Sheffield Hallam University

Exchange beyond the market

WHITE, Richard <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4756-4965> and WILLIAMS, Colin

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

https://shura.shu.ac.uk/25072/

This document is the Accepted Version [AM]

Citation:

WHITE, Richard and WILLIAMS, Colin (2020). Exchange beyond the market. In: PARKER, Martin, SWANN, Thomas and STOBOROD, Konstantin, (eds.) Anarchism, Organization and Management. Critical Perspectives for students. Abingdon, Routledge, 224-237. [Book Section]

Copyright and re-use policy

See http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html

Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive
http://shura.shu.ac.uk

17. Exchange beyond the market

Richard J. White and Colin C. Williams

Everything that standard management and business textbooks talk about - production, buying, selling, workplace, motivation, structuring your business - takes place strictly in the context of the market. Businesses are established, people are hired, services and goods are sold and then the money is counted. This is a very simplified sequence of activities, but that is largely what would be covered in most management courses. However, even in the most money-driven settings there are many activities that take place and are not reducible to money. Think of when people work overtime just because of a sense of duty or care, give advice without asking anything in return, or break the rules in order to help a customer. What is common to all these examples is that they might generate value, but they are not motivated by the generation of value (see chapter ten). In fact, caring for others, voluntary work and gift giving happen all around us and are at the centre of everyday life. It should not surprise us then that they happen in for-profit organisations too, as ordinary people ignore money and act, either individually or in groups, in ways that support each other. In this chapter, we will discuss how a lot of everyday economic life is practically anarchist, or rather, that we very often live like anarchists, even if we are encouraged not to.

This chapter will:

- introduce and discuss the idea of *homo economicus* and the forms of organisation and exchange it entails;
- suggest that this view of human beings and human society is not natural but constructed to reinforce certain economic arrangements;
- point towards anarchist values of fairness, cooperation and mutual aid that better reflect how people organise their daily lives; and
- highlight examples of these anarchist values in practice in everyday life, with a focus on our home lives, our commutes and our lives at university.

A trap of Homoeconomicus

Pick up most management text books published in the last forty years, and you will find *Homo economicus*. A specific type of *Homo sapiens* (human being; from the latin *homo* (human) and *sapiens* (wise)), *Homo economicus* is the embodiment of a supposedly rational version of human nature, describing the dominant motivations, perceptions and values of the human condition. For example, in their natural setting, *Homo economicus* acts apolitically and competitively, driven by the overriding need to "maximize [their] own well-being" (Nyborg, 2000, 306). In their relation to others, and to society, they act out of self-interest in pursuit of tangible goals, and care about other people “only insofar as they affect [their] final consumption of wealth" (Gintis, 2000, 312). In business schools, students are often encouraged to apply this common-sense reading of the nature of human beings in order to understand the appropriate organisational principles that emerge from it.

However, what if we were to personalise this question of human nature, and think about our own sense of values, motivations, perceptions and experiences that inform how we treat others in a given situation, with those of the *homo economicus*? Many of us would probably distance ourselves from such a construct, finding the 'common sense' rhetoric about human nature which informs our management textbooks impossible to identify *ourselves* with[1]. This then raises the question: what "is" human nature? The core aim of this chapter is to try to show how problematic this question is and offer instead an argument to say that whatever human nature may or may not be, homo sapiens are fundamentally *social* animals. Demonstrated through our relationships with others, and reinforced by the motivations that underpin these relations (sociability, mutual aid, cooperation and so on), we argue that these actions are highly consistent with anarchism, and can be found in anarchist forms of organisation (see also chapter three). The chapter asks that you adopt what Scott (2012, xii) would describe as an ‘anarchist squint' with which to see and understand yourself and the world around you. In doing so, as well as challenging our own understanding of what anarchism is and what anarchists do, it "…will also become apparent that anarchist principles are active in the aspirations and political action of people who have never heard of anarchism or anarchist philosophy."

[1] The paper, Are You An Anarchist? The Answer May Surprise You! (2000) by the anthropologist and anarchist activist, David Graeber has been influential in how this chapter has been structured and organised. There - and here - the reader is invited to pay close and careful attention to how they would respond to a number of 'everyday' scenarios or questions, and why they would choose to act or organise themselves in this way.

