Received: 19 January 2022 | Accepted: 8 April 2022

DOI: 10.1111/nana.12891

THEMED SECTION

WILEY

Introduction. Anarchism and the national question—historical, theoretical and contemporary perspectives

José A Gutiérrez[1,2] | Ruth Kinna[3]

[1]Schools of Law, Universidad Santo Tomás, Medellín, Colombia

[2]Institute for International Conflict Resolution and Reconstruction (Dublin City University), Dublin, Ireland

[3]Department of Politics, History and International Relations, Loughborough University, Loughborough, UK

Correspondence
José A. Gutiérrez, Institute for International Conflict Resolution and Reconstruction (DCU), Glasnevin Campus, Dublin 9, D09 V209, Ireland.
Email: jose.danton@ustamed.edu.co

Abstract

This article provides an introduction to the themed section 'Anarchism and the national question—historical, theoretical and contemporary perspectives.' We discuss first the long and often overlooked engagement of anarchists with the colonial and national liberation question, particularly—but not exclusively—in the heyday of the movement (from the second half of the 19th to the first decades of the 20th century). We discuss in particular the overlaps and tensions between anarchists and republicans (those who favoured republics as opposed to monarchies) and anti-colonial nationalists (anti-colonialists who defended the right of national self-determination). Then we proceed to discuss the potential for a dialogue between anarchist and nationalism studies based on three interventions. First, to problematise the narrative that conflates nations with state-building processes. Second, to better grasp the emergence of alternatives to the nation–state as a historical construct. Third, to complicate narratives that associate in an unproblematic fashion internationalism and classless society. Finally, the introduction highlights the four questions which lie at the core of the themed section and discuss briefly how the papers relate to these.

KEYWORDS
anarchism, anti-colonialism, federalism, nationalism, nation–state

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.
© 2022 The Authors. *Nations and Nationalism* published by Association for the Study of Ethnicity and Nationalism and John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

14698129, 2023, 1, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nana.12891 by Dublin City University, Wiley Online Library on [07/03/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

1 | INTRODUCTION

At the turn of the 20th century, anarchism was one of the most dynamic and strongest mass movements in the world. In countries including Spain, Argentina, Cuba, Japan, Korea, the United States, France and Italy, it represented one of the biggest challenges to the *status quo*. In the 1880s and 1890s, critical attention was often directed towards the 'anarchist peril', a phrase that dramatically captured the vulgar view that the anarchist critique of authority necessarily translated into a propensity to commit violence. As Richard Bach Jensen notes, the perceived threat of anarchism prompted the first ever international summit on terrorism and the outlawing of acts, deemed anarchist, which 'aimed at the violent destruction of "all social organisation"' (2013: 1). Yet the strength of the 19th and early 20th century movement was organised labour: millions of workers joined unions which explicitly or implicitly promoted anarchist social conceptions which championed organisation 'from the bottom up' and distribution according to need. These unions also privileged direct action, that is, the action of the exploited themselves, unmediated by political representatives (de Cleyre, 1912: 220–242; Rocker, 1947). Many of the rights that workers gained during this period owe a great deal to the contribution of anarchists, notably the 8-h working day (Avrich, 1984; Gutiérrez, 2010; Nelson, 1988). As Lucien van der Walt argues, anarchists mobilised against all forms of oppression (2016: 356) and organised with women exploited in sweated trades, deemed unskilled by conservative union bosses, experimented with innovative forms of strike action and set up unions with workers where none had existed before (Leeder, 1993; Pesotta, 1944).

The influence of anarchism was also felt culturally, notably in the arts and literature: anarchists placed special emphasis on education and popular culture and contributed to the creation of vibrant arts scenes across Europe and the Americas (Antliff, 2007; Roslak, 2016; Sonn, 1989). Anarchists promoted debates about the role of the church in society and variously attacked institutionalised religion and orthodoxy, championing dissent and contributing decisively to the spread of free-thought and secularism (Bray & Howarth, 2018); anarchist opposition to militarism also exercised a powerful sway on the anti-war movements that mushroomed in the years leading up to the First World War (Kinna & Adams, 2017) and pre-45 (de Ligt, 1989 [1938]). Anarchists explored ethical ways of living, promoting naturism, vegetarianism and alternative community. (Goodway, 2006; Ryley, 2013; Shaffer, 2005). They were early defenders of women's liberation and of the rights of the LGTBQI+ communities, taking a decisive stance against conservative moralism (Blatt, 1989; Frost, 2009; Goldman, 2016; Jeppesen & Nazar, 2017; Nicholas, 2019). Although it has often been claimed that anarchism did not have an intellectual tradition comparable to Marxism (Graeber, 2009; Guérin, 1970; Hobsbawm, 1973), it should not be forgotten that, at the time, some of the most influential intellectuals, including Pyotr Kropotkin, Elisée Reclus and Leo Tolstoy, as well as some outstanding political commentators such as Emma Goldman, elaborated, identified with and/or promoted anarchist ideas.

