰⁶

Indeed, the most striking recent contribution to this debate is Sho Konishi s study of the sojourn of Russian Populist Lev Mechnikov to the Japan of the Meiji Ishin, what is known in English as the “Meiji Restoration.” Mechnikov developed a concept of mutual aid linked to a debunking of Social Darwinism, which formed the basis later of Kropotkins anarcho-communism. Konishi argues that Mechnikov interpreted the Japanese *kaikoku* not as the opening of the nation to the West, but as an internal Japanese practice founded on mutual aid and equity, which was an alternative road to modernity that was not entirely reliant on Western knowledge. This astounding article suggests a reversal of the feedback loop: Kropotkinite anarchism is heavily reliant on a concept of mutual aid originally developed by a fellow Russian radicals digestion of Japanese culture and thought. On the other hand,

¹⁰⁵ R. Scalapino and G. T. Yu, *The Chinese Anarchist Movement* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961); A. Dirlik, “The Path not Taken: The Anarchist Alternative to Chinese Socialism (1921–1927),” *International Review of Social History* 34,1 (1989): 1–41; P. Zarrow, *Anarchism and Chinese Political Culture* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990); A. Dirlik, *Anarchism in the Chinese Revolution* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991); J. Crump, “Anarchism and Nationalism in East Asia,” *Anarchist Studies* 4, 1 (1994): 45–64; G.A. Hoston, *The State, Identity, and the National Question in China and Japan* (Princeton: Princeton University Press): 127–218; “Dimensions of Chinese Anarchism: An Interview with Arif Dirlik,” *Perspectives on Anarchist Theory* 1, 2 (1997); J. A. Rapp, “Maoism and Anarchism: Mao Zedong’s Response to the Anarchist Critique of Marxism,” *Anarchist Studies* 9,1 (2001): 3–28.

¹⁰⁶ Sanjay Seth, “Reason Unhinged: The Non-Western World and Modern, Western Knowledge,” Inaugural Lecture, Department of Politics, Goldsmiths, University of London, 13 January 2009.

and postcolonial worlds are uniquely important contributions to the field.¹⁰² As previously mentioned, the spread of syndicalism in the early twentieth century followed the circuits of international capital and empire. There are now a considerable number of studies of diasporic communities of the anarchists based in entrepot imperial cities (such as Marseilles, Tunis, Alexandria, Hong Kong, and Tokyo)¹⁰³ and the thriving migrant anarchist and syndicalist communities in Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, Australia, and South Africa.¹⁰⁴

Another parallel literature involves the debate about the reception of anarchism as an ism. Thus some historians of Japan and China assert that radicals in these countries were attracted to anarchism as ism because of domestic and religious idioms and traditions that predisposed them to it (Neo-Confucianism and Taoism, among others). Other historians have argued that anarchism was attractive to radicals because of its foreign

¹⁰² Schmidt and van der Walt, *Black Flame*; and Hirsch and van der Walt, *Anarchism and Syndicalism in the Colonial and Post-Colonial World*.

¹⁰³ For Alexandria, see A. Gorman, "Anarchists and Education: The Free Popular University of Egypt (1906)," *Middle Eastern Studies* 41,3 (2005): 303–20; and A. Gorman, "Anarchists on the Nile: Radical Internationalism in Egypt, 1860–1914," *Seventh European Social Science History Conference*. For Hong Kong, see Anderson, *Under Three Flags*. And for Tokyo, see J. Crump, *Hatta Shüzö and Pure Anarchism in Interwar Japan* (Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan, 1993).

¹⁰⁴ J. W. F. Dulles, *Anarchists and Communists in Brazil, 1900–1915* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1973); R. Munck, *Argentina: From Anarchism to Peronism: Workers, Unions and Politics, 1855–1985* (London: Zed, 1987); K. Shaffer, *Anarchism and Countercultural Politics in Early Twentieth Century Cuba* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2005); K. Shaffer, "Havana Hub': The Role of Tierra and Libertarian Journalism in Linking Cuba and Caribbean Anarchist Networks, 1903–1915," *Seventh European Social Science History Conference*; L. van der Walt, "Anarchism and Syndicalism in an African Port City: Cape Town, the IWW and the ICU, 1904–1924," *Seventh European Social Science History Conference*; K. Shaffer, "Contrasting Internationalism: Transnational Anarchists Confront US Expansionism in the Caribbean, 1890S–1920S," *Eighth European Social Science History Conference*, Ghent, Belgium, April 2010.

scientific method and the Enlightenment. The postanarchists are right when they identify the mainstream of classical anarchism in its scientific and positivist metanarrative (although they may be wrong to be dismissive of this inheritance and to have caricatured anarchist positivism in the bargain). Classical anarchists were progenitors of modernity. They were quite literally Max Weber's alter ego, perhaps seductive and embarrassing members of the family, but definitely sharing the same genetic code.⁴¹ Thus the Spanish anarchists were not primitive rebels, as Eric Hobsbawm famously suggested; they were part and parcel of the socialist intellectual debate of the late nineteenth century. Hobsbawm narrates an evolutionary story, a false genealogy, to prove the effectiveness and modernity of his preferred variety of Marxism.⁴²

However, we should take care not to be overly zealous boundary guards between the religious and secular worlds. The notion that the Enlightenment and its intellectual children were divorced from religion by a militant secularism is now largely debunked. And the relationship between religion and modern science is far more complex than we supposed. Thus the "precursor to anarchism," William Godwin, was a dissenting Christian, a Muggleonian anarchist, and indeed a Whig Constitutionalist of an odd sort.⁴³ Besides being a thorough anti-Semite and antifeminist, Proudhon was a religious socialist, a lapsed Catholic atheist.⁴⁴ Bakunin, pan-Slavist,

⁴¹ Whimster, *Max Weber and the Culture of Anarchism*.

⁴² Clark, *Living without Domination*, 121–26; Hobsbawm, *Primitive Rebels*.

⁴³ Peter Marshall, *William Godwin* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1984).

⁴⁴ For a pioneering attempt to discuss the relationship between revealed and organized religions and anarchism, see *Religious Anarchism: New Perspectives*, Alexandre Christoyannopoulos (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publisher, 2009). K. Vincent, *Pierre-Joseph Proudhon and the Rise of Revolutionary Syndicalism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).

radical democrat and populist, Gods wrestling partner, was also a “religious” Freemason.⁴⁵ In this respect the religious-secular interface of classical anarchism could be elucidated by an engagement with Jonathan Israels study of the Radical Enlightenment,⁴⁶ Gregory Claeys work on utopian socialism and cosmopolitanism,⁴⁷ or Maurizio Isabellas discussion of the “Liberal International” of post-Napoleonic exiles, whose modes of operation, sensibilities, and interactions with host communities established the model for future communities of nationalist, anarchist, and syndicalist diasporas in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.⁴⁸

Having implied the boundary between preanarchism and classical anarchism is porous should not convince us to adopt the fashionable concept of political religion to understand classical anarchism.⁴⁹ Cohn anticipated it, and its appropriateness

⁴⁵ The latest biography of Bakunin downgrades the psychosexual approach favored by previous biographers; see M. Leier, *Bakunin: The Creative Passion* (New York: St. Martins Press, 2006). For the orthodox approach, see E. H. Carr, *Michael Bakunin* (London: Macmillan, 1937); and Aileen Kelly, *Mikhail Bakunin: A Study in the Psychology and Politics of Utopianism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982). However, Leier may understate the pre-anarchist influences on the anarchist phase of Bakunins life.