Thinking and acting like an anarchist at this time of huge crises has practical consequences. There are many persuasive reasons to believe that we currently live in "an age that is desperately in need of [...] alternatives to the stasis of hierarchical social relations [which can be found through] mutual aid, voluntary association, direct, horizontality, and self-management." (Springer et al, 2016, 1). If this is the case, then recognising how we often act and think like anarchists through the everyday examples focused on in this chapter, might encourage us to consciously *see* the world more fully "as an anarchist". Furthermore, the challenge as to how to apply this new anarchist imaginary in our everyday world, in ways which encourage us to engage and organise *differently with others*, perhaps even in ways that will help inspire a "spirit of revolt" (Souza et al. 2016, 16) is something to reflect on long after this chapter - and this book - has been read.

The rest of our chapter is divided into three parts. The question of what it might mean to act or think 'like an anarchist'?" will be the focus of the next section. Then to illustrate the discussion at hand and help you to relate to it, the main body focuses attention toward anarchist forms of motivation and organisation with reference to: (1) your home/place of residence; (2) your community and; (3) the university campus. The final section of the chapter will encourage you to act more purposefully in ways to make both ourselves - and others more generally - aware of the centrality of anarchist practice in everyday life and society and the opportunity that this brings.

Thinking and Acting Like An Anarchist

David Graeber argues that "Anarchists are simply people who are capable of behaving in a reasonable fashion without having to be forced to. It is really a very simple notion " (2000, n.p.). Rejecting the common sense that caricatures anarchism in a wholly negative light, and demonises anarchists as perpetrators of reckless violence, who desire the destruction of 'civilised' values, it may be of surprise (and relief) to note that two key concepts lie are at the heart of anarchism and anarchist practice: freedom and autonomy.

In many ways the relationship between the two is deeply entwined. Crucially, anarchism anchors the location of freedom and autonomy within the individual, from which it then

radiates outwards across society. In other words, neither freedom nor autonomy are 'things' that can be externally granted to individuals by "starting from the State and working downwards." (Christopher et al., 1995, 83). Thinking about freedom quickly brings into focus questions of power, and inevitably the **intersectional** nature of oppression, exploitation, subjugation, violence and the multiple sources (and sites) where these occur (see box in chapter five). In this way the idea of (individual) autonomy becomes a central point of concern. Paul Goodman, for example (2011, 32) suggests that:

> "To me, the chief principle of anarchism is not freedom but autonomy. Since to initiate, and do it my way, and be an artist with concrete matter, is the kind of experience I like, I am restive about being given orders by external authorities, who don't concretely know the problem of the available means. Mostly, behaviour is more graceful, forceful, and discriminating without the intervention of top-down authorities, whether State, collective, democracy, corporate bureaucracy, prison wardens, deans, pre-arranged curricula, or central planning."

Anarchism in this context is defined in opposition, or in contrast to, other forms of organising. To use Colin Ward's framing (1982, 14) anarchism "is a description of a mode of human experience of everyday life, which operates side-by-side with, and in spite of, the dominant authoritarian trends of our society." Drawing attention toward anarchism in the context of everyday life is important in emphasising the social embeddedness of the individual. For the most part, anarchists make no overt statements about human nature. Instead they will emphasise how and why people engage with others in the way they do, and this goes a long way to understanding who and what we are. As geographer Simon Springer (2016, 132) concluded: "… after spending the last few years reading anarchist philosophy, I now realize I was born an anarchist. In fact we all were."

Avoiding claims about 'the human condition' (whether people are born good or evil, for example) many anarchists would be confident in arguing the case that humans are *social* animals. People have a fundamental desire and need to engage with others. As Cornelius Castoriadis (1922-1997) - a political philosopher, and a highly influential figure across academic and activist communities - argued: "People can exist only within society and through society" (2010, 45). In this way Ward (1982) suggests, we might understand anarchists to be "people who make a social and political philosophy out of the natural and

spontaneous tendency of human to associate together for their mutual benefit". Here, the emphasis on engaging on grounds of 'mutual' benefit is a critical one. The famous anarchist philosopher Peter Kropotkin (1901/1998, 180) emphasised that a tendency toward mutual aid is “deeply interwoven with all the past evolution of the human race". It is a direct rebuttal to the idea that human beings are motivated first and foremost by self-interest or self-gain, are asocial beings, competitive rather than cooperative, and so on. Understanding human nature as being inherently social - and co-operative - is central to how many assertions about how society - an anarchist society - should be organised.

