7 Toward an anarchist-feminist analytics of power

Sandra Jeppesen

Introduction

Anarchist-feminists have been engaged globally in political organizing and theorizing since the outset of the anarchist movement in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries (Farrow 1974; Molyneux 1986; Zarrow 1988; Ackelsburg 1991; Brown 1993; de Heredia 2007; Jeppesen and Nazar 2012). Despite this, Margaret Marsh has found that 'very little scholarly attention has been focused on anarchist women, with the exception of Emma Goldman, who was not fully representative' (Marsh 1978: 533). Deric Shannon (2009: 59) similarly argues that 'articles articulating or utilizing a distinctly anarcha-feminist perspective are rarely found in academic journals', leaving anarchist-feminist theory under-articulated. Writers propose various reasons: Marx has theorized capitalism so anarchist-feminists need not; anarchist-feminists believe theory to be elitist; and anarchist-feminists prefer action to theory. We may also observe that women, especially racialized and colonialized women, have disproportionate responsibilities for work both inside and outside the home, as well as an unequal portion of organizing work falling to them, leaving less time for theorizing. Moreover, anarchist-feminist academics may tend to produce time-consuming collaborative work, whereas anarchist men tend to produce individual work. I would argue, with Shannon, that more cross-pollination is needed between anarchist theories of the state and capital, and feminist theories of gender, queer, trans, race, colonialism, and ecology.

There is a growing emergence of global anarchist-feminist research on a wide range of issues. Drawing on this wealth of material, I will first develop a working definition of anarchist-feminism, and then propose an anarchist-feminist analytics of power.

What is anarchist-feminism?

Anarchist-feminism refers to a meeting of anarchism and feminism. Anarchism is a political theory dating back to the publication of two books: William Godwin's (1793) *Enquiry Concerning Political Justice* and Mary Wollstonecraft's (1792) *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*. Catherine Eschle (2001: 42) theorizes 'anarchism as opposition to relations and structures of hierarchical and coercive power', emphasizing practices grounded in critiques of domination. Today it is an activist practice gaining global momentum: 'From anti-capitalist social centres and ecofeminist communities to raucous street parties and blockades of international summits, anarchist

forms of resistance and organizing have been at the heart of the "alternative globalization" movement' (Gordon 2007: 29).

Feminist theories analyze gendered power inequities in politics, economics, and culture, including: psychoanalytic criticism; eco-criticism; French feminism; Marxist, socialist, and poststructuralist feminisms; liberal, bourgeois, and radical feminisms; antiracist, anticolonial, and transnational feminisms: 'In its assumption of the possibility for fundamental social change, feminist theory is supported by feminist practice' (Iannello 1992: 35). While anarchism 'points toward a model of democratic movement organization even if the general insensitivity to multiple forms of power means that this model remains incomplete' (Eschle 2001: 46), when combined with feminism, this sensitivity to multiple complex forms of power emerges.

Starting by defining anarchism and feminism separately, however, suggests that the two have historically been separate. This is not the case. Rather, 'the anarchist movement has long attracted and has had at its center noteworthy women who have influenced the development of the movement worldwide' (Kramarae and Spender 2001: 46). In Mexico, 'Carmen Huerta became the president of the labor congress as early as 1879, and labor policies always reflected women's concerns as a result of anarchist[-feminist] demands' (49). In Argentina, anarchist women produced a feminist newspaper, *La Voz de la Mujer* (Molyneux 1986), and in Spain anarchist-feminists organized the *Mujeres Libres*, which numbered over 20,000 women at its peak (Ackelsberg 2005: 21). Moreover, in 'Uruguay, Brazil and Mexico, anarchists also promoted anarchist-feminism very early on' (de Heredia 2007). Anarchist women such as Emma Goldman and Voltairine de Cleyre were active in the USA in the early twentieth century, when anarchist-feminists such as He Zhen were also organizing in revolutionary China (Zarrow 1988).

What, then, is anarchist-feminism? Lynne Farrow (1974: 3) famously argued in the 1970s that 'Feminism practices what Anarchism preaches'. Deirdre Hogan (2004) argues that 'anarchists believe that the liberty of one is based on the liberty of all and so there can be no true anarchist society without an end to all existing structures of domination and exploitation, including naturally the oppression of women'. De Heredia (2007: 44) argues that 'anarcha-feminism can serve to "mainstream"[1] gender and feminist struggle[s], thereby making anarchist practice more consistent with anarchist theory, [and] anarcha-feminism can contribute to other feminist critiques of and struggles against gender oppression'. Similarly, Breton and colleagues (2012a) have found that anarchist-feminism attempts to anarchize feminism and make anarchism more feminist. Anarcha-feminist and anarcha-queer movements:

> challenge gender and sex oppressions both in the world at large and within the anarchist movement, pushing non-feminist and non-queer anarchists to consider what are often labelled feminist and queer issues including the body, parenting, sex work, (dis)ability, health and mental health. On the other hand they challenge feminist and queer movements to consider oppressions intersectional with sex and gender such as capitalism, class, poverty, labour and housing, where anarchist analysis and practice are particularly strong.
>
> (Jeppesen and Nazar 2012: 163)

Anarchist-feminists are engaged in struggles internal to social movements against manarchism (systemic male domination in anarchist movements) and liberal feminism (reformist, classist, white-dominated, or essentialist claims for women's

rights), simultaneously struggling within these movements for systemic transformations in the broader society.

Alison Jaggar (1983: 11) argues that anarchist-feminist perspectives may sometimes be subsumed under feminist theories, including: Marxist feminism, in which the state withers away; radical feminist challenges to patriarchy; and socialist-feminist critiques of economic hierarchies. Thus we might assume anarchist-feminism does not have its own forms of thought. But anarchist-feminist theory does not claim ownership over ideas, valuing instead the democratization of knowledge for the benefit of humanity. Anarchist-feminists might thus welcome the fact that elements of anarchist-feminism have been integrated into a diverse range of feminisms. Kathleen Iannello suggests that anarchist-feminists offer a unique 'focus on the development of structures that avoid the kind of coercive power transmitted through hierarchical organization … While questions of hierarchy and power are important to all feminist frameworks, none address it as specifically as anarchists' (Iannello 1992: 42).

At the same time, historically, anarchist women did not always call themselves feminists, 'reject[ing] a feminist label because feminism was understood to be an ideology of the bourgeoisie' (de Heredia 2007), and of suffragists demanding the vote (Reichert 1976: 175–176). Voltairine de Cleyre famously quipped, 'The ballot hasn't made men free and it won't make us free' (cited in Marsh 1978: 541). Mainstream 'feminism did not, after all, threaten cultural foundations', such as marriage, patriarchy in the family, etc., and instead, 'concentrated on legal and political issues' (Marsh 1978: 534). But anarchist-feminists saw the legal and political systems as sites of gendered oppression, which they organized against. Early anarchist-feminists are thus often left out of feminist histories, despite having been active in campaigns against gender oppression, engaged in direct action, and developed important anarchist and feminist theories. Nonetheless, as De Heredia (2007: 50) argues, 'despite their rejection of the word feminism, Spanish anarchists attempted to address specifically women's cultural, social and economic subordination', and groups such as the *Mujeres Libres* were leading-edge feminists in their time, calling on women to think beyond superficial reforms, and noting connections between issues such as gender, class, the nation-state, race, immigration status, and war – some of which were only taken up in non-anarchist-feminist theory more than half a century later, when Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989) coined the term 'intersectionality theory'.

While some anarchist women did not self-identify as feminists, the reverse may also be true: anti-authoritarian feminists may not always identify as anarchists. Alison Jaggar (1983) argues that anarchist-feminists often organized around issues (war, reproductive justice, the environment, free schools, migrant justice, etc.) or identities (indigenous, queer, black, punk, etc.), rather than adhering to an anarchist ideology. 'Often these women might not even call themselves anarchists; more often, they identify themselves as radical feminists' (Kramarae and Spender 2001: 49). Uri Gordon (2007: 32) has found that 'movement participants often speak of themselves as "autonomous", "anti-authoritarian" or "horizontal" … words used for the sole purpose of not saying "anarchist" because of its popular connotations of chaos and violence'. The anarchist-feminist *Collectif de recherche sur l'autonomie collective* (CRAC) observed that:

> several reasons were given by activists to explain their refusal to take on the anarchist label: because they don't really feel the need to identify an ideological

> belonging, they fear outside judgment, they don't want to scare people away from their organizing work, or they don't want to take on ideological labels that they feel may be dogmatic on the one hand, or on the other hand, somehow predetermined by others.
>
> (Breton et al. 2012a: 157)

With this muddying of the waters, it is sometimes difficult to excavate anarchist-feminist histories.