⁴⁶ Jonathan Israel, *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity, 1650–1730* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001); and Jonathan Israel, *Enlightenment Contested: Philosophy, Modernity and the Emancipation of Man, 1670–1752* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

⁴⁷ G. Claeys, “Reciprocal Dependence, Virtue and Progress: Some Sources of Early Socialist Cosmopolitanism and Internationalism in Britain 1750–1850,” in *Internationalism in the Labour Movement, 1830–1914*, vol. 1, eds. F. van Holthoon and M. van der Linden (Leiden, NL: E.J. Brill, 1988).

⁴⁸ M. Isabella, *The Risorgimento in Exile: Italian Émigrés and the Liberal International in the Post-Napoleonic Era* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

⁴⁹ Mark Sedgwick, “Al-Qaeda and the Nature of Religious Terrorism,” *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 16, 4 (2004): 795–814; Michel Burleigh,

antebellum worlds of global bohemia and international syndicalism.¹⁰¹

Anarchism and the Global South

The relationship of anarchism to the colonial and postcolonial world is as complex and multilayered as the concept of the Global South itself. The recent works of Schmidt and van der Walt and the forthcoming edited overview of class struggle anarchism, labor radicalism, and syndicalism in the colonial

¹⁰¹ The following is a representative sample of an immense field: R. Drinnon, *Rebel in Paradise: A Biography of Emma Goldman* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982, 2nd ed.); A. Wexler, *Emma Goldman in America* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1984); A. Wexler, *Emma Goldman in Exile: From the Russian Revolution to the Spanish Civil War* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1989); C. Falk, *Love, Anarchy and Emma Goldman* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1990); B. Halund, *Emma Goldman: Sexuality and the Impurity of the State* (Montréal: Black Rose Books, 1993); C. Falk, “Emma Goldman, Power Politics and the Theatrics of Free Expression,” *Women’s History Review* 11, 1 (2002): 11–26; C. Falk, ed., *Emma Goldman: A Documentary History of the American Years*, vol. 1, *Made in America, 1890–1901*, vol. 2, *Making Free Speech, 1902–1909* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003); K. Morgan, “Herald of the Future? Emma Goldman, Friedrich Nietzsche and the Anarchist Superman,” *Anarchist Studies* 17, 2 (2009): 29–54. Mary Gluck examines in depth the origins and interweaving of the stock types of “Bohemia” in early nineteenth-century Paris in *Popular Utopia: Modernism and Urban Culture in Nineteenth-Century Paris* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005). These types and forms of behavior (decadence, primitive painting, and so forth) were also closely connected to commercial activities and consumerism. These worlds are captured brilliantly in the film “Reds” (1981), directed by and starring Warren Beatty. For Carlo Tresca and his milieu in Greenwich Village, see the marvellous biography by Nunzio Pernicone, *Carlo Tresca: Portrait of a Rebel* (New York: Paigraive Macmillan, 2005). For some examples of the French cultural map, see Gaetano Manfredonia, *La chanson anarchiste en France des origines à 1914* (Paris: L’Harmattan, 1997); and C. Alexander McKindley, “Anarchists and the Music of the French Revolution,” *Journal for the Study of Radicalism* 1,2 (2007): 1–33. And for the Italian cultural map, see S. Catanuto and F. Schirone, *Il canto anarchico in Italia nell’ottocento e novecento* (Milan, IT: Zero in condotta, 2001).

This leads us to the well-studied field of bohemia. In the best studies the interaction of the self-educated and the formally trained artist is at the crux of the story. Thus the political economy (the cabaret, for example) of a district (such as Montmartre) is interlaced with the life and modes of operation of the artist and the relationship between his/her “daring” work and the need for a citywide art market (such as Paris), in which bourgeois critics such as Felix Fénéon acted as mediators between bourgeois society and illicit anarchist activity, as well as arbiters and patrons of new schools of art and art markets; the approach could be extended to New Yorks Greenwich Village, for example.⁹⁹ Alan Antliff’s stunning book on modernism and anarchism is a triumph of intellectual and art history and is one of the best examples of a thriving literature in the history of art that examines how anarchism served as a muse to Post-Impressionists, Futurists, Dadaists, and some Surrealists.¹⁰⁰ In any case, here too global maps are needed. In much the same way that anarchists served as messengers of syndicalist ideology and its repertoire of social action, mobile artists and self-educated activists percolated through international bohemia. The political economy of the “professional” anarchist journalist or the full-time speaker is directly linked to this milieu. Journalism and literature were central to their lives, and both famous (Emma Goldman and Carlo Tresca among them) and lesser-known comrades were part of interlocking

Radical Ecological Thought,” *Anarchist Studies* 12,1 (2004): 60–71. In a similar fashion, Reclus has been rediscovered; see J. P. Clark and C. Martin, eds., *Anarchy, Geography, Modernity: The Radical Social Thought of Elisée Reclus* (Lanham, MD: Lexington, 2004). For the relationship between recent anarchist theory and postmodern and critical sociology, see J. Purkis, “Towards an Anarchist Sociology,” in Bowen and Purkis, *Changing Anarchism*, 39–54.

⁹⁹ Sonn, *Anarchism and Cultural Politics*; Halperin, *Felix Fénéon: Varias, Paris and the Anarchists*.

¹⁰⁰ Antliff, *Anarchist Modernism*; also see Alan Antliff, *Anarchy and Art: From the Paris Commune to the Fall of the Berlin Wall* (Vancouver, BC: Arsenal Pulp Press, 2007).

in the medieval context may be questioned, but surely its transposition to later eras is an example of the sort of academic bad faith and mental laziness, which Noam Chomsky demolished in his famous study of the New Mandarins.⁵⁰ Indeed in contrast to Norman Cohns argument, the latest detailed study of social revolt in medieval Europe (circa 1200–1425) demonstrates that, whereas religious themes may have been noticeable in the early modern period, these were not so prevalent during the medieval era when revolutionary movements were motivated by a secular “lust for liberty” with strong anticlerical overtones.⁵¹ Nor were classical anarchists motivated by a “religious” belief in the natural goodness of human beings or a yearning to return to a golden Edenic primitive past, as a recent forensic analysis the lapsed Calvinist Godwin and the scientific Kropotkin demonstrates quite convincingly.⁵²

Cycles within Classical Anarchism and the Varieties of Anarchism

As a distinctive ideology and set of social practices, anarchism is the product of the era of the First International (1864–1876) and the Paris Commune (1871). Indeed, well-defined Marxist and anarchist ideologies are not evident until the late 1870s and even 1880s. The political thought of Proudhon, Bakunin, and Kropotkin became flesh when

Earthly Passions: The Conflict between Religion and Politics from the French Revolution to the Great War (London: Harper Collins, 2005); Michael Burleigh, *Sacred Causes: Religion and Politics from the European Dictators to Al Qaeda* (London: Harper Collins, 2006).

