

ANARCHISTS AND LABOR UNIONS:
APPLYING NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENT THEORY TO THE CHARACTERISTICS
OF CONTEMPORARY ANARCHISTS

Dana Williams

23 August 2004

Sociology 753: Secondary Data Analysis

Dr. André Christie-Mizell

University of Akron

Akron, Ohio

ABSTRACT

This paper studies the characteristics and union membership of North American anarchists. Traditionally, anarchism has been a working-class based movement that rejects authority and domination. New social movement (NSM) theory suggests that movements have changed in recent decades to focus less on the working class and economic issues, and more upon social and political concerns. A survey by a prominent anarchist website was analyzed to study if the NSM framework assists in characterizing the contemporary anarchist movement in North America. Union membership was positively correlated with four primary explanatory variables: economic ideology, working class, and age. Union membership was negatively correlated with those who do not want work. Then, survey respondent's union membership was regressed on those explanatory variables. With multivariate logistic regression equation, these variables all remain significant, except for working class, which was no longer significant. North Americans were also significantly less likely to be unions than those not from North America. Given these findings, it is questionable how well anarchists are described by NSM. The association of unions to ideology, class, work, and age suggest that anarchists do participate in economic class and labor-related issues. The paper ends by making suggestions on how to improve upon this research and explore other questions regarding anarchists themselves and the anarchist movement.

Keywords: anarchism, labor unions, new social movements.

INTRODUCTION

Has the North American anarchist movement changed over time? As a historically class-oriented movement, are anarchists today less likely to join unions, when considering their ideology, class, work-focus, and age? This paper focuses on these questions and asks in what ways these questions apply to a prominent social movement theory.

Anarchists, who ascribe to a philosophy that rejects authority and domination, are active in various left-wing movements throughout North America and the world. Yet, the anarchist movement has not been greatly studied, or placed within current social movement theory. Further quantitative research as to the constitution of the anarchist movement, its beliefs, and current political activities, has been non-existent.

Contemporary social movement theory suggests that the middle-class is the economic class most directly engaged in social and political change activism (Cohen 1985). Further, it is claimed that there is a lack of anarchist participation in unions and labor-oriented campaigns, for reasons of differing culture, backgrounds, organizations, and tactics (Sheppard 2002). If anarchism is a new social movement, then an emphasis upon class and labor within traditional social movements (which tend to be working class) should not be present. In order to explore the above assumptions, the responses to a user survey of a prominent anarchist website were analyzed.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Anarchism

Anarchism as a social and political philosophy has formally been around since the mid-19th century, with ideas first expressed by philosophers William Godwin and Joseph-Pierre Proudhon. It is seen as a particular tendency within classical liberalism that seeks

the liberation of people from authority and domination (Chomsky 1973). Anarchism advocates the removal of all unnecessary authoritarian and hierarchical social institutions (such as capitalism and the centralized nation-state), to be replaced by cooperative, horizontal, and self-empowered relationships (Ward 1996). Although historically lumped together with communism in terms of highly valuing equality, anarchism rejects state power (Chirot 1986). As such, anarchists and communists have often been at odds with one another.

Anarchists advocate direct action, as opposed to indirect action (such as through elections) to accomplish the necessary functions of society (de Cleyre 1912). Acting directly empowers people individually and collectively—to both not rely on authority figures and also not to self-restrict oneself to the wishes of those figures, but rather the need of a given community. In the absence of authority figures, anarchists rely upon voluntary association with those they choose in order to coordinate their participation in society (Anarchy FAQ 2004, Ward 1996). Anarchists offer mutual aid and solidarity to those who require assistance and assume that this will reciprocate to them if the need arises. Historically, anarchists believe that self-determination is best achieved at smaller scales, and thus often act within small organizations, one being the “affinity group”. In these anarchist organizations decisions are made by a consensus process or by direct democracy. More complex forms of organizations are created for broader functions and needs, such as collectives, coalitions, federations, and spokes-councils (Graeber 2002, Polletta 2001). The anarchist vision is one of a decentralized world, composed of interlocking networks and federations.

The modern-day anarchist movement is a multi-cause movement that works towards these ends and seeks to interject its radical ideas into other social movements.

Anarchists have been active in the feminist, civil rights, anti-corporate globalization, environmental, and peace/anti-war movements. Renewed focus upon anarchism as a radical movement has resurged after the fall of the Soviet Union as a state-based alternative to capitalism (Day 2003). Increasingly wide-spread use of the Internet has also increased access to anarchist ideas and information, and allowed anarchists to communicate with each other—ironically within a highly anarchistic medium.

Shantz (2003) argues that resistance movements (and anarchism in particular) that want “no part of the world order, new or otherwise” (p. 90) have been neglected by social movement literature. He argues that most social movement theory studies movements trying to influence or become part of the existing system as opposed to replacing the entire order. This shortcoming is important because of heightened participation by anarchists in recent years in both North America and throughout the world, and increased media coverage (Elliott 1999, Kahn 2000) following the anti-World Trade Organization demonstrations in Seattle during 1999 that anarchists had a large role in planning. As such, anarchism as both a political tendency and as a movement deserves more attention by sociologists and social movement researchers. This paper attempts to begin addressing this deficit in research.

