

2

THE ANARCHIST LANDSCAPE

*Roderick T. Long***I. Introduction**

The anarchist landscape, like many landscapes, looks different from different vantage points within it. In particular, how one is disposed to draw the boundaries of anarchism often depends on where one is located.

Anarchists agree on rejecting the state, whatever else they disagree about. They do not necessarily agree as to what counts as rejecting the state, however. The federated workers' associations favored by anarcho-syndicalists,¹ the independent democratic communities hailed by libertarian municipalists,² and the private security systems advocated by many market anarchists,³ each strike one anarchist camp or another as states in anarchist guise. My present concern, however, is primarily with anarchist disagreements as to what, if anything, anarchism involves, or should involve, *beyond* opposition to the state.

II. Varieties of Individualism

The terms "social anarchism" and "individualist anarchism" are often used to distinguish two major branches within anarchism. But matters are immediately more complicated. By one accounting, the two groups differ over the role of markets, economic competition, and private ownership in an anarchist society: social anarchists (whether communistic, collectivistic, or syndicalist) tend either to oppose these outright or else to regard their role as properly marginal, seeing them as potential tools of domination and exploitation; for individualist anarchists, by contrast, private ownership is the embodied form that liberty takes, and market competition plays a crucial role in maintaining social cooperation.⁴

But the term "individualist anarchism" is also used quite differently, to refer to forms of anarchism centered on an amoralist egoism based on or in the same vein as the ideas of Max Stirner.⁵ While social anarchists, in characterizing their rivals, have often taken Stirnerism and support for markets together as defining features of individualist anarchism, most of the major nineteenth-century thinkers usually identified as individualist anarchists (including Thomas Hodgskin,⁶ Josiah Warren,⁷ Stephen Pearl Andrews,⁸ Ezra and Angela Heywood,⁹ Lysander Spooner,¹⁰ William B. Greene,¹¹ Moses and Lillian Harman,¹² Dyer Lum,¹³ and Voltairine de Cleyre¹⁴) either predated Stirner, ignored him, or explicitly rejected him, and embraced a moralistic orientation Stirner would have found uncongenial.

The Anarchist Landscape

Even the best-known Stirner enthusiast, Benjamin Tucker,¹⁵ had already become an anarchist before reading a word of Stirner;¹⁶ and after reading him, Tucker seems to have simply picked up his existing system of anarchistic thought and plopped it down onto its new Stirnerist foundations, with only the slightest resulting shifts in the overall structure. Indeed, the contractarian version of Stirnerism that Tucker developed lays such heavy emphasis on Stirner's cooperative dimension (such as the idea of a "Union of Egoists") and so little emphasis on Stirner's moral nihilism (his regarding other people as "food," for example) that Tucker's fellow Stirnerist Dora Marsden, in her debate with Tucker in the pages of her journals *The New Freewoman* and *The Egoist* (1913–1914), could fairly charge him with being a moralist in Stirnerist guise.¹⁷ Tucker often seems to be more an *ethical egoist* after the model of Epicurus¹⁸ or Ayn Rand¹⁹—one who seeks to ground morality, including a commitment to mutual respect for rights, on egoistic foundations—than the kind of moral nihilist that at least some of Stirner's pages seem to license. (Similar remarks would apply to many thinkers influenced by Tucker, such as Francis Tandy,²⁰ as well as to more independent anarchist theorists like Anselme Bellegarrigue.²¹)

Just as individualism in the market sense need not entail individualism in the Stirnerist sense, so the entailment does not run in the other direction either. There are Stirnerist egoist communists, such as the authors of the 1974 pamphlet *The Right To Be Greedy: Theses On The Practical Necessity Of Demanding Everything*,²² and there are currents, often labelled "individualist," ranging from the "post-left anarchism" of such thinkers as Bob Black²³ and Wolfi Landstreicher²⁴ to the views of the eco-terrorist group ITS (Individualists Tending Toward Savagery, aka Individualists Tending toward the Wild),²⁵ which embrace the moral nihilist strand in Stirner but show no particular affinity for markets. Indeed Stirner himself, while clearly rejecting communism, gives little clear indication as to what economic arrangements he favors; he uses the *language* of private property, but only to say that the true egoist regards everything in the world, including other people, as his own property—which is not the kind of commitment to property that represents a recognition of other people's property rights.

To complicate matters still further, there are thinkers routinely identified as individualist anarchists who *neither* express much enthusiasm for markets *nor* embrace Stirner-style amorality; examples include Leda Rafanelli, Émile Armand, Han Ryner, and André Lorulot.²⁶ These thinkers seem to be counted as individualist anarchists simply because they advocated an individualist ethics; but by that standard Emma Goldman, undisputedly a communist anarchist, would have to be reckoned an individualist too, for her ethical views were certainly staunchly individualist.²⁷ It's not clear that the category is being employed with any great consistency or precision.

Even leaving aside the latter group, it seems safe to say that the label "individualist anarchism" in fact applies to, at the very least, two distinct groups, only barely overlapping—a market-focused one and a Stirner-focused one. Let's leave the Stirner-focused one aside in turn, and consider the market-focused one.

While some anarchists have taken a "let a hundred flowers bloom" approach, seeing market-based and communal forms of anarchism as compatible,²⁸ for the most part social anarchists and individualist anarchists have regarded each other's positions as misguided. Communist anarchists like Pëtr Kropotkin, for example, argued that individualist anarchism was an unstable combination, and that its proponents would eventually be driven to give up either their anarchism or their individualism.²⁹ Conversely, individualist anarchists like John Henry Mackay argued that it was communist anarchism that was unstable and that its proponents would eventually be driven to give up either their anarchism or their communism.³⁰ Nevertheless, with some exceptions, each camp has regarded the adherents of the other as heretics rather than infidels—that is, as deviationists within the anarchist fold rather than as anarchists in name only.