2 | ANARCHISM, THE CONCEPT OF THE NATION AND NATIONALISM

Until recently, the contributions that anarchists made to the debates on colonialism and nationalism—debates that dominated much of the political agenda at the turn of the 20th century—have received scant attention. Yet anarchist engagement with national and colonial questions was part of the warp and weft of the movement. Indeed, when anarchism emerged as a distinctive 'anti-authoritarian' current in the socialist movement during the early 1870s, significant figures, including Mikhail Bakunin, used republicanism as a critical foil. Embracing republican tropes of liberation, he and others promoted an anti-state internationalist vision of emancipation, thus parting company with many emergent 'nationalists' who conflated independence with traditional forms of governance (cf., Cipko, 1990; Pernicone, 1993).

For Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, the author of *What is Property?* (1840) who had paved the way for the emergence of the European anarchist movement, the term 'republicanism' was imprecise. In accepting it, he added the label 'anarchist' to sharpen its meaning (Proudhon, 1969 [1840]: 259). Later anarchists acknowledged a similarly close

14698129, 2023, 1, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nana.12891 by Dublin City University, Wiley Online Library on [07/03/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

relationship between anarchism and republicanism, sometimes referring to their political project as a 'social republic' (cf., Sandoval, 2011, p.93; Vadillo, 2021)—a concept articulated again recently during the *procés* in Catalonia by the anarcho-syndicalist unions (Gutiérrez and Martí, this issue). Indeed, significant numbers of activists gravitated to anarchism from republicanism, disillusioned by what they regarded as the domestic and international tyranny of European and American governments. Not surprisingly, there is a significant convergence between the two movements.

In a negative sense, anarchists and republicans expressed common opposition to monarchy and the power of the Church, to empire and (notwithstanding some expressions of casual racism), to notions of supremacy (Abelló, 2010; Adams, 2019; Levy, 2004). The positive overlaps were on federalism, the devolution of power, self-determination or self-government, autonomy and the right of secession. Yet the encounter with republicanism revealed the distinctiveness of the anarchist position. Although 19th-century republicanism was an open-textured movement, not invariably tied to what we understand today as the nation–state formula, republican nationalists and anarchists disputed the role and character of the state. Their disagreements were theoretical and affected practical questions of organisation and strategy.

Proudhon's critique of contract theory as a device that concealed elite entrenchments of power, and his description of the government as a repressive 'law-driven' machine that routinely 'judged, condemned, shot, deported' and 'sacrificed' its citizens (Proudhon, 1989 [1851]: 294), emphasised the incompatibility of statism with the concept of the ideal commonwealth and the weakness of constitutionalism to constrain the arbitrary power rooted in the monopoly of violence. The state could never be a realm of peace and freedom, he argued. It was necessarily a system of domination. Consequently, when Proudhon described the nation as an association that commanded both 'force and virtue' (Proudhon, 2022), he pinpointed a fundamental tension between the aspiration for nationhood and the constitution of the state. On his view, 'nationhood' encapsulated a demand for freedom and independence that was negated by the state's hierarchical organisation and the competitive logics of the international system. His proposal was to anarchise the republican social contract by recognising the sovereign right of individuals and the collective force of their association (Proudhon, 1989 [1851]).

Subsequent anarchists elaborated Proudhon's critique, and adopting his conception of decentralised federalism—perhaps Proudhon's most enduring contribution to libertarian socialist politics—they rejected the institutions of government and struggled to transform rather than reform established constitutional arrangements (Adams in this volume). This did not involve the rejection of national self-determination, but it altered the basis on which activists entered national struggles.

Mikhail Bakunin, Karl Marx's rival in the First International during the early 1870s, brought his early engagement with Romantic and nationalist movements to bear on Proudhon's description of the nation as a mobilising ideal to explore the plight of subject 'nations'. In his youth, he had lent his support to several national resistance movements (Lavrin, 1966; Weintraub, 1949). Unlike Proudhon, who had been sceptical about the Polish rising of 1863, he threw his weight behind this struggle, too (Kofman, 1968; Prichard, 2015). Although he was not an uncritical supporter of nationalist aspirations, dramatically parting company with Mazzini in 1871 (Levy, 2018; Ravindranathan, 1989), Bakunin came to believe that demands for independence were infused by a radical critique of domination that could be steered in an anarchist direction. Stiffening Proudhon's realism, he described nations as 'facts' (1990 [1873]: 46). Yet, like Proudhon, he denied that the mere fact of a nation's existence automatically grounded distinct privileges. As he put it, 'every nation, like every individual, is of necessity what it is, and has an unquestionable right to be itself … But just because a nation or an individual has a certain identity and can have no other, it does not follow that they have a right … to nationality or individuality as special principles' (1990 [1873]: 46).

