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Since the emergence of classical anarchism in the mid-nineteenth century, the city and the urban commune have been central to the anarchist imagination and anarchist socio-political action. This chapter presents a synoptic overview of the uses of the city in the anarchists’ programmes, tactics, strategies and visions. From the Paris Commune of 1871, as the symbol of the revolution, to the works of Murray Bookchin on libertarian municipalism, the city has been central for the transformation of philosophical anarchism into a quotidian, vivid practice.


Before there was a movement of self-declared anarchists, the first ‘anarchists’ were called Mutualists, Federalists and Internationalists. Just as Marxism as an ideology evolved into a corpus of academic and doctrinal statements and programmes, and assumed a public face in the late nineteenth century, so too anarchism, in reaction to Marxism, but also in reaction to events on the ground, became a self-contained identifiable ideology and movement only in the 1880s and 1890s. For the advocates of anarchism, decentralized power structures in towns and cities were used to galvanise the imagination and the movements for the final goals of a stateless and anti-authoritarian world.

The study of the relationship of the anarchists to the city is useful in two regards: it helps to bridge the gaps and the controversies over the gaps in the periodization of anarchism (as a formal ideology and its precursors), namely pre-anarchism, classical anarchism (1860s to 1945) and new and post-‘anarchisms’ (1945 to the present): thus for example Peter Kropotkin
invoked aspects of the late medieval European city-state as a model for his modern anarchist city of 1900 and Colin Ward invoked libertarian solutions for the London of the 1960s and 1970s by invoking Kropotkin.\textsuperscript{3} This anarchist/city optic also is useful in the vexed discussion of whether or not anarchism was just another European provincial or Orientalist ideology, which accompanied the steamship, the telegraph, the missionary and the machine gun. To what extent did the arrival of anarchism and syndicalism in Latin America, China, Japan or India feed-off indigenous forms of thought and action and to what extent, as has been shown recently in the case of Japan where Russian Populist progenitors were inspired by non-Western models of cooperation in civil society?\textsuperscript{4} How can we imagine classical anarchism without taking into account the vibrant movements of Argentina, Cuba or Mexico?\textsuperscript{5} One way to address these issues is through examining movements found in the liminal cities of the Global South during the era of High Imperialism (1880-1920), thus for example, Buenos Aires, Shanghai, Havana or Beirut as well as the liminal cities of the Imperial overlords from San Francisco to London to New York to Barcelona.\textsuperscript{6} Not only does the study of the theme of anarchism and the city challenge the accepted chronology, it can also serve as a methodological tool, which grounds the recent interest in transnational, cosmopolitan and network approaches in a solid, day to day reality, the urban milieu, which can be grasped by the historian and also my others who study the dissemination and mutation of political ideologies and political practices.\textsuperscript{7}

Unlike other political movements, the study of anarchism relies upon ground-level social history to understand its nuance and continuity because long-term forms of organization can be elusive or short-live. Thus, to quote, Tom Goyens, in his suitably entitled monograph \textit{(Beer and Revolution)} a study of the German anarchists in New York City from 1880 to 1914, that particular centres of conviviality, the beer hall\textsuperscript{8}: 

---


\textsuperscript{4} This critique is discussed in Peter做得, \textit{Anarchism and the Spirit of the Age}, London: Verso, 1994.


A social and cultural history of German anarchists in the greater New York area must take into account the geography of the movement, its physical connection to the urban landscape. This movement was not merely an intellectual phenomenon, or some elusive threat- the ghost of anarchy- in the minds of respectable citizens. It consisted of men, women and children of exiled and immigrated families, of impetuous activists who were part of the citizenry of New York.

Anarchism became flesh and punched over its weight, through global syndicalism, in counter-institutions such as free schools and social centres and in the tissues of diasporic and immigrant communities, like the Italian colony of London (1870-1914), studied by Pietro Di Paola or the concurrent French colony, brought to life by Constance Bantman. Studying the role of the city, I think, is a red thread, which joins together syndicalism, conviviality and educational institutions. But let me add a disclaimer, I am not arguing that other approaches are not important: the studies of rural movements of the first and second Zapatistas of the Mexican Revolution and the Yucatan of today or the movement of the Maknovscina in rural Ukraine during the Russian Civil War (1918-1921), or even the ground-breaking and delightful work of the anthropologist James Scott, who identified a zone of anarchist-like structures and behaviours in upland South-East Asia (Zomia) in the early modern and the initial part of the modern eras and the works on pirate confederacies and maroon settlements in the America are all significant to our understandings of anarchism. But in this chapter, I will show that the urban optic has its utility.

THE COMMUNE OF PARIS 1871 AND ITS REPERCUSSIONS

The Commune of Paris of 1871 lasted just 72 days but it became the focus for the imaginations of Karl Marx, Michael Bakunin, Vladimir Lenin, William Morris, Peter Kropotkin, Louise Michel and Élisée Reclus. The city of Paris was abandoned by the
provisional government after the defeat by the Prussians, and the radicals of Paris, stirred by
the denizens of the popular and working-class clubs, which had flourished since the late
1860s during the liberalization of politics in the waning days of rule of Louis Napoleon, took
control. The politics and policies of the Commune were marked by improvisation but the
central themes were clear: the Universal Republic, a France of decentralized political units
and a Paris ruled in turn by its arrondissements (the Central Committee of the Twenty
Arrondissements). Public policies announced the institutions of free secular education for all
children: a polytechnical education, which combined manual an intellectual training, but also
a system of crèches for younger children. The renter would win out over the landlord.
Women were noticeably present in this polity, with the Women’s Union the largest and most
effective institution of the Commune. As Kristin Ross notes, artists were a predominant force
in the Commune- the painter Courbet was joined by a legion of decorative artists and
practitioners of woodworking and shoemaking. Art was to be universal and not imprisoned in
the Salon. The anarchist Reclus proclaimed that aesthetic concerns were also concerns of the
democratic polity, and thus heralded the birth of a communal luxury based on the ‘principles
of association and cooperation’. But the Commune was a balance between reformists and
revolutionaries, it even contracted a loan from the Rothschilds and reassured lenders that
debts would be repaid and it never seized the funds of the Bank of France. But it also
outlawed night work in bakeries and created worker controlled munition shops to arm the
National Guard.