⁵⁰ Noam Chomsky, *American Power and the New Mandarins* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1969).

⁵¹ S. L. Cohn Jr., *Lust for Liberty: The Politics of Social Revolt in Medieval Europe, 1200–1425* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006).

⁵² S. Clark, “Anarchism and the Myth of the Primitive: Godwin and Kropotkin,” *Studies in Social and Political Thought* 15 (2008): 6–25.

adopted by social movements, in much the same manner that German and other social democrats found Marxian or Engelsian “scientific socialism” congenial to their growing political parties after 1880.⁵³ In a parallel fashion to the spread, reception, and appropriation of Marxism, certain social movements in France, Italy, and Spain were predisposed to anarchist rather than Marxist ideology because cantonalist or communal-based forms of radicalism anticipated anarchism in action. Therefore the evolution of anarcho-collectivist and anarcho-communist doctrines flourished within these uniquely receptive subcultures.⁵⁴

But even within a less receptive environment such as the United Kingdom, the ethical anarchism of late Victorian Britain was closely and in some cases directly linked to the much broader tradition of ethical socialism. Anarchism as “voluntaryism” (a term then in vogue) could be digested once violence was absented from the menu. (William Morris’s beliefs—which wavered between a libertarian socialism that was for all intents and purposes anarchism and a fierce attack

⁵³ Eric Hobsbawm, “The Fortunes of Marx’s and Engel’s Writings,” in *History of Marxism*, vol. 1, *Marxism in Marx’s Day*, ed. Eric Hobsbawm (Bloomington: University of Indiana, 1982); Franco Andreucci, “The Diffusion of Marxism in Italy during the Nineteenth Century,” in *Culture, Identity and Politics: Essays for Eric Hobsbawm*, eds. Raphael Samuel and Gareth Stedman-Jones (London: RKP, 1983); Franco Andreucci, *Il marxismo collettivo: Socialismo, marxismo e circolazione delle idee dalla seconda alla terza internazionale* (Milan, IT: Franco Angeli, 1986); Carl Levy, “Introduction: Historical and Theoretical Issues,” in *Socialism and the Intelligentsia 1870–1914*, ed. Carl Levy (London: RKP, 1987), 8–10.

⁵⁴ David Stafford, *From Anarchism to Reformism: A Study in the Political Activities of Paul Brousse 1870–1890* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971); Caroline Cahm, *Kropotkin and the Rise of Revolutionary Anarchism, 1872–1886* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); George Esenwein, *Anarchist Ideology and the Working-Class Movement in Spain, 1868–1898* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989); K. S. Vincent, *Between Marxism and Anarchism: Benoît Malón and French Reformist Socialism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992); Nunio Pernicone, *Italian Anarchism, 1864–1892* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993).

s anticapitalist duelling partner was Karl Marx, Weber used anarchists as foils for shaping his political sociology.⁹⁶ Anarchists were precursors to the theoreticians of the elites, and in Bakunin’s writings one glimpses an early version of theories of social and cultural capital and a prophetic discussion of a “New Class” of Red Apparatchiks and authoritarian technocratic scientists.⁹⁷

Anarchism and modern geography deserve a great deal more study. Elisée Reclus was a pioneer geographer who combined a universal biotic approach with an anarchist critique of spatial power and has recently attracted the renewed interest of radical postmodern sociologists. Kropotkin pioneered the idea of garden cities; his manifold influences on anarchism and anarchist-influenced urban planning and theory have been charted by Steven Marks in his study of the global influence of Russian culture in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.⁹⁸

⁹⁶ M. Löwy, *Redemption and Utopia: Jewish Libertarian Thought in Central Europe* (London: Athlone Press, 1992); Whimster, Max Weber and the Culture of Anarchism.

⁹⁷ A. Gouldner, *The Future of the Intellectuals and the Rise of the New Class: A Frame of References, Theses, Conjectures, Arguments, and an Historical Perspective on the Role of Intellectuals and Intelligentsia in the International Class Contest of the Modern Era* (New York: Seabury, 1979); A. Gouldner, *The Two Marxisms: Contradictions and Anomalies in the Development of Theory* (London: Macmillan, 1980); A. Gouldner, *Against Fragmentation: The Origins of Marxism and the Sociology of Intellectuals* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985); G. Berti, *Il pensiero anarchico: dal settecento al novecento* (Manduria: Piero Lacaita Editore, 1998).

⁹⁸ For postmodern and critical Marxist geography, see Alberto Toscano, “Geography Against Capitalism: Elisée Reclus, David Harvey and the Spatial Strategies of Liberation,” paper given to the Research Unit for Politics and Ethics, Department of Politics, Goldsmiths, University of London, 19 January 2010. Also see S. Huston, “Kropotkin and Spatial Social Theory,” *Anarchist Studies* 5, 3 (1997): 109–30; R. Kinna, “Kropotkin’s Theory of Mutual Aid in Historical Context,” *International Review of Social History* 40,2 (1995): 259–83; B. Morris, “Kropotkin’s Metaphysics of Nature,” *Anarchist Studies* 9,2 (2001): 165–81; R. Kinna, “Fields of Vision and Revolutionary Change,” *Substance* 36,2 (2007): 67–86; V. Postinikov, “Russian Roots: From Populism to

movement and within turn-of-the-century Stirnerite circles present interesting case studies of the interweaving of the self-educated and the formally trained. Paul Avrighs sensitive study of the Modern School movement is unsurpassed, but one could go further a field and examine, for example, the relationship between the working and middle class followers of provincial anarchist-oriented Futurism in pre-First World War Italy.⁹³

But even if their numbers may have been limited, intellectuals and professionals were important in the anarchist movement. There are several ways to approach this: the relationship of anarchism to the emergent social sciences, clearly as a “problem” to be solved (Cesare Lombroso and all that); but there was also an anarchist criminology promoted by Pietro Gori that simply inverted the first premises of Lombroso’s work, yet remained wedded to positivist assumptions and mentality.⁹⁴ In an interesting comparative study, Richard Bach Jensen explains how, after 1900, the more liberal Giolittian regime in Italy drew a line under the terrorist panic of the 1890s by using Lombroso’s theories to medicalize anarchist defendants: attempted political assassinations resulted in the defendants being declared insane and shunted off to asylums instead of becoming political martyrs, whereas in Spain the strict enforcement of the law led to a cycle of assassinations, executions, and revenge attacks.⁹⁵

Anarchism was a source of inspiration for bourgeois sociologists (Max Weber and Robert Michels). Indeed if Weber

⁹³ Avrigh, *The Modern School Movement*; for an overview of studies on Futurism, see Berghaus, *Between Fascism and Anarchism*.