Kropotkin, one of the most influential anarchists of the latter part of the 19th century, similarly acknowledged the conservative pull of nationalist politics but read the resistance of 'small nations' against Empire as a launchpad for an anti-imperialist, anti-colonialist politics. Writing about Finnish national aspirations in the mid-1880s, he expressed his wariness about the likely outcome of Finland's cultural resurgence but refused to rule out its constructive disintegrative potential. Promoting independence movements against Russification, he also endorsed autonomist

14698129, 2023, 1, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nana.12891 by Dublin City University, Wiley Online Library on [07/03/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

14698129, 2023, 1, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nana.12891 by Dublin City University, Wiley Online Library on [07/03/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

and insurrectionary trends in European politics and was generally supportive of anti-imperialist struggles, notably the Irish independence campaign (Gutiérrez & Ferretti, 2019; Kropotkin, 1885). In an open letter calling on western workers to resist anti-Bolshevik interventions likely to harm the popular revolution (1919), he outlined his optimistic hopes for the nations collected in the former Russian empire. The 're-establishment of relations between the European and American nations and Russia', he wrote, 'does not mean the supremacy of the Russian nation over the nationalities that composed the Czarist Empire'. Turning to Proudhon's model of decentralised federation, he continued:

> Imperialist Russia is dead and will not be revived. The future of these different provinces lies in a great federation. The natural territories of the various parts of this federation are quite distinct, as those of us familiar with Russian history and ethnography well know. All efforts to reunite under a central control the naturally separate parts of the Russian Empire are predestined to failure. It is therefore fitting that the western nations should recognize the right of independence of each part of the old Russian Empire (Kropotkin, 1919).

The anarchist position was not without tensions: anarchists not only disagreed about which national struggles to support but whether to support them at all. They also argued about the politics of international power relations; most anarchists rejected Kropotkin's rosy analysis of European political trends and decisively broke with him when he lent his support to the Entente powers in 1914 (Kinna & Adams, 2017). Similarly, anarchists struggled in their daily practices to delineate the relationship between national organising and internationalism and to articulate anti-statist expressions of identity and principles of citizenship in the contexts of state repression. Some of these issues are discussed in this collection. However, the two points we want to emphasise here are that leading anarchists actively engaged in the politics of national liberation and that this engagement has an important bearing on modern militant movements whose politics leans strongly towards national liberation: the Zapatistas in Mexico (Subcomandante Marcos, 2004), indigenous movements in North and Latin America (Hill, 2009; Margarucci in this volume) and the Catalan *procés* in recent years (Gutiérrez and Martí, this issue). Particularly notable, in this respect, is the Kurdish revolution in the Middle East which has been strongly influenced by anarchist and ecologist Murray Bookchin (Bookchin, 2018).

These open texture of anarchist politics enabled militants to forge complex alliances with republican groups. Ultimately, however, anarchists differentiated the aspiration for self-government from the territorialised construction of the nation in the state. Anarchists, then, typically identified as anti-nationalist as well as anti-statist and rejected republican conceptions of national independence. Militants including Leo Tolstoy, Kōtoku Shūsui, Emma Goldman and Rudolf Rocker produced biting critiques of patriotism, as well as militarism and imperialism, and exposed its enculturation through state and church-led national education programmes, the media and the arts (Goldman, 1979 [1915]; Rocker, 1978 [1947]; Shūshi, 2015 [1901]). Describing a statist psychology of nationalism, M.P.T. Acharya, in 1928, articulated the prevailing anarchist anti-nationalist anti-statist view when he described Mohandas Gandhi's statist push for independence as aggressive and predatory:

> While he is violently opposed to violence in general, he is more opposed to the mass liberation from violence than to the violence of Governments. He does not believe that the violence established by Governments at their expense creates and necessitates the violence of the people at times. While he wishes to abolish the violence of individuals and groups, he believes that violence of governments is impersonal, necessary - nay perhaps in the end good. This psychology is opposed to the very idea of non-violence and peaceful, brotherly society … we have party after party coming up, all agreeing together that some violence or other has to be imposed and kept up over the people in the name of constituents and States. And Gandhi is not different in this respect—not better—than the usual run of man poisoned by habitual submission to violence of one kind or another (Acharya, 2019: 72–73).

3 | ANARCHISM AND NATIONALISM STUDIES

Notwithstanding the rich body of historical research on nationally based anarchist movements in the Americas, Asia and Europe, (e.g., Bowen Raddeker, 1997; Carlson, 1972; Craib, 2016; Dirlik, 1991; Esenwein, 1989; Goyens, 2007; Hwang, 2016; Maitron, 1951; Pernicone, 1993; Shaffer, 2013; Zimmer, 2015), anarchist perspectives on the national question remain neglected in nationalism studies. By the same token, few of the anarchism studies that touch upon the anarchists' involvement in independence movements and involvement with nationalisms provide sustained theoretical reflection on the nation or discuss the scholarship in nationalism studies (e.g., Casanovas, 2000; Dirlik, 1991; Hwang, 2016; Porter, 2011; Serrano, 1986; Van der Walt & Hirsch, 2010).