The lessons from the Commune were varied. For Lenin the Commune-State needed a
vanguard party to protect it from counter-revolution, while, it is argued by Ross and others
that in his last decade of his life, Marx used the example of the Commune of Paris to soften
his hostilities to communal socialism of the agrarian Populist of Russia. For the anarchists in
the late nineteenth century, the Commune of Paris was the turning point and counterpoint to
authoritarian Marxism. Indeed Bakunin’s collectivist anarchism was crystallized here: it was the transformation of the University Republic into a quest of for the realization of internationalist federalism. But although the Commune was celebrated and grieved by the anarchists in the late nineteenth century, it was not beyond their criticism.\textsuperscript{15} Thus Errico Malatesta thought its social policies had been too restricted and timid, that it was evolving disturbingly towards representative rather than direct democracy, and that the more dictatorial Jacobins and Blanquists had become too powerful in the Committee of Safety.\textsuperscript{16} William Morris and Peter Kropotkin would join the imagery of the Commune with a critical reinterpretation of modernity and particularly the growth of great capitalist conurbations such as London.\textsuperscript{17} In Morris’s \textit{News from Nowhere} the insurgents of the English Revolution echo the levelling of the Napoleonic Victory Column in the Place Vendôme by the Communards by turning Trafalgar Square into an orchard.\textsuperscript{18}

But Morris had little time for the industrial city as such, whereas Kropotkin combined the praise for anachronisms – the so-called primitive forms of democracy and adaptive cooperation, the mutual aid carried out by peasants, farmers, and the First Nations of the harsh landscapes of Siberia and Iceland (this of course shared with Morris) with an appreciation of the modern city. But the most recent and more modern might not necessarily be more evolved and better than past models of governance. For Kropotkin there were two roads in the history of Europe: the road traversed which embraced the communal liberties of the city states and the urban guilds of the late medieval Europe, that is in the era previous to the rise of the Absolutist State, and a Roman imperial road which led his troubled present-day of militarist imperial states of Europe, with their centralizing monster capital cities.\textsuperscript{19} But the other road from the city-state, demonstrated Kropotkin’s creative use of the anachronism and his approach was different than Morris’s or the Russian Populists’, who were partial to the smaller settlement of the \textit{mir}. For Kropotkin the decentralized city, based on the high
technology of his day- electricity- would humanize modernity, by the interweaving of fields, factories and workshops, through Garden Cities, promoted by his followers such as Patrick Geddes. 20 Here is another follower, Lewis Mumford in 1961, but it could easily be 2011. 21

Almost half a century in advance of contemporary opinion (Kropotkin) had grasped the fact that flexibility and adaptability of electronic communication and electric power, along with the possibilities of intensive biodynamic farming, had laid the foundations for more decentralized urban development in small units, responsive to direct human contact, and enjoying urban and rural advantages.

If Kropotkin felt that Morris was too naïve and anti-urban, Errico Malatesta criticized Kropotkin in turn for his belief that the urban general strike would usher in revolutionary change. Malatesta was a realist, he argued that (and examples in the twentieth century bear him out) modern cities relied on just-in-time provisioning, the city would starve during a general strike and the forces of the state could wait out the revolt. 22 Besides, Malatesta also insisted that continuity was key: the power plants needed to remain in operation, the city needed its provisioning agents in the countryside and the networked life of urban industrial society needed to be maintained. So during the occupation of the factories in Italy in 1920, he pleaded with the occupiers a large plant in Milan to restart production and exchange or face the consequences of a backlash, which of course was the rapid rise of Fascism. 23 As we shall see, later similar challenges were encountered by the anarchists of Barcelona when power was handed to them in the summer of 1936. But this discussion of realism returns us to the grim realities of the how the Commune of Paris was terminated.

After vicious fighting, the government forced carried out mass executions of men, women and children with anti-Communard civilians joining in the massacre. John Merriman estimates more than 100,000 residents of Paris were killed, imprisoned or fled the scene:
some 15,000 were shot out of hand in the weeks following the suppression of the Commune and the skilled trades: shoemakers, tailors, cabinetmakers, bronze workers, plumber (the backbone of the Commune) were so decimated that ‘industrialists and small employers complained about the paucity of artisans and skilled workers’. The Communards had executed under a hundred hostages. For the men of order, Merriman reports, the entire population of Paris was guilty. One man of order dreamed of ‘an immense furnace in which we will cook each of them in turn’. And thus as Ross concludes, ‘the attempt on the part of the bourgeois-republican government to physically exterminate its class enemy bears every resemblance to mass exterminations of religion and race’. Unleashing, Merriman adds, ‘the demons of the twentieth century’. The symbolism of the subversive heights Buttes de Chaumont was understood by the ‘men of order’, who ordered the construction of Sacré Coeur where the National Guards artillery had been parked.

The Paris Commune served as a catalysing agent in which the anarchist and the libertarian wings of the First International coalesced (an examples of ‘globalization from below’). In Italy and Spain, the example of decentralized federations of cities fell on fertile ground. In Italy radical Mazzinians disavowed Mazzini when he denounced the Commune as a breeder of class war and godlessness, and they turned their backs on his centralizing precepts. In Spain, the most radical communal federalist Republicans were one of the streams from which the Spanish anarchist movement developed, especially after Spain’s own short-lived Commune at Alcoy in 1873.

Several years later, as the direct action and insurrencional techniques of the anti-authoritarian branch of the First International ran into an impasse, the politics of the city and the urban commune were the route used to escape this ineffective radicalism. So one path to gas and water socialism on the continent was promoted by the former anarchist firebrands, such as the French Paul Brousse and the Italian, Andrea Costa, or the more moderate Communard
exile based in Palermo and then Milan, Benoît Malon, who championed a city based experimentalist socialism. The communal experiment was invoked as a form of reformist but radical programme at the city level, indeed in Costa’s case, maximalist socialism mixed with an older tradition of *campanilismo*. This for the his followers in the restive Romagna, expanding male suffrage made Bologna, Ferrara and smaller cities targets from which to control the growing armies of landless labourers in the adjacent commercial farming lands of the Po Valley. These cities and their rural hinterlands became the backbones of Italian socialism before they were smashed by Fascism in the early 1920s. The 1920 minimum programme of radical gas and water socialism was joined by a maximalist programme which envisaged the socialization of the land the creation urban soviets. The political geography of Padania, was forged in the late nineteenth century the aftermath of the First International, was transformed by the Communists after 1945 into the prosperous but left-wing Red Belt.

Within the broader boundaries of the Red Belt, the anarchists developed generational fortresses: to name four, Ancona, Massa-Carrara, Livorno and La Spezia. This network retained anarchism’s presence in Italy from the 1890s to the 1920s, even as the parliamentary socialists of the Partito Socialista Italiano with Costa as one of the early leaders in parliament a dominant player on the Left.

In June 1914, on the eve of the First World War, the power of this more radical network of small to medium-sized towns was vividly demonstrated during the so-called Red Week. Like the Tragic Week in Barcelona in 1909, the combination of anti-militarism caused by unpopular imperial adventures and the miserable treatment of conscripts, rising inflation, especially for basic food stuffs, and deeply embedded anti-clerical and republican sympathies, led to general strikes, police shootings and general uprisings, in Barcelona in 1909 and 1914 throughout the web of towns in central Italy, which saw the peninsula nearly cut in two, the declaration of republics in Romagnole towns and the raising of Trees of
Liberty (the Great French Revolution was a still a living political tradition here). Max Nettlau, the ‘Herodotus of anarchism’, reported, when the events were still unfolding, that the small towns of central Italy had retained their revolutionary spirit whereas in the Milan. Turn or Genoa events were less dramatic. Nettlau’s anarchism was suspicious of large organizations but the spirit he identified in the Romagnole towns could also be found in the distinctive areas of great cities, such as Paris’s Belleville or on the Buttes-Chaumont or in the fast growing but isolated industrial suburb of Borgo San Paolo in Turin during the First World War which was one of the hearts of the an urban insurrection in 1917, partially inspired by events in Dublin a year earlier, which saw war weary, bread hungry popular charged by events in Russia and local anarchists, march on the bourgeois centre of Italy’s motor city.

