27 Anarchism and utopia

Peter Seyferth

Anarchism is an action-oriented ideology directed against all forms of domination. It is also the "most utopian of ideologies" (Williams 2007: 310), but does anarchism need literary utopias, fictional depictions of what anarchy would be like? First, in this chapter, a basic usefulness of knowing your goal is claimed. Then, utopia is defined as exactly this "knowing," even if it is actually more of a "desiring." The limitations of utopianism and especially literary utopias are considered, and the literary loopholes discovered by utopian authors since the 1970s are addressed, concluding that utopias can be part of an anarchist transition culture – maybe even a kind of subversive gateway drug. After a brief historical overview, this chapter closes with the introduction (i.e. reading recommendation) of four anarchist utopias.

"Smash the state" is not enough

Anarchism is usually defined negatively: it is a non-archism, an anti-archism. Anarchists are against authority, against hierarchy, against domination. They are the enemies of the state. Bakunin in particular, one of the pillars of anarchism, is known for his violent anti-statism (1964: 299):

> Abolition of the State and the Church should be the first and indispensable condition of the real enfranchisement of society. It will be only after this that society can and should begin its own reorganization; that, however, should take place not from the top down, not according to an ideal plan mapped by a few sages or savants.

According to Bakunin, *tabula rasa*, the complete destruction of all authorities is the prerequisite to build a free society. But wouldn't that lead to chaos, insecurity, and, ultimately, the rise of warlords? Bakunin calms these fears down (1964: 407): "Do not fear that the peasants, once they are not restrained by public authority and respect for criminal and civil law, will cut one another's throats." To be sure, he admits that maybe at first there will be a few murders, but soon the peasants will make mutual arrangements for their daily lives (1964: 407):

> And do not fear that if these arrangements are concluded apart from the tutelage of any official authority and brought about by the force of circumstances, the stronger and wealthier peasants will exercise a predominant influence. Once the wealth of the rich people is not guaranteed by laws, it ceases to be a power.

That sounds good, and it gets even better (1964: 273):

> When the States have disappeared, a living, fertile, beneficent unity of regions as well as of nations – first the international unity of the civilized world and then the unity of all of the peoples of the earth, by way of a free federation and organization from below upward – will unfold itself in all its majesty, not divine but human.

This is the Pollyannaish anarchist's dream: just smash the state and everything will be fine. Unfortunately, there is strong evidence against this simplistic revolutionary theory. We notice so-called failed states like Somalia, Congo, and Liberia (to name just a few), which surely are not like what anarchists want to accomplish.[1] In these countries we can observe crime and conflicts that create "huge population shifts and refugee crises, long-term food shortages, failing economies, and the death of large numbers of civilians from disease, starvation and direct conflict" (Carment 2003: 409). Failed states are also dangerous for their neighbors and international relations in general (Eizenstat *et al.* 2005: 134–135). They are examples of the "bad anarchy" so many people fear.[2]

A state has several functions. Literature on failed states places emphasis on security (protection against internal and external threats, monopoly of the use of force, territorial sovereignty), basic services (education, health, welfare, infrastructure), and the protection of essential civil freedoms (rule of law, participation) (see Eizenstat *et al.* 2005: 136; Carment 2003: 422). Other functions of the state are less benevolent, like oppression and exploitation. Obviously, Bakunin and other anarchists want to get rid of the bad aspects of the state, but not necessarily qualities such as security, health, or freedom.

"If a government cannot ensure security, rebellious armed groups or criminal nonstate actors may use violence to exploit this 'security gap' – as in Haiti, Nepal, and Somalia" (Eizenstat *et al.* 2005: 136). Security is necessary, but anarchists do not think that government is the right tool to provide it; the same goes for the other state functions.[3] What anarchists need, therefore, is to build non-hierarchical solutions for the former state functions. They cannot hope that destroying state authority alone is enough. To get rid of the state without having something to supplant it seems to tend to create a Hobbesian state of nature. This "something" has to be at least an idea of how to provide all those goods the state purports to give us now.