New Social Movements

North American anarchist organizations, groups that espouse an anarchist philosophy, may arguably be best understood by Fitzgerald and Rodgers’ (2000) model of radical social movement organizations (RSMOs). Radical organizations differ from moderate social movement organizations in terms of organizational structure, ideology, tactics, communication, and assessment of success. RSMOs are thus nonhierarchical,

participatory, egalitarian, and radical, emphasize structural change, and use nonviolent action and innovative tactics. According to this model, RSMOs are also ignored and misrepresented by the mainstream media, utilize alternative media, use limited resources, and are subject to intense opposition and surveillance. This model modifies the framework set by resource mobilization theory (McCarthy and Zald 1977) by arguing that bureaucratization and institutionalization of social movements is not always necessary or inevitable.

However, for this study, I will use the more widely-known new social movements (NSM) theory, since it offers the best vantage point to challenge the oft-claimed notion that the anarchist movement is of the middle-class or that it is not active in class-related issues. It also speaks more directly to the individual characteristics of movement participants rather than the organizational structures they utilize.

NSM theory asserts that in this era of post-industrialism, modern social movements differ from earlier movements, and focus upon less-class-oriented issues such as racial equality, feminism, peace, the environment, and localist issues. In North America, non-class-oriented franchise anarchistic organizations that fall into these categories include ACT-UP, Anti-Racist Action, Animal Liberation Front, Critical Mass, Earth First!, Earth Liberation Front, Food Not Bombs, and Reclaim the Streets.¹ As such, Cohen (1985) argues that “Unlike the Old Left, actors involved in contemporary movements do not view themselves in terms of a socioeconomic class” (p. 667).

¹ I’m calling “franchise” anarchist organizations those groups with identical names that exist in multiple places, and have the same general focus and purpose. Critical Mass and Reclaim the Streets should be viewed more as events than organizations, since they have no permanent organizational structures to them. People work loosely with each other during planning, but allow for considerable spontaneity in action and statement.

Offe (1985) states that NSMs differ from traditional social movements by focusing on values of autonomy and identity, organizing with decentralization, self-government, and self-help in mind, and tend to be *ad hoc*, egalitarian, and non-hierarchical—incidentally strong anarchist values. Because problems related to authority and domination may be found within multiple domains, anarchists are unique in their relation to NSMs. There is considerable cross-movement participation within *all* the aforementioned movements by anarchists and their organizations (Epstein 1991, Graeber 2002, Shantz 2003). This varying participation agrees with McCarthy and Zald's (1977) concept of overlapping social movement "industries", composed of individual social movement organizations.

Sheppard (2002) claims, albeit without quantitative analysis, that anarchists are less likely to organize and belong to unions than in the past, and that they instead choose to find other work if their current job is disagreeable. Sheppard hypothesizes this is because of the aforementioned class collusion of modern unions, macho stereotypes of unions, and the punk subculture of rejection that contemporary anarchism draws heavily from. He opines that, "Young anarchists often correctly see the organized labor movement as not radical at all, but as a backwards force embodying the worst kinds of provincialism and political maneuvering" (para. 6). Sheppard's generalizations appear to support classifying anarchism within the NSM framework. Cohen (1985) supports this: "Instead of forming unions or political parties... [NSMs] focus on grass-roots politics and create horizontal, directly democratic associations that are loosely federated on national levels" (p. 667). Albert (2002) also argues that class has disappeared from left-wing activism, which he attributes to an ill-informed understanding of class stratification from

Marxists and the inability of activists to merge a class analysis with feminist and anti-racist analysis.²

Bagguley (1992) is critical of the NSM theory, because the above movements and organizational traits existed before the 1960s and post-industrialism, thus making a clear delineation difficult. Pichardo (1997) also criticizes NSM for a number of reasons. He points out that NSM theory focuses solely on left-wing movements, to the neglect of right-wing and reactionary movements. NSM ideas lack solid empirical evidence and as such tend to be more theoretical. Finally, Pichardo (1997) claims that NSM theory is less a brand new theory than just an *addition* to social movement theory.

Other Relevant Literature

Labor unions are organizations formed at a workplace or in a particular occupation for the purpose of providing leverage in negotiations with employers over different aspects of employment, including pay, benefits, and working conditions. The largest union in the United States is the AFL-CIO, a federation of many individual trade unions. Unions have historically been difficult for workers to organize and sustain because of harassment by employers, ranging from repression of union-related speech at work to firings of union organizers to outright repression by police forces (Brecher 1997). Robinson (1988) also notes declining organizing efforts of unions themselves and the corporate use of monetary rewards to compete with unions as other reasons for the recent decline in union membership.

The lack of anarchist participation in unions and the labor movement could be symptomatic of larger trends, such as the move towards a more service-based economy

² See pages 87-103 for more discussion.

and the widespread creation of “McJobs” (Klein 1999, Schlosser 2002). Relatedly, there has been a steady decline in union membership in the US during the last two decades (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2004). In response, Sheppard and others (Chomsky 1973, Dolgoff 1977) advocate a direct engagement with the labor movement, potentially along the lines of anarcho-syndicalism and radical trade unions (like the Industrial Workers of the World, or IWW), or participation in wholly-owned worker cooperatives (as detailed in Rothschild-Whitt 1979).