The transnational character of the movement and its internationalist commitments (Anderson, 2007; Bantman & Altena, 2015; Van der Walt & Hirsch, 2010) help explain the detachment of anarchism from nationalism studies. Yet just as the transnational turn has shone a light on the particularities and, in some cases, insularity of anarchist movements—their enduring 'national' character (Bantman, 2013; di Paola, 2013)—the re-examination of the anarchist critique of, and engagement with republicanism, has reignited debates about anarchist conceptions of domination in the context of Empire, imperialism, colonialism and class exploitation (Laursen, 2017; Ramnath, 2011). This re-examination, challenging the tendency to treat anarchism as the 'poor cousin' of Marxism (Kinna & Prichard, 2019; Levy, 2004), has significantly reframed and recontextualised the anarchist approaches to the national question.

This research agenda has been enhanced by the work of Benedict Anderson. As a leading scholar of nationalism studies, Anderson put anarchism on the map when he examined its relationship to anti-colonial nationalism at the end of the 19th century in Asia, Latin America and Europe. Extending the thesis first advanced in *Imagined Communities* (1985), which nationalism was a global movement, in *Under Three Flags* (2007) he revealed the connections between nationalism and anarchism by exploring the work of Filipino radicals fighting Spanish and US domination. Yet Anderson's analysis of anarchist theory was informed by the erroneous view that anarchism was an a theoretical, principally terroristic and transgressive practice. Moreover, he failed to engage significantly with the anarchist movements he described. For example, in Cuba, one of his areas of interest, he neglected to consider the active participation of anarchist movements in the independence struggle (e.g., Casanovas, 2000; Dolgoff, 1976; Fernández, 2000; Serrano, 1986). Following Anderson's lead, Van der Walt and Hirsch (2010) published an impressive collection of essays exploring anarchist internationalist politics and the anarchist movement participation in national struggles against colonialism. They demonstrate convincingly that anarchist engagement in national politics was systematic, not coincidental. However, their focus on anarchist internationalism side lines the analysis of the national question and neglects the scholarship in nationalism studies. David Porter's (2011) meticulous and magnificent research on French anarchism's engagement with the Algerian question at the critical time of its independence also avoids systematic discussion of the literature on nationalism and bypasses the anarchists' positions on the question in other contexts.

A critical appraisal of the engagement of anarchists in national struggles, informed by anarchist studies and nationalism studies, is thus long overdue. This thematic issue showcases the research of scholars interested in subjecting the anarchist analysis of the national question to new scrutiny. It is designed to provide a ground for a systematic appraisal of the anarchist contributions to the debates on republicanism, colonialism, imperialism and nationalism and the evolution of these contributions over time. We make no attempt to present a definitive anarchist account of the 'national question'. Any attempt to provide a monolithic formula would be futile and run counter to the logics of anarchist thinking. As we have noted above, anarchists adopted distinctive perspectives on the nation and nationalism but never aspired to present a unified anarchist theory or dogma on the national question. Indeed, as our contributors show, anarchists habitually advanced theory from practice, addressing particular national questions at specific moments to think creatively in the moment, paying due regard to like cases but avoiding generalised policy claims. Yet while they steered clear of grand theoretical statements, it is still possible to extract a *coherent* and

14698129, 2023, 1, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nana.12891 by Dublin City University, Wiley Online Library on [07/03/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

unique set of principles from the anarchists' anti-statist, anti-nationalist, anti-imperialist, anti-colonial, federalist and ardently emancipatory politics.

Anarchism's shared critical perspective centre on the idea, outlined above, that sovereignty is a principle of self-rule or self-determination referring to the self-management of the person and communities, and not a statist prerogative. This approach shaped the broader dialogue that anarchists conducted with each other and with other radicals involved in the movements of the day. In what follows, our aim is to use this general frame to consider how it relates to studies of nationalism. By doing so, we hope to open new conversations about the insights that anarchism can bring to research in the field, both as a movement and theoretical tradition.