Roderick T. Long

The nineteenth-century thinkers I've mentioned above, in the market-focused individualist anarchist group, while supporting free markets, economic competition, and private ownership, generally opposed what they called "capitalism," meaning the concentration of ownership of the means of production in a small number of hands, thereby requiring most people outside this privileged group to perform wage labour for them on pain of starvation. But, in the twentieth century, a movement arose within the free-market libertarian movement calling itself "anarcho-capitalist," and claiming to be continuing the legacy of individualist anarchism; Murray Rothbard³¹ and David Friedman³² are among the most prominent writers in this group.

III. "Libertarian" Clarifications

Before considering the place, if any, of anarcho-capitalism on the anarchist landscape, let's turn aside briefly to discuss the term "libertarian." Originally this was a generic term for an advocate of freedom of any sort (including not just political freedom but also, for example, metaphysical free will—a meaning it still bears in the free will literature today). Starting around the 1970s, the term came to be generally understood as referring specifically to a radical free-market philosophy (chosen as a replacement for "liberal," which in the twentieth century had lost its earlier free-market associations, especially in the U.S.). But "libertarian" had long been used (and to some degree continues to be used) in the anarchist movement either as a synonym for "anarchist"—and in particular for "social anarchist" (although its use by individualist anarchists is also quite early)³³—or else for a range of positions only slightly broader than anarchism.³⁴ The first use of "libertarian"—or rather its French equivalent, *libertaire*—to refer to an adherent of a specific political position rather than to an advocate of freedom more generally, was by the anarcho-communist Joseph Déjacque in 1857.³⁵ (Nowadays, French has two different equivalents of "libertarian": *libertaire*, meaning an anarchist, and the hideously un-French-looking *libertarien*, meaning a free-market radical.)

In the 1970s, in response to the wider usage of "libertarian" in the free-market sense, many social anarchists started referring to themselves as *left-libertarians*, and categorizing the free-market variety as *right-libertarians*. However, in the very same period, many free-market libertarians (such as Samuel Konkin³⁶ and Roy Childs³⁷) had independently started using the term "left-libertarian" differently, to refer to the left wing of the free-market libertarian movement (essentially, those who saw the New Left student movement more as allies than as opponents). Thus the very same thinkers might well count as *right-libertarians* by the first criterion and as *left-libertarians* by the second. To add to the confusion, in the 1990s and early 2000s, many analytic philosophers, apparently unaware of the two earlier meanings, began using "left-libertarian" with yet a third meaning, to refer to a position that combined individual self-ownership with common ownership of resources, without necessarily endorsing anarchism (though some left-libertarians in this sense are also anarchists).³⁸

IV. Anarchists and Markets

In any case, anarcho-capitalists, as I said, are free-market libertarians who identify with the individualist anarchist heritage; but this identification is controversial, as the main line of individualist anarchism has historically rejected capitalism. But anarcho-capitalists (or "ancaps") can point to a number of more-or-less capitalist thinkers in the nineteenth century who are clear precursors of the anarcho-capitalist position, such as Herbert Spencer, Gustave de Molinari, Auberon Herbert, and Wordsworth Donisthorpe; and while these thinkers generally did not apply the anarchist label to themselves, it must be borne in mind that a number of anti-capitalist individualists (such as Warren, Andrews, Greene, and Spooner) did not use the label either.

The Anarchist Landscape

But social anarchists, for the most part, grant heretic status to anti-capitalists like Tucker and Spooner, regarding them as misguided fellow anarchists, while treating ancaps as outsiders—fake anarchists and fake libertarians. And ancaps have largely returned the favor—not denying social anarchists’ status as anarchists (social anarchists are far too well embedded in anarchist history for that to be a plausible move) but denying social anarchists’ status as libertarians. For most social anarchists, capitalism is inherently a system of domination and exploitation, opposition to which is an essential part of any libertarian or anarchist project worthy of those names; for ancaps, by contrast, capitalism properly understood is a system of liberty, to which no true libertarian, surely, could be opposed.

Is this dispute over “capitalism” terminological or substantive? As is often the case with these sorts of disputes, it is some of each. By “capitalism,” most ancaps mean not the concentration of ownership of the means of production in the hands of an employing class, but simply free markets and private property. By that definition, individualist anarchists like Tucker and Spooner count as pro-capitalist. (Tucker’s views on land ownership differ from those that prevail among ancaps, but Spooner’s don’t, especially.³⁹ And Spencer is generally treated as a proto-ancap even though his views of land are even more “socialistic” than Tucker’s⁴⁰ and he also favored replacing wage labour with workers’ cooperatives⁴¹—whereas the “socialistic” Tucker, unlike both Spooner and Spencer, had no objection to wage labour so long as the labour market was properly flat and competitive.)⁴² Notably, Voltairine de Cleyre was willing to call her own position, albeit with tongue half in cheek, “capitalistic anarchism” in her 1891 critique of communism.⁴³ In Thomas Hobbes’s words: “Words are wise men’s counters, they do but reckon by them; but they are the money of fools.”⁴⁴

But the disagreement is more than merely terminological. While ancaps do not make economic concentration and the wage system a *definitional* part of the capitalism they defend, most of them do regard such features as likely, and acceptable, consequences of a free market; whereas the anti-capitalist individualists reject them. Should this disagreement exclude ancaps from being part of the individualist anarchist tradition? Most social anarchists think it should; most ancaps think it shouldn’t.