The anarchist movement is far more diverse than it was a century ago, when its primary focus was economic. It has ideologically branched out into other issues not widely part of social movements at the time. This new diversity can be seen in how anarchists sometimes identify with particular strains or tendencies, often noted in the prefix or suffix applied to their ideology. People who call themselves social anarchists focus on general social injustices and hierarchy. Anarcha-feminists deal with gender-related issues, such as reproductive choice, domestic violence, and forms of patriarchic domination. Eco-anarchists emphasize a tandem focus upon environmental defense (of places such as old-growth forests), and protest of corporate and government destruction of the environment. Anarcho-communists emphasize egalitarian, communist values such as producer and consumer cooperatives and collective ownership. Finally, anarcho-syndicalists advocate worker control over the means of production at the workplace, often practiced in the form of radical unionism.

It may be assumed that if one bothers to claim a specific orientation as those mentioned above, that such a decision reflects the tendency towards certain actions. For example, those with an anarcho-syndicalist focus may be more likely to join and organize labor unions. Yet, there are also those who identify as “anarchists without adjectives”,

which signifies a tolerance for all the various strains (Nettlau 1996). Although seemingly disparate in nature, all the aforementioned strains are linked by a common rejection of hierarchical authority and domination, and the desire to address society's problems in a fashion that allows for self-determination and cooperation.

Modern anarchists and radical Marxists (DeLeon 1996, Meltzer 1996, Pannekoek 2003) have typically—and cynically—characterized modern trade unions as “class traitors”, noting union leadership's collusion with large corporations against workers' class interests. This analysis is also found in Marxism (Robinson 1988). This characterization is always followed by a disclaimer noting that unions themselves are not the problem, just the bureaucratic and hierarchical way in which many are run. This analysis of unions is particularly relevant due to anarchism's central place within the labor movement during the late 19th and early 20th centuries, and the importance placed upon working class organizing (Berkman 2003, Brecher 1997, Goldman 1970, Rucker 1990). The IWW, for instance, was a major force in US labor history, helping to unite Native-born and immigrant workers in a wide-range of industries into “One Big Union” that thus wielded incredible clout.

There are contemporary anarchists who organize with class in mind (particularly with the working class), such as the IWW in the US and the Class War Federation of Great Britain (Class War Federation 1992).

The counter-perspective within anarchism is best illustrated by the writings of the CrimethInc Ex-Workers Collective (2000). This activist collective publishes inexpensive and widely-read propaganda for the anarchist movement. CrimethInc's writings are the work of multiple individuals and thus offer varying opinions on the subjects discussed. The group's main goal is to inspire readers to take more active control of their own lives.

Their suggested method for battling capitalism and its entrenched corporate power structure is to evade participation in it at all. Instead they aim to live free of wage slavery and to survive off the excesses of capitalism, in order to provide resources for fighting against authority. Frequent suggestions for this include, but are not limited to, scamming, theft, and dumpstering.

CrimethInc does not advocate participation in unions or other forms of class-based organizing, nor does it explicitly encourage working at actual, so-called normal jobs. Bookchin (1995) calls this perspective “lifestyle anarchism”. The writings of Black (1985) and Zerzan (1994) have been influential to this “no work” attitude, in the former’s call to “abolish work” and that latter’s desire to “end civilization” itself. Even though CrimethInc has a , particular anti-work tendency, it usually reserves its harshest criticism for mind and body numbing labor. CrimethInc makes a thoughtful critique of capitalism and passionate call for personal liberation from it. CrimethInc is relatively new, thus many of its adherents are likely younger anarchists.

Anarchists are commonly portrayed as younger than the general population—or so asserts the media stereotype of the rebelling teenager. Some argue that these people are more idealistic in their youth (Mead 1974), while other studies (Fendrich and Turner 1989) have shown the opposite affect, as activists politically mature with age and become more active. In addition to these maturation affects, there can be generational differences, as the interests, focuses, and activities of certain age groups in various eras.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics (2004) concluded that workers in 2003 aged 16-24 had the lowest levels of union membership (5.1 percent), even lower than workers 65 and over. The workers with the highest percentage of membership were aged 45-54 (17.6).

Lower age workers have low union membership, in part, due to the low-levels of unionization in low-paid entry jobs frequently held by youth.

Whites in the US had the second highest percentage of union membership after African-Americans (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2004). In 2003, 16.5 percent of all employed African-Americans were in unions, while 12.5 percent of Whites were in unions. The Bureau also notes that males are more likely to be in unions than females. For those workers 16 years old and over, 14.3 percent of men and 11.4 percent of women are union members.