BOX
MUTUAL-AID
Mutual-aid is one of the cornerstone concepts of anarchist political philosophy and its associated practices. It was fully developed by Peter **Kropotkin** (see box in chapter three) in his book *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution* and explored mutually-beneficial cooperation and reciprocity. He emphasised the principles of mutual-aid against social Darwinists, who insisted that competition was the main factor of survival of the fittest individual species. While recognising the presence of competitive struggle in the animal kingdom, he insisted that tcooperative behaviour was downplayed, yet was crucial for collective survival of species in harsh environments. After all, if cooperation facilitates individual survival then it is encouraged by natural selection. This finds confirmation with the views of contemporary biology, and as such is not just a well-meaning political idea. Principles of mutual-aid are at the heart of such organisations as trade unions, **cooperatives** (see box in chapter eight) and social movements and also, as this chapter demonstrates, are pervasive in just our everyday lives.
END BOX

An explicit focus of attention for anarchists is to explore anarchism in everyday life though exploring the relationships, forms of organisation and modes of exchange which seem to work best for most people in practical terms. By situating a radical politics in everyday life, anarchists resist and reject any tendency for ready-made, narrow blueprints or appeals to a utopia that individuals and society should dogmatically adhere to.

> "We anarchists do not want to emancipate the people; we want the people to emancipate themselves. We do not believe in the good that comes from above and

imposed by force; we want the new way of life to emerge from the body of the people and correspond to the state of their development and advance as they advance. It matters to us therefore that all interests and opinion should find their expression in a conscious organisation and should influence communal life in proportions to their importance.' (Malatesta, 1965, 90)

This means rejecting the idea that blueprints or absolute schemes should be used to inform and determine a political programme of change in society. Indeed, for Rudolf Rocker (1938), to seek to do so was not just evil, but: "The *greatest* evil of any form of power is just that it always tries to force other rich diversity of social life into definite forms and adjust it to particular norms."

So political 'revolution', from an anarchist perspective, is imagined as an ongoing, self-determined process, which is embodied in Castoriadis's understanding of autonomist society:

> "I first used the concept of autonomy, extended to society, in the sense of "collective management". I have now been left to give it a more radical content that is no longer collective management (self-management), but the *ongoing, explicit self-institution* of society, meaning a state in which the community knows that its institutions are its own creation and has been able to regard them as such, to re-examine them and transform them. If you accept that idea, it defines a unified revolutionary project." (2010, 41)

At a time of prolonged economic, political and environmental crisis, such as the current period we live in, embracing the complex diversity of contemporary society at 'the human scale' is necessary in order to avoid the problems with grand schemes and plans. This allows us to start making the everyday changes today that will help shape our future.

It is important to recognise the examples of cooperation, mutual aid and alternative modes of consumption and production that are embedded in the here and the now. "The anarchist envisages a different kind of federal society, one in which the responsibility begins in the vital nuclei of social life, the workplace and the neighbourhoods where people live." (Woodcock, 1986, 25) Valuing those precious and often overlooked spaces and times we can recognise justice, solidarity, freedom and autonomy in our own lives as a first step. The second is to focus on how to harness and enrich these spaces and also radiate them ever

further outwards and upwards within society, both now and in the future. To these ends, the chapter invites you to think about three places:

- Your home
- Your community
- Your university campus

Everyday anarchism: home and community

To encourage *your* anarchist imaginary to come to the fore, think carefully about the building blocks of social life and, indeed, about your own life and experiences. Think about the seemingly ordinary, routine and perhaps small points of everyday engagement with other people that you have experienced so far today and perhaps will look forward to over the rest of the day. These will, without doubt, provide some meaningful examples of anarchy in action. For example, if you are living in shared accommodation, then this might include: making your housemate(s) a cup of tea; taking the bins out; leaving the kitchen tidy (so as not to risk friendships and the milk going sour); agreeing to drop off a housemate's book at the library on their behalf; offering to take lecture notes; bring back food or medicines if a housemate is sick; buying tickets for a nightclub or sporting event. Assuming you are not charging a premium rate for these services and/or you have not been coerced into doing so, but have done so voluntarily, then you are acting like an anarchist. On the way to campus, maybe you have given someone directions, offered to give your seat up on the bus for somebody else, treated the bus driver as a human being with respect and been courteous to the 'freedoms' of fellow commuters on the bus (e.g. music levels kept low and personal, not engaging in loud conversations on your mobile phone, or not putting your feet on the seats). Perhaps you held a door open for someone, or even gave money or food to a homeless person. Adhering to these social rules and expectations are indicative of our expectations of what any 'good', 'decent' human being tends to do.

The focus on these ordinary practices and informal coping strategies, and how these are organised in ways to complete a range of material tasks or provide emotional support have underpinned much research focused on highlighting the pervasive nature of "alternative" economies in so-called formal capitalist societies (White and Williams, 2016). Within this literature there is an explicit focus on 'community self-help', which covers a diverse

spectrum of activities "that are not formally provided by the market or the state" (Burns, et al. 2004, 29). One type of community self-help is referred to as self-help or self-provisioning. This largely concerns unpaid work (anything from childcare to cooking and cleaning, as well as forms of household maintenance such as decorating and gardening) undertaken for and by household members. The second type is mutual aid, which means unpaid work that is undertaken by extended family or community networks .

Research conducted through Time Use Surveys and Household Work Practice Surveys in the UK, and western 'capitalist' economies more generally, has explored the extent of participation in community self-help as well as barriers to it (White and Williams, 2016). The results have found non-capitalist, informal modes of work and organisation to be both pervasive and desirable. From an explicitly anarchist reading of these practices of community self-help, in terms of how people organise, and how the products of labour are distributed it reminds us of the slogan suggested by the French anarchist geographer Élisée Reclus: "From each according to ability, to each according to the principle of solidarity." (Ward, 2010, 222). When engaging with family and non-family relations, altruism, reciprocity, mutual aid, volunteerism and **horizontalism** (see box in chapter nine) are the assumed ways that people relate to each other. In the management textbook, it might seem as if *Homo economicus* is everywhere. But research into what people actually do suggests that anarchist practices of exchange and distribution are powerful in informing our own sense of **identity** (see box in chapter four) and our complex relationships to others.

Anarchism at the university

Having thought about our home and our commute to work, the third place we want to look at is the university campus itself. We might begin by looking at the intellectual content of your business or management course. Think about the theoretical or methodological assumptions embedded within the research that is drawn on, and the relevance and application of the knowledge you are meant to acquire. To what end does it serve? In many parts of the world, higher education is being increasingly defined by marketization and commodification, wherein "goods and services are increasingly produced and delivered by capitalist forms of monetized exchange for the purpose of profit" (Williams, 2005, 14). Ultimately, these

processes have transformed the university’s overt role and purpose away from being a 'public' to a 'for profit' entity, a change that many university employees disagree with (Heath and Burdon, 2017).

Unsurprisingly, there is a longstanding critique of the nature of learning and pedagogy by anarchists (e.g. Goodman, 2001, Parker et al 2014) and many would agree with Springer et al. (2016: 20) when they suggest that,

> "While education has often been touted as a path to freedom and enlightenment, all too often it operates as a mechanism that stupefies through the promotion of ignorance, prejudice, and submission to authority." Springer et. al (2016, 20)

How might we draw attention to the everyday presence of anarchism on campus? One obvious example would be to recognise the many inter-connected forms of interaction and modes of organisation that we engage in directly that make the university possible. For example, think of how you and your fellow students queued up when waiting for the last lecture or seminar you had. Did you do so in an orderly way? Was there quarrelling or fighting or jostling? How might this mode of organising play out when reflecting on broader experiences of waiting in line? When the lecturer arrived how did you then decide where to sit? Our guess is that was mostly undertaken in a self-organised and voluntary manner. Perhaps, in a small class in a big lecture theatre, the lecturer may have asked you to 'move closer to the front', but usually no explicit guidance or instruction is necessary.