But let's not be unfair to Bakunin. He concedes (1964: 381) that

> no one can aim at destruction without having at least a remote conception, whether true or false, of the new order which should succeed the one now

> existing; the more vividly that future is visualized, the more powerful is the force of destruction.

This conception is of course *utopia*. Bakunin is too fixated on destruction to deliver detailed (and consistent) depictions of an anarchist society (Pyziur 1955: 113–114); other anarchists offer more, for example Kropotkin in his *Fields, Factories and Workshops* (1898) (see Kinna 2005: 98–99). Before we turn to more recent anarchist utopias, a few basic things about utopia in general have to be said.

The (non-)place of utopia in anarchism

As utopian scholar Lyman Tower Sargent (2007: 303) has said, "it is easier to get somewhere if you know where you want to go." Anarchists want to go to "good anarchy" and would therefore benefit from some knowledge about what this desired anarchy would be like. As long as there are no actual anarchist countries to look at and learn from,[4] they are restricted to producing and discussing thought-experiments, theories, and depictions of working anarchy in addition to building small-scale anarchist communities and affinity groups to test their assumptions of how it is possible to live and act together freely, and of how to make decisions and solve conflicts without (even informal) hierarchies. In short: anarchists need utopias.

In its widest definition, utopia is "the desire for a better way of being" in conjunction with discontent with the present (Levitas 1990: 198). This definition contains all kinds of hopes for the "Not Yet" (Bloch 1959), literary descriptions, golden-age myths, normative political theories, intentional communities, and whatever is an expression of desire. For Saage (1994: 4) utopias are "pictures of polities that are either desired or dreaded," and for Sargent (1994: 3) they are "the dreams and nightmares that concern the ways in which groups of people arrange their lives." Utopias do not have to be anarchistic – religious fundamentalists and right-wing extremists have their desires and dreams about society, too. Utopias do not have to be fictional narratives, either – in particular, anarchists are adherents of direct action and hence often prefer "a 'prefigurative politics' committed to define and realize anarchist social relations within the existing society" (Gordon 2007: 40). This includes, on the one hand, the form of any revolutionary organization that foreshadows the form of post-revolutionary society (as Bakunin demanded, see Shantz 2008: 24), and, on the other hand, utopian experiments in anarchistic intentional communities (regarding decision making, see Sargisson 2004; regarding maintaining order, see Amster 2003). "Non-hierarchical, anarchic modes of interaction are no longer seen as features on which to model a future society, but rather as an ever-present potential of social interaction here and now – a 'revolution in everyday life'" (Gordon 2007: 36).[5] Anarchists dismiss blueprints, and thus the focus here is on fictional anarchist utopias – i.e. literary visions of anarchistic societies. Can mere written words be relevant and effective for social transformation?

Lucy Sargisson (2007: 36) notes that the utopian offerings of radical alternatives provoke further thought, debate, and experimentation, arguing that "utopias are

subversive and estranged. These qualities permit them to perform the political functions long-privileged by feminists: consciousness raising and critique." Reading these escapist texts can simulate the feeling of what it might be like to live in an alternative society for some time. Tom Moylan (2000: xvii) even ("lightly but seriously") warns students in his utopian science fiction classes that "this degree of involved reading can be dangerous to their social and political health, for it can 'damage' their minds by allowing them to think about the world in ways not sanctioned by hegemonic institutions and ideologies." This is especially interesting for curious non-anarchists reading anarchist utopias – and if you are already an anarchist, your critique of hierarchism and the state can gain new aspects and depth through this reading. But we shouldn't overstate the impact fictional utopias have on the real world. It may be true that utopias "can inspire or catalyze change," as Sargisson concludes, by "showcasing new ways of being" (2007: 39), but showcases first have to attract attention before they can fulfill their function. In our time of internet, TV, radio, and movies, it is quite difficult for books to have a mass impact on people.[6] Kenneth Roemer (2007: 148) states that

> there has been a decline in the power of books to transform lives. There are no reform clubs or political parties inspired by Le Guin, Marge Piercy, Samuel R. Delany, Octavia E. Butler, or Kim Stanley Robinson; and the reviews and essays written about their utopias lack the sense of dire warnings or ecstatic hopes about the impact of reading utopias that characterized the reviews of late-nineteenth-century American utopias.