Lesbian and gay labor activists “have long seen themselves as a bridge between two natural allies” (Bain 1999, 58). Grevatt (2001) likewise argues that the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) movement is solidly rooted in the working class, and points towards the Pride At Work constituency group within the AFL-CIO as a good example LGBT organizing within the labor movement. Yet, Humphrey (1999) found little union support in a study of lesbians and gays in public service occupations, despite the official recognition by the union of the discrimination some faced for their sexual orientation. Homosexual union members self-organized within the union, constituting an important committee.

Historically, many anarchists have rejected organized religion, particularly hierarchical religions like Catholicism (Bakunin 1970, Goldman 2001). The strongest proponents of atheism within anarchism have themselves been working class union organizers. Still, some anarchists remain religious or spiritual; Leo Tolstoy and the Catholic Worker movement are primary examples of Christian anarchists. There are also differences in the tendency to unionize based upon religious affiliation. A study

conducted by Misra and Hicks (1994) found that Catholics in affluent democracies—as those in Canada and the US—have on average not unionized at the rate of non-Catholics.

Union membership in the US is relatively low compared to other industrialized countries such as in Western Europe. For example, British union membership was until recently 50 percent of the working population (Heery, et al. 2002). Although in decline, British membership still remains higher than in the US, where union members constitute just under 13 percent of the labor force (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2004).

SUMMARY AND HYPOTHESES

This work posits anarchism within a new social movement theory framework. It begins to create a rudimentary analysis of the North American anarchists and their various qualities and attitudes, analysis that till present has been severely lacking.

In this research I hypothesize that:

H1: Working class anarchists tend to belong to unions;

H2: Anarchists with an economic ideology tend to belong to unions;

H3: Anti-work beliefs and practices tend to deter membership in unions;

H4: Older age is a strong predictor of union membership, therefore:

H5: Anarchists do not fit neatly within NSM theory, although they share some sympathetic tendencies.

DATA AND METHODS

Sample

For this study, data we extracted from a 2002 user survey of the prominent North American anarchist website www.infoshop.org, the Mid-Atlantic Infoshop (herein called “Infoshop”). Previous mass media research has shown that Infoshop is an online nexus for anarchist information (and “counter-propaganda”) and other anarchist websites (Owens and Palmer 2003). The survey includes 922 responses.

The survey was posted on a single webpage, linked from the site’s homepage. It consisted of nineteen personal and demographic questions, thirteen questions about politics, eight questions about activism, fifteen questions about the Infoshop webpage, and ten other questions about “other stuff”. The questions commonly offered only fixed-response answers, although the survey would sometimes offer the opportunity to specify an “other” response. Anyone – not just anarchists – who visited the webpage could take the survey, there was no time limit, and it was only offered in English.

A “digital divide” bias might be found in internet-based surveys. A National Telecommunications and Information Administration study (2002) shows that Whites and Asian-Americans, the more affluent, and more educated tend to use computers and the internet more than other race/ethnic groups, the less affluent, and less educated. Roughly equal numbers of men and women use the internet. Seventy-five percent of respondents were male and one-third of respondents described their economic background as “working class”. In terms of gender and class, the Infoshop survey is an atypical sample of respondents for internet users.

The respondents form a group that is really part of only one generation (late teens to middle twenties), and that a minority of middle-age and older respondents skew the mean age to appear older than one might expect at first glance. The relative youthfulness of survey respondents should caution the reader. And as evidenced by the Bureau of

Labor Statistics' (2004) study, this age group also tends to have the lowest union membership.

Measures

Dependent variable. The outcome measure for this study is union membership. User responses were dummy-coded to true or false for each possible response; thus if a respondent is in a union, s/he is assigned a 1 value (true), or a 0 value (false) if not a union member. Respondents who answered affirmative to the union question in the Infoshop survey are compared to those who report not belonging to a union.

Explanatory and Control Variables. Also dummy-coded are the following explanatory, independent variables. The variable "economic anarchist" is created from the two responses to political ideology that are both economic and anarchist in focus "anarcho-communist" and "anarcho-syndicalist" (1=yes). These two ideologies emphasize the importance of attention to class and economic issues. All other responses to ideology were dummy-coded as 0=no, including regular anarchists. Those who simply called themselves anarchists might sympathize with the same values as economic anarchists or may also call themselves such, but they are still dummy-coded 0 as economic anarchists in this study.

Working class (responses to economic background, includes "dirt poor" and "working class, blue/pink/white collar"; 1=yes), while 0=no and includes both middle- and upper-class respondents; Those who don't want work (responses to work, includes "never", "Crimethinc", and "government handouts"; 1=yes), while the omitted categories include those who work full- and part-time, are students, or are currently unemployed.

Age is a continuous variable measured in years.

I controlled for other standard demographic variables, including: White (response to race; 1=yes), while 0 includes Asian, African-American, Latino, indigenous, and mixed; male (response to gender; 1=yes), while 0 includes female and transgender/other; heterosexual (response to sexual orientation; 1=yes), while 0 includes gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, and “gender-queer”; no religion (responses to religion, includes “agnostic”, “atheist”, and “not religious”; 1=yes), while 0 includes both mono- and polytheistic religions, and other spiritual philosophies (such as Taoism and Church of the SubGenius); North America (responses to country of residence, includes “Canada”, “Mexico”, and “United States”; 1=yes). Dummy-coded as 0 are all others, who are predominantly European. The label “North American” might be slightly misleading, since although Mexicans are counted, they are very few in number. They are included since I assume that the proximity to the US and other possible cultural similarities makes these respondents analogous to other North Americans (O’Connor 2003), despite the language difference (Infoshop is written overwhelmingly in English).