Reflect on the learning experience during that last lecture/seminar. Did the lecturer play a dominant role from start to finish? Or, alternatively, was a conscious attempt made to encourage and facilitate more engaged, informal, shared and safe spaces between and within the class to discuss and debate the issues at hand? Did everybody speak and listen "appropriately". Respectfully listening when 'the speaker' was talking, or not speaking for 'too long' and speaking in respectful tones (not shouting or ranting) when given the opportunity? If, on an unfortunate occasion, somebody transgressed and violated these rules, how were they addressed? Did the lecturer encourage them to self-reflect? Or appeal to authority: reprimand them, send them out and threaten to report them?

Assuming the discussion was engaging, maybe even inspiring, perhaps you (or a peer) might have stayed behind and asked the lecturer some questions, or followed up a discussion after the class? We mention this because as employees of the university, your lecturers will have various contact time allocated for teaching, which can be distributed across all related activities: lectures, seminars, tutorials, dissertation supervision, fieldwork and so on. Beyond the hour lecture then, if working to the rule of their formal contract, they would be within their rights to not volunteer an extra five or ten minutes or even more to entertain these questions (or equivalent issues). It is instructive to see how these unpaid minutes add up. When looking across the education sector as a whole for example, the Trade Union Congress, the body representing the various trade unions in the UK, drew on unpublished Office National Statistics data from the Labour Force Survey (July-September 2016) and the Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (2016). Their analysis found that people working in education are among those most likely to be putting in unpaid overtime and clocking up 12.1 free hours a week. The trade union for many members of university staff in the UK said the figures highlighted how staff working in schools, colleges and universities continue to go above and beyond the call of duty and put in the extra unpaid mile. The analysis revealed that over half of people working in education (51.8%) do extra unpaid work (UCU 2017).

This is a difference that makes all the difference. Modes of organisation and exchange in which support is given regardless of financial remuneration is still the lifeblood that animates and gives life to the University. This is despite the authoritarian top-down style of governing that is increasingly, forcibly, administered to these spaces. For another example, think about the acknowledgements written in the academic books you read. As Nocella and Juergensmeyer, (2017, xix) note

> "Acknowledgements are so critical and a radical humbling of oneself because it publicly notes that no one is an island and that everyone is interdependent and needing support because we are living creatures and part of an ecosystem, where everyone is interwoven and interdependent of one another…"

Unfortunately, much of the collaborative element, particularly where remarkable intellectual and technological achievements have been achieved, has often been obscured by its attribution to the success of individuals rather than groups or networks. This should not be surprising in one respect because, as Cumbers (2012, 70) observes: "The failure to treat

knowledge production and economic action as socially embedded and interactive processes also applies to most of mainstream economics with its focus upon atomized individuals and market exchange." To take one example, we might suggest Schaffer's (2015) analysis of the multi-billionaire Elon Musk. She argues that:

> Musk's success would not have been possible without, among other things, government funding for basic research and subsidies for electric cars and solar panels. Above all, he has benefited from a long series of innovations in batteries, solar cells, and space travel. [...] The problem with such portrayals is not merely that they are inaccurate and unfair to the many contributors to new technologies. By warping the popular understanding of how technologies develop, great-man myths threaten to undermine the structure that is actually necessary for future innovations.

A generation ago, academics were also warning of the dangers of the proliferation of property rights over knowledge. Focusing attention on the privatization of biomedical research, Heller and Eisenberg, 1998, 698) argued that the result "may lead paradoxically to fewer useful products for improving human health" resulting in what they termed as an 'anticommons', the privatization of public goods. With this in mind, think how different history may well have turned out if the British computer scientist Tim Berners-Lee decided to patent "his" invention of HyperText Transfer Protocol which led to the World Wide Web. Imagine if this had been a private network with no social media or public resources like Wikipedia or all the many news and information sites you often use to do your research (see **open source** box in the introduction).