The decline of the power of utopian books depends not only on the book form, but also on the utopian content per se. In the twentieth century, several attempts at putting utopian ideals into practice led to horrible results, like Nazism and Soviet Communism. Additionally, a new type of negative utopia emerged out of satire and the utopian tradition: the *dystopia* (for example, Zamyatin's *We*, Huxley's *Brave New World*, or Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*). Dystopias show the dangers of utopia, especially its possible connection to totalitarianism, which fostered an anti-utopian attitude in the popular mind (Roemer 2007: 148). But the harshest critics of utopia have always been the authors of utopias themselves (Seeber 2003: 21) – which means that you do not have to become fully anti-utopian if you recognized the flaws of previous utopias. On the contrary, "not believing in the possibility of betterment, however flawed, condemns us to live in someone else's vision of a better life, perhaps one forced on us," as Sargent (2003: 230) concludes.

Utopianism is eager to learn from its own faults. Saage identifies particularly a libertarian and anarchist lineage of utopias as a corrective for the classical utopian tradition (1997: 162). In their works, utopians not only criticize their contemporary society, but the (not seldom authoritarian, perfectionist, and rigid) utopian tradition, too. In this manner, not only the well-known dystopias emerged, but, following and answering them, the open-ended or critical utopias in the 1970s (Somay 1984; Moylan 1986) and the critical dystopias in the 1980s and 1990s (Moylan

2000).[7] Critical utopias are positive depictions of polities that are neither static nor perfect: they are rather flawed and ambiguous, and they do not smack of the mandatory happiness of the citizenry that so often makes classical authoritarian utopias appear totalitarian. Exemplary critical utopias are Marge Piercy's *Woman on the Edge of Time*, Samuel R. Delany's *Trouble on Triton*, and Ursula K. Le Guin's *The Dispossessed*. Critical dystopias are depictions of horrendous polities as in the classical dystopias, but they leave some hope for the oppressed and exploited: resistance or enclaves for subjugated individuals make new utopian aspirations possible. Exemplary critical dystopias are Kim Stanley Robinson's *Gold Coast*, Octavia E. Butler's *The Parable of the Sower*, and Marge Piercy's *He, She and It*.

The critical utopias and dystopias seem to follow Bakunin's advice (1964: 299) that the reorganization of society should take place "not according to an ideal plan mapped by a few sages or savants." They are not meant as blueprints to be implemented by social engineers. They are open to change (to the better or the worse) and therefore are far from an ideal plan. And they are not mapped by their authors alone. This is crucial, since in traditional utopias the author is the highest authority, regardless of anarchistic embroideries. The citizens of utopia live and act just as the author wants them to, and if he/she says so, they are happy with their blissful society, end of story! Not so in critical utopias: they need the imaginative collaboration of an engaged reader, because not everything in the alternative society is described (or, more to the point: *pre*scribed). They may use, for example, non-linearity and/or a multiplicity of voices as narrative instruments to open themselves to the readers, with Le Guin's *Always Coming Home* being the best example of this (Jose 1991: 190; Seyferth 2008: 276–282; see also Roemer 2003: 50–60). But can such postmodern (and sometimes quite messy) narrations be the first step for widespread social transformation? Not in a straightforward way, suspects Roemer (2007: 149):

> Considering all the forces undermining belief in our ability to imagine Utopia as a "perfect" world, it is not surprising that the literary utopias most often admired by critics and scholars are complex and ambiguous. In other words, they are the types of books unlikely to spawn large-scale activist groups.

It sounds like a serious dilemma: literary utopias seem to either domineer over or discourage readers. If the function of utopia was to be a construction plan that has to be followed strictly, utopia would fail for anarchists because it would then lack the openness that is constitutive of anarchism. If the function of utopia was to draw the masses to revolutionary action, utopia would fail for anarchists, too, because utopias open-ended enough for anarchism are not compatible enough with mainstream, best-selling literature.[8] But maybe these aren't the main functions for anarchist utopias.