⁹⁴ D. Pick, *Faces of Degeneration: A European Disorder 1848–1918* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), ch. 5; M. Antonioli, *Pietro Gori Cavaliere errante deUanarchismo* (Pisa, IT: BFS, 1995); M. Gibson, *Born to Crime: Cesare Lombroso and the Origins of Biological Criminology* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2002).

⁹⁵ Richard Bach Jensen, “Criminal Anthropology and Anarchist Terrorism in Spain and Italy,” *Mediterranean History Review* 16, 2 (2001): 31–44.

on “anarchism” as a synonym for terrorism—exemplify his confusion but also anarchisms congeniality to currents of British socialism and radical liberalism.)⁵⁵ Similarly, in the United States, Gilded Age post-Civil War radicalism was not that dissimilar to home-grown anarchism; indeed to paraphrase the American anarchist, Benjamin Tucker, anarchists were merely unterrified Jeffersonian democrats.⁵⁶ In this respect the term “anarchist” is less interesting than the terms “collectivist,” “federalist,” “Internationalist” (as in being a member of the First International), or “communist.” By contrast, the term “libertarian” became popular at the turn of the century to indicate a broader subculture and style of life, which included both the artistic “bohemia” (Greenwich Village, Schwabing, Montmartre, Fitrovia, among others) and the anarchist countercultures of free schools, free sexual unions, antimilitarism, communes, and cooperatives.⁵⁷ After the turn of the century,

⁵⁵ I discuss “voluntaryism” in “Malatesta in Exile.” See also John Quail, *The Slow Burning Fuse: The Lost World of British Anarchism* (London: Paladin, 1978); M. Bevir, “The Rise of Ethical Anarchism in Britain, 1885–1900,” *Historical Research: Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 69,169 (1996): 143–65; Ruth Kinna, *William Morris and the Art of Socialism* (Cardiff, UK: Cardiff University Press, 2000); M. Thomas, *Anarchist Ideas and Counter-Cultures in Britain, 1880–1914: Revolutions in Everyday Life* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2005); Ruth Kinna, “William Morris and the Problem of Englishness,” *European Journal of Political Thought* 5,1 (2006): 85–99. For a careful analysis of British public opinion and anarchism, see H. Shpayer-Makov, “Anarchism in British Public Opinion 1880–1914,” *Victorian Studies* 31,4 (1988): 487–516.

⁵⁶ J. J. Martin, *Men Against the State* (DeKalb, IL: Adrian Allen Associated, 1953); E. M. Schuster, *Native American Anarchism: A Study of Left-Wing American Individualism* (New York: Da Capo, 1970); Paul Avrigh, *An American Anarchist: The Life of Voltarine de Cleyre* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980); F. Brooks, “American Individualist Anarchism: What It Was and Why It Failed,” *Journal of Political Ideologies* 1,1 (1996): 95–75

⁵⁷ In general see, Gemie, “Counter-community”; and S. Gemie, “Historians, Anarchism and Political Culture,” *Anarchist Studies* 6,1 (1998): 153–59. A good example of the anarchists’ countercommunity remains Paul Avrigh’s

syndicalism lent anarchism the institutional cover and vitality to remain part of a broad radical oppositional force against

study of the Modern School, *The Modern School Movement: Anarchism and Education in the US* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980). Also see the recent study of the effects of Ferrers teachings on a broader band of militant freethinkers and socialists before 1914; D. Laqua, “‘Laïque, démocratique et sociale?’ Socialism and Freethinkers’ International,” *Labour History Review* 74,3 (2009): 253–73. Recent examples of sexual politics are Sheila Rowbotham’s magisterial biography, *Edward Carpenter: A Life of Liberty and Love* (London: Verso, 2008); and Ginger Frost’s “‘Love is Always Free’: Anarchism, Free Unions and Utopianism in Edwardian England,” *Anarchist Studies* 17,1 (2009): 73–94. On art, literature, anarchism, and Bohemia, see E. W. Herbert, *The Artist and Social Reform: France and Belgium, 1885–1900* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1961); Reg Carr, *Anarchism in France: The Case of Octave Mirbeau* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1977); J. Rubin, *Realism and Social Vision in Courbet and Proudhon* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980); C. Tsuzuki, *Edward Carpenter 1844–1929: Prophet of Human Fellowship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980); J. U. Halperin, *Felix Fénéon: Aesthete and Anarchist in Fin-de-Siècle France* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989); Patricia Leighton, *Re-ordering the Universe: Picasso and Anarchism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1989); Richard Sonn, *Anarchism and Cultural Politics in Fin-de-Siècle France* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989); J. G. Hutton, *Neo-Impressionism and the Search for Solid Ground: Art, Science and Anarchism in Fin-de-Siècle France* (Baton Rouge: LSU Press, 1994); G. Berghaus, *Futurism and Politics: Between Anarchist Rebellion and Fascist Reaction* (Providence, RI: Berghaus, 1996); A. Varias, *Paris and the Anarchists: Aesthetes and Subversives during the Fin-de-Siècle* (Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan, 1997); D. Weir, *Anarchy and Culture: The Aesthetic Politics of Modernism* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1997); Whimster, *Max Weber and the Culture of Anarchy*; S. Gemie, “Octave Mirbeau and the Changing Nature of Right-Wing Political Culture: France 1870–1914,” *International Review of Social History*, 43 (1998): 111–35; D. Sweetman, *Explosive Acts: Toulouse-Lautrec, Oscar Wilde and Felix Fénéon and the Art of Anarchy of the Fin-de-Siècle* (New York: Basic Books, 1999); D. Kadler, *Mosaic Modernism: Anarchism, Pragmatism, Culture* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 2000); Kinna, William Morris; A. Antliff, *Anarchist Modernism: Art, Politics and the First American Avant Garde* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001); Thomas, *Anarchist Ideas and Counter-Cultures in Britain*; David Goodway, *Anarchist Seeds Beneath the Snow: Left-Libertarian Thought and British Writers from William Morris to Colin Ward* (Liverpool, UK: Liverpool University Press, 2006).

tracts of cities (Barcelona, Turin, Buenos Aires, Tampa, Paterson, among others), and diasporic communities (Italians, Jews, and others). Larger mental maps are needed. Associated studies by Benedict Anderson, José Moya, Davide Turcato, or Richard Jensen⁹⁰ can be used as templates to give us a broader picture of the radiation of strike waves and demonstrate how anarchism and syndicalism were energized by these cosmopolitan organizers, intellectuals, and workers.