BOX

COMMONS

Land over which members of the community could exercise customary rights, such as the right of grazing or collecting. In England, the rights of commons were eroded by the enclosures that began in the 12th century and was largely completed by the end of the 19th. In modern use, the commons has acquired a broader meaning to include not only land but also other natural resources (water, biodiversity) and cultural resources (traditional knowledge, information and creative works) which were openly available to all. There have been many attempts to protect the commons from modern forms of enclosure, in particular corporate

encroachment through privatisation and marketisation. Reclaiming the commons has become one of the rallying calls of the anti-capitalist movement. The **Open Source** Software movement (see box in chapter one) is also an attempt to keep software within the public domain through copyleft licensing that ensures that anyone can use or modify a programme, but no one can appropriate it through copyright or patent laws. In addition, there have been campaigns to reclaim privatised water as a common resource; to defend the right of small farmers to use common land against the threat of eviction and privatisation; or to reclaim public spaces for public use by taking direct action against developments.

END BOX

It seems to us that a rich and diverse range of common resources and ideas helps to generate better ideas (see Hess and Ostrom, 2007), just as a range of forms of self-help and mutual aid supports us in our everyday lives. Our final section focuses on the possibilities of anarchism to help recognise and grow this world. As Paul Goodman suggests:

> "In any present society, though much and even an increasing amount is coercive, nevertheless, much is also free. […] In creative work, in passion and sentiment, in spontaneous recreation, there are healthy spheres of nature and freedom: it is the spirit of these that we most often extrapolate to all acts of utopian free society, to making a living, to civil life and law." (2011, 35)

The real challenge is never only 'out-there' in the future, but always personal and now, involving us and what we do and the ways in which we can extend this in order to create, "new living institutions, new groupings, new social relationships […] for [our] own futures". (Malatesta, 1965).

The future: extending anarchism in the everyday

We have argued that encouraging a deeper understanding of anarchism also means a greater awareness of the ways in which everyday forms of anarchist organisation can be seen in our own lives. This sort of anarchism involves you, the reader, as a central protagonist, not a detached and neutral observer on the side-lines. Moreover, this reading of anarchism is not asking you to *imagine* what an anarchist society might look like, but to recognise that what

gives our society meaning is largely rooted in a primitive form of anarchist sensibility. So how can this encourage us to think about the desirability of anarchism and the ways of extending anarchist practices to challenge domination and bring forward a more socially just, collective and emancipated world.

Anarchist practices encourage us to recognise our own agency and think creatively about the power that we have and how we can use it. What can we do, *in addition to what we do already*, to encourage social, economic and environmental justice to flourish? In other words, how can we (in company with others) think and act in ways that extend "spheres of free action until they make up most of social life." (Goodman, 2011, 34)? One point to strongly emphasize here is the need for absolute consistency between ‘means" and ‘ends". Anarchists who desire a non-violent, non-coercive future must, at fear of contradiction, engage in non-violent, non-coercive forms of direct action as a means to achieve this (see Baldelli, 1972).

The three sites we covered in the chapter demonstrate the practical ways in which non-market forms of engagement and organization are embedded in our everyday lives, so let us conclude by exploring one of these in a little more detail. Within the university there are a great many inspiring and purposeful forms of direct action which are largely consistent with anarchism (Clare et al. 2016). Individually, and working with others, areas to think about here include resisting and challenging the increasingly commodified 'for profit' nature of university spaces, and organising positively in ways that can reclaim higher education institutions and open up new and alternatives for transformative action to take root (see Nocella and Juergensmeyer, 2016; Springer et. al. 2016; Thomson 2017). We can also critically explore everyday spaces and situations (what goes on in the lecture theatre or library, for example) to focus attention on the ways in which these spaces are connected to broader configurations of hierarchical oppression and exclusion that exist across and beyond the campus (e.g. capitalism, sexism, racism and classism). This would mean acting in ways that can maintain and foster cooperation, democratic involvement and solidarity between faculty, staff and students. This would certainly be highly desirable if it built new, meaningful bridges with minority and vulnerable student groups who routinely experience persecution and exclusion (see Finley, 2017) and in cases where the freedom of speech is threatened.