Anarchists need not worry about their utopias being too complex and their reading too cumbersome. They already made their choice for a lively interplay of many different individuals and groups, performing themselves the tasks usually

found in the hands of authorities. Present-day anarchism is a multitude of voices, movements, and actions, many of them not even calling themselves "anarchist": "Anarchism today is theoretically diverse, philosophically fragmented, and practically divided," as Williams (2007: 311) observes, but "the typical theorist sees in today's anarchism a worthy diversity and pluralism, rather than a destructive factionalism" (2007: 307). And Gordon (2007: 32–35) contends that "[t]here is also a reluctance to use the label 'anarchist' on the part of many groups whose political culture and discourse obviously merit the designation." Those groups exist, regardless of the supposed lack of effect of suitable utopias – and regardless of the arduousness of acting out anarchist principles like DIY ("do it yourself") or decision making by consensus. If you are too lazy to make decisions and come to terms with others' interests on your own, you may find that governments are quite labor-saving for feeble subjects like yourself.[9] But if you are keen to take your life in your own hands, even if that means attending tedious plenums, getting electricity cut off (because you live in a squat), or regularly being harassed by police officers – in other words: if you are an anarchist – you may very well also have the energy and patience to read even the least easy-to-read utopias. Compared to what anarchist activists often have to endure, reading postmodern critical utopias appears to be rather comfortable.

So then, what is the place of utopia in anarchism? The multi-faceted phenomenon of anarchism builds a "transfer culture," which Shantz (2008: 26) defines as "that agglomeration of ideas and practices that guides people in making the trip from the society here to the society there in the future." Utopias are part of this transfer culture, as are demonstrations, punk songs, squats, or wildcat strikes (to name just a few examples). For many, utopias only preach to the already converted, but something has to have converted them in the first place. That is where the academy comes into play: openly agitating anarchism is seldom possible in state-run or profit-oriented universities, neither for students nor for teachers. But to deal with certain aspects of certain cultures, and especially to read books, is relatively unproblematic – precisely because that is so apparently harmless. It can be concluded that engaged reading of utopias can change the reader's mind, albeit not as inevitably and extensively as some may wish. Additionally, a few changed minds are surely not enough to make the world a better place – action has to follow to put anarchy into practice, in the academy and elsewhere.

A couple of beautiful examples

The first accounts of what might be called fictional anarchist commonwealths are the myths of the Golden Age, known since Virgil. Especially in the writings of Zenon and Iambulos one can find "anarchistic tendencies" (Saage 2001: 34–37): state institutions are deemed not necessary because nature guides the acts of men;[10] work is considered not an imperative but a virtue (therefore slavery is abolished), and a bawdy hedonism is made possible. In the Early Modern Times, the travelogues of the discoverers resembled much the descriptions of the Golden Age and inspired many authors: strange people with strange customs become the

noble savages in Montaigne's essays *Of Cannibals* (1580) and *Of Coaches* (1588; see Saage 2001: 216–219) and in Bougainville's *Voyage autour du monde* (1771). Following Saage (2001: 45), the first full-fledged anarchist utopias[11] are de Foigny's *La Terre Australe connue* (1676; see Saage 2002a: 35–51), Lahontan's *Dialogues de Monsieur le Baron des Lahontan et d'un Sauvage dans l'Amerique* (1703; see Saage 2002a: 95–114), Morelly's *La Basiliade* (1753; see Saage 2002a: 131–152), and Diderot's *Supplément au voyage de Bougainville* (1772; see Saage 2002a: 153–75; the *Supplément* is the culmination and the end of the anarchistic utopian tradition of the noble savage, see Saage 2006: 137). In these Early Modern utopias, the antique patterns of nature and hedonism recur (Saage 2001: 42–48).