Intelligentsias, Bohemia, and Anarchism

One must start with history of the relationship of self-educated and the educated middle classes within anarchism. Earlier in my career, I looked at this within the context of socialism before 1914, but we need a similar effort for anarchism.⁹¹ Every since Max Nettlau claimed it was so, many historians have argued that classical anarchism had a higher percentage of self-educated activists than the socialism of the Second International and indeed that anarchists were keen on denouncing the predominance of bourgeois leaders in socialist political parties and former proletarian careerists in socialist trade unions.⁹² And although some local case studies seem to prove the anarchists’ point, it would be useful to have a global amalgamation of the statistics, which one could garner from the wide variety of national and local studies and biographical dictionaries now available. Associated with this would be an atlas of anarchist global culture—songs, fashions, and rituals—for many of these were the province of the anarchist autodidact. In a similar vein, anarchists in the Modern School

⁹⁰ Moya, “The Positive Side of a Stereotype”; Jensen, “Daggers, Rifles and Dynamite”; B. Anderson, *Under Three Flags: Anarchism and the Anti-Colonial Imagination* (London: Verso, 2005); Turcato, “Italian Anarchism as a Transnational Movement.”

⁹¹ Levy, *Socialism and the Intelligentsia*.

⁹² See the discussion by Schmidt and van der Walt, *Black Flame*, 271–72.

as Barcelonas “Tragic Week” in 1909 and central Italy’s “Red Week” in 1914.⁸⁹

The three most relevant fields of study are the political cultures forged from occupational groups (miners, landless laborers, seamen, lumberjacks, tailors, as examples), suburbs or dis-

⁸⁹ B. Holton, *British Syndicalism* (London: Pluto, 1976); F. Boll, “International Strike Waves: A Critical Assessment,” in *The Development of Trade Unionism in Great Britain and Germany*, eds. W. J. Mommsen and H-G Husung (London: Allen & Unwin, 1985); M. Dubofsky, *We Shall Be All: A History of the Industrial Workers of the World* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988, 2nd ed.); Thorpe, “The Workers Themselves”; S. Salerno, *Red November, Black November: Culture and Community in the Industrial Workers of the World* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1989); C. Tsuzuchi, *Tom Mann 1856–1941* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991); J. C. White, *Tom Mann* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1991); V. Burgmann, *Revolutionary Industrial Unionism: The Industrial Workers of the World in Australia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); M. Mann, “Sources of Variation in Working-Class Movements in the Twentieth Century,” *New Left Review* 212 (1995): 14–54; M. van der Linden, “Second Thoughts on Revolutionary Syndicalism,” *Labour History Review* 63, 2 (1998): 182–96; D. Gabaccia, “Worker Internationalism and Italian Labor History, 1870–1914,” *International Labor and Working Class History* 45,1 (1999): 63–79; D. Howell, “Taking Syndicalism Seriously,” *Socialist History* 16 (1999): 27–46; L. van der Walt, “*The Industrial Union Is the Embryo of the Socialist Commonwealth: The International Socialist League and Revolutionary Syndicalism in South Africa, 1915–1920*,” *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 19,1 (1999): 1–24; D. Gabaccia, *Italy’s Many Diasporas* (London: UCL Press, 2000); D. Gabaccia and F. Ottanelli, eds., *Italian Workers of the World: Labor Migration and the Formation of Multiethnic States* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2001); N. Kirk, *Comrades and Cousins: Globalization, Workers and Labour Movements in Britain, the USA and Australia from the 1880s to 1914* (London: Merlin, 2003); Levy, “Anarchism, Nationalism and Internationalism”; J. Moya, “The Positive Side of a Stereotype: Jewish Anarchists in Early Twentieth-Century Buenos Aires,” *Jewish History* 18,1 (2004): 19–48; R. Shor, “Left Labor Agitators in the Pacific Rim of the Early Twentieth Century,” *International Labor and Working-Class History* 67 (2005): 148–63; R. Darlington, “Syndicalism and the Influence of Anarchism in France, Italy and Spain,” *Anarchist Studies* 17, 2 (2009): 29–54; Schmidt and van der Walt, *Black Flame*; S. Hirsch and L. van der Walt, eds., *Anarchism and Syndicalism in the Colonial and Post-Colonial World, 1870–1914* (Amsterdam: Brill Academic Press, 2010).

social democracy until the First World War and the Bolshevik Revolution, or until 1939 in the case of Spain.

This first take on the cycles of classical anarchism demonstrates its protean qualities. Anarchism survived through mutation and creative application, but is this very different from parallel histories of the spread and dissemination of Marxism and socialism? As Irving Horowitz suggested in the 1960s, a contextual and situational analysis—which takes into account social, economic, and political circumstances—is the most fruitful approach to study the origins and mutation of the sub-isms within anarchism (individualism, collectivism, communism, syndicalism) during its classical period.⁵⁸ Or as Benjamin Franks suggests, one could adopt Michael Freedens approach to the study of ideologies in which each ideology has core, adjacent, and peripheral concepts, and thus Crowder’s definition could serve as a central unit of analysis, giving coherence to classical anarchism but allowing its constituent schools the liberty to follow variations on these core attributes.⁵⁹

The Dissemination and Reception of Anarchism from the 1880s to 1914: Introduction

It is remarkable that historians forgot that frequent cognitive dissonance is the default position of the minds of human beings. We are able to hold two contradictory worldviews in our heads simultaneously; this is certainly the case when one inves-

⁵⁸ Irving Horowitz, *The Anarchists* (New York: Dell Publishing, 1964), 30–55; Kinna, *Anarchism: A Beginners Guide*, 20.

⁵⁹ B. Franks, “The Beginnings and Ends of the Schism..(unpublished paper) 6–8; Michael Freedens, *Ideologies and Political Theory: A Conceptual Approach* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996); and Michael Freedens, *Ideology: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

tigates the social universe of anarchism before 1914. Activists were able, for example, to declare individualist and antiorganizationalist anarchism as their final goal while being the most loyal members of trade union organizations. Social organization allowed for the flourishing of the individual personality, they argued.⁶⁰ This is one of the reasons that Schmidt and van der Walts strict definition of classical anarchism as class struggle anarchism is unsatisfactory. It leads them to claim that Godwin, Stirner, Proudhon, and Tucker may have been libertarian or mutualist but not anarchist because they were either not totally anticapitalist or, in the case of Stirner, antipathetic to any form of socialism.⁶¹ Of course there is a valid discussion to be had about when anarchism became a self-conscious social movement, when the emergent ideology was reflected in a mass movement of anarchists. Although Proudhon used anarchism in its modern sense, his followers were mutualists, and it is only in the late 1860s that a social movement called “anarchism” arrives on the scene, accompanied as we have seen by many variations on the theme. But Schmidt and van der Walt have overlooked the way militants and theoreticians even within “class war anarchism” wove a variety of intellectual legacies (from mutualism to individualism) into their ideology. Their approach is also two-dimensional by their dismissal of the global cultural intelligentsia, who are largely overlooked because they are considered mere “lifestyle anarchists.” But the boundaries between class struggle anarchism and this lifestyle anarchism, or philosophical anarchism, are not easily drawn without distorting and impoverishing the social history of classical anarchism, as I hope this article will show.

Measuring the effects of these varieties of anarchism in political cultures is made more difficult by the informality of anarchist organization. Hence one must look at the appropriate

⁶⁰ Levy, Gramsci and the Anarchists, 40–41.