Analytic Strategy

The core of my analysis is to see how union members are associated with the working class and economic anarchists, holding constant work and age. The predictive diagram for this research is as follows:

I use logistic regression analysis, since the dependent variable is binary (1 = union membership). The independent variables of the regression model also include basic socio-demographic variables (such as race/ethnicity, gender, sexuality, religious affiliation, place of origins). I use progressive adjustment models (Stolzenberg 1980) in three steps. First, I regress the dependent variable on the control variables. This step allows analysis

of the relationship between union membership and the general demographic traits of survey respondents. Secondly, only the independent variables that measure anarchism are regressed. This step shows the relationship between the variables which should directly predict union membership. Third, I regress the dependent variable on all variables, both the independent and control variables.

This process shows how the independent variables of both Models 1 and 2 affect the dependent variable, and then how each set affects each other when combined together in Model 3. If the variables were never split-up in smaller groups, it would be difficult to know what affect the groups have separately.

RESULTS

Descriptive findings

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics and correlations for all the variables in this study. Nineteen percent (170 people) of those who answered the question stated they belonged to a union. Although this percentage may seem higher than US figures for union membership, remember that this number is inflated by non-US respondents (only 16 percent of US respondents were in a union). People who specified an economic anarchist ideology (anarcho-communist or anarcho-syndicalist) accounted for 14 percent of responses. There may be far more who *would* identify or sympathize with these ideologies, yet chose to respond simply with a fundamental answer of “anarchist” (23 percent did). One-third of respondents placed their economic background in the working class, while six percent professed a CrimethInc or other don’t want work attitude.

[TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

The average age was 24 years old. Age is a particularly important variable to the study, yet as mentioned earlier the low average age should caution the reader to conclusions drawn by the age variable. The range is from twelve to 65, and more than half the respondents were between the ages of 18 and 25.

Anarchists in the Infoshop survey differ from the general population in a number of other key ways—gender (75 percent male), sexual orientation (only 68 percent heterosexual), and religion (65 percent not religious). Eighty-two percent identified as White and eighty-five percent were from North America.

Union membership is correlated with all four of the predictive independent variables (economic anarchist, working class, don't want work, and age), as well as the North American control variable. Three of these variables are positively correlated to unions: economic anarchists ($r=.191$, $p<.0001$), working class ($r=.075$, $p=.026$), age ($r=.236$, $p<.0001$). Don't want work ($r=-.095$, $p=.005$) and North American ($r=.119$, $p=.000$) were both negatively correlated to union membership. Being working class is significantly correlated to economic anarchists ($r=.137$, $p<.0001$), don't want work ($r=.102$, $p=.002$), and age ($r=.088$, $p=.010$).

There were some significant relationships between the explanatory and control variables. Economic anarchists were positively correlated with White ($r=.094$, $p=.008$) and male ($r=.113$, $p=.001$). Working class was negatively correlated to White ($r=-.140$, $p<.0001$). Age was negatively correlated to no religion ($r=-.083$, $p=.015$).

Significant correlations were found among the control variables themselves. Male was positively correlated with heterosexual ($r=.343$, $p<.0001$) and negatively correlated with North American ($r=-.088$, $p=.009$). No religion (1 = yes) was positively correlated to

White ($r=.071$, $p=.047$), male ($r=.101$, $p=.003$), and heterosexual ($r=.092$, $p=.008$), and also negatively correlated to North American ($r=-.109$, $p=.001$).

Multivariate findings

Table 2 displays findings from the logistic regression analysis. Model 1 shows union membership (1=yes) regressed on the control variables. North Americans (1=yes) are less likely, compared to their counterparts (predominantly European) to be union members. In fact, being North American reduces the probability that the respondent will belong to a union by about 50 percent $[(e^{-.704} - 1) \times 100]$. None of the other control variables are significant.

[TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

In Table 2, Model 2, union membership is regressed on the independent measures for this study. Being an economic anarchist compared all other ideological focuses increases the probability of belonging to a union by more than 210 percent $[(e^{1.136} - 1) \times 100]$. Those who don't want work, when compared to all those who do work, are 92 percent less likely to be in unions $[(e^{-2.528} - 1) \times 100]$. They also have the largest absolute regression coefficient in Model 2. Finally, age increases the likelihood of being in a union by six percent $[(e^{.062} - 1) \times 100]$. Although expected to predict union membership, having a working class background was not significant in Model 2.