In the nineteenth century, another spirit prevailed: the transformation of society seemed actually possible, which is reflected in the rise of anarchism as a revolutionary movement. The most famous depiction of a non-hierarchical socialist polity is Morris's *News from Nowhere* (1890; see Saage 2002b: 157–181), but there are some less well-known anarchist utopias, too. Saage (2002b: 329–343) enumerates Déjacques's *L'Humanisphère, Utopie anarchique* (1858–59), Rossi's *Une commune socialiste* (1878) and *Le Paranà au 20° siecle* (1894), and Mackay's *Die Anarchisten* (1891), most of which are inspired by Charles Fourier. The first half of the twentieth century sees the rise of the dystopias, constituting a literary counter-movement against authoritarian, anti-individualist utopias, which Saage construes as a "hegemony of anarchist scenarios" (2006: 60). For the second half of the twentieth century, four examples are particularly interesting.

In 1951, Eric Frank Russell published a humorous short-story called ". . . And Then There Were None," which became the third section of his 1962 published novel *The Great Explosion*. In it, a libertarian society is depicted in a traditional utopian manner: terrestrial soldiers visit the anarchist planet of the "Gands" (a salute to Gandhi) to reintegrate this renegade human colony in a new interstellar empire, but discover (for them) very unusual social and economic arrangements. The Gands's society is extremely individualistic and economically based on a credit system that recalls today's local exchange trading systems. It is more a variation of barter than of anarcho-communism. The Gands are very insubordinate and do not follow orders; to the demands of earth's military they react with expressions of steadfast unwillingness ("Myob"[12] and "I won't!" are their mottos) and civil disobedience (a behavior very attractive for the soldiers, making more and more of them defect), until the authorities have to give up and leave the planet.

The utopian travelogue is turned upside down in Ursula K. Le Guin's 1974 novel *The Dispossessed*: here Shevek, a citizen of the anarchist planet Anarres, visits a capitalist-dystopian state, which shows very unusual characteristics to him, like the repellent rituals of bankers. In alternating chapters, both societies are depicted. Anarres has a communist economy and is organized in syndicates. This society clearly resembles ideas from Peter Kropotkin's *Mutual Aid* and *Fields, Factories and Workshops* and Paul Goodman's *Communitas*. In its tone, *The Dispossessed* is much more austere than *The Great Explosion*; Le Guin's view of the anarchist society appears to be realistic, not satirical, since shortcomings are not left out. On Anarres, people live with all their human failures. Their attempt

to organize society without hierarchies or coercion does not work as well as desired (for example, a bureaucracy emerges). Adequately, this novel bears the subtitle *An Ambiguous Utopia*. It is one of the best-known critical utopias and has evoked reams of secondary literature in many disciplines (see Davis and Stillman 2005; Seyferth 2008: 130–150).

Not really satisfied with her much-lauded *The Dispossessed*, Le Guin wrote another utopia that was published in 1985, called *Always Coming Home*. This work is a critical utopia as well, with an unrivaled open-endedness and post-modern multiplicity of voices. The book is a medley of narrations, poems, songs, recipes, myths, plays, and drawings with no obvious order. The pictured society is strongly reminiscent of indigenous lifestyles with their totems, kinships, rituals, and their close affinity to nature. Hunting, gathering, and gardening are the main food sources. But this primitivistic dream-land has serious problems, too: it suffers from the remains of our environmental pollution and is endangered by fascist warmongers nearby. Inspired by Taoism, ethnological theories, and Murray Bookchin's *The Ecology of Freedom*, Le Guin created a utopian masterpiece that is far more demanding and sophisticated than *The Dispossessed* (Seyferth 2008: 276–326).

Our last example is P.M.'s *bolo'bolo*, first published in Switzerland in 1983 and since then translated into many languages. *bolo'bolo* is not a novel but rather a dictionary. It introduces terms that explain what a new world-wide political order might look like. The most important term is *ibu*, a quite solipsistic concept of the ego, around which everything else is constructed. About 500 *ibus* make a *bolo* (intentional community), characterized by *nima* (lifestyle), *sila* (hospitality), *kodu* (agrarian self-sufficiency) and many more. All *bolos* form *bolo'bolo*, the network of economic and cultural intercommunion. Gift-exchange and barter are the main trade principles, but markets are possible, too. P.M. makes almost no specifications of how *ibus* or *bolos* arrange their affairs; this little book is rather a skeleton of a (fallible and open-ended) blueprint than a traditional or critical utopia. It wants to be put into practice (it even includes a schedule for the actions that have to take place to make world-revolution happen!), but leaves room for a wide variety of interpretations about details – excluding capitalism and the state, which are seen as no longer possible.