Historically, most individualist anarchists—meaning those recognized by social anarchists as genuine if misguided anarchists—have thought it shouldn’t either. Tucker, for example, although he believed and hoped that anarchism would bring about a more economically egalitarian society, took this as an empirical prediction rather than as a matter of definition, and moreover insisted that he would still be committed to anarchism, albeit less enthusiastically so, should the prediction prove mistaken;⁴⁵ moreover, proto-ancaps Molinari, Herbert, and Donisthorpe were hailed in the pages of Tucker’s journal *Liberty*, the foremost individualist anarchist periodical, as fellow individualist anarchists or nearly so, despite their capitalist tendencies.⁴⁶ Indeed, social anarchists undertaking to tell individualist anarchists who counts as a true individualist anarchist can seem a bit presumptuous, like Catholics undertaking to tell Episcopalians whether Mormons count as Protestants.

But since the boundaries of individualist anarchism are in fact disputed, let’s substitute the term “market anarchism,” meaning any version of anarchism that gives free markets and private property an essential coordinating role in an anarchist society. (“Essential” need not mean “exclusive”; many versions of market anarchism also make room for communal property.)⁴⁷ Contemporary continuators of the nineteenth-century individualist anarchist movement (such as Kevin Carson, Charles Johnson, Gary Chartier, William Gillis, and others associated with the Center for a Stateless Society) have made use of the label “left-wing market anarchist” (or “LWMA”), so we can treat the LWMA as one wing of the market anarchist movement (applying the term retroactively to the Spooner–Tucker group as well), and assign the anarcho-capitalists to the other wing—while reserving debate as to whether all market anarchists, or only the LWMA wing thereof, count as *genuine*

Roderick T. Long

anarchists. (LWMAs can also be seen as the anarchist wing of left-libertarianism, in the second of the three senses of “left-libertarian” distinguished above.)

Let me note in passing a further complication: social anarchists and LWMAs share not only an opposition to capitalism but also an opposition to various other forms of oppression, including hierarchies of race, gender, and the like; such opposition is often seen as a crucial part of the “left” in “left-wing market anarchism” (as well as in “left-libertarian”).⁴⁸ Some anarcho-capitalists share this opposition as well, but others see such issues as irrelevant to their concerns, while still others see hierarchies of race and/or gender as “natural” and worthy of defense; and this has sometimes served as another basis for excluding anarcho-capitalists (all or some) from the anarchist ranks. To be sure, Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, the first thinker to use the “anarchist” label himself, has been claimed for both the social and individualist anarchist traditions (as has the mutualist tradition he inaugurated), despite Proudhon’s own intense antisemitism, misogyny, and homophobia. Presumably he is given a pass because he lived in the nineteenth century; but his own anarchist contemporaries were not always so obliging. In fact, the term “libertarian” (or *libertaire*) in its anarchist use was coined by Déjacque as part of a polemic against Proudhon, arguing that Proudhon could be no true libertarian so long as he denied women equal status with men. (Déjacque would go on, in the following year, to use *Le Libertaire* as the title of his journal.)

Returning specifically to the issue of “capitalism,” the social anarchist basis for excluding ancaps from the anarchist ranks is not always clear. Precisely what features of ancaps’ support for capitalism renders them ineligible for the status of genuine anarchists? It’s hard to find any criterion that won’t also rule out some LWMAs whom social anarchists want to rule in. For example, social anarchists sometimes point to ancaps’ support for private security firms as evidence of crypto-statism; yet LWMAs Tucker, Spooner, and Bellegarrigue, acknowledged by social anarchists to be genuine if misguided anarchists, also supported private security firms. Again, social anarchists will point to ancaps’ support for rent and wage labour as incompatible with anarchism. Well, Tucker opposed rent but not wage labour, regarding the latter as no longer exploitative once the wage *system*—the *necessity* to work for others, or starve—had been eliminated; Spooner, by contrast, opposed wage labour but not rent. And not only will these criteria rule out some LWMAs whom social anarchists want to rule in, but they also run the risk of ruling in some ancaps that social anarchists want to rule out; for example, at the time that ancap David Friedman wrote the second edition of his most famous book, *The Machinery of Freedom*, he was also opposed to the wage system;⁴⁹ but I’m not aware that any social anarchist has seen this as a reason to welcome *The Machinery of Freedom* into the anarchist canon.

V. Distinguishable Tendencies

But if the criteria for inclusion or exclusion are not completely precise, they are not completely arbitrary either. If we think of political groupings as picked out by family-resemblance concepts rather than by specifications of necessary and sufficient conditions, then it seems reasonable to take social anarchists, LWMAs, and ancaps as forming three camps within which, whatever deviations toward one camp some individuals in another camp may have with respect to this or that specific issue, it will still be the case that members of each camp share a greater ideological resemblance to one another than to those in either of the other two camps.

It will also be the case, though, that LWMAs share more affiliations with each of the other two camps than those two camps share with each other. This is seen, for example, in the fact that while it is rare to find social anarchists favorably citing Rothbard, or ancaps favorably citing Kropotkin, LWMAs are frequently to be found citing both favorably (albeit not uncritically). Social anarchists’ greater affinity with LWMAs than with ancaps explains why social anarchists have found it easy to think of themselves and LWMAs as belonging to a common “anarchist”

The Anarchist Landscape

tradition from which ancaps are excluded. And, by the same token, ancaps' greater affinity with LWMAAs than with social anarchists explains why ancaps have found it correspondingly easy to think of themselves and LWMAAs as belonging to a common "individualist anarchist" tradition from which social anarchists are excluded. And those affinities also explain why LWMAAs have historically been friendlier toward both the social anarchist and the ancap camps than those camps have been toward each other.