If Costa’s usage of the Paris Commune was an uneasily mixture of reformism and revolutionary rhetoric, the former anarchist Paul Brousse and the Belgian libertarian social democrat, Cesar de Paepe, choose to advance a model which they felt avoided the bureaucratic and centralizing tendencies of the German Social Democratic party. Socialism at the municipal level would be more democratic and efficient. This de Paepe argued for the democratic control of local utilities, municipal bakeries and public, cooperative housing. His model avoided the statist and bureaucratic dangers because the local citizenry and the workers of the utilities would manage and control the sinews from a socialist society would be created. Local democracy at the borough, commune or parish level and worker’s control would avoid anonymous statist ownership (communalist not anarchist or social democrat). This model of decentralized democratic gas and water socialism was disseminated throughout Europe and influenced the Fabians in Britain. Of course, when one hears the words Fabian or Fabianism the images are of bureaucratic control by experts, or the lavish praise of the Webbs for the High Stalinist Soviet Union’s new civilization or Bernard Shaw’s appreciation of
Mussolini’s social programmes in the 1920s. This is misleading. Early Fabian history is quite different. Charlotte Wilson with the Italian Francesco Merlino championed an anarchist wing of the Fabians in the 1880s and in the early twentieth century G.D.H. Cole championed guild socialism. In the 1890s the Webbs took anarchism or small ‘a’ anarchism very seriously indeed: their massive studies of the history of trade unionism and industrial democracy were driven by a need to show how ‘primitive’ direct democracy in workers’ organizations was outlasting its usefulness but was certainly not ignored and their next great project was a study of local government in England. Indeed in the 1880s both Beatrice Potter and Bernard Shaw had been attracted to individualist anarchism and part of their conversion to Fabianism involved journeying down convoluted roads away from this attraction. In Bernard Shaw’s case it was a mutualist Proudhonian Communard refugee who introduced him to socialism in the first place. ‘We had not sorted ourselves out’, he recalled. So the gas and water socialism of the Fabians and the Webbs’s appreciation for local government must be placed in a larger zeitgeist, which also included the lessons and influences of the Paris Commune. Of course when the post-1945 Welfare State used local government as its agency for the delivery of services, anarchists in London such as Colin Ward, as we shall see, were confronting an different beast entirely, and the New Left and the anarchists in the 1960d and 1970s were not friends of London’s Fabian or Morrisonian local state.

CITIES, ANARCHISM AND THE GLOBAL SOUTH IN THE LATE NINETEENTH AND EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY

I now return to a theme flagged at the beginning of this chapter, classical anarchism and the Global South. The city has been central to the recent pioneering research and has been carried out by piecing together the transnational networks, which bound the world together in this first era of modern globalization. The spread of anarchism and syndicalism followed the circuits of power, the circuits of migration, the paper, print and human links of diasporic
communities, of language communities and within cosmopolitan melting pots of anarchist and syndicalist conviviality and politics. How does one trace these circuits? Simply, by identifying port cities and global hub cities in which one can identify longstanding or temporary communities of native, immigrants and nomadic anarchists and syndicalists.

There are two ideal-typical networks: those of political refugees, another which mixes that status with individuals who follow the circuits of imperialism and capitalism, which is composed of labourers, skilled workers and sailors. Both carry anarchism and syndicalism into new environments and pitch up in a series of large and medium sized ports. Thus, for example, is the back and forth between Argentina and Spain, which can be traced for fifty years between Buenos Aires and the vast hinterland of the Rio Plata (with its engrained port-based syndicalist political culture) and Spanish and Catalan port cities. Thus repression and search for work drove Spanish anarchists to Argentina in the 1890s and 1920s and after a military coup in Argentina in 1931 anarchists and syndicalists returned to the Spanish Republic and played a signal role in the Civil War, only once again after to defeat to flee largely to Mexico and South America.

The Industrial Workers of the World organized sailors, stevedores and oil workers of the West (and East) Coast of the USA, Mexico, Peru and Chile and those Wobbly locals stretched down the coast from San Francisco and San Diego to Baja California towns, Peruvian port towns and Valparaiso in Chile, and these efforts spread inland so that Santiago’s vibrant anarchist scene had been seeded by those nomadic Wobblies, whereas in Peru the coastal town anarchists and syndicalists linked up with indigenous peoples and organized them against a semi-feudal system of state-enforced corvée labour. The anarchist inspired Liberal Party of Mexico used a base in San Diego to organize an invasion of Baja California during the Mexican Revolution. And a recent study shows how Los Angeles and San Diego became melting pots of Anglo, immigrant and Mexican labourers and radicals,
involved on both sides of the border. In East Asia, anarchist and syndicalist student and intellectuals, used Shanghai, Canton, Hong Kong and Tokyo as centres of refuge, study and plotting. Thus, for example, Vietnamese radicals were inspired by Chinese and Korean anarchists in Shanghai and Hong Kong.

The modernization of Egypt and the rise of the cotton-cash crop, factories and the building of the Suez Canal attracted peasants from the Egyptian countryside but also workers and artisans from the Ottoman Empire, Greece, Italy, the Habsburg land and Czarist Russia. From these parts anarchists and syndicalists arrived in Alexandria and Cairo and as Ilham Khuri-Makdisi shows in her comparison of Beirut, Cairo and Alexander, a variety of secular radical movements thrived which owed a great deal to anarchism and related rationalist educational theories and practices of Francisco Ferrer. Although in these cities, the European quarters and indigenous Christians were more likely to be attracted to these movements, solidarity cemented by struggles against entrepôt capitalists, dissolved some of the sectarian boundaries between Muslims and non-Muslims. Other studies have traced hubs such as Havana from where anarchists and syndicalists spread their ideas and practices at Tampico in Mexico, Ybor City in Florida, the Panama Canal Zone with its vast labouring force and San Juan in Puerto Rico. The Italian diaspora is an extraordinary example of city networks spanning the globe and feeding back to the Italian movement in the peninsula. By utilizing newspaper subscriptions, Davide Turcato has mapped out network from Alexandria, to Paterson, New Jersey and New York City to Sao Paolo and Buenos Aires and more recent studies have used similar techniques to map city and town networks covering Canada and the USA. I have done the same thing in following the movements of Errico Malatesta, who made London home for nearly thirty years. Whereas Kenyon Zimmer’s study of cosmopolitan San Francisco is a case apart. Here no single immigrant or native anarchist group dominated, thus East European Jewish and Italian anarchists arrived from the East Coast, Mexican radicals from
the south and Chinese and Japanese anarchists from the East joined by the strong presence of Indians of the Ghadar movement, who this point were attracted to anarchism. Cowboys, hoboés, former hard rock miners and bindlestiffs from Irish and Anglo-Saxon backgrounds pitched up too and thus activities were pointed to homelands, city politics, the Mexican Revolution and the vigorous organization of farm labourers by the IWW in the extraordinarily fertile Central Valley of California.51

One might also trace the movements of intellectuals and professionals from the Global South to imperial cities, just as had been done previously for anti-colonial nationalist elite formation and indeed this fashion for tracing networks of anarchists began with that premier student of nationalism, the late Benedict Anderson, in his study of the life of José Rizal, novelist, anarchist and national martyr of the Philippines, who journeyed from Manila to Hong Kong, to Barcelona, Paris, various German cities and London. Here the mixing of Tagalog, Spanish, French, German and British cultures unveils a fascinating life story.52 Thus starting with Anderson’s work and my forays into the life and times of Errico Malatesta, this field has expanded into series of cartographies of anarchism and radicalism through network analysis of urban hubs and port cities and thereby present us with an alternative modernity, an alternative globalization during the era of High Imperialism.