The anarchist characterisation of the state suggests three interventions into nationalism studies. First and foremost, it complicates teleological narratives that conflate the nation with state-building processes, a view that cuts across the modernist and the perennialist divide in nationalism studies. To borrow Skey's formulation, anarchism places less emphasis on the 'when and what' of the nation and instead focusses attention on its instantiation (2009: 333). Anarchists have spent considerable time developing concepts of the nation, variously describing it as an expression of monarchy or aristocracy (Proudhon, 1989 [1851]); a social construction rooted in shared and invented histories, cultural, linguistic or religious identities, (Kropotkin, 1885); a construct of the bureaucratic state, epitomised in totalitarianism, which lacks any clear foundation in language, history and culture of faith (Rocker, 1978 [1947]); a spiritual community permanently in the process of becoming (Landauer, 2010 [1907]); and an intervention that resonates with indigenous struggles against nation–state nationalisms built on bordering and exclusion (Smith, 2011: 62). One common thread tying these ideas together is the nation's territorialisation and constitutionalisation in the state. The questions anarchists ask are about impact that statism has on histories, cultures, religions, languages and movements of peoples and how these facets of human existence can be enhanced without recourse to the state. As Landauer put it: '[i]neradicable, real difference' exist 'between peoples' and all 'human beings'. These are politically significant, but not foundational to community membership, still less to notions of citizenship. Landauer continued: 'Each human being talks, thinks and feels differently to others.' Embracing diversity is the stuff of live: 'Sameness breeds hate.' For Landauer, sameness was the central problem of the state. His argument was that statism imposes uniformity while fuelling nationalist narratives that confuse diversity with division and undermine meaningful social interaction or, in his terms, make it 'impossible' and 'dreadful' (Landauer, 2010 [1907]: 277). His view not only avoided the kind of methodological nationalism that Michael Billig has identified in mainstream sociology and psychology (1995: 53), it also suggested the prospect of deterritorialised anti-statist nations and new forms of communitarian, spiritual unity (Grauer, 1994: 7–11). This vision underpinned Landauer's hope for Jewish communities. And it resonates with the Kurdish project in the Middle East.

Second, the anarchist distinction between state and nation complicates some assumptions of banal nationalism. Billig's concerns about the pervasiveness of nationalism as an ideology in everyday life leave little conceptual space to theorise the state. Billig criticises theorists who attempt to defend national liberation struggles by decoupling nationalism from the state for failing to consider how 'autonomy, unity and independence' are to be maintained, once achieved, beyond the 'ideological complex' of 'the autonomous nation–state' (1995: 43). Yet his concluding remarks to *Banal Nationalism* stand in contradiction to this assertion. Anticipating 'changes in the structures of nations', he looks forward to the passing of 'the age of nationhood' arguing that: 'History has created nations and, in time, it will unmake them' (1995: 176). These projected changes point (hopefully) to new forms of community and universalism. But in contrast to more recent future projections (Wimmer, 2021), the emergent shift lacks clear sociological form. In the anarchist imagination, too, the decoupling of nation from nationalism in the state suggests the possibility of non-state, inter-national relations. Specifically, in turning to decentralised federation, anarchists provide a global alternative to the sovereign 'nation–state' model. This achieves its unity through free agreement, recognises the fluidity of social relationships and uses the right of secession to constrain domination. While admitting local difference, it empowers the construction of complex associations horizontally, from 'the bottom up'. In 1947, Rudolf Rocker, author of the most comprehensive anarchist critique of nationalism, *Nationalism and Culture*, (1978 [1947]),

14698129, 2023, 1, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nana.12891 by Dublin City University, Wiley Online Library on [07/03/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

used Proudhon's idea to elaborate an anti-nationalist, anti-statist and anti-capitalist plan for European co-operation (Kinna, 2020).

Following from this, the third intervention lies in the realm of socialist internationalism. Specifically, the anarchists' engagement with nationalism challenges the idea that internationalism relies exclusively or solely on the achievement of classlessness. Anarchists uniformly argued that internationalism necessitated the abolition of class divisions and that the emancipatory force of national struggles rested on the destruction of elite power and displacement of permanent, fixed authority—state sovereignty. Yet internationalism did not posit the transcendence of 'national' differences through the attainment of class consciousness, as is sometimes argued in nationalism studies (Özkirimli, 2000). For anarchists like Kropotkin and Landauer, internationalism described an arrangement between diverse and distinct linguistic and faith communities. It thus projected what Patrick Geddes understood as the glocal community.

4 | THE COLLECTION

This collection started to build up from a session we organised on anarchism and the national questions for the European Social Science History Conference that was supposed to take place in Leiden in March 2020. Unfortunately, the Covid-19 pandemic prevented the conference from taking place as planned, being postponed for a year. Even tually, two sessions were held online on 24 and 25 March 2021 that brought the bulk of the papers in this collection together. To investigate how anarchists examined the three issues outlined in the preceding paragraphs, we asked our contributors to consider the following four questions:

1. How have anarchists have engaged with concepts of autonomy and self-determination and how this engagement has intersected with nationalist and republican movements historically and at present?
2. How did anarchists perform their national identity and reproduced forms of 'banal nationalism'?
3. How did the anarchist critique of republicanism influence concepts that were as novel as elastic in the 19th century such as state and nation?
4. How have anarchist conceptions of nation, state and capitalism complicated/influenced positions on national liberation struggles?