Moving confidently away from the self-interest, competitive norms and asocial motivations that are believed to inform human nature, and captured in *homo economicus*, what this

chapter has hoped to encourage is a greater understanding of how we are in fact motivated by 'anarchist' principles of fairness, cooperation and mutual aid. Recognising ourselves as social animals, we can also appreciate how these values underpin the way in which others engage with us. They are, after all, the core foundations of meaningful relations, be they with colleagues, friends, neighbours or those we love. Far from being a utopian ideal, anarchist forms of organising are already deeply familiar to us. They are already happening in our everyday lives, with people who are known and familiar to us, as well as with those we share buses and seminars with. Ultimately, anarchist ideas offer up futures that are radical and vital antidotes to top-down governance and coercive forms of organisation. As Maletesta (1891 [2016], 46) believed, if you can 'convince the public that government is not only unnecessary but extremely harmful, then the word anarchy, just because it means absence of government, will come to mean for everybody: *natural order, unity of human needs, and the interests of all, complete freedom within complete solidarity.*'

Looking at the world and ourselves through an 'anarchist squint' will prove to be empowering, not least through firmly rejecting the spectre of *homo economicus* that continues to haunt mainstream management organisation textbooks. In this way, embracing a practical understanding of anarchism perhaps also enriches our continual quest for meaning, and might speak to those existential questions that we carry with us about the nature of life and our relations with others. On a more applied level, without appealing to authority, anarchist practice offers original, radical and new ways of analysing problems, identifying the most appropriate solutions and working out what types of organisation might be needed. There is nothing to stop us thinking and acting in ways that help create emancipatory anarchist modes of organising, because we are demonstrably not (only) creatures of the market. And we can do this from where we stand, in the here and in the now.

Questions for further study:

1. Think of the three areas of anarchist practice discussed in this chapter (home, the commute and the university). From your own experience, can you think of examples that confirm what the chapter has said about everyday fairness, cooperation and mutual aid?
2. Can you think of any processes or forces that encourage other values such as those of market based selfishness? How do these pose a threat to everyday forms of cooperation?

3. The cases discussed here are focused on small scale examples of anarchist values in organisation and exchange. What would larger, more wide-reaching examples of these same values might look like? How could they be used to extend the practices discussed in the chapter to the scale of a corporation or of society as a whole?
4. Anarchism has been defined here as having to do with some common ideas of fairness, cooperation and mutual aid. Do you think adhering to these ideas makes someone an anarchist? Is there anything more that is needed for a person, group or form of organisation and exchange to be called 'anarchist'?

References

Baldelli, G (1972) **Social Anarchism**. Harmondsworth: London.

Bowles, S. and Gintis, H., 1993. The revenge of homo economicus: contested exchange and the revival of political economy. *Journal of economic perspectives*, *7*(1), pp.83-102.

Castoriadis, C. (2010) **A Society Adrift, Interviews & Debates 1974-1997**. E. Escobar, M. Gondicas and P. Vernay (Ed). Fordham University Press: New York.

Clare N, White G and White RJ (2017) Striking Out! Challenging academic Repression in the neoliberal university through alternative forms of resistance: some lessons from the UK. in A. Nocella and E. Juergensmeyer (ed) **Taking Back Our Universities: Strategies to Fight Against Academic Repression and the Corporatization of Higher Education** Peter Lang: New York pp.15-31

Christopher, B. Robinson, J. Sansom, P. and Turner, P. (1970 [1995]) The Relevance of Anarchism in. d. Rooum and Freedom Press (ed.) **What is Anarchism? An Introduction**. Available at https://libcom.org/files/donald-rooum-and-freedom-press-ed-what-is-anarchism-an-introduction.pdf [last accessed 14.05.2018)).

Cumbers, A. (2012) **Reclaiming Public Ownership: Making Space for Economic democracy.** Zed: London.

Gintis, H., 2000. Beyond Homo economicus: evidence from experimental economics. **Ecological economics**, 35(3), pp.311-322.

Goodman, P. (2011) **Freedom and Autonomy** in S. Goodman **The Paul Goodman Reader.** PM Press: Oakland.

Graeber, D. (2000) 'Are you an anarchist? The answer may surprise you'. *The Anarchist Library*. https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/david-graeber-are-you-an-anarchist-the-answer-may-surprise-you, accessed 8/19.

Graeber, D. (2011) Communism in K. Hart, J-L Laville and A D Cattani (ed) **The Human Economy.** Polity: London. pp 119-210.