Nonetheless, we can safely argue that anarchist-feminism was alive and active at the outset of anarchism, has maintained a presence in the anarchist movement throughout, and is increasingly active today. 'Since the 1960s, anarchist-feminism has seen a resurgence of interest. With the emergence of third-wave feminism, there is an anarchist impulse alive and well in the women's movement' (Kramarae and Spender 2001: 49). In the 1970s and 1980s, 'a substantial number of contemporary feminists identif[ied] themselves as anarchists'(Jaggar 1983: 11). Moreover, there is also a feminist impulse alive and well in the anarchist movement, where a substantial number of anarchists identify as feminists or pro-feminists[2] (Ehrlich 1994; de Heredia 2007; Gordon 2007; Shannon 2009; Breton et al. 2012a, 2012b; Rogue 2012; etc.).

Today, matters such as transnational feminisms, sex worker decriminalization, queer and trans rights, reproductive justice, indigenous self-determination, and climate change all have anarchist-feminists working on them, thinking through ways to challenge state and capitalist power from an anarchist-feminist position and engaging in global grassroots community building through mutual aid and direct action. These global actions are increasingly based on complex theories of power from an anarchist-feminist perspective.

Toward an anarchist-feminist analytics of power

In this section I will start to develop a theoretical framework for understanding power dynamics, relationships, politics, and processes of anarchist-feminist organizing – what I am calling an anarchist-feminist analytics of power.

I borrow the term 'analytics of power' from Michel Foucault, whose work has been explored by anarchist theorists such as Todd May (1994) and Saul Newman (2001, 2010). Foucault (1978: 82) suggests that the goal of rethinking power is 'to move less toward a "theory" of power than toward an "analytics" of power: that is, toward a definition of the specific domain formed by relations of power'. He argues that an analytics of power must free itself from the Western juridico-discursive conception of power as inherently repressive, limit-setting, negating, and prohibitive, bounded by legal discourse and the rule of law.

If we rethink power as a mechanism that hides itself to create conformity (Foucault 1980: 86), then unmasking power is key. Anarchist-feminists have long sought to reveal and challenge unequal conditions of power, working to create non-hierarchical power dynamics in activist groups. We see this in their early rejection of nationalist, racist, bourgeois, and capitalist systems. For Foucault, people tend to accept restrictive power because it is not absolute – it limits but does not eradicate desire or agency completely, 'leaving a measure of freedom – however slight – intact' (Foucault 1980: 86). People find this acceptable because power is understood

'as a pure limit set on freedom' (Foucault 1980: 86). Foucault counters this, and I argue that anarchist-feminists have always-already been engaged with countering it too, at least in part because they have rejected juridico-discursive conceptions of power, refusing to petition for legal reforms or expecting profound change to come through the state. The conception of power beyond the state underpins anarchist-feminist rethinking of gender oppression as well.

Following Foucault, we must ask different questions. Rather than asking how anarchist-feminists fight gender oppression, we might ask: How are power relations redistributed, reorganized, and re-characterized by anarchist-feminist collectives in their horizontal, consensus decision-making, cooperative social movement spaces? Or as Marsh (1978: 534) puts it, how do anarchist-feminists 'exercise their power?'

Table 7.1 Toward an anarchist-feminist analytics of power

Axis of theory	*Analytics of power*	*Axes of activism*
Gender, sex, sexuality	• patriarchal power relations constructed by state and capital • private/public sphere is a false, gendered, heteronormative binary • anti-heteronormative, anti-patriarchal power sharing • horizontal relational power from feminist centres of influence	• bodily autonomy, polyamory, radical monogamy, reproductive justice, sex workers' rights • queering anarchism, trans activism • non-mixed groups (e.g. Sorcières, APOC, QPOC) • politics of everyday life beyond private/public divide
Capital	• capitalist oppression depends on patriarchal Western property system • capitalist eco-destruction based on anthropocentrism • anarchist-feminist economics • empowerment, cooperation against neo-liberalism and for humanity	• collective gardens, squatting, housing collectives, communes • civil disobedience, direct action, property destruction • anti-capitalist gay shame critiques of corporate pride parades • climate camps, green anarchism
State	• critique of state role in maintaining gender binary (e.g., legal, medical, prison, police, military, education) • critique of monopoly of legitimate violence by the state (police and military) and masculinity • (pro)feminist collective self-determination and autonomy • prefigurative organizational forms	• anti-police brutality, prison industrial complex, military, war • creation of anarchist commons: anarchist day cares, care collectives, free schools, universities, etc. • no-border camps • anarcha-feminist insurrectionists, use of political violence
Colonialism, race	• borders as sites of racialized power • free movement, against all borders • indigenous self-determination; decolonizing minds, methods, actions • intersectionality theory: race and colonialism intersect with gender and capitalism, state, ecology, etc.	• (im)migrant support work: solidarity cities, 'don't ask don't tell' campaigns • forefront global groups in solidarity coalitions • indigenous anarchism, blockades • global anarchist-feminism

Gender, sex, sexuality

Anarchist-feminists historically have been concerned with the 'vexing questions of domestic and economic equality' (Marsh 1978: 535), arguing along individualist lines that 'the primacy of complete individual liberty' (536) in anarchism also applied to women. They insisted that 'women should always be self-supporting' (536), 'decried the sexual double standard' (537), and 'demanded equality of sexual freedom' sometimes in the form of 'varietism' or polyamory, as 'exclusivity implied that lovers held property rights over one another' (537). They believed the female body was not property to be controlled or coerced by men.

We can read Foucault as supporting anarchist-feminist critiques of inter-personal power: 'Relations of power are not in a position of exteriority with respect to other types of relationships (economic processes, knowledge relationships, sexual relations), but are … the immediate effects of the divisions, inequalities, and disequilibriums' found within all relationships. However, relations of power do not have a prohibitive role but a 'directly productive role' (Foucault 1980: 94). This productive role is seen in nurturing horizontal relationships, wherein horizontalism locates the exercise of mutual power in organizational forms: consensus decision-making, talking and listening structures, participatory power, and mutual aid organizing. Relations of equalizing power are integrated into anarchist-feminist practices.

Reformulating the rejection of power hierarchies, three key sites of action-as-theory emerge for anarchist-feminists: destabilizing gender hierarchies; deconstructing the private-public divide; and re-establishing bodily autonomy.

Gender hierarchies

Historically one of the key gender hierarchies challenged by anarchist women was heterosexual marriage and the nuclear family. In North America,

> Voltairine [de Cleyre] and the anarchist-feminists did not just question the unfair nature of marriage laws of that time, they repudiated institutional marriage and the conventional family structure, seeing in these institutions the same authoritarian oppression as they saw in the institution of the State.
>
> (Presley 2005: 192)

Anarchist-feminist He Zhen, in China, and later in Japan, organized the 'Women's Rights Recovery Association' (Zarrow 1988: 800), critiquing the triple domination of women by fathers, husbands, and sons: 'She specifically and repeatedly criticized such institutions as polygamy, concubinage, and the authority of the mother-in-law' (806). In Argentina, anarchist-feminists forwarded an anti-marriage

> position on free love, … [a] rejection of men's traditional authority over women and control of their sexuality. In the context of Southern European *machismo*, in which virginity, fidelity, and the double standard were the common currency of male privilege …
>
> (Molyneux 1986: 122)

Despite specific cultural differences (fidelity to fathers, husbands, and sons in Chinese culture vs. *machismo* in Southern European culture, for example), anarchist-feminists

universally rejected marriage as a socially constructed gender hierarchy that assigned men power over women.