London of course was the capital of the capitalist world and the centre of the greatest empire on Earth and the host to interconnecting anarchist colonies originally based in Soho and the East End but gradually suburbanized by the spreading of the Underground Railway. Populated by exiles from the continent, even liberal Switzerland, they had fled or had been deported to the sole remaining country in Europe whose asylum laws were more flexible and open than her neighbours’, albeit the era dynamite and assassinations in the 1890s and the 1905 Aliens’ Act tightened up on flows of anarchists and so-called paupers. However there was limits to the cosmopolitan nature of these colonies, since language communities could
limit intermingling and could lead to tensions, equally exacerbated by the spies and police agents of a dozen interested foreign governments found its echo in fictional accounts of this London, most famously by another immigrant, the Polish novelist and denizen of the globalization of High Imperialism, Joseph Conrad.53

ART, ANARCHISM AND THE CITY

From the 1880s to the present, the artists, the art market, the anarchist and the urban bohemia have been complex constant feature of the city, From Pissarro to Rothko and beyond certain districts (Montmartre or Greenwich Village, Lower Eastside, etc.) hosted an urban ecology characterized by cheap rents, immigrants, the marginalized or the peripheral working classes, and a network of cheap restaurants, cafés, cabarets, dance centres, radical churches, unorthodox bookshops, the list could go on). As myriad studies of Paris based impressionists, cubists and early surrealists show, the political economy of Montmartre, anarchist argot and the humour of cabaret performers, were interlaced with the aura of daring surrounding the artists’ work and the need for a citywide art market in a city with national and international predominance (such as Paris or New York) in which bourgeois critics such as the mercurial Felix Fénéon (civil servant, high bourgeois, art critic journalist and possible terrorist in the 1890s), acted as mediators between bourgeois society and this milieu: pathfinders, arbiters and patrons of the new schools and art markets: the commodification of the daring and the commodification of the rebels against the society of the spectacle as a recent study of so-called ‘Creative Cities’ have always fetched top dollar, there is no Banksy without the anarchist human ecology of Bristol’s Stokes Croft.54

In general the relationship between the artistic and literary worlds and anarchism is a complex one. Bohemia and the dandy were originally apolitical or indeed right-wing and elitist, but it is the case that a certain reading of Nietzsche, Ibsen, Kropotkin or syndicalist
ideas might turn writers and artists to anarchism for at least a period of their lives: O’Neill, Joyce, Kafka, the list rather long. But one should be careful because the effect of anarchism on their work ranged from the muse and provocateur, to technical guide to their literary or painterly style, to a deep and long-lasting commitment to the movement. Thus, for example, Pissarro and Signac were committed to the movement whereas Picasso ingested a certain energy from the anarchists of Barcelona. Previously, I mentioned how global ports and hubs acted as transmission and ideational houses of exchanges in a global network of anarchist and syndicalist organizers and militants, so too the global network of libertarian artistic bohemia can be traced particularly by mobile artists (take Man Ray, for example, from a New York to a Parisian setting), but also by self-educated activists bridging the world of art and literature with the more focussed worlds of anarchist politics and anarchist culture.

Perhaps the best example is Emma Goldman. To understand Goldman is to invoke a popular term in radical intellectual and activist circles of today: intersectionality. Thus according to the concept of intersectionality, or the matrices of domination, power relations (capitalism, racism, patriarchy, age etc.) overlap and exert mutual influences on each other, with individuals and institutions being placed at the intersections of these systems of domination. Goldman suffered from an abusive father in Czarist Russia; she was the victim of abusive relationships from Johann Most to Ben Reitman, but she also had been a sweatshop worker in capitalist America; she was a Jew in a world of pogroms and widespread anti-Semitism; she was an immigrant from the suspect not quite white extremities of East Europe; she was a feisty self-educated radical in the schizophrenic world of plutocratic American democracy: intersectionality explains her biography. But Goldman became a leading conveyor of the avant-garde of Greenwich Village and Provincetown to the timid if titillated WASP provincial middle classes. One could map her biography of intersectionality onto the social geography of Gilded and Progressive Age New York. Thus from the nerve centre of her
journal *Mother Earth*, first in Greenwich Village and then in Harlem, a network of connections arose. 61 *Mother Earth* was in many respects a rather outré member of those little magazines which shook the cobwebs from staid WASP literature and art, albeit Margaret Anderson still exhibited the sniffy attitude of the ‘original’ Americans about these rather odd, rather shakily educated, and threatening but alluring interlopers. Goldman’s Pilgrims Progress from sweatshop worker in Rochester, New York to the liberating possibilities of Manhattan is mapped out in this geography. 62 Goldman’s introduction to politics and literature came largely through an earlier Lower Eastside network of anarchist, the same network described in *Beer and Revolution*, but filtered through a culturally secular but Jewish milieu of cafés and restaurants, in which Yiddish and Russian, not German, was the lingua franca. The all-American Red Emma of the immediate years before 1914 came later, where in small-town America, at the gatherings which combined politics with the open air entertainment of the tent camp evangelist, she proclaimed the right of women to control their own bodies but also the ennobling virtues of Whitman, O’Neill, Nietzsche, Hauptmann and Ibsen.

In any case, she was in her pomp in the tiny offices of *Mother Earth*. In a rich Manhattan geography where the Ferrer School, radical Greenwich Village churches, branches of the IWW and her journal mixed, for a brief moment (1914), as Thai Jones shows in his superb portrait of this world: anarchists, anarchist bohemians, Wobblies and unemployment marches gripped the city’s imagination. 63 A few years earlier, the Wobbly led strike at the nearby silk mills of Paterson, New Jersey, the host to a lively community of Italian anarchists mentioned earlier, gave force to the Paterson Pageant in Manhattan, organized with the help of the Western ‘exotic’ of the hard rock miners of the West, Big Bill Haywood, with the assistance of Emma Goldman and John Reed (memorably depicted in Warren Beatty’s film *Reds*), which occurred almost concurrently with the revolutionary Armoury Show of Post-
Impressionist paintings. And Big Bill was not immune to the attractions of Greenwich Village bohemia, with other comrade Wobblies complaining that he had gone soft and could be found writing poetry on the park benches of Washington Square. The anarchism of Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman (lover, comrade and lifelong friend) was inseparable from the physical presence of New York. Berkman lamented as the ship passed through Lower New York Bay in the early morning.

Slowly the big city receded, wrapped in a milky veil. The tall skyscrapers, their outlines dimmed, looked like fairy castles lit by the winking of stars and then all was swallowed in the distance.