In addressing these questions, our contributors build a complex picture of the relationship between nationalism and anarchism. As Kenyon Zimmer argues, anarchist uniformly rejected conventional concepts of citizenship, even while sometimes using the rights they evidently conferred to resist aggressive attacks on immigrant populations and deportation. Matthew Adams examines the divergence between liberal and anarchist conceptions of federalism. In his discussion of Canadian politics in the 1970s, he shows how the anarchist historian and literary critic George Woodcock advanced an idea of the 'anti-nation' to critique Pierre Trudeau's civic nationalism and proposed a model of governance based on regionalism and direct democracy. Anarchist expressions of national identity are discussed in Tom Goyens' account of German immigrant anarchists in the United States and Brazil from the 1880s to the end of the Third Reich. Constance Bantman and Pietro di Paola explore similar themes, focussing on 19th-century French and Italian movements exiled in London. Although their analysis highlights the strength and consistency of the anarchists' rejection of banal as well as hot forms of nationalism, it also raises questions about everyday nationhood in anti-statist and non-statist agglomerations. Finally, the tension in the anarchists' national-anti-nationalist politics explains the complex relationship anarchist have to conventional national independence and/or nationalist movements. Ivanna Margarucci explores one dimension of this relationship in her account of the mobilisation of Indian and *mestizo* workers in Boliva in the 1920s and 1930s. Anarchists, she notes, decoupled the nation from white Creole supremacy and constructed an idea that demanded the destruction of social, political, and patriarchal privileges. Bringing the collection up to date, José Gutiérrez and Jordi Martí Font explore another dimension of the same

14698129, 2023, 1, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nana.12891 by Dublin City University, Wiley Online Library on [07/03/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

topic, this time examining anarchist involvement in the Catalan 'procés' and highlighting the contingent circumstances that facilitated anarchist participation on it, but at the same time their specific contributions given their experience of outside-of-the-institutions and working-class mobilisation.

The wide range of topics covered in this thematic issue highlight the importance of exploring the links between nationalisms and anarchism from a theoretical and practical, as well as historical and contemporary perspective. Most certainly, this is far from the last word on the subject. This is the start of what we expect to be a fruitful dialogue between the studies of anarchism and nationalism, and the first steps into a research agenda that has much potential.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank the European Social Science History Conference organising committee for hosting the sessions which informed this themed section (Leiden, March, 2021). We would also like to thank each and all of the participants and contributors to those sessions, and to the Loughborough University Nationalism Network. In particular, we are indebted to Marco Antonsich, Daniel Chernilo, Clelia Clini and Line Nyhagen for their valuable comments on earlier dra. We are also thankful to Sinisa Malesevic (UCD) for his feedback on the early drafts. Finally, we would like to dedicate this collection to the memory of two brilliant, inspirational scholars, Bert Altena and Arif Dirlik. Open access funding provided by IReL.

ORCID

José A Gutiérrez https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2335-2677
Ruth Kinna https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1920-464X

REFERENCES

Abelló, T. (2010). Anarchism in the Catalan speaking countries: between syndicalism and propaganda (1868 1931). *Catalan Historical Review*, *3*, 87–102.

Acharya, M. (2019). *We are anarchists: Essays on anarchism, pacifism, and the Indian independence movement, 1923-1953*. AK Press.

Adams, M. (2019). Utopian civic virtue: Bakunin, Kropotkin, and anarchism's republican inheritance. *Political Research Exchange*, *1*(1), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/2474736X.2019.1668724

Anderson, B. (2007). *Under three flags: anarchism and the anticolonial imagination*. Verso.

Antliff, A. (2007). *Anarchy and art: From the Paris commune to the fall of the Berlin wall*. Arsenal Pulp Press.

Avrich, P. (1984). *The Haymarket tragedy*. Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780691222202

Bach Jensen, R. (2013). *The battle against terrorism*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524124

Bakunin, M. (1990). *Statism and anarchy*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139168083

Bantman, C. (2013). *The French anarchists in London, 1880 1914 exile and transnationalism in the first globalisation*. Liverpool University Press. https://doi.org/10.5949/liverpool/9781846318801.001.0001

Bantman, C., & Altena, B. (Eds.). (2015). *Reassessing the transnational turn: scales of analysis in anarchist and syndicalist studies*. Routledge.

Billig, M. (1995). *Banal nationalism*. Sage.

Blatt, M. (1989). *Free love and anarchism: The biography of Ezra Heywood*. University of Illinois Press.

Bookchin, D. (2018). "*How my father's ideas helped the Kurds create a new democracy*". The New York Review, June 15, 2018 https://www.nybooks.com/daily/2018/06/15/how-my-fathers-ideas-helped-the-kurds-create-a-new-democracy/ (Accessed 9 August 2021).

Bowen Raddeker, H. (1997). *Treacherous women of Imperial Japan: patriarchal fictions, patricidal fantasies*. Routledge.

Bray, M., & Howarth, R. (2018). *Anarchist education and the modern school: a Francisco Ferrer reader*. PM Press.

Carlson, A. (1972). *Anarchism in Germany*. The Scarcrow Press.

Casanovas, J. (2000). *¡O Pan, o Plomo Los Trabajadores Urbanos y el Colonialismo Español en Cuba, 1850 1898*. Siglo XXI.

Cipko, S. (1990). Mikhail Bakunin and the national question. *The Raven Quarterly*, *1*(3), 3–14.

Craib, R. (2016). *The cry of the renegade: politics and poetry in interwar Chile*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190241353.001.0001

de Cleyre, V. (1912). Direct action. In A. Berkman (Ed.), *Selected works of Voltairine de Cleyre*. Mother Earth.