A strategy rejecting men's participation emerged, 'encouraging the development of a whole movement of autonomous women's only groups across not only the United States, but also in Europe' (de Heredia 2007: 52), Canada (Breton et al. 2012a: 159), Latin America (Molyneux 1986), and beyond. For example, Breton and colleagues argue that:

> Some feminists have experienced sexism within left-wing student organizing and anticapitalist networks, or they might perceive a lack of a feminist analysis of globalization among antiglobalization activists. These experiences among others can be the impetus for the creation of autonomous women-only spaces.
>
> (Breton et al. 2012a: 159)

Non-mixed groups reduce gendered power dynamics; rather than struggling to assert the importance of developing a gendered analysis of globalization, for example, a non-mixed anarchist-feminist group can simply do this work.

These two strategies – rejection of marriage in the private sphere, and non-mixed organizing in the public sphere – are representative of the way in which anarchist-feminist politics conceives of the two spheres as both political and gendered.

The public and private spheres

Typically when anarchist-feminists have brought up issues in anarchist collectives such as marriage, birth control, free love, polyamory, sexual assault, trans inclusion, day care, self-care, mental health, or intentional families, the response is that these are private issues outside the public sphere of anarchist politics. However, Eschle (2001: 42) argues for 'a more expansive definition of anarchism as opposition to relations and structures of hierarchical and coercive power' including intimate relationships, kinship relations, and other social structures. This definition is taken up today in movements on sexual consent, accountability, and sex work (Jeppesen and Nazar 2012).

Deconstructing the private/public binary using Foucault's notion that power runs through all relations, I propose several arguments. First, following Marsh, we must understand that the private sphere has been deemed the less important of the two spheres, with no place in politics, and beyond the reach of the state. As Sarah Brown (1988: 462) argues, 'The assumption that women have not been … constitutive of international relations conjoins easily with liberal feminist views of the basis of gender inequality as the expropriation of women's political power through relegation to the private sphere'. The binary private/public is thus hierarchical, with public being political, masculine, and privileged, and private being personal, feminine, and devalued. The dismissal (by men) of the private sphere as feminine can only take place through recourse to masculine power, however, demonstrating that the (heteronormative) private sphere is in fact also male-dominated.

Second, we might argue, with MacKinnon, that in fact the public sphere predetermines or structures to a great extent the private sphere, so that relations of male hegemony are enacted both in the public sphere through relations of the state, law, policing, and governance, and in the private sphere through relations of marriage, sexuality, parenting, finances, and physical/sexual violence. The public and private spheres are in fact not binary opposites, but rather evidence of similar relations of

patriarchal domination enacted in different spaces. Male hegemony may better be understood, according to an anarchist-feminist analytics of power, as the tendency to read masculinity as enacting greater power, and femininity as enacting lesser power. If we can assume that the personal is political, and the private sphere is equal to the public sphere, then the political is also personal, and the public sphere engenders the same unequal power relations as the private sphere. Assumptions regarding gendered power relations affect both types of spaces; therefore macro/public and micro/private spheres are equally important to an anarchist-feminist analytics of power.

Bodies

Bodies, often constructed as belonging to the private sphere, are in fact micro-political spheres of engagement in both public and private spaces. They offer the ultimate return to freedom, control, power-over-self, and the autonomy of the affective internal space.

Anarchist women, queers and trans people have long struggled for bodily autonomy in the context of industrializing capital, advocating relationships unfettered by power dynamics over-determined by ideologies of gender. Having deconstructed the private/public divide, we can define bodily autonomy as a collective political project to exercise self-power. Sometimes this is related to reproductive rights, including abortion (critiqued as white-Western-middle-class feminism), the right to choose to have children or not; to keep children when the state has historically removed them from racialized and colonized women; and to decide how, where, and with whom to raise children (e.g. in multi-generational, multi-parenting, queer, trans and/or same-sex parent households) (Luna 2009).

Contemporary feminist movements understand sex, gender, and sexuality to be three components of liberatory bodily autonomy. If a person's sex is female, their gender is not necessarily feminine, nor is their sexuality necessarily heterosexual. The binaries male/female, feminine/masculine, and heterosexual/homosexual are, like public/private, not neutral but hierarchical, and can be subverted through practices of diverse sexes, genders, and sexualities.

Hierarchical gender, sex, and sexuality binaries are arguably themselves a state form. Jamie Heckert (2012: 66) argues that, 'Whereas a state-oriented LGBT politics tries to challenge the hierarchies of hetero/homo, cis/trans, while keeping the identities, queer politics might ask how the identities themselves might already be state-like with their borders and policing'. Identities have become micro state forms, whereby the state demands that we stabilize our sex/gender/sexuality (on our passports, marriage licenses, birth certificates, etc.), and other people also police the boundaries of our identities. Fluidity of genders is therefore a political act of resistance. 'To become anarchist, to become queer, is not easy. To learn to cross lines, to see that the lines are not even real, is a radical transformation' (Heckert 2012: 72). Similarly, Jerimarie Liesegang suggests that:

> the core of the trans existence and persona is radical and anarchistic, if not insurrectionary, in its embodiment – such that pure liberation of sex and gender will not come through complicit reform within the state but rather through rejecting the state and its many social constructs.
>
> (Liesegang 2012: 88)

Trans, queer, and feminist bodily autonomies 'attempt to "prefigure" a revolutionary future. Thus, for example, self-governing collectives are established before wholesale social transformation has been achieved, to enable individual self-determination in the here and now' (Eschle 2001: 43). The importance of the politics of gender-variant bodies is consistent with the notion that 'the idea of prefiguration involves an assumption that participation in anarchist struggle can generate new ways of being, knowing and identification' (46). Each embodied queer/trans/feminist subject exists in the pre-conditions of liberation for the entire society. Bodily autonomy is crucial if we understand from Foucault that power is everywhere, and each embodied subject, freed from the limits of gender binaries, asserts its autonomy to participate in the collectivity (community, intentional family, partnership, polyamory). Moreover, communities must be anti-capitalist if gender liberation is to be achieved.

Capital

There is a gendered logic to the unequal power relations implicit in capital. Deric Shannon (2009: 63) argues that, 'at the root of anarcha-feminism [i]s an opposition to *power* itself, rather than those who wield it'. If we understand power as the root of oppositional theory, and if power is internal to sexual and gendered relations and simultaneously to capitalist relations, then anarchist-feminists are perhaps in opposition neither to those who wield power, nor to power itself, but rather to the unequal distribution of power across axes of gender and capital. Shannon argues that 'a contemporary anarcha-feminism would actively argue and fight for working class liberation from capitalism' (68).

For Foucault (1978: 94), 'Power comes from below; that is, there is no binary and all-encompassing opposition between rulers and ruled at the root of power relations'. The notion that there is no binary oppositional force within power relations offers a diffuse freedom for labourers, lower socio-economic classes, and those with low cultural capital. We can move from oppositional politics (capitalist vs. working class) to the politics of constructing alternative working arrangements in which participants are neither ruler nor ruled but equals in decision-making and the organization of labour.

However, Foucault's conception of power from 'below' is a binary formulation, contradicting his challenge to the ruled/rulers binary, re-establishing the dichotomy above/below, and discursively constructing power divisions as hierarchical and fixed. If power comes from below, then to exercise productive power must workers remain 'below'? This binary prevents us from integrating a rhizomatic analysis of intersectional oppressions and liberations.

Anarchist-feminism rejects binary conceptions such as male/female, ruler/ruled, above/below, as binary pairs are socially constructed and coercive. '[T]he manifold relationships of force that take shape and come into play in the machinery of production, in families, limited groups, and institutions, are the basis for wide-ranging effects of cleavage that run through the social body as a whole' (Foucault 1980: 94). Power can instead be created by, for, and with those who challenge inequitable power relations by engaging in direct action tactics such as property destruction to demonstrate that the power society believes inheres in particular institutions is not infallible. Marion Crain (1992: 1820) argues that 'labor scholars have unnecessarily cabined the discussion by adopting a patriarchal vision of power as materially based, and of its exercise as synonymous with domination and control'. Anarchist-feminists challenge coercive power,

experimenting with ethical practices of creative power-sharing in the organization of work. Crain advances 'an alternative vision of power [in] woman-centered labor unions' (1821), based on 'participatory democracy, and consensus-style leadership' (1823).