This list of four examples is of course not even remotely complete. Everyone who dreams of "good anarchy" creates a new anarchist utopia in their mind. Some people share their dreams by writing them down in books, while others share their dreams by acting them out. Engagement with both kinds of anarchist desires is worthwhile and very inspiring.

References

Amster, R. (2003) "Restoring (dis)order: sanctions, resolutions, and 'social control' in anarchist communities," *Contemporary Justice Review*, 6(1): 9–24.

Bakunin, M. (1964) *Scientific Anarchism*, G.P. Maximoff (ed.), London: Collier-Macmillan.

Bloch, E. (1959) *Das Prinzip Hoffnung*, Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Carment, D. (2003) "Assessing state failure: implications for theory and policy," *Third World Quarterly* 24(3): 407–427.
Chomsky, N. (2006) *Failed States: the abuse of power and the assault on democracy*, New York: Metropolitan Books.
Crowder, G. (1991) *Classical Anarchism: the political thought of Godwin, Proudhon, Bakunin, and Kropotkin*, Oxford: Clarendon.
Davis, L. and Stillman, P. (2005) *The New Utopian Politics of Ursula K. Le Guin's* The Dispossessed, Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
Eizenstat, S., Porter, J.E., Weinstein, J. (2005) "Rebuilding weak states," *Foreign Affairs* 84(1): 134–147.
Gordon, U. (2007) "Anarchism reloaded," *Journal of Political Ideologies* 12(1): 29–48.
Jose, J. (1991) "Reflections on the politics of Le Guin's narrative shifts," *Science Fiction Studies* 18(2): 180–197.
Kinna, R. (2005) *Anarchism: a beginner's guide*, Oxford: Oneworld.
Le Guin, UK. (1999) *The Dispossessed: an ambiguous utopia*, New York: HarperCollins.
—— (2005) *Always Coming Home*, Berkeley, CA: California University Press.
Levitas, R. (1990) *The Concept of Utopia*, Hemel Hempstead: Syracuse University Press.
Moylan, T. (1986) *Demand the Impossible: science fiction and the utopian imagination*, London: Methuen.
—— (2000) *Scraps of the Untainted Sky: science fiction, utopia, dystopia*, Boulder, CO and Oxford: Westview.
Palij, M. (1976) *The Anarchism of Nestor Makhno*, Seattle, WA and London: Washington University Press.
P.M. (1995) *bolo'bolo*, Zürich: Paranoia City.
Pyziur, E. (1955) *The Doctrine of Anarchism of Michael A. Bakunin*, Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press.
Roemer, K. (2003) *Utopian Audiences: how readers locate nowhere*, Amherst and Boston, MA: Massachusetts University Press.
—— (2007) "More aliens transforming utopia: the futures of reader response and utopian studies," in T. Moylan and R. Baccolini (eds), *Utopia Method Vision: the use value of social dreaming*, Oxford: Peter Lang.
Russell, E.F. (1951) ". . . And then there were none," *Astounding Science Fiction* 47(4). Online. Available http://www.abelard.org/e-f-russell.htm (accessed 28 February 2008).
—— (1962) *The Great Explosion*, New York: Torquil/Dodd, Mead.
Saage, R. (1994) *Politische Utopien der Neuzeit*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
—— (1997) *Utopieforschung: eine bilanz*, Darmstadt: Primus.
—— (2001) *Utopische Profile, Band I: renaissance und reformation*, Münster: Lit.
—— (2002a) *Utopische Profile, Band II: aufklärung und absolutismus*, Münster: Lit.
—— (2002b) *Utopische Profile, Band III: industrielle revolution und technischer staat im 19*, Jahrhundert. Münster: Lit.
—— (2006) *Utopisches Denken im Historischen Prozess*, Materialien zur Utopieforschung. Münster: Lit.
Sargent, L.T. (1994) "Three faces of utopianism revisited," *Utopian Studies* 5(1): 1–37.
—— (2003) "The problem of the 'flawed utopia': a note on the costs of eutopia," in R. Baccolini and T. Moylan (eds), *Dark Horizons: science fiction and the dystopian imagination*, New York and London: Routledge.
—— (2007) "Choosing utopia: utopianism as an essential element in political thought and action," in T. Moylan and R. Baccolini (eds), *Utopia Method Vision: the use value of social dreaming*, Oxford: Peter Lang.
Sargisson, L. (2003) "Justice inside utopia? The case of intentional communities in New Zealand," *Contemporary Justice Review*, 7(3): 321–333.
—— (2007) "The curious relationship between politics and utopia," in T. Moylan and R. Baccolini (eds), *Utopia Method Vision: the use value of social dreaming*, Oxford: Peter Lang.
Seeber, H.U. (2003) *Die Selbstkritik der Utopie in der Angloamerikanischen Literatur*, Münster: Lit.
Seyferth, P. (2008) *Utopie, Anarchismus und Science Fiction: Ursula K. Le Guin's werke von 1962 bis 2002*, Münster: Lit.
Shantz, J. (2008) "Anarchist futures in the present," *Resistance Studies* 1: 24–34.
Somay, B. (1984) "Towards an open-ended utopia," *Science Fiction Studies* 11(1): 25–38.
Stowasser, H. (2007) *Anarchie! Idee, Geschichte, Perspektiven*, Hamburg: Edition Nautilus.
Suvin, D. (2003) "Theses on dystopia 2001," in R. Baccolini and T. Moylan (eds), *Dark Horizons: science fiction and the dystopian imagination*, New York and London: Routledge.
Williams, L. (2007) "Anarchism revived," *New Political Science* 29(3): 297–312.
Zirnstein, C. (2006) *Zwischen Fakt und Fiktion: die politische utopie im film*, Munich: Herbert Utz.