⁶¹ Schmidt and van der Walt, *Black Flame*, 18–19.

Dissemination before 1914: Labor Movements, Anarchism, and Syndicalism

Internationalized patterns of capital and labor lay at the bottom of the mass support for the First International, especially the attachment of English, Belgian, and French trade unionists. A wave of globalization, reaching an apogee before our own era, occurred in the period 1880 to 1914. Individual anarchists using their own networks (for example, Errico Malatesta or Emile Pouget in London during the 1890s) and political refugees from the generic revolutionary organizations of the Bermuda Triangle period (see above) were the pioneers who shaped the ideologies and repertoires of action, which came to be known as syndicalism in the early twentieth century.⁸⁸ The anarchists played a prominent part in the generic internationalist syndicalism, in which antimilitarism and industrial trade unionism were disseminated by a new mobile proletariat of laborers, transportation workers, and some skilled artisans, most notably Italians, Spaniards, Russians, Scandinavians, Britons, Irish, and Yiddish-speaking Jews of various nationalities. They were part of the vast labor migration between Europe, the Americas, and the so-called White Dominions of the British Empire. This reached a crescendo just as a series of international strikes surged through the global economy, clustered around the period of the Russian Revolution of 1905 to 1914, and was interwoven with open insurrections such

⁸⁸ Levy, “Malatesta in Exile”; H. Oliver, *The International Anarchist Movement in Late Victorian London* (London: Croom Helm, 1983); Levy, “Malatesta in London”; G. Berti, *Errico Malatesta e il movimento anarchico italiano e internazionale* (Milan, IT: Franco Angeli, 2003); Bantman, “Internationalism without an International?”; C. Bantman, “The Militant Go-Between: Émile Pouget’s Transnational Propaganda (1880–1914),” *Labour History Review* 74,3 (2009): 274–87; Davide Turcato, “European Anarchism in the 1890s: Why Labor Matters in Categorizing Anarchism,” *Working USA: The Journal of Labor and Society* 12 (2009): 451–66.

noted in the literature; the spike of anarchist activity lasted from roughly 1917 to 1924.⁸⁶ Furthermore, the upstart Bolsheviks had a fight on their hands: anarchists and libertarian syndicalists retained a greater presence in local political cultures in France and even Germany far longer into the 1920s and 1930s than has previously been thought. Nevertheless, a younger generation, which might have been attracted to anarchism or syndicalism as movements more radical than social democratic parties or trade unions, were wooed by the communists, and thus the true believers started pondering the questions of freedom and the role of the individual more intensely in light of the inroads of fascism and communism in the interwar period. They asked themselves: what was at the core of anarchist belief? And they anticipated the polemics associated with the disenchanting “God that died” ex-Communists of the 1950s.⁸⁷

I have already mentioned the cycle of libertarian countercultural anarchism, which I will return to in great detail under the rubric of *Intelligentsia, Bohemia, and Anarchism*. But before that we must look more closely at syndicalism and anarchism.

⁸⁶ See references in note 82 and A. Lindemann, “The Red Years”: European Socialism versus Bolshevism, 1919–1920 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974); W. Thorpe, “The Workers Themselves”: Revolutionary Syndicalism and Industrial Labour, 1912–1923 (Dordrecht, NL: Kluwer Academic Amsterdam, International Institute of Social History, 1989), chs. 3–6; W. Thorpe, “The European Syndicalists and War 1914–1918,” *Contemporary European History* 10,4 (2001): 1–24; W. Thorpe, “El Ferrol, Rio de Janeiro, Zimmerwald and Beyond: Syndicalist Internationalism, 1914–1918,” *Revue Belge de Philologie e DHistoire* 84,4 (2006): 1005–24; R. Darlington, “Revolutionary Syndicalist Opposition to the First World War: A Comparative Re-assessment,” *Revue Belge di Philologie e DHistoire* 84,4 (2006): 983–1004.

⁸⁷ See for example, D. Berry, “Fascism or Revolution: Anarchism and Antifascism in France, 1933–1939>” *Contemporary European History* 8,1 (1999): 5171-. And also see the recent study of evolution toward a premature Cold War position: K. Zimmer, “Premature AntiCommunists?: American Anarchism, the Russian Revolution, and Left-Wing Libertarian Anti-Communism, 1917–1939,” *Labor: Studies in Working-Class History of the Americas*.71–45 :(2009) 2 ,6

sources: club, café, and public house subcultures,⁶² certain rural districts or urban quarters,⁶³ the diaspora rather than the homeland.⁶⁴ It is also worth bearing in mind that one did not have to be a signed-up member of an anarchist group to be affected by its influence; in Italy, for example, it was perfectly possible to vote socialist but be very sympathetic to anarchism and anarchist militants.⁶⁵ As socialist party schools and pamphlets became more prominent in the years before 1914, boundaries may have become more rigid, but anarchist and libertarian heresies seeped through party barriers, either through the effect of notable individuals, the force-field of syndicalism, or longstanding anarchist countercultural institutions and symbols (the Paris Commune, aspects of history and practice of May Day, and anarchist songs, for example).⁶⁶

⁶² For recent examples see Goyens, *Beer and Revolution*; P. Di Paola, “Club anarchici di Londra: Sociabilità, politica, cultura,” *Società e storia* 38,2 (2005): 353–72; Chris Ealham’s study of the streets, neighborhoods, suburbs, and anarchist heartlands of Barcelona, *Class Culture and Conflict in Barcelona 1898–1937* (London: Routledge, 2005); and Roman Ducoulombier, *Les Anarchistes contre la République. Contribution à l’histoire des réseaux sous la Troisième République (1880–1914)* (Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2008).

⁶³ For some examples, see Levy, *Gramsci and the Anarchists*; Jerome Mintz, *The Anarchists of Casas Viejas*, 2nd ed. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004); N. Rider, “The Practice of Direct Action: the Barcelona Rent Strike of 1931” in *For Anarchism: History, Theory, Practice*, ed. David Goodway (London: Routledge, 1989), 79–108; A. Smith, ed., *Red Barcelona: Social Protest and Labour Mobilization in the Twentieth Century* (London: Routledge, 2002); Chris Ealham, “An Imagined Geography: Ideology, Urban Space and Protest in the Centre of Barcelona’s ‘Chinatown,’ 1835–1936,” *International Review of Social History* 50, 3 (2005): 37397-•

⁶⁴ Davide Turcato, “Italian Anarchism as a Transnational Movement,” *International Review of Social History* 52, 3 (2007): 407–44; and C. Bantman, “Internationalism without an International?,” *Revue Belge de Philologie e d’Histoire* 84,4 (2006): 961–83.

⁶⁵ Carl Levy, “Italian Anarchism, 1870–1926,” in *For Anarchism: History*, 44–45.