Indeed, anarchist-feminists question labour practices as a set of pre-determined power relations. Catharine MacKinnon (1989: 75) argues that, 'Analyses of labor power often proceed as if labor power were produced by and for capital, yet somehow still sprang out of "nature", not out of social relations'. But there is no *a priori* organizational form for work; rather it has been organized by (straight white male) capitalists with the explicit goal of obtaining profits through exploitation, based on the conception of power-over. Crain argues that conventional union organizing today, or business unionism, has taken on a capitalist structure, as 'union structure – hierarchical, bureaucratic, formalistic – has come to mimic the structure of the large companies in opposition to which unions were formed' (Crain 1992: 1835). This failure to challenge power structures disempowers the rank and file (1835), as the 'union becomes simply one more layer in the hierarchy between the individual and the employer, rather than the collective voice of the workers' (1843). Unions can thus be seen as patriarchal structures having adopted the form of capitalism, exercising power-over in similar ways.

Crain articulates the need to engage 'an alternative feminist concept of power as energy, competence, and influence' (1824). Instead of patriarchal unions, based on a patriarchal notion of power-over, Crain argues that unions can be organized along feminist lines, conceiving of power as ability (1851), 'nurturant' (1852), and shaped by experience (1854). Similar to the *Mujeres Libres*, she argues that 'power-with' 'is primarily a capacity or a relation among people' (1851), and thus it can only be exercised through participation in communities, developing 'affiliative relationships of care' (1854). She concludes that 'a feminist theory of power rejects the understanding of power as domination, focusing instead on ability, competence, and the capacity to influence others. Power exercised in a community emanates horizontally, expanding outward in a weblike fashion' (1857). This echoing of Foucault's web of power is consistent with anarchist-feminist prefigurative organizing models.

Moreover Crain argues that 'Those who exercise power may be visualized as positioned at the center of a group, from where they are able to mobilize others' (1857–58), using stereotypically feminine strengths such as nurturing, understanding, compassion, care-giving, inspiration, and interdependence. Women in labour unions who organize according to this model describe their own interactions as 'reaching out rather than down' (1860) in a style of leadership that takes the long view and focuses on the bigger picture (1860). Citing Audre Lorde's famous supposition that 'the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house', Crain argues that people comfortable living in the 'master's house' – union leaders today – are threatened by feminist organizing tactics (1885) that reject the assumption that the house even belongs to the master. Business unionism is therefore not the strongest model of emancipation for working-class women.

Instead, an anarchist-feminist analytics of power relies on anti-heteronormative and anti-patriarchal power-sharing. Through gender, sex, and sexuality campaigns, anarchist-feminists create spaces in which cooperative horizontal power is inspired, produced, circulated, shared, and diffused in communities grounded in mutual care, compassion, survival and resilience. Permissiveness circulates, people experiment and play at deconstructing power, and potential spaces of equal power relations evolve. If

we understand that power emanates horizontally from compassionate centres of influence, how might this help us critique the state, and develop horizontal forms of governance?

The state and governance

Catharine MacKinnon asks several important questions about the relationship between women and the state:

> Is the state constructed upon the subordination of women? If so, how does male power become state power? Can such a state be made to serve the interests of those upon whose powerlessness its power is erected? … [I]s masculinity inherent in the state form as such, or is some other form of state, or some other way of governing distinguishable or imaginable?
>
> (MacKinnon 1989: 161)

Anarchist-feminists draw parallels between the masculinist authoritarianism of the state-form in the public sphere and male hegemony in the private sphere. The state, thus conceived, cannot properly be expected to serve the interests of women, as there is an inherent gendered inequality in its function and form. Indeed, 'anarchist-feminists go further than most radical feminists: they caution that the state by definition is always illegitimate' (Ehrlich 1994: 5) and that 'the very structure of a state creates inequities' (Ehrlich 1994: 5) based in gender, racism, and colonialism. Eschewing the state form, anarchist-feminists self-govern in horizontal collectives, communities, non-mixed groups, affinity groups, coalitions, and other groupings conducive to power sharing.

Anarchist-feminism, like anarchism more generally, is based on 'a commitment to abolishing, rather than capturing, the state – arguing for the state's replacement with horizontally organized trade unions, collectives, neighbourhood associations, etc.' (Shannon 2009: 61). This commitment is in contradistinction to mainstream 'feminism [which] has been caught between giving more power to the state in each attempt to claim it for women and leaving unchecked power in the society to men' (MacKinnon 1989: 161). To understand this critique, Foucault's notion of power as emanative or distributive, rather than inherently hierarchical, is helpful.

Foucault (1978: 93) argues that, 'Power is everywhere; not because it embraces everything, but because it comes from everywhere'. Power can be a strength that groups embrace, engage, encounter, disrupt, channel, absorb, refract or enact. Power can be 'exercised from innumerable points, in the interplay of non-egalitarian and mobile relations' (94). It is precisely non-egalitarian social relations that anarchist-feminists challenge, self-governing from feminist centres of influence, the innumerable points where feminists actively challenge domination. Power is thus 'everywhere' and not *a priori* hierarchical, meaning that all subjects may develop the capacity to share non-hierarchical power.

Whereas systems of domination might enable subjects to exercise power in particular ways skewed to favour the masculine, there is no assumed disempowered position for women, but rather modes of acting that can be changed and challenged by collective subjects. Within anarchist-feminism we see a call to enact power cooperatively to develop what the *Mujeres Libres* called *capacitación*. '*Capacitación* is more than

"empowerment" … The *capacitación* of women meant a process of developing the skills and confidence that would enable them to fight for their emancipation' (de Heredia 2007: 51) along three lines – gender oppression, education, and labour (51). This capacity building is crucial to the exercise of collective autonomy and collective self-empowerment in the prefigurative practice of non-state forms of organization and self-governance.

Uri Gordon, for example, develops a typology of power that considers power-over, power-to and power-with. Power-to builds on the *Mujeres Libres*' notion of *capacitación*, where women develop capacities for emancipatory self-determination and collective power. Power-with builds on the work of anarchist-feminist Starhawk (2008: 219), who argues that 'women's empowerment involves acknowledging our anger, owning our rage, allowing ourselves to be powerful and dangerous as well as accommodating and understanding'. In *Webs of Power*, an argument for rethinking power relations through feminist strategies of non-violent direct action, she suggests that we need to go beyond tactics that 'reinforce the system's focus on individuals as isolated actors' (221) to develop strategies where we ask, 'How do we collectively take power?' (221). She advocates for 'activism as empowered or empowering direct action' (231) and maps out ten principles that include using the body in taking action, solidarity and inclusivity, affective positivity found in hope and passion, intentionality of strategies and tactics, prefiguration of direct democracy in horizontal organizing forms, and the practice of direct-action empowerment as a creative expression of freedom (231–233).

Following Starhawk, the *Mujeres Libres*, and other anarchist-feminists, prefigurative politics are taken up not just in bodily autonomy movements but more generally in 'the principle that means must be consistent with ends' (de Heredia 2007: 48) whereby 'in pursuit of a non-hierarchical cooperative society' (de Heredia 2007: 48), anarchist-feminists develop alternatives to state power – in addition to confronting state power directly as it is exercised by the police, government agencies, etc. 'Anarchism ultimately does not provide a narrow path to follow but instead aspires to achieving the time when people make their own choices and work in collaboration with others' (de Heredia 2007: 48). Prefiguration combined with cooperative horizontalism and the intentional absence of a top-down or bottom-up programme reveals an interpretation of power as something that can be redistributed and shared among equals in the construction of the 'anarchist commons' (Sarrasin et al. 2012). Uri Gordon explains it thus:

> Drawing on Foucault and contemporary feminist and queer theorists, May and others argue that the unfreedom of human beings is not reducible to the presence of explicit hierarchical structures and overt coercion, but often an insidious dynamic, reproduced through performative disciplinary acts in which the protagonists may not even be conscious of their roles.
>
> (Gordon 2007: 44)

Opposed to these micro-fascisms, the goal of horizontal power-sharing, consensus decision-making, participatory direct democracy, and affinity group organizing is prefiguratively to 'cultivate the habits of freedom so that we constantly experience it in our everyday lives' (Ehrlich 1994: 5). These habits are political practices of collective organizing integrated into our everyday private and public lives, replacing the internalized

masculinist hierarchical individualist state-form with a feminist horizontal collective-self-determination form.