10 I think we "older generation" feminists feel a similar disconnection when younger women who define themselves as feminists nevertheless fail to understand our concerns about the whittling away of abortion rights, or of rights to equal treatment at the workplace. I have addressed these issues before (Ackelsberg 2003b).
11 A group of contemporary anarcha-feminist women who modeled themselves, to some extent, on an organization of the same name that was active during the period of the Spanish Civil War. For further information about the original Mujeres Libres see, for example, Lisa Berger and Carol Mazer, *De Toda la Vida* (videocassette) 1986 and Ackelsberg (2005).
12 The claim that those who raise questions about the functioning of ongoing institutions are being "divisive" is a typical mode of dismissing such questions.
13 Womanists, black feminists, Latina feminists, and others have been making similar and parallel claims vis-à-vis feminist and other social change movements. And most of these movements have yet to fully figure out exactly how to respond effectively to those demands.
14 Here is another point where my scholarly concerns have come together with these seemingly more personal ones. I have explored this issue before (see Ackelsberg 1984b and 2005 – especially Ch. 6 and "Conclusion").
15 Recent work by Patricia Williams and Lani Guinier, among others, have addressed this issue in the context of a discussion of "race" in the United States. Both have noted that, in all-too-many contexts, those who call attention to racist comments or behaviors are targeted as trouble-makers, and find the conversation turned away from the original affront, and reframed as an issue of "civil discourse." See, for example, Williams (1991) and Guinier and Torres (2002: especially Ch. 2).
16 One of the more egregious examples of this, from within the academic community, is Huntington (2004).