I don't mean to give the impression that LWMAAs can always be counted on to welcome both social anarchists and ancaps as fellow anarchists, or that social anarchists and ancaps can always be counted on to exclude each other while welcoming LWMAAs as fellow anarchists. There are always cases of individuals either more or less accepting than this stereotype would suggest. At one point in his career, for example, social anarchist Murray Bookchin was enthusiastic about having right-wing libertarians as allies.⁵⁰ (In later and grumpier life he rejected them as fake libertarians;⁵¹ but then again, in later and grumpier life Bookchin rejected most participants in the anarchist movement in general as fake libertarians.⁵²) Tucker,⁵³ while (as noted above) accepting capitalist antistatists as genuine albeit misguided anarchists or near-anarchists, grew increasingly inclined over the course of his career to write anarcho-communists like Kropotkin, Johann Most, and the Haymarket martyrs out of the movement. And neither social anarchist nor ancap acceptance of LWMAAs should be exaggerated.

One thing that (many) social anarchists and (many) ancaps have in common is that they recognise anticapitalist individualist market anarchists as valuable comrades (albeit erring ones) as long as they're dead 19th-century figures like Benjamin Tucker, Lysander Spooner, and Voltairine de Cleyre, and even include them in their favourite anthologies, but as soon as they encounter actual living 21st-century examples of anticapitalist individualist market anarchists, they cringe in horror and shriek either 'capitalist!' or 'commie!' depending on the direction of deviation.⁵⁴

Nevertheless, it remains true *on the whole* that social anarchists and ancaps are readier to recognize LWMAAs as deviationists within the fold, while anathematizing each other, and that LWMAAs are readier to recognize both social anarchists and ancaps as deviationists within the fold.

If anarchism is concerned with opposition to domination, then social anarchism, which is highly sensitive to ways in which private property relations can enable domination, but relatively insensitive to ways in which *interference* with private property relations can do so—and anarcho-capitalism, which conversely is highly sensitive to ways in which interference with private property relations can enable domination, but relatively insensitive to ways in which private property relations *themselves* can do so—each seem to be specializing in opposition to one aspect of domination while neglecting another aspect. From that perspective, the LWMA approach seems to represent a more systematic opposition to domination, in virtue of synthesizing the concerns of both of its main rivals without falling prey to the one-sidedness of either.

VI. Left-Wing Market Anarchism as a Mediating Position

There is actually one affiliation that social anarchists and ancaps share with each other and not with LWMAAs, and that is the tendency either to identify free markets with capitalism (in the sense of economic concentration and a wage system), or else to assume that the former naturally leads to the latter. The difference is one of evaluation; social anarchists take the case against capitalism (so understood) to constitute a case against free markets, whereas ancaps take the case for free markets to constitute a case for capitalism. For LWMAAs, by contrast, free markets and capitalism are incompatible; competition is a natural levelling force, since if one person or group is raking in

Roderick T. Long

profits by providing some good or service, then others will imitate them if not prohibited from doing so—and so capitalism is a product of government intervention that could not survive on a free market.⁵⁵

And this is why who counts as an anarchist, or as a libertarian, seems to depend on where on the anarchist landscape one is oneself located. It's natural to take one's own preferred form of anarchism as representing the core of anarchism; slight deviations from that core will still fall within the boundaries, while large deviations from it will fall outside. On economic issues, from the social anarchist perspective, LWMA's are at least half-right (laudably anti-capitalist, mistakenly pro-market) while ancaps are completely wrong (mistakenly pro-capitalist *and* pro-market). Conversely, from the ancap perspective, LWMA's are again at least half-right (laudably pro-market, mistakenly anti-capitalist) while social anarchists are completely wrong (mistakenly anti-market *and* anti-capitalist). But from the LWMA perspective, social anarchists (laudably anti-capitalist, mistakenly anti-market) and ancaps (laudably pro-market, mistakenly pro-capitalist) are each half-right. (Social anarchists like to put the “anarcho” in “anarcho-capitalist” in scare quotes; LWMA Anna Morgenstern has argued that instead it is the “capitalist” in “anarcho-capitalist” that should be put in scare quotes, since implementing ancaps' preferred policies would in fact dismantle capitalism, whether or not ancaps realize this.)⁵⁶

For social anarchists, social anarchism naturally represents the main line of anarchism; LWMA's are deviationists close enough to be within the fold, while ancaps are distant enough to be beyond the pale. For ancaps, it is anarcho-capitalism that represents the main line, if not of anarchism, then at least of libertarianism; LWMA's are deviationists close enough to be within the fold, but social anarchists are beyond the pale. For LWMA's, by contrast, it is the LWMA position that is the main line of anarchism and libertarianism—not in terms of numbers (LWMA's represent a tiny group compared to the other two, a mouse squeezed between the social anarchist elephant and the ancap bear) but in terms of the “objective tendency of the problematic”; and social anarchists and ancaps are both close enough to count as deviationists within the fold rather than outsiders.

Does this mean that one must first decide which purported version of anarchism is most defensible in order to decide which positions are genuinely anarchist, or genuinely libertarian? That would be awkward; in particular, it would leave those who find all purported versions of anarchism or libertarianism equally unappealing with no way of determining any boundaries for the concept. I think we can do a bit better; more precisely, I think there are grounds for accepting the LWMA's' more eclectic drawing of the boundaries even if one is not oneself an LWMA. Fair warning, though: since I am myself an LWMA, my argument might reasonably be taken as a product of LWMA bias. I hope not, but the danger should be kept in mind.