⁶⁶ For the legacy of the Paris Commune, see Eva Civolani, *^anarchismo dopo la Comune, I casi italiano e spagnolo* (Milan, IT: Franco Angeli, 1981);

The anarchist movement cut its teeth during the First International, and after 1889, a Second International composed of national parliamentary socialists at first marginalized the anarchists in the early 1890s and finally expelled them in 1896. But what remains understudied is the Bermuda triangle of anarchist history, when hybrid organizations of revolutionary socialists and collectivists were notable in Germany, the Low Countries, France, and the United States from the late 1870s to the early 1890s (the German *Jungen* and localists, the French followers of Allemane or Brousse, the *Partito operaio italiano*, and American supporters of the Chicago Idea). These movements were suspicious of parliamentary socialism, critical of intellectual leadership, and supportive of localism and forms of revolutionary municipal socialism. Much of the prehistory of syndicalism can be found here, but we still lack a synthetic overview of this period; rather it is seen as an interlude between the era of the First and Second Internationals.⁶⁷

Maurizio Antonioli, "Bakunin tra sindacalismo rivoluzionario e anarchismo," in *Azione diretta e organizzazione operaia. Sindacalismo rivoluzionario e anarchismo tra la fine dell'Ottocento e il fascismo* (Manduria, 149.31.21.88 on Mon, 14 Sep on Thu, 01 Jan 1976 12:34:56 UTC IT: Piero Lacaita Editore, 1990); J. Jennings, "Syndicalism and the French Revolution," *Journal of Contemporary History* 29 (1994): 349–67. For the legacy of Haymarket, May Day, and anarchism, see Paul Avrich, *The Haymarket Tragedy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984); Maurizio Antonioli, *Vieni 0 Maggio: Aspetti del Primo Maggio in Italia tra Ottocento e Novecento* (Milan, IT: Franco Angeli, 1988); B. Nelson, *Beyond the Martyrs: A Social History of Chicago's Anarchists 1870–1900* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1988).

⁶⁷ Levy, "Introduction: Historical and Theoretical Issues"; and S. Pinta, "Anarchism, Marxism and the Ideological Composition of the Chicago Idea," *Working USA: The Journal of Labor and Society* 12, 4 (2009): 403–20. One could also add the swirling debates within the British labor movement, which took place from the 1880s into the early 1900s, concerning alternatives to the bureaucratic state and parliamentary representation (direct democracy, the referendum, and forms of localism) that were the harbinger to the syndicalist revolt of 1910–1914 and impacted the development of Guild Socialism. On this, see Logie Barrow and Ian Bullock, *Democratic Ideas and*

It is definitely the case that next generation of anarchists and syndicalists in Southern Europe (barring Spain) saw many recruits migrate to international communism. (One reason that the CNT-FAI [Confederación Nacional del Trabajo-Federación Anarquista Ibérica] faced a different constellation of forces is that Spanish communism was ruptured by the emergence of the POUM [Partido Obrero Unificación Marxista].)⁸³ Nor should the unique interaction of Catalan nationalism, intellectuals, and syndicalist organizers in Barcelona be forgotten when one deals with the Spanish case, as Angel Smith demonstrates.⁸⁴

However, anyone who studies memoir literature or the international anarchist movements newspapers will sense a gestalt shift from the 1920s to the 1940s.⁸⁵ Nevertheless, the cumulative effect of local and national studies of syndicalism and anarchism during the interwar period presents a more nuanced picture. The interplay of wartime and postwar anarchist and syndicalist networks with newer but related organizations of shop steward movements and council communists has been

munism: *An International Comparative Analysis* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2008); R. Tosstorff, "The Syndicalist Encounter with Bolshevism," *Anarchist Studies* 17, 2 (2009): 12–28.

⁸³ For the unusual history of Communism and dissident communists in Spain and especially Catalonia in the 1920s and 1930s, see G. Meaker, *The Revolutionary Left in Spain, 1914–1923* (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 1974); B. Boloten, *The Spanish Civil War: Revolution and Counterrevolution* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991); R. J. Alexander, *The Anarchists and the Spanish Civil War*, vols. 1 and 2 (London: Janus, 1999).

⁸⁴ Angel Smith, *Anarchism, Revolution and Reaction: Catalan Labour and the Crisis of the Spanish State, 1898–1923* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2007).

⁸⁵ A good example is Armando Borghi's Italian anarchists autobiography, *Mezzo secolo di Anarchia (1898–1945)* (Naples: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 1954). Also consult the correspondence of Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman, *Nowhere at Home: Letters from Exile / Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman*, eds. Richard and Anna Drinan (New York: Schocken, 1975).

has been identified as the “inventor” of the car bomb, albeit his bomb was placed in a horse-drawn wagon.⁷⁸

Except for Russia, anarchist terrorism took few lives during this era, far less than the terrorism of nationalists for example, yet it caught the popular and literary imagination in the most dramatic fashion, and for much of the public, the bomb-throwing terrorist became the image of the anarchist. Thus it is necessary to examine the magnifying effect of the rise of the mass circulation press, the search for sensation and bohemian exoticism in modern life, and the spectacular meanings given to anarchist bombings and assassinations that occur under the gaze of modern urban newspaper reader.⁷⁹ Undoubtedly, Paris in the 1890s would be an excellent case study.⁸⁰ But we do have a very entertaining, well-researched and popularly written book by Alex Butterworth, who supplies us with a pen portrait of this murky world of journalists, police spies, international power politics, and anarchist exiles before 1914.⁸¹

The Paris Commune (1871) and the First World War (1914–1918) are signal events in the history of classical anarchism, and in traditional accounts of the persistence of anarchism, Spain is the exception to the rule. A review of the literature on Spanish anarchism would deserve an article in itself. In any case popular nationalism, the interventionist social state, and the rise of Bolshevism, it is argued, took the wind out of the sails of the good ship Anarchy but seemed to avoid Spain.⁸²

⁷⁸ Mike Davis, *Buda's Wagon: A Brief History of the Car Bomb* (London: Verso, 2007), 1–4.

⁷⁹ Jensen, “Daggers, Rifles and Dynamite.”

⁸⁰ For a recent recreation of the Parisian milieu in the 1890s, see John Merrimans *The Dynamite Club* (London: JR Books, 2009).

⁸¹ Alex Butterworth, *The World that Never Was: A True Story of Dreamers, Schemers, Anarchists and Secret Agents* (London: Bodley, 2010).