Anarchism's opposition to the state arguably plays out with the greatest stakes in anti-racist and anti-colonial struggles. Here we run up against the limits of the strategy of creating a new world in the shell of the old. Some racialized and/or colonized groups and individuals, locked in struggles for survival against the re-entrenchment of the neo-liberal state and its security forces in a post-9/11 world, have little freedom to experiment with new forms of self-determination. Anarchist-feminists organizing in anti-racist and anti-colonial groups and networks therefore are highly cognizant of the risk of creating informal hierarchies, as horizontal feminist power can often become re-hierarchized along lines of race and colonialism.

Race, colonialism and global anarchist-feminism

Anarchist-feminist movements are improving commitments to anti-racist and anti-colonial struggles, which have always been at the forefront of organizing by anarchist-feminists of colour but not always by white anarchists and/or feminists, who typically prioritize their own struggles. Deric Shannon (2009: 69) notes that 'a contemporary anarcha-feminism would avoid this prioritizing of struggles and recognize the deep connections between all forms of domination' by integrating 'an intersectional approach to our activist praxis'. Rogue argues that 'the multiracial feminist movement developed this approach, which argues that one cannot address the position of women without also addressing their class, race, sexuality, ability, and all other aspects of their identity and experiences' (Rogue 2012: 28). Moreover, 'This is in accordance with the anarchist view that we must fight all forms of hierarchy, oppression, and exploitation simultaneously; abolishing capitalism and the state does not ensure that white supremacy and patriarchy will somehow magically disappear' (Rogue 2012: 28). There is a connection between anti-state, anti-racist, and anti-colonial organizing in that most EuroAmerican states were founded on racism and colonialism, and thus tend to have racist and colonial policies (imprisoning refugee claimants in detention centres, subjecting indigenous children to residential schools or family removal).

This exercise of power is teleological, but when it emerges from apparatuses of capital or the state (gendered, racialized, and colonial apparatuses), it may appear more cohesive and directional than it actually is. Foucault's (1980: 94–95) fourth premise is that 'power relations are both intentional and nonsubjective … there is no power that is exercised without a series of aims and objectives'. There is a logic to the enactment of power, which may be clear, and may yet be unintelligible in its mechanisms, which it hides in order to function. Power-over hides itself; power-with reveals itself. Cognizant of this, how do we extend an intersectional anarchist-feminism?

Anti-racist anarchist-feminism

Intersectionality is a theoretical description of anti-oppression politics (Breton et al. 2012b; Jeppesen and Nazar 2012), critically analyzing interlocking systems of oppression and privilege such as race, class, and gender. Yasmin Jiwani (2006) explores the intersectional mechanisms of gendered racism in the neo-liberal context, where claims we are now in a postracist and multicultural era allow racism to be disguised as a generalized cultural relativism, demarcating who properly belongs to the nation-state,

who is violent or non-violent, and whose bodies, intellects, and spirits are then allowable targets for symbolic, physical, or sexual annihilation – both by others in society and by the state itself. This annihilation denies its sexist racism behind discourses of multicultural pluralism. The teleological nature of power, which refuses to take a non-racist society as its goal because it proclaims that such a thing already exists, masks the current lived experiences of racialized women in the West.

Given this masked racialized-gendered power-over, how do we enact power-with, organizing to transgress borders impeding the flow of particular racialized bodies, and resisting illegitimate forms of state power that have systemically dominated or excluded non-white people? State power has explicitly capitalist objectives, such as: generating unfettered profit from resource extraction ventures; maintaining a powerful police force whose illegal actions, including murder, go un-prosecuted; and developing a precarious labour force that keeps austerity wages low and racialized-gendered subjects in dependent relationships to their workplace and often straight-white-male bosses.

Foucault's final premise is 'Where there is power, there is resistance' (Foucault 1978: 95). This is because of the 'strictly relational character of power relationships' (95), wherein the power to act collectively and autonomously 'depends on a multiplicity of points of resistance … [that] are present everywhere in the power network' (95). This is how we might conceive of anti-racist anarchist-feminist organizing from an intersectional analytics of power. An anti-statist analytics of power, for example, is enacted in groups such as No One Is Illegal (NOII) and Solidarity Across Borders (SAB), where activists oppose the legitimacy of borders, developing campaigns for 'Solidarity cities', campaigning for immigrants, regardless of status, to have access to free health care, education, and other social benefits. Moreover, they insist that the Canadian Border Services Agency (CBSA) 'should not have any right to enter and arrest migrants in hospitals, clinics, shelters, schools, or any space providing essential services' (SAB 2013). They link race to labour, demanding that 'labour and other human rights standards are applied equally to all, without regard to immigration status' (SAB 2013). While SAB is not an anarchist group, it has anarchist and anarchist-feminist organizers; it emphasizes the illegitimacy of the state, borders, and specifically the CBSA. Moreover, some of the Solidarity City signatories are anarchist-feminist groups, such as La Belle Époque, or have anarchist-feminists within them, such as the Convergence des luttes anti-capitalistes (CLAC), which has an anarchist-feminist caucus; the Coalition Opposing Police Brutality (COPB); *homoparentales*; and the Southwest Solidarity Network. The signatory groups, working on issues as diverse as anti-capitalism, police brutality and impunity, same-sex parenting, insurrectionary anarchism, and housing rights, demonstrate an intersectional analysis active within anti-racist anarchist-feminism.

Everyday refusals are examples of struggles against micro-fascisms, where everyone who works in 'the system' – from police to social service providers – knows the rules, which are there to protect people, but contrarily implements an internalized micro-fascist (racialized-gendered) process that contravenes the rights and dignity of individuals. When subjects can resist this teleological power, in these micro moments they are enacting a power-with (with their communities, with other immigrants, with anti-racist activists, with anarchist-feminists, etc.) and simultaneously challenging the stronghold of imperialist, colonial borders. In a series of coordinated micro-direct-actions anarchist-feminist anti-racist politics operate on two levels – the enactment of power from multiple sites of resistance, and an anti-state, anti-capitalist refusal to respect borders and their racialized-gendered restrictions.

Anti-colonialism and anarchaindigenism

Anarchist-feminists theorize decolonization, and support indigenous self-determination movements in 'anarchoindigenist solidarity activism' (Lagalisse 2011: 653). This takes place in the context of poststructuralist feminist critiques of an uncritical 'sisterhood' (women are essentially the same, sharing the experience of being a woman). Linda Tuhiwai Smith ([1999] 2006: 73) suggests that 'Third World women and women of colour also attacked this assumption because it denied the impact of imperialisms, racism and local histories on women, who were different from white women who lived in First World nations'. Anti-imperialist, anti-colonial feminist movements must account for many different perspectives, from Western individualist ideologies that render indigenous collectivities invisible to important distinctions in discourse that reject the notion of an 'authentic' indigenous experience (73–74). How do non-indigenous people participate in solidarity without re-colonizing movements by re-enacting inherited colonialist cognitive, decision-making, and action frameworks?

Colonization has long produced colonial frameworks that privilege pre-existing knowledge structures, using them to document, analyze, and judge indigenous cultures. Colonizers enact power-over to define those colonized through purportedly scientific research. For Tuhiwai Smith, however, the scientific and popular representations (in newspapers, books, and films) of the colonial Other appear indistinguishable and equally inaccurate. Whereas Westerners describe colonization as a process of contact, decline, acculturation, assimilation, and hybridity, indigenous people describe the same process as invasion, destruction and genocide, resistance, survival, and recovery as indigenous peoples (Tuhiwai Smith [1999] 2006: 88). This latter narrative re-centres indigenous peoples as documenters and researchers producing knowledge. Anti-colonial anarchist-feminist solidarity activists are therefore attentive to learning about existing situations from indigenous perspectives and following the leadership of indigenous women, rather than arriving at solidarity actions with cultural assumptions and movement prescriptions.