(Note that while I'll be defending an ecumenical view of the anarchist landscape, according to which social anarchists, LWMA's, and ancaps all count as anarchists and libertarians, I do not mean to give the impression that *every* self-described anarchist or libertarian thinker or group should be welcomed in as part of the fold. So-called “national anarchists,” for example, while sharing genuine points of affiliation with various forms of anarchism, share far more in common with fascism; and as I take fascism to be point-for-point the polar opposite of anarchism in any of its forms, being more closely affiliated with fascism than with anarchism necessarily means not being a genuine anarchist.)

There are good reasons to regard left-wing market anarchism as standing at the center of the libertarian and anarchist traditions, even if one does not regard it as the most defensible version of anarchism. Nicolas Walter, a social anarchist and historian of anarchism, has stressed anarchism's historical dependence on both (state) socialism and (classical) liberalism.⁵⁷ If social anarchism and anarcho-capitalism represent the fullest anarchistic developments of each of these lineages respectively, left-wing market anarchism combines both lineages the most equally.

The Anarchist Landscape

To be sure, if one focuses solely on the social anarchist and ancap positions (which is easy to do, since they are both more prominent than the LWMA position), the two seem so different that it's easy to come to the conclusion that there's no wider tradition to which both belong. But once the LWMA position is brought clearly into view, its web of affiliation with the other two positions makes it easier to see how all three are part of a common conversation, with LWMA as the chief mediator. Historically, the conversation can be seen in such phenomena as the mutual influence between Molinari and Proudhon;⁵⁸ Tucker's engagement with Herbert and Donisthorpe in the pages of *Liberty*; Sophie Raffalovich's treatment of the Boston Anarchists in Molinari's journal;⁵⁹ Dyer Lum's association first with Tucker and later with Albert and Lucy Parsons; de Cleyre's association first with Tucker and then with Goldman and Berkman; the membership of Warren, Andrews, and Greene (and, according to one source,⁶⁰ Spooner, though this is doubtful) in the First International; and the influence of proto-ancap class theory on LWMA Hodgskin, and through him on ancaps, LWMA, and social anarchists alike.

And once one recognizes those affiliations between social anarchists and ancaps that are mediated by LWMA, it becomes easier to see the significance of those (admittedly fewer) affiliations between social anarchists and ancaps that are *not* so mediated, such as Kropotkin's and Goldman's admiration for proto-ancap Spencer; Spencer's call (even in his more conservative later years) for replacing the wage system with workers' cooperatives; Kropotkin's singing the praises of private enterprise;⁶¹ Rothbard's call for the return of conquistador-stolen land to the peasants⁶² and the takeover of government-privileged corporations by their workers;⁶³ and the enthusiasm for the free mercantile cities of the late mediæval period that unites social anarchists like Kropotkin and Bookchin with proto-ancaps like Augustin Thierry (whom Kropotkin frequently cites) and Charles Dunoyer.⁶⁴

VII. Conclusion

Seen from either the social anarchist or the anarcho-capitalist region of the anarchist landscape, the corresponding region can easily look so distant and so different that it's easy to relegate it to an alien and hostile territory. But, I've argued, once one carefully surveys the intermediate, left-wing market anarchist region, the deep intertwining of root and branch among all three traditions comes more clearly into view.

Social anarchist John Clark offers an apposite observation in his article "Bridging the Unbridgeable Chasm." The purported chasm he has in mind is not the one between social anarchism and anarcho-capitalism, and I have no reason to think he would agree with my use of it here (in fact I have some reason to think he wouldn't).⁶⁵ But I do think it applies:

The idea that there is an 'unbridgeable chasm' between two viewpoints that share certain common presuppositions and goals, and whose practices are in some ways interrelated, is a bit suspect from the outset. It is particularly problematic when proposed by a thinker like Bookchin, who claims to hold a dialectical perspective. Whereas nondialectical thought merely opposes one reality to another in an abstract manner, or else places them inertly beside one another, a dialectical analysis examines the ways in which various realities presuppose one another, constitute one another, challenge the identity of one another, and push one another to the limits of their development. Accordingly, one important quality of such an analysis is that it helps those with divergent viewpoints see the ways in which their positions are not mutually exclusive but can instead be mutually realized in a further development of each.⁶⁶

This passage perfectly describes what I see as the relationship among social anarchism, anarcho-capitalism, and left-wing market anarchism.⁶⁷