14698129, 2023, 1, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nana.12891 by Dublin City University, Wiley Online Library on [07/03/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

de Ligt, B. (1989). *The conquest of violence: an essay on war and revolution (the libertarian critique)*. Pluto.

di Paola, P. (2013). *The knights errant of anarchy: London and the Italian anarchist diaspora 18801917*. Liverpool University Press. https://doi.org/10.5949/liverpool/9781846319693.001.0001

Dirlik, A. (1991). *Anarchism in the Chinese revolution*. University of California Press. https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520913738

Dolgoff, S. (1976). *Cuban revolution: a critical perspective*. Black Rose.

Esenwein, G. (1989). *Anarchist ideology and the working class movement in Spain, 1868–1898*. University of California Press. https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520334410

Fernández, F. (2000). *El Anarquismo en Cuba*. Fundación Anselmo Lorenzo.

Frost, G. (2009). Love is always free anarchism: free unions, and utopianism in Edwardian England. *Anarchist Studies*, *17*, 73–94.

Goldman, E. (1979). Patriotism: a menace to liberty. In A. K. Shulman (Ed.), *Red Emma Speaks*. Ashgate.

Goldman, E. (2016). In S. Wilbur (Ed.), *Anarchy and the sex question essays on women and emancipation 1896-1926*. PM Press.

Goodway, D. (2006). *Anarchist seeds beneath the snow: left libertarian thought and British writers from William Morris to Colin Ward*. Liverpool University Press. https://doi.org/10.5949/UPO9781846312557

Goyens, T. (2007). *Beer and revolution: the German anarchist movement in New York City, 1880 1914*. University of Illinois Press.

Graeber, D. (2009). *Direct action: an ethnography*. AK Press.

Grauer, M. (1994). Anarcho nationalism anarchist attitudes towards Jewish nationalism and zionism. *Modern Judaism*, *14*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1093/mj/14.1.1

Guérin, D. (1970). *Anarchism from theory to practice*. Monthly Review Press.

Gutiérrez, J. A. (2010). *Los Orígenes Libertarios del Primero de Mayo de Chicago a América Latina (1886-1930)*. Quimantú.

Gutiérrez, J. A., & Ferretti, F. (2019). The nation against the state: the Irish question and Britain based anarchists in the age of empire. *Nations and Nationalism*, *26*(3), 611–627.

Hill, G. (2009). *500 years of indigenous resistance*. AK Press.

Hobsbawm, E. (1973). *Revolutionaries*. Weidenfeld & Nicholson.

Hwang, D. (2016). *Anarchism in Korea: independence, transnationalism, and the question of national development, 1919-1984*. State University of New York Press.

Jeppesen, S., & Nazar, H. (2017). Anarchism and sexuality. In N. Jun (Ed.), *Brill s companion to anarchism and philosophy*. Leiden.

Kinna, R. (2020). What is anarchist internationalism. *Nations and Nationalism*, *27*(4), 976–991.

Kinna, R., & Adams, M. (2017). *Anarchism 1914-18: internationalism, anti-militarism and war*. Manchester University Press. https://doi.org/10.7228/manchester/9781784993412.001.0001

Kinna, R., & Prichard, A. (2019). Anarchism and non-domination. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, *24*(3), 221–243. https://doi.org/10.1080/13569317.2019.1633100

Kofman, M. (1968). The reaction of two anarchists to nationalism: Proudhon and Bakunin on the polish question. *Labour History*, *14*, 34–45. https://doi.org/10.2307/27507890

Kropotkin, P. (1885). Finland: a rising nationality. *The Nineteenth Century*, 527–546. Available online at: http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist_Archives/kropotkin/Finland/Finland.html

Kropotkin, P. (1919). "*The Russian revolution and the Soviet government: letter to the workers of Western Europe*". Available online at: https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/petr-kropotkin-the-russian-revolution-and-the-soviet-government-letter-to-the-workers-of-wester

Landauer, G. (2010). Revolution. In G. Kuhn (Ed.), *Revolution and other writings: a political reader*. PM Press.

Laursen, O. (2017). The bomb plot of Zurich: Indian nationalism, Italian anarchism and the First World War. In R. Kinna & M. Adams (Eds.), *Anarchism* (pp. 1914–1918). Manchester University Press. https://doi.org/10.7228/manchester/9781784993412.003.0007

Lavrin, J. (1966). Bakunin the Slav and the Rebel. *The Russian Review*, *25*(2), 135–149. https://doi.org/10.2307/127327

Leeder, E. (1993). *The gentle anarchist: Rose Pesotta, anarchist and labor organizer*. State University of New York.

Levy, C. (2004). Anarchism, internationalism and nationalism in Europe, 1860 1939. *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, *50*(3), 330–342. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8497.2004.00337.x

Levy, C. (2018). The Italians and the IWMA. In F. Bensimon, Q. Deluermoz, & J. Moisand (Eds.), *Arise Ye Wretched of the Earth The first International in Global Perspective*. Brill.