Anarchaindigenism is gaining traction among anarchists (Lagalisse 2011: 653). Lagalisse details a case where Montreal anarchist indigenous solidarity activists invited an indigenous man and woman from Oaxaca, Mexico, Magdalena and Juan, on a speaking tour. Magdalena, a public health nurse, was active in resisting forced sterilization of indigenous women under colonial government programmes. She spoke of her work in spiritual terms, using narratives that had deeper resonance, particularly when speaking to the indigenous communities of Kahnawake, Six Nations, and Kanehsatake (659). However, the white activists privileged Juan's more masculine, Western mode of speaking:

> Juan spoke of union movements … and the state repression of his people. He spoke in the third person, assuming the voice of a generalized, objective 'other.' Magdalena spoke in the first person, about specific people who were tortured and what they told her afterward. She told stories about her experience as a community health worker (*promotora*) and described how government representatives tried to persuade her to promote sterilization among indigenous women across the region. Magdalena also spoke of the need to maintain harmonious ways of life among the communities (*pueblos*) and the need to respect all of Creation, land, water, and peoples. … The anarchist translators largely omitted these references and summed

> up her narratives rather than offering the word-for-word translation they granted Juan's discourse.
>
> (Lagalisse 2011: 659)

Lagalisse is critical of the failure of the male anarchists to take Magdalena's spiritual propositions for sustainable lifestyles seriously, an example of sexist re-colonization. Some anarchist-feminists attempted to challenge this, but to little effect. One male apparently said '"F—k Jesus anyway, we're not here to talk about religion, what's important is the struggle!"' (660), imposing a EuroAmerican atheist cognitive framework. Moreover, the male anarchists argued that Juan had '"more of an analysis, he [was] more articulate, educated, and he'[d] had more experience in politics and the union movements"' (661). Union organizing, a shared form of radicalism in the global north and south, was privileged over anti-sterilization movements, particular to indigenous women in the global south. Moreover, Magdalena's organizing is not seen as 'experience in politics', as the affective, gendered labour of women organizers has historically been dismissed by male anarchists. In these examples, Lagalisse also draws attention to the gendering of spirituality as feminine (661–662), and rational secular atheism as masculine, thereby dismissing the former as not properly anarchist and insisting on the circulation of information consistent with what the white male anarchists already knew.

This example points to deeper issues in indigenous solidarity activism. The teleological power of Western colonialism is evident in the male anarchist privileging of Juan, their failure to translate Magdalena's stories, and their dismissal of her work as apolitical. The female anarchists in the group, who saw her struggles as liberation struggles, attempted to decolonize the process of evaluating the speeches, and to demonstrate the power-with or non-hierarchical power processes of harmonization in the community that Magdalena was espousing as important new knowledge.

The commitments of the Oaxacan people as represented by Magdalena, and of anarchist-feminists as represented by women in the collective which organized the tour, are emblematic of the distributive nature of power, the fact that resistance is everywhere, including in struggles against micro-fascisms within our own collectives. If white Western anarchists cannot understand the discourse of an indigenous woman as explicitly anti-colonial, then it will continue to be challenging for anarchists to participate in indigenous solidarity activism where power, respect, and dignity are shared equally. Moreover, this is an example of the development of informal elites in non-hierarchical organizing. The male organizers of the tour, with Juan's complicity, gradually removed Magdalena from the feminist centre of influence she occupies in her own community, putting themselves in her place, and forcing her to the outside of the circle where she was unable to speak or exercise self-determined horizontal power.

Global anarchist-feminisms

Racism and colonialism can also appear in the neglect of non-Western anarchist-feminist histories, of which there are many, historical and contemporary, four of which we will analyze here. Two key issues arise. Firstly, we must consider the specificity of different political contexts in which anarchist-feminism develops. We will analyze the revolution in China, the anti-Franco war in Spain, immigrant uprisings in Argentina, and the Arab Spring in Egypt. The generation of revolutionary geopolitical events in

different global cultural contexts will be analyzed. Second is the search for commonalities, as anarchists believe we cannot be liberated until everyone in society is liberated; therefore a strong cross-cultural understanding must be developed in an anarchist-feminist analytics of power that engenders solidarity through creating power-with global struggles.

As early as the nineteenth century, non-Western anarchist-feminists were active in organizing and publishing. In Argentina a newspaper called *La Voz de la Mujer* was published from 1896–97, 'written by women for women, … an independent expression of an explicitly feminist current within the continent's labour movement' (Molyneux 1986: 119). Molyneux situates the anarchist movement in Argentina in the context of a mass migration from Europe to Argentina of working-class men and women, among whom were notable anarchists. The men supported gender equality on paper but less so in organizing: 'The first issue of *La Voz de la Mujer* seems to have aroused considerable hostility' (Molyneux 1986: 127) in the form of anti-feminist attacks rebutted in subsequent issues by writers insisting they were not attacking good pro-feminist anarchists but rather 'false Anarchists' (128) who did not support the emancipation of women, key to the anarchist project. Like feminist-anarchists in other global locations, they opposed 'coercion implied by the marriage contract' (132) at a time when divorce was still illegal in Argentina, and they advocated 'free love … through social revolution' (132), arguing for the 'benefits of multiple relationships' (132), and organizing and living in 'free-love communes that had come into existence among the immigrant communities in some Latin American countries' (133).

In addition to bodily autonomy, they struggled against poverty, the church, and domestic slavery, and recommended militant tactics. *Voz* writers noted that having too many children could increase a working-class woman's poverty, but she would nonetheless have strong maternal bonds (133). They denounced the church (136), the labeling of children as illegitimate (135), and women suffering the label of 'damaged reputation' (135). '[E]ditors called for an end to unequal and restricted opportunities for women, discrimination against women at work, domestic slavery, unequal access to education, and men's uncontrolled sexual demands'(141), while also advocating the use of direct action such as 'smash[ing] the machinery' of workplaces (141), focusing predominantly on struggles of working-class women.

Around the same time period in China, as the revolution was growing, anarchist women were also organizing against traditional roles. Radical feminist Jin Yi condemned foot-binding and superficial concerns with appearance, and simultaneously 'demanded a recognition of women's rights to education, business, property, free marriage, and friendship and to become politically involved' (Zarrow 1988: 798), a mixture of anarchist-feminism (free love and intimacies) and state-capitalist feminism (business, property, governance). While economic, familial, and political autonomy were considered key to feminist liberation, anarchist-feminist He Zhen did not tie these to the state but rather 'stressed the centrality of women's liberation in any true revolution' (799) and moreover, joined the predominantly anarchist 'left-wing caucus within the Chinese revolutionary movement' (800) in 'call[ing] for an absolute end to hierarchical social systems' (800). In the state-like, patriarchal family in China, women suffered triple oppression (dominated by father, husband, and sons), as well as subjugation to the mother-in-law, and coerced participation in patriarchal polygamy or the concubine system.

With other anarchist-feminists, He Zhen organized a group called 'The Women's Rights Recovery Association' which opposed capitalism, the ruling elite, and society's hierarchical organization. Their by-laws 'prohibited supporting governments, acting in subservience to men, and becoming a concubine or second wife' (800). She also argued for forefront organizing, as she 'expected women to free themselves; no one would give them their rights' (800). Moreover she drew connections between patriarchy and economics: 'male dominance operated through the unequal distribution of wealth, which led to relationships of dependent and master' (801), arguing for a deeper analysis 'of the relationship between gender and class' (802) as well as sexuality (805). 'He Zhen said, men had thought of women as private property that must be prohibited from loving other men and had established a political system and moral teachings' (805) to institutionalize these social norms.