Roderick T. Long

Notes

- 1 See, *for example*, Rudolf Rocker, *Anarcho-Syndicalism: Theory and Practice* (Oakland, CA: AK 2004).
- 2 See, for example, Murray Bookchin, *The Next Revolution: Popular Assemblies and the Promise of Direct Democracy*, ed. Debbie Bookchin and Blair Taylor (London: Verso 2015).
- 3 See, for example, Edward P. Stringham, ed., *Anarchy and the Law: The Political Economy of Choice* (Oakland, CA: Independent 2007).
- 4 This disagreement is complicated, however, by the fact that the different camps do not all use the term “property” with the same meaning; see Kevin Carson, “Are We All Mutualists?” *Center for a Stateless Society* (Molinari Institute, Nov. 8, 2015) <https://c4ss.org/content/40929> (June 15, 2020).
- 5 Max Stirner, *The Ego and Its Own*, ed. David Leopold, trans. Steven T. Byington and Leopold (Cambridge: CUP 1995).
- 6 David Stack, *Nature and Artifice: The Life and Thought of Thomas Hodgskin (1787–1869)* (Woodbridge: Boydell 1998).
- 7 Crispin Sartwell, ed., *The Practical Anarchist: Writings of Josiah Warren* (New York, NY: Fordham UP 2018).
- 8 Madeleine B. Stern, *The Pantarch: A Biography of Stephen Pearl Andrews* (Austin, TX: U of Texas P 1968).
- 9 Henry Blatt, *Free Love and Anarchism: The Biography of Ezra Heywood* (Chicago, IL: U Illinois P 1989).
- 10 Steve J. Shone, *Lysander Spooner: American Anarchist* (Lanham, MD: Lexington 2010).
- 11 James J. Martin, *Men Against the State: The Expositors of Individualist Anarchism in America, 1827–1908* (Colorado Springs, CO: Myles 1970) 125–38.
- 12 Hal D. Sears, *The Sex Radicals: Free Love in High Victorian America* (Lawrence, KS: UP of Kansas 1977).
- 13 Frank H. Brooks, “Anarchism, Revolution, and Labor in the Thought of Dyer D. Lum: ‘Events Are the True Schoolmasters’” (PhD diss, Cornell U, 1988).
- 14 Sharon Presley and Crispin Sartwell, eds., *Exquisite Rebel: The Essays of Voltairine de Cleyre—Anarchist, Feminist, Genius* (Albany, NY: SUNY 2012).
- 15 Benjamin R. Tucker, *Instead of a Book, by a Man Too Busy to Write One: A Fragmentary Exposition of Individualist Anarchism* (New York, NY: Tucker 1893).
- 16 Benjamin R. Tucker, “The Life of Benjamin R. Tucker: Disclosed by Himself in the Principality of Monaco at the Age of 74,” unpublished ms., New York Public Library archives (Tucker collection) [transcribed by Wendy McElroy] www.wendymcelroy.com/plugins/content/content.php?content.57.
- 17 Sidney E. Parker, “The New Freewoman: Dora Marsden & Benjamin R. Tucker,” *Benjamin R. Tucker and the Champions of Liberty: A Centenary Anthology*, ed. Michael E. Coughlin, Charles H. Hamilton, and Mark A. Sullivan (St Paul, MN: Coughlin 1987) 149–57.
- 18 Phillip Mitsis, *Epicurus’ Ethical Theory: The Pleasures of Invulnerability* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP 1988).
- 19 Douglas J. Den Uyl and Douglas B. Rasmussen, eds., *The Philosophic Thought of Ayn Rand* (Urbana, IL: U of Illinois P 1986).
- 20 Francis Dashwood Tandy, *Voluntary Socialism: A Sketch* (Denver, CO: Tandy 1896).
- 21 Michel Perraudeau, *Anselme Bellegarrigue: Le Premier des Libétaires* (Saint-Georges-d’Oléron: Libétaires 2012).
- 22 For Ourselves: The Council for Generalized Self-Management, *The Right to be Greedy: Theses on the Practical Necessity of Demanding Everything* [1974], ed. Bob Black (Port Townsend, WA: Loompanics 1983).
- 23 Bob Black, *The Abolition of Work and Other Essays* (Port Townsend, WA: Loompanics 1986); Bob Black, *Anarchy After Leftism* (Oakland, CA: CAL 1997).
- 24 Wolfi Landstreicher, *The Network of Domination: Anarchist Analyses of the Institutions, Structures and Systems of Domination and Exploitation to be Debated, Developed and Acted Upon* (Olympia, WA: Last Word); Wolfi Landstreicher, *Willful Disobedience* (San Francisco: Ardent 2009).
- 25 Individualists Tending toward the Wild, *The Collected Communiques of Individualists Tending toward the Wild* (n.p.: Plain Words 2012).
- 26 For the first, see Andrea Pakieser, ed., *I Belong Only to Myself: The Life and Writings of Leda Rafanelli* (Oakland, CA: AK 2014); for the latter three, see *Down with the Law: Anarchist Individualist Writings from Early Twentieth-Century France*, ed. and trans. Mitchell Abidor (Chico, CA: AK 2019).
- 27 See, for example, Emma Goldman, *The Individual, Society and the State* (Chicago, IL: Free Society 1940).
- 28 For example, Fred Woodworth explains: “I have no prefix or adjective for my anarchism. I think syndicalism can work, as can free-market anarcho-capitalism, anarcho-communism, even anarcho-hermits, depending on the situation.” Qtd. Paul Avrich, ed., *Anarchist Voices: An Oral History of Anarchism in America*, 2d ed. (Edinburgh: AK 2005) 475.
- 29 Peter Kropotkin, “A Few Thoughts About the Essence of Anarchism,” *Direct Struggle against Capital: A Peter Kropotkin Anthology*, ed. Iain McKay (Oakland, CA: AK 2014) 201–4.