Maitron, J. (1951). *Histoire du Mouvement Anarchiste en France 1880–1914*. Gallimard.

Marcos, S. (2004). *Ya Basta!: ten years of the Zapatista uprising*. AK Press.

Nelson, B. (1988). *Beyond the martyrs. A social history of Chicago's anarchists, 1870 1900* (Vol. 76, p. 943). Rutgers University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/2936493

14698129, 2023, 1, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nana.12891 by Dublin City University, Wiley Online Library on [07/03/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

Nicholas, L. (2019). Gender and sexuality. In C. Levy & M. Adams (Eds.), *Palgrave handbook of anarchism*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-75620-2_34

Özkirimli, U. (2000). *Theories of nationalism: a critical introduction*. Palgrave.

Pernicone, N. (1993). *Italian anarchism, 1864 1892*. Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400863501

Pesotta, R. (1944). *Bread upon the waters*. Dodd, Mead & Co.

Porter, D. (2011). *Eyes to the south French anarchists in Algeria*. AK Press.

Prichard, A. (2015). *Justice, order, anarchy: the international political theory of Pierre Joseph Proudhon*. Routledge.

Proudhon, P.-J. (1969). *What is property? An inquiry into the principle and right of government*. William Reeves.

Proudhon, P.-J. (1989). *General idea of the revolution in the nineteenth century*. Pluto.

Proudhon, P.-J. (2022). *War and peace*. AK Press.

Ramnath, M. (2011). *Decolonizing anarchism: an anti-authoritarian account of India s liberation struggle*. AK Press/Institute for Anarchist Studies).

Ravindranathan, T. R. (1989). *Bakunin and the Italians*. McGill-Queen s University Press.

Rocker, R. (1978). *Nationalism and culture*. Michael E. Coughlin.

Rocker, R. (1947). *Anarcho syndicalism*. Phoenix Press.

Roslak, R. (2016). *Neo impressionism and anarchism in Fin de Siècle France Painting, politics and landscape*. Routledge.

Ryley, P. (2013). *Making another world possible anarchism, anti-capitalism and ecology in late 19th and early 20th century Britain*. Bloomsbury. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781501306754

Sandoval, H. (2011). *La Configuración del Pensamiento Anarquista en México*. Universidad de Guadalajara.

Serrano, C. (1986). *Anarchisme et Indépendence Nationale á Cuba á la Fin du XIX Siécle*. Université de Paris VIII.

Shaffer, K. (2005). *Anarchism and countercultural politics in early twentieth century Cuba*. University Press of Florida.

Shaffer, K. (2013). *Black flag Boricuas anarchism, antiauthoritarianism, and the left in Puerto Rico, 1897-1921*. University of Illinois Press. https://doi.org/10.5406/illinois/9780252037641.001.0001

Shūshi, K. (2015). Monster of the twentieth century. In R. T. Tierney (Ed.), *Monster of the twentieth century Kōtoku Shūshi and Japan s first anti-imperialist movement*. University of California Press.

Skey, M. (2009). The national in everyday life: a critical engagement with Michael Billig s thesis of *banal nationalism*. *The Sociological Review*, *57*(2), 331–346. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2009.01832.x

Smith, A. (2011). Against the law: Indigenous feminism and the nation state. *Affinities Theory, Culture, Action*, *5*(1), 56–69.

Sonn, R. (1989). *Anarchism and cultural politics in Fin de Siècle France*. University of Nebraska Press.

Vadillo, J. (2021). *Historia de la FAI*. Catarata.

Van der Walt, L. (2016). Back to the future revival, relevance and route of an anarchist syndicalist approach for twenty first century left, labour and national liberation movements. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, *34*(3), 348–367. https://doi.org/10.1080/02589001.2016.1235365

Van der Walt, L., & Hirsch, S. (2010). *Anarchism and syndicalism in the colonial and postcolonial world, 1870–1940: The praxis of national liberation, internationalism, and social revolution*. Brill.

Weintraub, W. (1949). Mickiewicz and Bakunin, *the Slavonic and east*. *European Review*, *28*(70), 72–83.

Wimmer, A. (2021). Worlds without nation states: Five scenarios for the very long term. *Nations and Nationalism*, *27*(2), 309–324. https://doi.org/10.1111/nana.12690

Zimmer, K. (2015). *Immigrants against the state Yiddish and Italian anarchism in America*. University of Illinois Press. https://doi.org/10.5406/illinois/9780252039386.001.0001

How to cite this article: Gutiérrez, J. A., & Kinna, R. (2023). Introduction. Anarchism and the national question—historical, theoretical and contemporary perspectives. *Nations and Nationalism*, *29*(1), 121–130. https://doi.org/10.1111/nana.12891

14698129, 2023, 1, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nana.12891 by Dublin City University, Wiley Online Library on [07/03/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License