The Futurists in Milan before 1914 were closely associated with anarchism, here, too, we have another examples of the anarchist imagination encountering the urban, modernist frisson of the pulsating city. The first painting considered Futurist, Carlo Carrà’s ‘The Funeral of the Anarchist Galli’, depicts ferocious and confused flight of anarchist mourners, charged by the carabinieri in the streets of Milan. The inspiration was far from the bucolic dreams of William Morris’s garden Trafalgar Square or even the fields, factories and workshops and garden cities of Kropotkin or Geddes. The city was speed, confusion, danger, bricks and mortar, sensation and lights. Thus Carrà describes the genesis of the drawing and painting.

I found myself unwillingly in the centre of it, before me I saw the coffin in red carnations sway dangerously on the shoulders of the pallbearers; I saw horses go mad, sticks and lances clash, it seemed to me that the corpse could have fallen to the ground at any moment and the horses would have trampled it. Deeply struck, as soon as I got home I did a drawing of what I had seen.

There urban settings where these bohemias briefly impacted directly on politics and State power. Under the influence of Dada in Zurich in 1917-1918, the so-called writer’s and poets’
revolution of the Munich Soviet in 1919 is perhaps the most famous. But as Roy Foster shows, a mixture of Irish Republican politicos, syndicalists and Dublin’s avant-garde seized the Post Office in 1916. In Munich in 1919, anarchists and their artistic followers ran a Soviet for one week, only to be displaced by the far more ruthless Jacobin Bolsheviks, only in turn for them to be eliminated by the proto-Fascist Freikorps. The image of urban Cultural Bolshevism, as the Nazis deemed it, of Schwabing armed (with Corporal Hitler cooling his heels in the barracks during the Soviet episode), led incongruously by the writer and anarchist pacifist Gustav Landauer, the Expressionist playwright, invalidated war veteran Ernst Toller and the author Erich Mühsam, and others, became an abiding theme in Nazi propaganda throughout the 1920s and 1930s. Many of these revolutionaries shared with others on the Right, the life reform movements, the cults of sun and dance, monetary quackery and the Laban dance experiments, but the war and the Munich Soviet served as a bloody division.

In a similar fashion, but with different lead players, bathed in a cult of violence, the poet D’Annunzio and his Legionaries seized the city of Fiume on the Adriatic coast in 1919 and claimed it for Italy. A correspondence for the Milanese anarchist daily, Umanità nova, noted several former comrades from the 1914 Red Week in his ranks. The city of Fiume became a theatre for D’Annunzio’s experiment in ultra-nationalism, but an ultra-nationalism also connected to a bohemian, life reform and drug addled zeitgeist. Indeed for a brief moment there were suggestions of a March on Rome, to overthrow the hapless post-war government, in which the Legionaries, the Maximalist Socialists and the briefly very popular anarchists, led by the charismatic Errico Malatesta would all participate. While Mussolini absented himself from this March on Rome, it was precisely D’Annunzio’s Arditi shock troops (once the government dispersed the grotesque theatre at Fiume, with a taste grapeshot at Christmas of 1920) who would launch the Fascist counter-revolution and deliver havoc in those Red Belt towns of Padania, previously mentioned in reference to the Red Week of 1914.
RED AND BLACK BARCELONA IN 1936: PARIS COMMUNE REDUX

In the summer of 1936 the CNT-FAI, the anarcho-syndicalist movement of Spain were the masters of one of the great modern industrial, commercial and intellectual cities of Europe. Just as the Paris Commune of 1871 loomed large in the memories and imaginations of Marxists and Socialists in the half century after its bloody suppression, so too has the multiple images of Red and Black Barcelona generate heat and some light on the Left and the ex-Left ever since. Anarchism gained a grip on Barcelona for two reasons. First, the anarcho-syndicalist union, the CNT, grew to an immense size during the rapid industrialization of the city as a centre of war production in neutral Spain during the First World War. Second, we must point to the growth of Barcelona’s suburbs, where migrants streamed into the building trades as the continuous growth of bourgeois, art deco, Barcelona demanded more and more skilled and unskilled labour. In the suburbs, with their jerry built housing, unscrupulous landlords, lack of well-established Catholic clerical networks, the anarchists took on the mantle of community organizers (rent strikes etc.) and political recruiters, and established street by street strongholds: thus industrial strategies and life in the city gave the anarchists remarkable continuity, even if their ranks were thinned by employer gunmen in the early 1920s and the suppression by the dictatorship Primo de Rivera for the rest of the decade. But there was also a growing linkage with the left-wing of middle class Catalan nationalism and indeed Barcelona born reformists in the CNT sought common ground.72

But once the anarchist militias were triumphant in the summer of 1936, they engaged in workers’ self-management of large and medium sized firms, they instituted new forms of education, they sought a more comprehensive health system and to regulate drinking and sex
workers, they sought neighbourhood forums of democracy, the used large luxurious hotels as popular mensas and sought to make access to visual art, theatre and music more accessible to the general public. They even engaged in their own version of gas and water socialism, through the control of the municipal water company.⁷³

But the full anarchist package was not on offer. Due to the threat from Franco’s forces, Hitler and Mussolini, and the need by the Republican forces for outside support (increasingly the Soviet Union and therefore the growing power of Spanish Communism), some of the more radical figures of pre-1936 anarchism joined the national government. But even before the Soviet Union and the Spanish Communists were force to reckon with, the anarchists of Barcelona refused to take power when handed it by the President of Cataluña and instead established anti-fascist coalition to run affairs. On July 21, 1936, municipal committees were established for supplies, transportation and production, but when the CNT met on the 23rd the motion to institute libertarian communism in Barcelona was defeated: anarchists did not seize power like Jacobins or Bolsheviks instead they joined a cross-party anti-fascist coalition which formed in turn a Catalan government.⁷⁴ The war prevented further radical changes and the imperatives of war production increased the hierarchy within the industrial economy: shortages and rationing brought internal tensions and the controversy on the militarization of the militias was married to suspicions about the growth of the Communists and the direct and indirect influence on the formidable Socialists. The crisis came to a head with the conflict about regaining control by the government of the central telephone exchange from anarchist element and street fighting ensued in the heart of Barcelona in May 1937. In the end the anarchist leadership gave in because they would not call their armed supporters back from the front and endanger the war efforts. Hundreds died in street fighting in the aftermath Soviet influenced elements of the security forces hunted down the irreconcilable anarchists but more pointedly the dissident Marxists of the POUM, including that eyewitness to Red and Black
Barcelona, George Orwell.75 And it is Orwell’s vivid description of the only city he had been in where the working class was in the saddle and even the bootblacks had been collectivized and had painted their shoe boxes red and black and the waiters looked you in the face, which still lingers in the imagination.76

One shouldn’t forget the darker sides of the scene: the destruction of churched, spurred on by the intense loathing of much of the popular classes and at least in the summer of 1936, the ride out of town and the bullet in the head for identifiable enemies, albeit according to Paul Preston’s accounting, the forced of Franco carried out far more executions in their areas.77