Chapter 26: Anarchism: past, present, and utopia

1 Syndicalism and individualism feature most prominently in the explanatory literature of anarchism's failure, and the history of the movement is now sometimes written as a confrontation between these two tendencies. See, for example, Skirda (2002); Bookchin (2008); and, for a rather different view of the confrontation, Bookchin (1995).
2 Franks (2006) provides an abstract four-point definition of class-struggle anarchism but this conception is nevertheless drawn from the notion that nineteenth-century anarchist theory was narrowly concerned with an idea of collective, industrial struggle.
3 One of the most recent examples of this attitude is N.J. Jun (2007: 132), who argues that Deleuzian anarchism *is* anarchism despite not being "the utopian anarchism of the nineteenth century . . . but the provisional and preconditional anarchism which is, and will continue to be, the foundation of postmodern politics."
4 A good analysis of Proudhon's theory of history can be found in Noland (1968). The location of this piece in a volume edited by Hayden White, the arch-postmodern historian, is somewhat ironic.

Chapter 27: Anarchism and utopia

1 None of the states usually called "failed," "failing," or "collapsed" in governance studies result from anarchist uprisings, but revolutions are one kind of cause for failure. Carment refers to "four kinds of state failure: (1) revolutionary wars, (2) ethnic wars, (3) mass killings, and (4) adverse or disruptive regime change" (2003: 422). Bakunin had a revolutionary war in mind, and in spite of his different historical situation a comparison is possible: most modern failed states suffer from a bloody history of imperialist colonialism, whilst Bakunin's peasants suffered from a bloody history of czarist feudalism. Both situations seem to be capable of being turned to violent chaos

by very similar means; just think of the brutalities during the Russian Civil War (1917–21), where you have a failed monarchy, a disruptive regime change, and even fighting anarchists (in the Black Guards and in Makhno's army) (see Palij 1976).

2 It should be noted that following Chomsky (2006) even the most powerful state (USA) shows characteristics usually attributed to failed states. It seems that the evils of "bad anarchy" are not so much the result of states failing or not, but of domination carried out.

3 Most anarchists will regard the monopoly on the use of force and the rule of law as not necessary, and all anarchists must (per definition) regard oppression and exploitation as not necessary.

4 One might object that it is an ethnocentric prejudice to assume that there are no societies organized in an anarchistic manner – haven't there been enough indigenous tribes and nations that knew no state power? That may very well be the case (see, for example, the writings of Harold B. Barclay, Pierre Clastres, or John Zerzan), and those stateless societies can serve as useful inspirations for anarchist struggles and alternatives. But unfortunately, these societies seem to be in fallback or on the edge of obliteration, if not already extinct. (One exception might be the Zapatistas in Oaxaca.) And you cannot just join them in large numbers – what you can do is read about their cultures and politics, and that is not so much different from reading utopias. Readers of utopias seem to be special cases of armchair anthropologists.

5 What would that be? Leonard Williams lists "everything from do-it-yourself media to neighborhood organizing, from promoting alternative energy to providing free food to the poor and homeless" (2007: 308).

6 Of course there are famous exceptions like the Bible, the Koran, and certain self-help books (Roemer 2007: 147). Interestingly, there seem to be only negative utopias – dystopias – in blockbuster movies. Maybe Chloé Zirnstein is right and positive utopias are too boring to be suited for blockbuster movies: the more surveillance they depict and hence the more dystopian they are, the more thrilling the sci-fi movie plot becomes (2006: 79–81). I hope she is wrong, and look forward to exciting (but not yet projected) film adaptations of *The Great Explosion* and *The Dispossessed.*

7 Darko Suvin calls the last two Fallible Eutopia and Fallible Dystopia respectively (2003: 195–196).

8 This applies first and foremost to the critical utopias. Their successors, the critical dystopias, are more easily accessible, as Moylan finds (2000: 199).

9 Governments can be labor-saving in regard to making decisions for your life, but they are usually very opposed to the anarchist goal of "abolition of work," which would be an abolition of their profits, really.

10 Neither Zenon nor Iambulos are anarchists in a present-day meaning of the word. For them a stateless society does not mean equality of all human beings; rather it is suitable for some men, but women and children have no say in political matters.

11 Prior to these is Rabelais's *Abbey of Thélème* (a part of his humorous *Gargantua et Pantagruel*, 1532), but it is not considered a full-fledged utopia (Saage 2001: 212–216).

12 "Myob" is the acronym for "Mind Your Own Business!"