Table 2, Model 3 represents the final model for this study. Union membership is regressed on both the explanatory and control variables. The same variables stay significant as in Models 1 and 2. Being an economic anarchists compared to other

ideologies increases the probability of being in a union by nearly 260 percent $[(e^{1.275} - 1) \times 100]$, an increase of 46 percent once the control variables are added into the model. The other variables do not change as greatly. Not wanting work, when compared to others who work, decreases the likelihood of being in a union by 90 percent $[(e^{-2.352} - 1) \times 100]$, a two percent increase once the controls are added. The influence of the variable age on union membership in Model 3 is the same as in Model 2. Age increases the probability of being in a union by six percent $[(e^{0.062} - 1) \times 100]$. North Americans are 47 percent $[(e^{-0.761} - 1) \times 100]$ less likely to be in unions, compared to those not from North America, a three percent change compared to Model 1, which included only control variables.

DISCUSSION and CONCLUSIONS

Union membership of Infoshop respondents in the US (16.4 percent) was marginally higher than in the general population. This unionization level is half that of respondents from Europe (35.3 percent). NSM applies to developed Western nations generally, and thus the higher European membership rate should be included when considering anarchism and NSMs. This suggests that other regions may deviate from the NSM framework more clearly than North Americans. However, since this paper centered upon North America I focused on anarchists in that region, whom were only slightly more likely to be in a labor union than their mainstream fellow citizens. The percentage of union members may be noticeably larger if the “don’t want work” respondents are removed from the analysis, as non-workers are removed from Census Bureau analysis of union membership (BLS 2004).

Both the bivariate and multivariate findings generally support H1, that one's political ideology—particularly the emphasis upon economics—influence membership in unions. If an individual is concerned enough to identify specifically as anarcho-syndicalist or anarcho-communist, as opposed to just an anarchist, this commitment seems to translate into carrying out that “class struggle” ideology into action. The regression coefficient increased as the control variables were inserted, becoming a stronger relationship.

Although working class is significantly related to union membership, when evaluated by multivariate analysis, its importance diminishes. Consequently, the impact of other independent variables lessen the impact that working class has for predicting union membership. This weakens the conclusion related to H2.

In addressing H3, work appears to play a role in influencing union membership. Those who “don't want work”, although negatively predictive of union membership, constitute a very small percentage of the overall sample (5.5 percent of respondents) and consequently the coefficient has a large standard error (1.027). Still, the overall result is as expected—those with don't want work attitudes and behaviors would not be part of unions. This attitude is clearly not very pervasive in the movement, although the Infoshop survey did not directly ask respondents if they shared an affinity for it.

The don't want work attitude and CrimethInc perspective has a distinct lifestyle behind it, one that is not conducive to organizing, participation in, or even basic sympathy with unions. These people provide a strong case against H5—which predicts that anarchists do not fit the NSM framework—by showing that they are unlikely to belong to unions.

Older anarchists have a higher likelihood of union membership than younger anarchists. On the surface, this would suggest support for H4. The sample includes respondents who are minors and may be one explanatory factor.³ This finding may also be partially explained by the need for security that increases with age. The need for security tends to lead people to find stable work, which can often be found within labor unions. Finally, since the standard deviation of respondents to age is roughly 8 years (above or below 24), the survey is not really multi-generational.

The only significant control variable from Model 3 is North Americans, who tend toward non-membership in unions. Since three-fifths of the non-North Americans are Europeans, this suggests varying attitudes across the Atlantic Ocean. The other controls—Whites, males, heterosexuals, and the non-religious—are not significant, nor are they correlated with membership.

This paper has begun the task of creating quantitative research looking at North American anarchists. It has sought to address the assumptions of anarchists as participants in a middle-class movement, as is the case with NSMs generally. The regression model generated successfully addressed the first four hypotheses, with the exception of H2.

It is clear that when anarchists identify specifically with an economic ideology they are more likely to belong to labor unions. What's not clear is that these anarchists come from the working class (at least at a multivariate level). The working class is very present within the anarchist movement. But this background does not predict union membership within the full regression model, despite being significantly correlated. The

³ There is a strong negative relationship ($r = -.314$, $p = .000$) between the age of recipient and if they were a student who does not work, more than half of whom are 18 or under. One-tenth of overall respondents were both minors and students that didn't work (thus could not be part of a union). This obviously influences the work and possibly the political ideology of respondents.

countervailing trend—although far less common amongst anarchists—is the influence of the CrimethInc work ideology in which anarchists are far less likely to be in unions. Older anarchists are more likely to belong to unions, yet this point should be viewed as inconclusive due to the small range of age in the Infoshop dataset. North Americans tend not to belong to unions compared to others throughout the world.

In addressing H5, it is unclear if anarchists may be placed within the NSM framework or not. If the results for H2 were more conclusive, it would be easier to do so. Generally, the results suggest that anarchists are not apart of NSMs, for the simple fact that of high working class response to the Infoshop survey, while NSM asserts that movements are primarily composed of elements of the middle class. Yet, the non-significant tendency for the working class to participate in unions (the best counter-example to NSM in this study) makes this point unclear.

It should be noted that although this research has tested the characteristics of anarchists who do or do not belong to labor unions, this does not suggest anything beyond that. Active participation, organizing, or activism is unknown for these individuals. Since NSM theory suggests that traditional movements were active labor and class-based movements, it is not possible to claim that simple membership to a union constitutes a labor *movement*.