The entry of Franco’s troops into Barcelona in 1939 has been used to signal the end of classical anarchism, whether or not the new anarchism of 1945 may have had more continuities with the past than has been assumed, I will leave unanswered, but what is clear is that encounters of anarchism with the city although may be understood through different optics they still remain vital for both sides of these encounters.78

ANARCHISTS AND THE COLD WAR CITY

In the aftermath of the Second World War and in the context of the Cold War, the Welfare State and the Consumer Society many of the cultural and sociological contours of Classical Anarchism disappeared. The student, the dropout, the graduate student and even the university lecturer were far more prominent: the anarchist worker, the anarchist peasant, the anarchist artisan and mobile semi-skilled anarchist migrant were not there: Third World Marxist movements were far more important for radical movements, at least until the 1990s. Science which had been celebrated was contested: post-materialism, ecology and later postmodernism took prominent roles in the ethos and ideas of the movement. Anarchism no longer proclaimed s grand narrative where a final battle would lead to a new world, anarchism was composed of provocative acts and liberated zones: these formed part of an
ongoing process. In short this form of anarchism was part and parcel of the rise of new social movements which endorsed participatory democracy, horizontal organization, consensual governance and global networking. Some of the pioneers of these trends can be found in the 1950s, amongst the group of intellectual whose corpus of work grew out of the battled with the Cold War city.

Paul Goodman (and his architect brother Percival), Colin Ward and Murray Bookchin are central to this discussion. They proposed antidote to the Welfare/Warfare State, the deadening Bomb Culture and the suburbanization of daily life. In the 1950s and 1960s, Ward, the self-described follower of Kropotkin, aimed to revivify London’s civil society through counter-institutions based on the principles of mutual aid. There was a small ‘c’ conservatism in Ward’s interpretation of Kropotkin: like Edmund Burke he was a fan of the small platoons of neighbours and volunteers who challenge the bureaucratic imperatives of urban welfare capitalism: he had a soft spot for shop-keepers and his take on the Thatcherite ‘Right to Buy’ was unorthodox in the context of the London left of the 1970s and 1980s. Working in an architect’s office, he had a keen sense of how much of the rebuilding of London was going horribly wrong. Thus he promoted, squatting, self-build, neighbourhood adventure playgrounds, child friendly cities, where children would embrace the city and humanize it, city farms and other counter-institutions.

In a similar fashion the Goodmans and Bookchin looked in alarm at the modernization and bureaucratization of the warp and woof of New York neighbourhood life. While pacifist anarchists such as Dorothy Day, Julian Beck and Judith Malina courted arrest by refusing to participate in city-wide nuclear shelter drills, and other small ‘a’ anarchists and new anarchists such as the Goodmans were involved in anti-highway protest campaigns. Although Jane Jacobs never self-identified as an anarchist, her book, The Death and Life of Great American Cities (1961), was not very different from what Paul Goodman or Colin
Ward in London prescribed. Thus the essence of a good neighbourhood was network of conviviality in the streets (not social workers or city inspectors), of mutual aid which reinforced civic trust. Thus Jacobs described the role of the local corner shop keeper as the eyes and ears of the block, the emergency holder of an extra pair of house keys, the friendly advisor and the networker. There may be a whiff of naivety in all of this, certainly in an increasingly racially charged and segregated city like mid-twentieth century New York. But she was also the lead campaigner in preventing Robert Moses ploughing the planned Lower Manhattan Expressway through parts of Greenwich Village and SoHo, and she realized that the death of small industrial workshops because of planning blight here and elsewhere in the city (the successfully built Cross Bronx Expressway) would store up trouble, which manifested itself in the burning of whole sections of the Bronx in the 1970s.\textsuperscript{85} The campaign in Lower Manhattan was successful (and became a prototype of decades of anti-road campaigns elsewhere): the unintended result was that the vacant large workshops were a perfect fit for a new artistic bohemia and later commodification of an edgy neighbourhood.

Murray Bookchin was born and bred in the Bronx and he had travelled from Great Depression Era Communism to varieties of dissident Trotskyism to anarchism that pioneered radical Green and ecological thought.\textsuperscript{86} From the 1960s to his death in the early twenty-first century, he crafted a form of Libertarian Municipalism, in New York and later in Burlington, Vermont where he first supported the youngish mayor, Bernie Sanders.\textsuperscript{87} But he fell out with ‘The Bern’ when Mayor Sanders started to make deals with the local developers on the Lake Champlain waterfront. Bookchin was of another generation from the Hippies, street anarchists and art street gangs, who had colonized the Lower East Side in the 1960s, but he quickly linked up with the Yippies and the politicized hippies of the areas vibrant and anarchic anti-Vietnam War movement.\textsuperscript{88} Later he evolved from anarchism to a form of libertarian municipalism, which for all intents and purposes was a modern version of what
Brousse and de Paepe had suggested in the late nineteenth century. He wrote histories of communalism, taking up where Kropotkin had left off: thud he identified a red thread of anti-statism in Europe from the Middle Ages to the modern era: the Lombard League against the Holy Roman Empire, Comunero rebels against Castile, the American colonial towns against British imperial power, the Paris Commune against the French state, specific neighbourhood of Paris, Petrograd (Kronstadt) and Barcelona as seedbeds for revolution in the twentieth century.

Bookchin envisaged a municipalisation of the economy, a reenergized polis and vibrant town hall democracy (he was living in Vermont) as the basis for genuine citizenship, with a confederation of municipalities replacing the Warfare/Welfare Federal government. Just like Ward, he hoped to see civil society revivified through block committees, tenants’ associations, neighbourhood councils, cooperative day care, free schools, and food co-ops and squatting. In New York City, local projects and congeries of intellectual critics, pacifist anarchists and groups of students grew into something unpredicted and rather extraordinary by the late 1960s.

PARIS 1968: ‘Beneath the Paving Stones the Beach’

In early 1968, Le Monde lamented the fact France was boring, nothing much was happening. In May 1968, 10 million women and men were on strike, many of them occupied factories, offices, schools, universities and even the Odéon. De Gaulle rushed to Baden Baden in the Federal Republic of Germany to be assured of the loyalty of the army and to make doubly sure he released from prison members of the OAS (who had tried to kill him for leaving Algeria). Paris 1968 was the most startling ‘black swan’ of a year that had a bevy of ‘black swan’ events: the Tet Offensive, the withdrawal of Lyndon Baines Johnson from the US presidential primary, the assassinations of Martin Luther King and Bobby Kennedy within
two months of each other, the suppression of the Prague Spring in August by the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies, and the massacre of hundreds if not thousands of Mexican students in the heart of Mexico City on the eve of the Olympics.\footnote{91}

But May in France, in particular Paris, was extraordinary. Once again Paris fired the anarchist, or at least, the radical imagination. In the decades since there have been attempts to normalize and relativize these events. But they defied prediction (just as the Arab Spring or Occupy did so many years later): anarchist methodology is a pretty good way to explain how small ‘a’ anarchism and a group of anarchists set the ball rolling or as Jim Mac Laughlin puts it, ‘is an unplanned ‘historical happening’, the product of ungoverned hybridizations that literally unify a whole variety of seemingly unconnected events both in the raw material of social experience and in the social consciousness of peoples’.\footnote{92}