Although she did in fact marry, 'He Zhen believed', like many anarchist-feminists globally who were her contemporaries, 'that a truly liberated woman would be free to have many lovers' (806). Unlike her contemporaries in the USA and Europe, however, she believed that raising children placed an unfair duty on women, and 'that freeing women from the burden of raising their children was one of the key elements in achieving equality' (806). She proposed children be raised in collective nurseries, thus moving beyond the stereotype of women as nurturers, earth mothers, and 'mothers of the nation', to argue that child care is not a women's issue, but an issue for all of society. She argued that in a liberated society 'the family as an institution marked by biological reproduction, the strict sexual division of labor, and continuation of the family line would no longer exist' (806), proposing an anarchist-feminist model of social transformation that eradicated patriarchal familial and sexual dominance, gendered economic divisions, and the male-dominated state. 'The anarcho-feminist understanding that structural social change was needed was widely accepted after the 1911 revolution' (810); moreover, Zarrow argues, the 'powerful and affecting prose that He Zhen was capable of producing stands as one of the significant achievements of Chinese feminism before the 1911 Revolution' (811).

Several decades later, also challenging the very basis of society, anarchist-feminists in Spain started organizing during the Spanish Civil War (1936–39), forming the *Mujeres Libres*, discussed earlier, emphasizing a politics of capacity building (Ackelsberg 2005). Marta Iñiguez de Heredia provides an insider genealogy of the contemporary *Mujeres Libres*. When the anarchists were defeated, the *Mujeres Libres* went underground only to re-emerge in the 1960s, participating in 'the anti-war and anti-colonial movements' (de Heredia 2007: 52) of the day, and 'advocating gender equality and sexual liberation' (52). The group is currently experiencing a resurgence in Global Justice Movement (GJM) and its anti-austerity protests. They argue that some forms of power are legitimate (e.g., people power) and others are illegitimate (e.g., state power), providing a complex analytics of power that extends intersectionality and resistance theory beyond race, class, and gender to include the environment and inter-generational knowledge. Moreover, de Heredia articulates the anarchist-feminist concept of solidarity organizing across difference, developing shared frameworks beyond identity.

More recently, following the uprisings in Egypt and the appearance of an anarchist black bloc at the Tahrir Square protests, some debate over substance and style of protests has arisen, critiquing the colonizing impulse of Western anarchists who presume that anarchism is Western and male-dominated. In an article on de-colonizing anarchism, Budour Hassan (2013) argues that 'skimming through the US anarchist

blogosphere during that period would have given one the impression that the Black Bloc was Egypt's first-ever encounter with anarchism and anti-authoritarianism'. The author argues that American anarchists and Islamists alike reacted in particular but opposing ways due to the black bloc actions and outfits, the former uncritically celebrating the tactic, and the latter denouncing them 'merely because they looked like Westerners' (Hassan 2013). Hassan provides a brief but important history of anarchist organizing in Egypt to dispel the myth that anarchism is new there, arguing that this 'is but one example of how "white anarchism" has yet to break away from orientalist prejudices that plague the Western left'. He shows how women organizers against the Israeli occupation have demonstrated more militant leadership than the 'patriarchal political "leaders" with masculine energy' who, afraid of reprisals from the Israeli police, attempted to disperse a particular protest while the women held strong. He explicitly challenges the framing of non-Western women in anti-colonial struggles as powerless or voiceless, demonstrating their power-with each other to organize and lead at the forefront of their own struggles.

This article generated a great deal of online debate, particularly regarding the characterization of the anarchist movement as 'white anarchism' which is an essentialist notion of anarchism that not only denies the widespread existence of non-white people organizing as anarchists, but also erases the anti-racism of the global anarchist movement. At the same time, a movement may be committed to anti-racism but not effectively practise it; therefore we must recognize the depth and importance of feminist anti-racist, anti-colonial organizing.

Forms of power-with promoted by indigenous feminists and non-Western anarchist-feminists challenge EuroAmerican solidarity activists to exercise horizontal forms of organizing, not just internally in local feminist collectives, but also in relation to collectivities outside of our experience, in the growing emphasis on *glocalization* – acting locally in solidarity with global struggles (Juris 2005: 191).

Conclusion: Beyond an anarchist-feminist analytics of power

We will conclude with three findings. First, what comes into focus is a deep-seated historical and contemporary image of an overwhelming majority of anarchist men who seem to have had profound difficulty in understanding and actively prioritizing struggles against gender oppression. De Heredia (2007: 48) has observed that, 'while gender norms have been challenged, they have not been eliminated. Despite political development, within the anarchist movement people tend to replicate the same behaviours that a broader society imposes on us'. Similarly, Lagalisse has found that 'anarchists' lack of engagement with gendered power within activist collectives and the gendered aspect of neoliberal political economy' (Lagalisse 2011, 653) points to a failure to address gender in internal and external struggles. While de Heredia (2007: 49) characterizes the problem as a 'male dominated anarchist movement', the CRAC has found that the anti-authoritarian movement in Montreal has many key organizers who are women and/or queer and/or trans and/or of colour, who make important contributions in shaping the direction, actions, and analysis within the anarchist movement (Breton et al. 2012b, Eslami and Maynard 2013), despite encountering racialized, gendered, and heteronormative dynamics.

Some important changes are evidenced in a small but crucial trend toward 'men against patriarchy' groups, men taking the role of pro-feminist allies, and some male

theorists taking up questions of anarchist-feminism. Nonetheless, the challenge of unlearning oppressive behaviours remains a daunting task for the anarchist movement.

Second is the irrefutable conclusion that an incredible number of anarchist women globally have struggled in a dizzying array of activist, theoretical, ideological, poetic, artistic, sexual, bodily, conceptual, educational, relational, research, organizing, communal, everyday life, and other forms of resistance, confirming that where there is power there is resistance, and perhaps the corollary – where there is resistance, there is power. For these expressions of anarchist-feminism are exercises in the expression of power, of the *Mujeres Libres* notion of *capacitación*. As Margaret Marsh (1978: 539) has found, those anarchist-feminists 'who were lifetime activists, or who adopted the ideology as mature adults, appear to have developed an intellectual framework which emphasized the interrelationships of anarchist theory, the psychological needs of individuals, and a sense of social responsibility'.

Third, intersectionality theory, which provides an excellent theoretical framework for understanding interlocking oppressions based on race, class, gender, or sexual identities, has its limits. As Heckert (2004: 105) argues, 'Identity provides a problematic starting point for any form of political movement', partially because 'identities develop from social movements rather than the other way around' (105). Often identities develop in opposition to institutions, such as punitive state border policies that create racialized or non-status immigrants, or LGBTQ identities 'defined in opposition to institutionalized heterosexuality' (105). Intersectionality runs up against its limits, therefore, in its assumption of pre-existing axes of identity, on the one hand, and on the other hand, its inability to include forms of oppression which may intersect with socially constructed identities but are not themselves identity-based oppressions. Police brutality, for example, is not an identity but rather an axis of analysis that implicates racialized groups, sex workers, trans people, people with mental health struggles, and others. Similarly, ecology is not an identity, but it is an increasingly important axis of exploitation that is intersectional to capital, sexuality, race, colonialism, and the state (Heckert 2004; Shannon 2009; Jeppesen 2012). Green anarchist-feminists have developed complex analyses of power and practices of disruption, from climate camps to earth liberation and animal liberation direct actions. Intersectionality theory must therefore extend its premises or be superseded by an analytics of power that can better account for these axes of domination.

Finally, many spaces of action and theory have been left out here. These include a deeper consideration of diverse sexualities; an emphasis on art, DIY projects, and media; autonomous spaces; and global connections among anarchist-feminist movements, theories and practices. We can only hope that these directions of research and activism will engage with this tentative dialogue and/or make useful departures from it. If each person's liberation depends on the liberation of all others, then anarchist-feminist theories of power might help us better understand the multiplicity of anarchist struggles we are engaged in today as a broad-based global movement.

Notes

1 De Heredia (2007, 45) explains, 'in the context of anarchism, gender mainstreaming means to make the fight against gender oppression, to go hand in hand with the struggle against capitalism and the state'.

2 Cf. RAG on pro-feminist solidarity: 'feminism has led to a growing consciousness of male oppression under patriarchy, such as strict adherence to masculine gender roles, duty to "provide" in the realm of work and lack of equal rights to active parenthood. Male oppression

has been misconstrued as either a product of the feminist movement, or an oversight of it. Yet it is often through feminist dialogue that a space has opened up for discussing these aspects of men's lives and experiences. Pro-feminist solidarity between men and women can make meaningful inroads into these issues' (RAG n.d.).