The Anarchist Landscape

- 30 John Henry Mackay, *The Anarchists: A Picture of Civilization at the Close of the Nineteenth Century*, trans. George Schumm (Boston, MA: Tucker 1894) 145–7.
- 31 Murray N. Rothbard, *The Ethics of Liberty* (New York, NY: New York UP 1998); Murray N. Rothbard, *For a New Liberty: The Libertarian Manifesto*, 2d ed. (Auburn, AL: Mises 2006).
- 32 David D. Friedman, *The Machinery of Freedom: Guide to a Radical Capitalism*, 3d ed. (Charleston, SC: CreateSpace 2015).
- 33 See, for example, Benjamin R. Tucker, “A Want Supplied,” *Liberty* 3.13 (Aug. 15, 1885): 4.
- 34 See, for example, Charles T. Sprading, ed., *Liberty and the Great Libertarians: An Anthology of Liberty, a Hand-book of Freedom* (Los Angeles, CA: Sprading 1913).
- 35 Joseph Déjacque, *De l'être-humain mâle et femelle: Lettre à P.J. Proudhon* (New Orleans, LA: Lamarre 1857).
- 36 Samuel Edward Konkin III, “SEK3’s History of the Libertarian Movement,” *Center for a Stateless Society* (Molinari Institute, Dec. 7, 2012) <http://c4ss.org/content/13240> (June 15, 2020).
- 37 Roy A. Childs, Jr., “How Bad is the U.S. Government?” *The Abolitionist* 2.2 (May 1971): 2–3, www.unz.org/Pub/Abolitionist-1971may-00002.
- 38 Peter Vallentyne and Hillel Steiner, eds., *Left Libertarianism and Its Critics: The Contemporary Debate* (London: Palgrave 2000); Michael Otsuka, *Libertarianism without Inequality* (Oxford: OUP 2005); Eric Roark, *Removing the Commons: A Lockean Left-Libertarian Approach to the Just Use and Appropriation of Natural Resources* (Lanham, MD: Lexington 2013).
- 39 Roderick T. Long, “Spooner on Rent,” *Austro-Athenian Empire* (n.p., Feb. 21, 2006) <http://praxeology.net/unblog02-06.htm#12> (June 15, 2020). For arguments that the difference between Tuckerite occupancy-and-use views and Lockean absentee-ownership views is in large part one of degree more than of kind, see Carson, “Mutualists,” and Jason Lee Byas, “How Rothbardians Occupy Part of the Occupancy and Use Spectrum,” *Center for a Stateless Society* (Molinari Institute, Nov. 23, 2015) <https://c4ss.org/content/41581> (June 15, 2020).
- 40 Herbert Spencer, *Social Statics: Or, the Conditions Essential to Human Happiness Specified, and the First of Them Developed* (London: Chapman 1851) chs 9–10.
- 41 Herbert Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, 3 vols. (New York, NY: Appleton 1896) 3: 535–74 (§§825–39).
- 42 Benjamin R. Tucker, “Should Labor Be Paid or Not?” *Liberty* 5.19 (April 28, 1888): 4; Benjamin R. Tucker, “Solutions of the Labor Problem,” *Liberty* 8.14 (Sep. 12, 1891): 2–3.
- 43 Rosa Slobodinsky [Rachelle Yarros] and Voltairine de Cleyre, “The Individualist and the Communist: A Dialogue,” *Twentieth Century* 6.25 (June 18, 1891): 3–6.
- 44 Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan* (London: Crooke 1651) 1.4.
- 45 Benjamin R. Tucker, “Why I Am an Anarchist,” *Twentieth Century* 4.22 (May 29, 1890): 5–6; cp. Benjamin R. Tucker, “Neglected Factors in the Rent Problem,” *Liberty* 10.16 (Dec. 15, 1894): 4. And compare, from the other side, social anarchist David Graeber’s affirmation that he would still endorse anarchism even if markets turned out to play a more central and crucial role in anarchist society than he predicts: Graeber, *The Democracy Project: A History, a Crisis, a Movement* (New York, NY: Spiegel 2013) 193.
- 46 Benjamin R. Tucker, “Auberon Herbert and his Work,” *Liberty* 3.10 (May 23, 1885): 4–5; Benjamin R. Tucker, “A Prophecy in Course of Fulfillment,” *Liberty* 5.18 (April 14, 1888): 7–8; S. R. [S. H. Randall], “An Economist on the Future Society,” *Liberty* 14.23 (Sep. 1904): 2.
- 47 This is true not only of many anti-capitalist individualists (see, for example, James Tuttle, ed., *The Anatomy of Escape: A Defense of the Commons* [Tulsa, OK: Center for a Stateless Society 2019] but even of some pro-capitalist ones (see, for example, Randall G. Holcombe, “Common Property in Anarcho-Capitalism,” *Journal of Libertarian Studies* 19.2 (2005): 3–29, https://cdn.mises.org/19_2_1.pdf).
- 48 See, for example, Gary Chartier, *Anarchy and Legal Order: Law and Politics for a Stateless Society* (Cambridge: CUP 2012) 378–86; Gary Chartier, “The Distinctiveness of Left-Libertarianism,” *Bleeding Heart Libertarians* (n.p., Nov. 5, 2012) <http://bleedingheartlibertarians.com/2012/11/the-distinctiveness-of-left-libertarianism/> (June 15, 2020); Kevin A. Carson, “Class vs. ‘Identity Politics,’ Intersectionality, Etc.: Some General Observations,” *Center for a Stateless Society* (Molinari Institute, March 26, 2013) <https://c4ss.org/content/17886>; Kevin A. Carson, “What is Left-Libertarianism?” *Center for a Stateless Society* (Molinari Institute, June 15, 2014) <http://c4ss.org/content/28216> (June 15, 2020); Charles W. Johnson, “Liberty, Equality, Solidarity: Toward a Dialectical Anarchism,” *Anarchism/Minarchism: Is a Government Part of a Free Country?* ed. Roderick T. Long and Tibor R. Machan (Aldershot: Ashgate 2008) 155–88, <http://radgeek.com/gt/2010/03/02/liberty-equality-solidarity-toward-a-dialectical-anarchism/>; Charles W. Johnson, “Women and the Invisible Fist: How Violence Against Women Enforces the Unwritten Law of Patriarchy” (unpublished essay 2013): <http://charleswjohanson.name/essays/women-and-the-invisible-fist/women-and-the-invisible-fist-2013-0503-max.pdf> (June 15, 2020); Roderick T. Long and Charles W. Johnson, “Libertarian Feminism: Can This Marriage Be Saved?” (unpublished essay, May 1, 2005) <http://charleswjohanson.name/essays/>