⁸² I discuss the generational gap in Gramsci and the Anarchists; also see W. Thorpe, “Syndicalist Internationalism before World War II,” in *Revolutionary Syndicalism: An International Perspective* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 1990), 237–60; Ralph Darlington, *Syndicalism and the Transition to Com-*

Another cycle of classical anarchism can be traced in the development and evolution of the practice of terrorism and assassinations. We can pinpoint two clusters of activity—in the late 1870s and early 1880s, and the 1890s, with outliers stretching into the earlier twentieth century—in Barcelona, Paris, Buenos Aires, and Russia.⁶⁸ Within Spain, Julián Casanova has charted the dialectic between forms of mass violence and terrorism and wider social movements over an eighty-year span (1860s to 1940s).⁶⁹ Thus violence in the Spanish movement can be detected in clandestine and decentralized forms of terror (assassinations and bombings), rural insurrections and rural or urban mass organizing, and on occasion, full-fledged insurrectionary moments (1909, 1917» «-1933, 1934 and 1936).⁷⁰

Modes of terrorism are finally getting serious historical treatment; the spread of a subterranean literature and “practical manuals” has been undertaken. Ruth Kinna has published a vast collection of terrorist pamphlet literature.⁷¹ Martin Miller's broader contextual account of terrorism and Richard Jensen's magisterial overview of anarchist assassinations are essential,⁷² and Steven Marks has charted the spread of the “Russian method” to other movements.⁷³ The evolution of con-

the British Labour Movement 1880–1914 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

⁶⁸ Richard Bach Jensen, “Daggers, Rifles and Dynamite: Anarchist Terrorism in Nineteenth Century Europe.” *Terrorism and Political Violence* 16,1 (2004): 116–53.

⁶⁹ J. Casanova, “Terror and Violence: The Dark Face of Spanish Anarchism,” *International Labor and Working-Class History* 67 (2005): 79–99.

⁷⁰ Schmidt and van der Walt, *Black Flame*, 20.

⁷¹ Ruth Kinna, ed., *Early Writings on Terrorism*, vols. 1–3 (London: Routledge, 2006).

⁷² Martin A. Miller, “Ordinary Terrorism in Historical Perspective,” *Journal for the Study of Radicalism* 2,1 (2008): 125–54; and Jensen, “Daggers, Rifles and Dynamite: Anarchist Terrorism in Nineteenth Century Europe.”

⁷³ S. G. Marks, *How Russia Shaped the Modern World from Art to Anti-Semitism, Ballet to Bolshevism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003), 7–37.

cepts, the propaganda by the deed (from demonstrative rural or urban acts to bombing and assassination), the affinity group and insurgent localized forms of struggle (“skirmishing”) have been traced.⁷⁴ Likewise, the reciprocal exchange of anarchist modes of violence between Fenians, Narodniks, and Bengali nationalists has been studied.⁷⁵ In this respect the study of

⁷⁴ Marie Fleming, “Propaganda by the Deed: Terrorism and Anarchist Theory in Late Nineteenth-Century Europe,” *Terrorism: An International Journal* 4,4 (1980): 1–23; U. Linse, “‘Propaganda of the Deed’ and ‘Direct Action’: Two Concepts of Anarchist Violence,” in *Social Protest, Violence and Terror in Nineteenth-Century Europe*, eds. W. J. Mommsen and G. Hirschfeld (London: Macmillan, 1982); C. Hawkins, “Assassination, Self-Expression and Social Change: Emma Goldman and Political Violence,” *Anarchist Studies* 7,3 (1999): 324–; N. Whelehan, “Political Violence and Morality in Anarchist Theory and Practice: Luigi Galleani and Peter in Comparative Perspective,” *Anarchist Studies* 13,2 (2005): 147–68; C. Levy, “The Anarchist Assassin in Italian History”; C. Wellbrook, “Seething with the Ideal: Galleanisti and Class Struggle in Late Nineteenth-Century and Early Twentieth-Century USA,” *Working USA: The Journal of Labor and Society* 12,4 (2009): 403–20.

⁷⁵ L. Clutterback, “The Progenitors of Terrorism: Russian Revolutionaries or Extreme Irish Republicans?,” *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 16 (2004): 154–81; N. Whelehan, “‘Skirmishing,’ the Irish World and Empire,” *Éire-Ireland* 42,102 (2007): 180–200; M. Thorup, “The Anarchist and the Partisan—Two Types of Terror in the History of Irregular Warfare,” *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 20 (2008): 333–355. M. Silvestri, “The Bomb, Bhadrakok, Bhagavad Gita, and Dan Breem: Terrorism in Bengal and Its Relations to the European Experience,” *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 21 (2009): 1–27. For the debate over comparisons between Al-Qaeda and classical anarchism, see this debate, James L. Gelvin, “Al-Qaeda and Anarchism: A Historian’s Reply to Terrorology,” *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 20 (2008): 563–581; L. Binder, “Comment on Gelvin’s Essay on Al-Qaeda and Anarchism,” *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 20 (2008): 582–588; R.B. Jensen, “Nineteenth Century Anarchist Terrorism: How Comparable to the Terrorism of al-Qaeda?,” *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 20 (2008): 589–596; G. Esenwein, “Comments on James L. Gelvin’s Al-Qaeda and Anarchism: A Historian’s Reply to Terrorology?,” *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 20 (2008): 597–600; J. L. Gelvin, “Al-Qaeda and Anarchism: A Historian’s Reply to Terrorology: Responses to Commentaries,” *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 20 (2008): 606–611.

diaspora and refugee networks has become very fashionable because of attempts to compare and contrast contemporary global Islamist networks with those of classical anarchism, and therefore anarchist studies is receiving support from the most unlikely sources.⁷⁶ Historical symmetries present themselves to political scientists, resulting in comparisons between Italian anarchists in London in the 1890s and Algerian Islamists in the London of the 1990s, or comparisons of different global waves of terrorism from the anarchist wave to the Islamist wave. The bombing of Wall Street by an Italian anarchist on 16 September 1920—which was the bloodiest terrorist attack in New York City before 9/11, occurring just several hundred meters from 9/11’s Ground Zero—is the subject of Beverly Gages recent monograph, a brilliantly researched book that details how law enforcement agencies were hobbled by incompetence and grandstanding xenophobia. In the end the bomber, Mario Buda, died in his bed decades later.⁷⁷ Buda

⁷⁶ D. C. Rapoport, “Then and Now: The Significance or Insignificance of Historical Parallels,” paper given at “What Can and Cannot Be Learned From the History about Terrorism: A Dialogue between Historians and Social Scientists,” the Human Factors Division, Science and Technology Directorate, Department of Homeland Security, Arlington, Virginia, June 15–16, 2007.

⁷⁷ Michael Collyer, “Secret Agents: Anarchists, Islamists and Responses to Politically Active Refugees in London,” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28, 2 (2005): 278–303; P. Di Paola, “The Spies Who Came in from the Heat: The International Surveillance of Anarchists in London,” *European History Quarterly* 37,2 (2007): 89–215; Beverley Gage, *The Day Wall Street Exploded: A Story of America in Its First Age of Terror* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009). The classic statement on waves of terrorism is by David Rapoport, “The Four Waves of Modern Terrorism,” in *Attacking Terrorism: Elements of a Grand Strategy*, ed. Audrey Kurth Cronin and James M. Ludes (Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2004). Some criticisms can be found in M. Sedwick, “Inspiration and the Orgins of Global Waves of Terrorism,” *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 30 (2007), 97–112. And see why terrorism ends in E. Ayndinli, “Before Jihadists There Were Anarchists: A Failed Case of Transnational Violence,” *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 31 (2008): 903–923 and R. B. Jensen, “The International Campaign against Anarchist Terrorism, 1880-1930S,” *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 21,1(2009): 89–109.