While it is generally clear that the focus and composition of anarchists themselves have changed from earlier generations, it is less clear how the anarchist movement itself has changed. Anarchists appear to be embracing a broader philosophy and issue-focus than in the past. Does this suggest that anarchists belong to NSMs? Or, if the picture is less clear, does it merely support part of the NSM theory, yet not others?

The values of NSMs are very *anarchistic*; values such as autonomy, self-determination, and decentralization are professed as core values in anarchist literature. Bagguley (1992) notes that these are not necessarily new tendencies, which is true for the anarchist movement; classic anarchist theorists (like Proudhon and Bakunin) wrote about these values well before sociology itself became a discipline. Yet, this paper did not test anarchist values and attitudes, so a comparison based upon these criteria is not possible. It is difficult to answer these large questions with just one survey, especially a limited one.

Future research should consider the philosophical and real support of unions as part of anarchist ideology, not just that which is economic in focus. It may be that “anarchists without adjective” are equally likely to participate in unions as their economic-focused counterparts, yet this is impossible to tell from the Infoshop survey results. Questions that expand on simple union membership, such as activity within a union or union-organizing itself, would be useful.

Unions are not the only working class or economic-focused organizations that exist, but they are the most prevalent and prominent. Future research should look for other organizations that derive from the working class or focus on economic issues. Anarchist participation in such organizations may be different than membership in labor unions. This would strengthen the confidence that other possible structures of traditional movements are being studied, not just unions.

Using a different measure for class, such as annual income, may provide a different result than the question used by the Infoshop survey to illicit economic class background. The ability to separate certain sectors of the middle-class—service sector workers, non-profit workers, students, and retirees—would aid in testing who in the middle class is supportive of the anarchist movement according to NSM. Asking for

educational status would facilitate analysis of the “traditional intellectual” position of the middle class in NSM theory. Finally, efforts to seek out anarchists of older generations to test the impact of age upon union membership would help provide a richer context.

More importantly, future research may wish to seek a better way to explore the ideology versus identity question proposed by NSM. One possible way is to evaluate anarchist beliefs in NSM values, tactics, and focus. In doing so, it would be possible to apply these elements to the RSMO theory discussed earlier, allowing a contrast between the two frameworks.

Finally, differentiating between anarchists and participants in an anarchist movement and being able to study them, their actions, and their beliefs over time will be the key in being able to analyze the anarchist movement itself, as opposed to merely the characteristics of individual anarchists. This will help deal with the question of causality with who is part of a union, and if that membership is possibly a deliberate choice and not just a requirement for their job.

REFERENCES

- Albert, Michael. 2002. *The Trajectory of Change: Activist Strategies for Social Transformation*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Anarchy FAQ. 2004. *An Anarchist FAQ*. Version 10.0. <http://www.anarchyfaq.org>.
- Bagguley, Paul. 1992. "Social Change, the Middle Class and the Emergence of 'New Social Movements': A Critical Analysis". *The Sociological Review*, 40 (1), February: 26-48.
- Bain, Christian Arthur. 1999. "A Short History of Lesbian and Gay Labor Activism in the United States". Pp. 58-86 in *Laboring for Rights: Unions and Sexual Diversity Across Nations*, edited by G. Hunt. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Bakunin, Michael. [1916] 1970. *God and The State*. New York: Dover. Originally from a French translation.
- Berkman, Alexander. [1937] 2003. *What is Anarchism?*. Edinburgh: AK Press.
- Black, Bob. 1985. *The Abolition of Work and Other Essays*. Port Townsend, WA: Loopmaniacs.
- Bookchin, Murray. 1995. *Social Anarchism or Lifestyle Anarchism: An Unbridgeable Chasm*. Edinburgh: AK Press.
- Brecher, Jeremy. 1997. *Strike!* Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2004. *Union Members in 2003*. Press release. January 21. <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/union2.pdf>
- Chirot, Daniel. 1986. *Social Change in the Modern Era*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1973. *For Reasons of State*. New York: Pantheon.

- Class War Federation. 1992. *Unfinished Business: The Politics of Class War*. Edinburgh: AK Press.
- Cohen, Jean L. 1985. "Strategy or Identity: New Theoretical Paradigms and Contemporary Social Movements". *Social Research*, 52 (4): 663-716.
- CrimethInc. 2000. *Days of War, Nights of Love*. Atlanta: Crimethinc.
- Day, Christopher. [1994] 2003. "Love and Rage in the New World Order". Pp. 55-64 in *A New World in Our Hearts: Eight Years of Writings from the Love and Rage Revolutionary Anarchist Federation*, edited by R. San Filippo. Oakland: AK Press.
- de Cleyre, Voltairine. 1912. *Direct Action*. New York: Mother Earth.
- DeLeon, David. 1996. "For Democracy Where We Work: A Rationale for Social Self-Management". Pp. 192-210 in *Reinventing Anarchy, Again*, edited by H. J. Ehrlich. Edinburgh: AK Press.
- Dolgoff, Sam. 1977. *The Relevance of Anarchism to Modern Society*. Minneapolis: Soil of Liberty.
- Elliott, Michael. 1999. "The New Radicals". *Newsweek*, December 13: 36-39.
- Epstein, Barbara. 1991. *Political Protest and Cultural Revolution*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Fendrick, James Max and Robert W. Turner. 1989. "The Transition from Student to Adult Politics". *Social Forces*, 67 (4), June: 1049-1057.
- Fitzgerald, Kathleen J. and Diane M. Rodgers. 2000. "Radical Social Movement Organizations: A Theoretical Model". *The Sociological Quarterly*, 41 (4): 573-592.
- Goldman, Emma. 1970. *Living My Life*. Volumes 1 and 2. New York: Dover.