Heath, M. and Burdon, P. (2017) Academic Resistance: Landscape of Hope and despair in. in A. Nocella and E. Juergensmeyer (ed) **Taking Back Our Universities: Strategies to Fight Against Academic Repression and the Corporatization of Higher Education** Peter Lang: New York pp.33-45.

Heller, M.A. and Eisenberg, R.S. (1998). Can Patents Deter Innovation? The Anticommons in Biomedical Research. ***Science.*** 01 May 1998 : 698-701.

Hess, C. and Ostrom, (ed). (2007). **Understanding Knowledge as a Commons: From Theory to Practice.** MIT Press: London.

Hill, R. and Myatt, T.(2010) T**he Economics Anti-Textbook: A critical thinker's guide to microeconomics**. Zed Books: London.

Malatesta, E. (1965) **His Life and Ideas**. V. Richards (ed). Freedom Press: London.

Nocella, A. and Juergensmeyer, E. (ed) **Taking Back Our Universities: Strategies to Fight Against Academic Repression and the Corporatization of Higher Education** Peter Lang: New York

Nyborg, K., 2000. Homo economicus and homo politicus: interpretation and aggregation of environmental values. **Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization**, 42(3), pp.305-322.

Parker, M. Cheney, G. Fournier, V. and Land, C. (2014). The question of organization: A manifesto for alternatives. **ephemera** 14 (4). 623-638.

Rocker, R (1938) 'Anarchy: aims and purposes' https://www.panarchy.org/rocker/anarchy.html, accessed 8/19.

Schaffer, A. (2015) **Tech's Enduring Great-Man Myth in MIT Technology Review**. Available at https://www.technologyreview.com/s/539861/techs-enduring-great-man-

myth/?utm_campaign=add_this&utm_source=facebook&utm_medium=post [last accessed 14.05.2018].

Scott, W. (2012). **Two Cheers for Anarchism.** Princeton University Press. Princeton.

Seis, M. (2017) Parasites, Sycophants, and Rebels: resisting Threats to Faculty Governance. In. A. Nocella and E. Juergensmeyer (ed) T**aking Back Our Universities: Strategies to Fight Against Academic Repression and the Corporatization of Higher Education** Peter Lang: New York

Shannon, D. T**he End of the World as we Know It. Crisis, Resistance and the End of Austerity**. ALK Press: Edinburgh.

Souza, SML de, White, RJ and Springer, S. (2016). Introduction: subverting the Meaning of Theory. in Springer, S, White RJ, Souza, ML de. 2016. *Introduction Transgressing Frontiers through the Radicalization of Pedagogy*. In S. Springer, S. R.J. White and ML de Souza (eds.) **The Radicalization of Pedagogy: Anarchism, Geography and the Spirit of Revolt,** Rowman & Littlefield, Lanham. Pp 1-26.

Springer, S. (2016) **The Anarchist Roots of Geography: Towards Spatial Emancipation**. Minnessota Press: Minnessota.

Thompson, R. (2017). Reclaiming Campus as an Event Site : A Comparative Discussion of Student Resistance Tactic**s**. in A. Nocella and E. Juergensmeyer (ed) **Taking Back Our Universities: Strategies to Fight Against Academic Repression and the Corporatization of Higher Education** Peter Lang: New York

UCU (2017) 'Education workers putting in long hours of unpaid overtime' https://www.ucu.org.uk/article/8693/Education-workers-putting-in-long-hours-of-unpaid-overtime, accessed 8/19.

Ward, C. (1982) **Anarchy in Action.** Freedom Press London.

Ward, C. (1976) **Housing: An anarchist approach**. Freedom Press. London.

Ward, D. (2010) Alchemy in Clarens: Kropotkin and Reclus, 1877-1881. In N.J. Jun and S. Wahl (ed) **New Perspectives on Anarchism.** Lexington Books: Plymouth.

White RJ and Williams, C.C. (2016) Valuing and harnessing alternative work practice in a neoliberal society. In Springer, S., Birch, K, and MacLeavy, J. (eds.). **The Handbook of Neoliberalism**. London, Routledge.

Williams, C.C. (2005). **A Commodified World.** Zed: London.

Woodcock, G. (1986). **Anarchism: A Historical Introduction** in G. Woodcock (ed) **The Anarchist Reader** William Collins Sons: Glasgow.