The facts are well known: after disruption in a new campus of the Sorbonne at Nanterre, led by a small group of self-identified anarchists, the 22 March Movement, and arising from agitation about the visitation rights of males and females, as well as concerns about the rights of inhabitants of the bidonville (shanty town of largely North African residents), which lay adjacent to the university, the main student culprits (Danny Cohn-Bendit and company) were expelled and started an occupation of the main building of the Sorbonne in the heart of the Latin Quarter. Their eviction and arrest by the police led to a confrontation with other student and then several nights of large scale disturbances fought on the boulevards of the Left Bank. This in turn led to the occupation of the universities and then this spread to the occupation of factories in Paris and elsewhere in France. The government tottered but de Gaulle mobilized the Right Bank through massive demonstrations on the Champs Elysées, a settlement with the workers and a repression of the student and radical movement was followed by electoral victory for the Right. So from minor incidents in the suburbs of Paris, within weeks, through
a chain of events which followed the mental maps of Parisian urban insurrectionary history, one of the most powerful industrial nations in the world started to dissolve.  

Of course one can trace the roots of May 1968 to simmering discontent with the quality of the straining universities and the availability of groups of articulate young people brimming with resentment and confidence. Or one can argue that the Glorious Thirty Years had so far not given enough of the pie to the manual working class or indeed the technicians and white collars. Perhaps the growing presence of Left-wing groups: the forty-nine varieties of Maoists and Trotskyists and dissident Socialists and the tiredness of the Communist Party, allowed space for the inventive imagery of the Situationists and the anarchists to seize the movement. But another way to chart these unexpected events is to focus on the city, Paris. The most unorthodox Marxists (such as Henri Lefebvre) and the Situationists (part Marx, part surrealist, part Dadaist, but drawing the lessons of the anarchists from the Commune to Kronstadt) centred on urban space and a society of mass consumerism and domination embedded in physical space as the repository of the society of the spectacle.

Lefebvre’s book on the right to the city published in 1967, argued with a Marxist cadence but not too dissimilar to Colin Ward, that urban revolutionary movements did not have to await a great revolutionary rupture, the spontaneous, indeed serendipitous fusing of unrelated movements and events could lead to surprising outcomes. One of the initial tasks of the Situationists was to engage in random walks through Paris, recalling the flâneur and the Communard. They engaged in what were essential happening, in the then novel but now very popular pastime of psycho-geography. Of course there were other memories, hidden memories stored in these stones and in the Seine itself, the railway stations and obscure suburbs, where only a few years previously Algerians and their supporters were hunted down and driven into the Seine but the police under the cover of blanket press silence, or earlier in the 1940s with the roundup of the Jews and their transportation to Auschwitz with much the
same indifference. I need not remind the reader of a newer chapter in these tearful and bloody histories. There was something widely optimistic and even self-indulgent in this exercise in psycho-geography when so many other troubled ghosts had not been exercised from the cobblestones.

The migration of March 22 from Nanterre to heart of Paris and its explosion into a national happening, in which street theatre nearly brought de Gaulle down is extraordinary. The movement became flesh through street art: the slogans and graffiti on the buildings of Paris: the glorious poster of the students of the occupied Beaux Arts. But unlike 1848 or 1871, there was no seizure of power or even occupation of power, marchers marched past the Hôtel de Ville even as the edifices of culture, education and economy were occupied. In the local neighbourhoods, a repeat of the committee of the arrondissements of the Commune occurred: in an earlier book, the marvellous The Afterlives of 1968, Kristin Ross discusses the local neighbourhood committees that struggled to continue the movement after the first flush of enthusiasm, and these committees were certainly inspired by a flash of small ‘a’ anarchism and sought to carry autogestion a crucial political step further. But it is worthwhile to return to Errico Malatesta’s thoughts on general strikes. With lorry drivers on strike, petrol running out, provisioning was becoming precarious. The non-Communist Left divided but scenting its change sought to channel the movement towards electoral victory, the Communist dominated trade unions made sure that student marchers did not link with the Red Fortress of Renault’s Billancourt. In the short run the Right Bank saw off the Left Bank: the cobblestones were tarmacked over, the beach returned to its ordinary geographical location, but just more than a decade later, for the first time in the Fifth Republic, the Socialists finally came to power feeding off the energy and mobilization of the generation who took part in these extraordinary games of psycho-geography during some balmy May days in 1968.
‘TEARING DOWN THE STREETS: FROM 1968 TO THE OCCUPY AND SQUARE MOVEMENTS’

In the last decades of the twentieth century, the neo bohemian zones in major Western cities became force-fields of competing interests: New Social Movements, hipsters, gentrifiers, and generations of autonomists, squatters, and municipal government seeking to regenerate quarters that still retained character but had seen their best days’ years ago. The post-1968 generation and the generations of activists in anti-nuclear movements of the 1980s melded autonomists and anarchists in cities as varied as Berlin, Milan, Stockholm, Genoa, Copenhagen or London. This was a variation on the theme of the bohemia but on a much larger scale and within a different context. The spirit of 1968 lived on in certain enclaves, from Christiania in Copenhagen to Milan’s social centres. More aggressive autonomist movements melded with Marxist and anarchist traditions. Fundamentally the battle was over property. Squatting permitted, half-permitted or ignored allowed for an urban ecology of anarchist life-styles to survive, along with a panoply of cheap and daring clothing shops, restaurants, cooperatives, cutting edge obscure art galleries, music gigs- legal or illegal. When depressed property markets perked-up, when city and national governments were pressed to be more entrepreneurial and more illiberal and when fresh hot money flowed in, these quasi-anarchist magic gardens, indeed real life community gardens, from the Lower Eastside to Berlin to Hackney came under pressure. And these areas were softened up for resettlement by the so-called creative classes, who thrived in the hedonistic spirit of capitalism, foretold by the thrill of bohemia in the 19th century and thoroughly commoditized in the late 20th century. Luc Boltanski and Ève Chiapello describe how artistic critique of capitalism, a dissatisfaction with its disenchantment of the world, its inauthenticity, its social oppression too, were recycled into a new spirit of capitalism, replacing the hierarchies of the
Protestant Ethic with networks and the self-organization of employees: thus the hipster and the precariat entered suitably renovated anarchist enclaves.101

In the aftermath of the Cold War, new formations came into existence, feeding off the experience of 1968, the New Social Movements of the 1970s and 1980s, as well as the ‘anarchist gardens’: the global justice movement sparked by a post-Leninist movement of intellectuals, peasants and villagers in Mexico’s Yucatan peninsula, and later by the horizontalists of Argentina and the Bolivian mass democracy of La Paz’s twin city of indigenous shanty dwellers, El Alto.102 A worldwide network dialogue between Global South and North, an alternative globalization took to the scene, and it burst into the consciousness of the Western media with the events in Seattle in 1999, causing the failure of the WTO talks and resulting in chaos in the streets. This movement too relied on street theatre and juxtapositions: at Seattle hardhat steel workers were in the streets with protesters dressed as sea turtles. Over the next ten years set piece confrontations occurred during G7/G8 and other elite gatherings in various settings from Québec City to Prague and tragically in Genoa. Tony Blair called it a travelling anarchist circus, and if we remove the spiteful tone of his utterance, there was certainly a strong sense of urban theatre in these encounters, the gentle and mocking choreography of protesters in fluffy overalls to prevent bodily damage from police truncheons and the more aggressive Black Bloc dressed in de rigueur black garments with black balaclavas.103