Roderick T. Long

- libertarian-feminism/; Billy Christmas, "Libertarianism and Privilege," *Molinari Review* 1.1 (Spring 2016): 24–46, <http://praxeology.net/MR1-1-S16-CHRISTMAS.pdf>.
- 49 Friedman 144–5 (the text of the third edition is unchanged from that of the second in this regard, though the third edition does include a note in an appendix [334–5] indicating that he's subsequently changed his mind).
- 50 Jeff Rigenbach, "Interview with Murray Bookchin," *Reason*, Oct. 1979, 34–38, <https://reason.com/1979/10/01/interview-with-murray-bookchin/>; cp. Jesse Walker, "Murray Bookchin, RIP," *Reason*, July 31, 2006, <https://reason.com/2006/07/31/murray-bookchin-rip/>.
- 51 Murray Bookchin, "What is Communalism? The Democratic Dimension of Anarchism," *Democracy and Nature* 3.2 (1995): 1–17, www.democracynature.org/vol3/bookchin_communalism.htm.
- 52 Murray Bookchin, *Social Anarchism or Lifestyle Anarchism: The Unbridgeable Chasm* (San Francisco, CA: AK 1995); Murray Bookchin, *The Next Revolution: Popular Assemblies and the Promise of Direct Democracy*, ed. Debbie Bookchin and Blair Taylor (London: Verso 2015).
- 53 Benjamin R. Tucker, "General Walker and the Anarchists," *Liberty* 5.8 (Nov. 19, 1887): 4–5, 8.
- 54 Roderick T. Long, "They Love Us When We're Dead," *Center for a Stateless Society* (Molinari Institute, Dec. 11, 2016) <https://c4ss.org/content/47199> (June 15, 2020).
- 55 For defense of the LWMA position, see Gary Chartier and Charles W. Johnson, eds., *Markets Not Capitalism: Individualist Anarchism against Bosses, Inequality, Corporate Power, and Structural Poverty* (New York, NY: Minor Compositions–Autonomea 2011) <http://radgeek.com/gt/2011/10/Markets-Not-Capitalism-2011-Chartier-and-Johnson.pdf>; Cory Massimino and James Tuttle, eds., *Free Markets and Capitalism? Do Free Markets Always Produce a Corporate Economy?* (Tulsa, OK: Center for a Stateless Society 2016); Kevin A. Carson, *Studies in Mutualist Political Economy* (Charleston, SC: BookSurge 2007) <https://kevinacarson.org/pdf/mpe.pdf>; Kevin A. Carson, *Organization Theory: A Libertarian Perspective* (Charleston, SC: BookSurge 2008) <https://kevinacarson.org/pdf/ot.pdf>; Kevin A. Carson, *Labor Struggle: A Free Market Model*, Center for a Stateless Society Paper 10 ([Tulsa, OK: Center for a Stateless Society] 2010) <https://c4ss.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/09/C4SS-Labor.pdf>; Roderick T. Long, "Left-Libertarianism, Market Anarchism, Class Conflict, and Historical Theories of Distributive Justice," *Griffith Law Review* 21.2 (2012): 413–31.
- 56 Anna Morgenstern, "Anarcho-'Capitalism' is Impossible," *Center for a Stateless Society* (Molinari Institute, Sep. 19, 2010) <https://c4ss.org/content/4043> (June 15, 2020).
- 57 Nicolas Walter, *The Anarchist Past and Other Essays* (Nottingham: Five Leaves 2009); Nicolas Walter, *About Anarchism* (Oakland, CA: PM 2019).
- 58 Roderick T. Long, "Molinari and Proudhon: Mutual(ist) Influence?" *Austro Athenian Empire* (n.p., June 15, 2020) <https://aeblog.com/2020/06/15/molinari-and-proudhon-mutualist-influence/> (June 15, 2020).
- 59 Sophie Raffalovich, "Les Anarchistes de Boston," *Journal des Économistes* 41.3 (March 1888): 375–88.
- 60 George Woodcock, *Anarchism: A History of Libertarian Ideas and Movements* (Melbourne: Penguin 1962) 460.
- 61 Kropotkin 122–3.
- 62 Rothbard, *New* chs 10–11.
- 63 Murray N. Rothbard, "Confiscation and the Homestead Principle," *Libertarian Forum* 1.6 (June 15, 1969): 3–4.
- 64 For more on the relationships among social anarchism, anarcho-capitalism, and left-wing market anarchism, see Roderick T. Long, "Anarchism and Libertarianism," *Brill's Companion to Anarchism and Philosophy*, ed. Nathan Jun (Leiden: Brill 2018) 285–317; cp. Roderick T. Long, "Anarchism," *The Routledge Companion to Social and Political Philosophy*, ed. Gerald Gaus and Fred D'Agostino (New York, NY: Routledge 2013) 217–230; Roderick T. Long, "Against Anarchist Apartheid," *Austro-Athenian Empire* (n.p., April 1, 2007) <https://aeblog.com/2007/04/01/against-anarchist-apartheid/> (June 15, 2020).
- 65 John P. Clark, *The Anarchist Moment: Reflections on Culture, Nature and Power* (Montreal: Black Rose 1983) 70, 128.
- 66 John P. Clark, "Bridging the Unbridgeable Chasm: Personal Transformation and Social Acton in Anarchist Practice," *The Impossible Community: Realizing Communitarian Anarchism* (New York, NY: Bloomsbury 2013) ch. 7. For a similar dialectical orientation in free-market libertarian thought, see Chris Matthew Sciabarra, *Total Freedom: Toward a Dialectical Libertarianism* (University Park, PA: Penn State UP 2000).
- 67 An earlier version of this chapter benefited from comments at a Molinari Society Symposium held in conjunction with the Eastern Division meeting of the American Philosophical Association in New York, 8 January 2019.