- Goldman, Emma. [1916] 2001. "The Philosophy of Atheism". Pp. 88-93 in *Anarchy! An Anthology of Emma Goldman's Mother Earth*, edited by P. Glassgold. Washington, D.C.: Counterpoint.
- Graeber, David. 2002. "The New Anarchists". *New Left Review*, 13, Jan/Feb: 61-73.
- Grevatt, Martha. 2001. "Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Transgender Liberation: What's Labor Got to Do With It?". *Social Policy*, 31 (3), Spring: 63-65.
- Heery, Ed, John Kelly, Jeremy Waddington. 2002. "Union Revitalization in the United Kingdom". International Institute for Labor Studies: DP/133/2002.
<http://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/inst/download/dp13302.pdf>
- Humphrey, Jill C. 1999. "Organizing Sexualities, Organized Inequalities: Lesbians and Gay Men in Public Service Occupations". *Gender, Work and Organization*, 6 (3), July: 134-151.
- Kahn, Joseph. 2000. "Anarchism, the Creed That Won't Stay Dead". *New York Times*, August 5.
- Klein, Naomi. 1999. *No Logo: No Space, No Jobs, No Choice*. New York: Picador.
- McCarthy, John D. and Mayer Zald. 1977. "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory". *American Journal of Sociology*, 82 (6): 1212-1241.
- Mead, Margaret. 1974. "Youth Would Be Valiant". *Education*, 94 (4), April/May: 376-379.
- Meltzer, Albert. 1996. *Anarchism: Arguments For and Against*. Edinburgh: AK Press.
- Misra, Joya and Alexander Hicks. 1994. "Catholicism and Unionization in Affluent Postwar Democracies: Catholicism, Culture, Party, and Unionization". *American Sociological Review*, 59 (2), April: 304-326.
- National Telecommunications and Information Administration. 2002. "A Nation Online: How Americans Are Expanding Their Use of the Internet". Washington, DC: US

Department of Commerce, February.

http://www.ntia.doc.gov/ntiahome/dn/nationonline_020502.htm.

Nettlau, Max. 1996. *A Short History of Anarchism*. London: Freedom Press.

O'Connor, Alan. 2003. "Punk Subculture in Mexico and the Anti-globalization Movement: A Report from the Front". *New Political Science*, 25 (1): 43-53.

Offe, Claus. 1985. "New Social Movements: Challenging the Boundaries of Institutional Politics". *Social Research*, 52 (4): 817- 868.

Owens, Lynn and L. Kendall Palmer. 2003. "Making the News: Anarchist Counter-Public Relations on the World Wide Web". *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 20 (4), December: 335-361.

Pannekoek, Anton. [1948] 2003. *Workers' Councils*. Oakland: AK Press.

Pichardo, Nelson A. 1997. "New Social Movements: A Critical Review". *Annual Review of Sociology*, 23 (1): 411-430.

Polletta, Francesca. 2001. "This is What Democracy Looks Like': A Conversation with Direct Action Network Activists David Graeber, Brooke Lehman, Jose Lugo, and Jeremy Varon". *Social Policy*, 31 (4), Summer: 25-30.

Robinson, J. Gregg. 1988. "American Unions in Decline: Problems and Prospects". *Critical Sociology*, 15 (1), Spring: 33-56.

Rocker, Rudolf. [1938] 1990. *Anarcho-Syndicalism*. London: Phoenix Press.

Rothschild-Whitt, Joyce. 1979. "The Collectivist Organization: An Alternative to Rational-Bureaucratic Models". *American Sociological Review*, 44, August: 509-527.

Schlosser, Eric. 2002. *Fast Food Nation: The Dark Side of the All-American Meal*. New York: Perennial.

- Shantz, Jeff. 2003. "Beyond the State: The Return to Anarchy". *disClosure: A Journal of Social Theory*, 12: 87-103.
- Sheppard, Brian Oliver. 2002. "Anarchism and the Labor Movement". *Z-Net*, August 5.
<http://www.zmag.org/content/showarticle.cfm?SectionID=41&ItemID=2188>
- Stolzenberg, Ross M. 1980. "The Measurement and Decomposition of Causal Effects in Nonlinear and Nonadditive Models". *Sociological Methodology*, 11: 459-488.
- Ward, Colin. 1996. *Anarchy in Action*. London: Freedom Press.
- Zerzan, John. 1996. *Future Primitive and Other Essays*. New York: Autonomedia.