References

Ackelsburg, M.A. (1991) *Free Women of Spain: Anarchism and the Struggle for the Emancipation of Women*, Bloomington: University of Indiana.

Ackelsberg, M.A. (2005) *Free Women of Spain: Anarchism and the Struggle for the Emancipation of Women*, Oakland: AK Press.

Breton, É., Jeppesen, S., Kruzynski, A. and Sarrasin, R. (Research Group on Collective Autonomy) (2012a) 'Prefigurative Self-Governance and Self-Organization: The Influence of Anti-authoritarian (Pro)Feminist, Radical Queer and Antiracist Networks in Quebec', in A. Choudry, J. Hanley, and E. Shraffe (eds.) *Organize! Building from the Local for Global Justice*, Oakland: PM Press, pp. 156–173.

Breton, É., Jeppesen, S., Kruzynski, A. and Sarrasin, R. (Research Group on Collective Autonomy) (2012b) 'Feminisms at the Heart of Contemporary Anarchism in Quebec: Grass-roots Practices of Intersectionality', *Canadian Woman Studies*, 29(3): 147–159.

Brown, S. (1988) 'Feminism, International Theory, and International Relations of Gender Inequality', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 17(3): 461–475.

Brown, S. (1993) *The Politics of Individualism: Liberalism, Liberal Feminism and Anarchism*, Montreal: Black Rose.

Crain, M. (1992), 'Feminism, Labor, and Power', *Southern California Law Review*, 65(4): 1819–1886.

Crenshaw, K. (1989) 'Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics', *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 1(8): 139–167.

de Heredia, Iniguez M. (2007) 'History and Actuality of Anarcha-feminism: Lessons from Spain', *Lilith: A Feminist History Journal*, 16: 42–56.

Ehrlich, H.J. (1994) 'Toward a General Theory of Anarchafeminism', *Social Anarchism*, 19: 44–50.

Eschle, C. (2001) *Global Democracy, Social Movements, and Feminism*, Boulder CO: Westview Press.

Eslami, S. and R. Maynard (2013) 'Antiracist and Anticolonial Antiauthoritarian Networks in Montreal', in R. Bellemare-Caron, E. Breton, M.-A. Cyr, F. Dupuis-Déri and A. Kruzynski (eds.) *Nous sommes ingouvernables. Les anarchistes au Québec aujourd'hui*, Montréal: Lux, pp. 203–224.

Farrow, L. (1974) 'Feminism as Anarchism', http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library.

Foucault, M. (1978) *The History of Sexuality: Volume 1, An Introduction*, New York: Random House.

Foucault, M. (1980) *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*, New York: Vintage.

Godwin, W. (1793) *An Enquiry Concerning Political Justice*, London: Robinson.

Gordon, U. (2007) 'Anarchism reloaded', *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 12(1): 29–48.

Hassan, B. (2013) 'The Colour Brown: De-colonising Anarchism and Challenging White Hegemony', Random Shelling, http://budourhassan.wordpress.com/2013/07/24/the-colour-brown-de-colonising-anarchism-and-challenging-white-hegemony/.

Heckert, J. (2004) 'Sexuality/Identity/Politics', in J. Purkis and J. Bowen (eds.) *Changing Anarchism*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp. 101–116.

Heckert, J. (2012) 'Anarchy without Opposition', in C.B. Daring, J. Rogue, D. Shannon and A. Volcano (eds.) *Queering Anarchism*, Oakland: AK Press, pp. 63–75.

Hogan, D. (2004) 'Anarcha-feminism: Thinking about Anarchism', Workers Solidarity, http://struggle.ws/wsm.women.html, accessed 4 August 2013.

Iannello, K. (1992) *Decisions without Hierarchy: Feminist Interventions in Organization Theory and Practice*, New York: Routledge.

Jaggar, A.M. (1983) *Feminist Politics and Human Nature*, New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

Jeppesen, S. (2012) 'DIY Zines and Direct-Action Activism', in K. Kozolanka, P. Mazepa and D. Skinner (eds.) *Alternative Media in Canada: Policy, Politics and Process*, Vancouver: UBC Press, pp. 264–281.

Jeppesen, S. and H. Nazar (2012), 'Genders and Sexualities in Anarchist Movements', in R. Kinna (ed.) *The Continuum Companion to Anarchism*, London: Continuum, pp. 162–191.

Jiwani, Y. (2006.) *Discourses of Denial: Mediations of Race, Gender, and Violence*, Vancouver: UBC Press.

Juris, J. S. (2005), 'The New Digital Media and Activist Networking within Anti-Corporate Globalization Movements', *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 597: 189–208.

Kramarae, C. and Spender, D. (eds) (2001) *Routledge International Encyclopedia of Women: Global Women's Issues and Knowledge, Volume 1 Ability-Education: Globalization* [online], London: Taylor & Francis, (accessed 16 July 2013).

Lagalisse, E.M. (2011) '"Marginalizing Magdalena": Intersections of Gender and the Secular in Anarchoindigenist Solidarity Activism', *Signs* 36(3): 653–678.

Liesegang, J. (2012) 'Tyranny of the State and Trans Liberation', in C.B. Daring, J. Rogue, D. Shannon, and A. Volcano (eds.) (2012) *Queering Anarchism*, Oakland: AK Press, pp. 87–99.

Luna, Z., 2009, 'From Rights to Justice: Women of Color Changing the Face of US Reproductive Rights Organizing', *Societies Without Borders*, 4(3): 343–365.

MacKinnon, C. (1989) *Toward a Feminist Theory of the State*, Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Marsh, M.S. (1978) 'The Anarchist-Feminist Response to the "Woman Question" in Late Nineteenth-Century America', *American Quarterly*, 30(4): 533–547.

May, T. (1994) *The Political Philosophy of Poststructuralist Anarchism*, Pittsburgh: Penn State Press.

Molyneux, M. (1986) 'No God, No Boss, No Husband: Anarchist-feminism in Nineteenth-Century Argentina', *Latin American Perspectives*, 13(1): 119–145.

Newman, S. (2001) *From Bakunin to Lacan*, Lanham MD: Lexington.

Newman, S. (2010) *The Politics of Postanarchism*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Presley, S. (2005), 'The Exquisite Rebel: The Anarchist Life of Voltairine de Cleyre', in V. de Cleyre, *Exquisite Rebel: The Essays of Voltairine de Cleyre-Anarchist, Feminist, Genius*, Albany: SUNY Press, pp. 17–27.

RAG (n.d.) ragdublin.blogspot.ca (Accessed, 4 August 2013).

Reichert, W. (1976) *Partisans of Freedom: A Study in American Anarchism*, Bowling Green: Bowling Green University Popular Press.

Rogue, J. (2012), 'De-essentializing Anarchist-feminism: Lessons from the Transfeminist Movement', in C.B. Daring, J. Rogue, D. Shannon and A. Volcano (eds.) *Queering Anarchism*, Oakland: AK Press, pp. 25–32.

Sarrasin, R., Kruzynski, A., Jeppesen, S. and Breton, E. (Collectif de recherche sur l'Autonomie Collective) (2012) 'Radicaliser l'action collective: portrait de l'option libertaire au Québec', *Lien social et politiques*, 68 (Fall): 141–166.

Shannon, D. (2009) 'Articulating a Contemporary Anarcha-Feminism', *Theory in Action*, 2(3): 58–74.

Solidarity Across Borders (SAB) (2013) Solidarity City Declaration. solidarityacrossborders.org/en/solidarity-city/solidarity-city-declaration (accessed 31 July 2013).

Starhawk (2008) *Webs of Power*, Gabriola Island: New Society Publishers.

Wollstonecraft, M. (1792) *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, London: Unwin.

Tuhiwai Smith, L. ([1999] 2006) *Decolonizing Methodologies*, New York: Zed Books.

Zarrow, P. (1988) 'He Zhen and Anarcho-Feminism in China', *The Journal of Asian Studies* 47(4): 796–813.