These movements for global justice determined their tactics and strategy from an evolving street democracy of horizontal structures, consensual decision-making and global networking, reaffirmed at large gathering in Porto Alegre or some other locate in the Global South but also elsewhere, in London’s Alexandra Palace, where anarchists, Trotskyists and even the Mayor of London, Ken Livingstone, jostled for space. Joined to this were flash mobs/illegalized demonstrations such as a series of May Days held in London in the early
2000s and inspired by and moved forward by Critical Mass (mass cycling), Climate Camps
and other urban occupations. The direction of these movements faltered after 9/11 and
other atrocities in London and Madrid, but the Iraq War served to reenergize and redirect this
ongoing urban effervescence in other direction.

The end of the Great Moderation (or speculative bubble) and the ushering in the Age of
Austerity, signalled by the crash of 2007-2008 and the ensuing Euro-crisis, saw a new level
of urban agitation. It easy enough to trace many of the activists of Occupy back through a
decade or more of activism in the Global Justice and anti-war movements, indeed David
Graeber wrote an incisive ethnography of the urban encounters of the Global Justice
Movement, Direct Action and later was present at the creation of Occupy Wall Street and
then wrote another book which added historical contexts and theoretical arguments to the
pragmatics of these street politics. Graeber explained how anarchism melded with Occupy
Wall Street.

For “small-a” anarchists such as myself – that is, the sort willing to work in broad
coalitions as long as they work on horizontal principles – this is what we’d always
dreamed of. For decades, the anarchist movement had been putting much of our
creative energy into developing forms of egalitarian political process that actually
work; forms of direct democracy that actually could operate within self-governing
communities outside of any state. The whole process was based in a kind of faith that
freedom is contagious.

Here we return to the lessons of Murray Bookchin: Occupy and the Indignados of Madrid
where the assembly of citizens, the polis in action; governed by rules and regulations of
consensual decision-making fleshed out during the Global Justice Movement. The indebted
graduates, the laid-off workers, and the heavily indebted mortgage holders in the Global
North were the curious visitors and participants in Occupy, anticipated by events in Athens’s anarchist quarters in 2008.\textsuperscript{107}

When Proudhon proclaimed that property was theft, he was not licensing pick pocketing or house burglary, he meant monopoly control of property and capital was theft. The target of Occupy type movements in the Global North were the turbo-capitalist cities; London and New York being the prime examples: the flow of the world’s dirty money into the world’s greatest and most efficient laundries: off-shore islands were side-shows. This dirty money from the monopoly rents on natural resources or other rigged rents, from narcotics and human trafficking were deposited by gangsters, gangster politicians, ex-communists turned security state capitalists and the Princelings of Leninist Communism, with Chinese capitalist characteristics or were the hidden tax liabilities of monopolist rent-seeking businesses which had colonized the Internet commons. And this money made it increasingly difficult for younger generations of Londoners and New Yorkers to live in their own cities because property soared in value, rents skyrocketed and habitations replaced gold, diamonds and ‘Rothkos’ as excellent places to squirrel away hot loot.\textsuperscript{108}

The necessity to change this start of affairs has filtered through from impermanent Occupy camps to new libertarian gas and water political formation, particularly in the cities of Spain (Podemos).\textsuperscript{109} The melding of New Left populist formations has seen the fusing of the legacies of Occupy/Square movement with the rather hard bitten Marxist urban sociologist, David Harvey, who has been rather taken by Bookchin’s municipal confederalism.\textsuperscript{110} He makes the case with certain eloquence, in this case discussing the time and place of Henri Lefebvre’s, \textit{The Right to the City} and now seems closer to an anarchist sensibility than theoretical Marxism.\textsuperscript{111}
But what we academics so often forget is that role played by the sensibility that arises out in the streets around us, the inevitable feelings of loss provoked by the demolitions, what happens when whole quarters (like Les Halles) get re-engineered or grands ensembles erupt seemingly out of nowhere, coupled with the exhilaration or annoyance of street demonstration about this or that, the hopes that lurk as immigrant groups bring life back into a neighbourhood (those great Vietnamese restaurant in the 13th arrondissement in the midst of the HLMs), or the despair that flows from the glum desperation of marginalization, police repression and idle youth lost in sheer boredom of increasing unemployment and neglect in soulless suburbs that eventually become sites of roiling unrest.

Although Square movements of the Arab Spring were influenced and compared notes with Occupy, and can argue that small “a” and visible anarchists at first quite prominent in Tahrir Square, the spread of the Arab Spring and the counter-revolution which followed, had something of the piazza politics of the Revolutions of 1848 to it (albeit the protests in Istanbul’s Gezi Park were closer to the European and American Occupy movement than those of the Arab cities.).

I conclude this chapter with a curious return to Murray Bookchin.

In the early 2000s, from his prison cell on a Turkish island in the Sea of Marmara, the jailed leader, Abdullah Öcalan, of the PKK, the Kurdish nationalist party founded on Marxist-Leninist principles, and which had been at war with the Turkish since 1984, started to read the works of Bookchin on municipal confederalism. This led to his conversion from demanding a Kurdish state and running a top-down cultish and Leninist political formation to ordering his followers to ceasefire and adopting libertarian communalism of the Bookchin variety with a markedly feminist slant: the denizen of the Bronx became required reading for
party and militia members. As the Syrian civil war progressed since 2011, the Syrian wing of the PKK, the PYD, gained control of three cantons in north eastern Syria, named Rojava. In these three cantons the principles of confederal libertarian municipalism were carried out, which meant the institution of a series of ascending citizen assemblies and the representation of the variety of ethnic and religious factions in this tortured part of the world. Will Murray Bookchin solve the Syrian question? Far too early to tell and recent signs are not promising: competing parties have not agreed to partake in this form of governance and the ceasefire broke down between the Turkish state and the PKK and the PYD, which means further bloody complications in Syria’s civil wars. Nevertheless it is worthwhile remembering two ruined cities of Syria: the slaughterhouse that was once the glorious city of Aleppo and the now ruined if peaceful city of Kobanî, freed from the Islamic State by a marriage of convenience of the ‘Bookchinite’ militias of the PYD, including all women units, the worst possible nightmare for the Islamic State warriors, and the relentless bombing by the US Air Force. Here it is also worth recalling once more the Munich Soviet of 1919, since Gustav Landauer (who described himself as a Jew, a South German and an internationalist): proposed a form of confederal communalism not very different than Bookchin’s, while Landauer’s friend, Martin Buber, the philosopher and utopian, hoped that such a solution might be carried out in Palestine between the Jews and Arabs in the 1930s and 1940s, before the partition. Perhaps the ruined city of Kobanî will be sign that municipal confederalism will soothe the deep wounds of Syria?
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