

8

The Hitchhiker as Theorist: Rethinking Sociology and Anthropology from an Anarchist Perspective¹

Jonathan Purkis

"I began to hitchhike in something akin to geological time: slow, ancient, vast I removed the freeway from its temporal context. Overpasses, cloverleaves, exit ramps took on the personality of Mayan ruins for me" Sissy Hankshaw.

Tom Robbins, *Even Cowgirls Get the Blues*, 1976

People spend more time at traffic lights than kissing.

Kieran Hurley, *Hitch*, 2010

Vagabond Views

In 1970 a young Danish photographer named Jacob Holdt decided to hitchhike around the North American continent, in search of adventure, friendship and what he later called a 'vagabond sociology'. For 5 years he criss-crossed 48 states and provinces, stayed with 434 separate families or individuals, many of whom lived in a world that Depression-era hitchhiking counterparts would have seen and experienced: malnutrition, absence of health care, ramshackle houses more appropriate to a third world slum, indentured labour that barely differed from the slavery of the previous century, and of course alcoholism and prostitution. The poorer the people Holdt encountered, the greater their capacity for generosity; not only did he rarely sleep rough or go hungry, but guided by the belief that being on the road and having little is actually a form of security, he managed to make his starting \$40 last the entire 5-year journey.

The journal that he kept, accompanied by hundreds of photographs, eventually became the widely acclaimed book *American Pictures*² and Holdt the darling of the liberal media for producing 'the new Roots', according to some. The depiction of the brutality and violence experienced by the African Americans whom Holdt encounters does make uncomfortable reading, as does his attempt

to understand the alienation of the white racists, who are also victims of a structured poverty. Gaining access to the underclass and thereby a more convincing portrait of America, was he believed, best gleaned through the experience of the hitchhiker. The constant negotiation of lifts with strangers at the roadside, being welcomed into threadbare homes and offered hospitality were unique in terms of their possibilities for encountering groups of people normally outside of one's daily routine, and from which one could learn. These mini-ethnographies of the road were more potentially meaningful in terms of their exposure of existing hierarchies and alienation than could be inferred from more conventional research methods, based on formal interviews and surveys. Somehow the mode of transport assisted the method of research.

Holdt's work defies categorization; part-journalism, part autobiography, it takes the classical anthropological position (white middle class visitor to a culture not his own) and offers insights about the brutal coexistence of two ethnically different communities that are primarily defined by poverty and exclusion from mainstream America. It was, as he illustrates all too poignantly when his presence probably causes a murder, a position no social scientist would ordinarily be brave enough to even enter let alone have to suffer for their 'research'.

Unsurprisingly, Holdt felt a sense of responsibility for his research, which continued after publication. Leaving the fawning intelligentsia behind, he sets out thumbing with his 2-year-old son, retracing his steps, to show his presentation to some of the people in it and to check up on those whom he feels accountable to. Holdt's slideshows facilitate a variety of responses: many of his subjects 'get it'; others are bemused or perplexed; some are angry or feel so much pain that they wish to burn the book. Constantly optimistic, he hopes that *American Pictures* can be as influential as Jacob Riis's 1890 collection of photographs of the urban poor *How the Other Half Lives*. Struggling to maintain a dialogue between two different worlds, Holdt lectures everywhere, visiting both academic and penal institutions, and after hearing some of his publisher's marketing plans, decides to set up a number of alternative schemes whereby 'his subjects' can sell the book and make small profits for themselves and their communities.

Holdt's book emerged at a time when considerable subject examination about *process* was occurring in sociology and anthropology; when feminist, environmental and postcolonial perspectives were politicizing even basic assumptions and purposes behind what were perceived as elite forms of knowledge. For many working in these disciplines it seemed axiomatic that 'process' included acknowledging the power relationships that existed between academics and their 'research subjects', whether 'in the field' or in terms of how their 'findings' were collated and distributed. Although at this time anarchist influences as such were less visible in academia, they nevertheless paralleled and deepened these concerns, with a burgeoning mass of work in recent years linking

questions of process to theoretical developments in post-structuralism and theories of complexity in particular.

What follows is an outline of the key issues for those attempting to construct anarchist forms of interpretations within the disciplines of sociology and anthropology, by way of a case study of hitchhiking. I suggest that 'intentional' hitchhiking by the roadside (as distinct from simply walking and occasionally being offered lifts) provides an ideal method for observing the workings of power and hierarchy, since these often define the respective positions and attitudes of lift seeker and giver. Moreover, hitchhiking provides an ideal theoretical touchstone for anarchists since it foregrounds informal (and frequently marginal) sets of social relations based on mutual aid, cooperation and trust, the qualities of which have often existed in the 'primitive' societies' studied by anthropologists. Similarly, sociological studies of social cohesion in communities and political networks have led to a reappraisal of work around 'the gift' as a crucial element in the generation of cultural meaning. Given that both disciplines have often been premised on certain forms of inevitable historical progress and development, the hitchhiker offers us a glimpse of another kind of modernity; of alternative structures and associations beyond those defined by political, economic and social hierarchies, mobile or otherwise.

The hitchhiker therefore offers us a synthesis of theory and method; a traveller observing the landscapes of power through which they are moving, yet seeking alternatives to its hierarchies and formal economies through constant negotiation and exchange. Using the hitchhiker as an anarchist leitmotif, I suggest that (what we might tentatively call) 'roadside ethnographies' or 'vagabond sociologies' can help facilitate new ways of thinking about sociology and anthropology, thereby adding to existing attempts to devise more accountable forms of academic theory and practice. However, first it is important to re-familiarize ourselves with the history, assumptions and limitations of non-anarchist sociology and anthropology.

The Premises of Power

Holdt's namesake hero Jacob Riis was one of many progressives of late nineteenth century America, who utilized photography to try and assist in the development of welfare schemes, better housing and urban facilities. Although a journalist, his concerns were similar to the contemporaneous investigations of the Chicago School of urban sociology, whose mapping of the different zones of cities was an attempt to understand the relationship between the expanding city populations, their immediate physical environment and each other. Trying to theorize the pace of life and sense of alienation and anonymity that many individuals felt in the cramped conditions of the new metropolises defined

early sociology, whether in America or in the minds of European theorists such as Emile Durkheim and Georg Simmel. These early enquiries into how human societies bonded, whether in urban or rural contexts were fuelled by a belief in the power of the rational intellect to identify and resolve contradictions within the society. Crucially, this combined a reformer's compassion with a clear epistemology of how the social world was ordered.

'Sociology', according to Auguste Comte who coined the phrase in 1842, employed a kind of 'social physics', to describe the component parts of an integrated whole. It is a description that defined its first and most enduring analytical perspective, Functionalism, a largely American school of thought most famously associated with Robert Merton and Talcott Parsons. Although wide ranging in terms of the concepts used to describe social actors' choices and rationalizations within a given situation, it nevertheless assumes the naturalness of the social roles, experiences and differentiated structures (economy, law, politics) within modern capitalist nations. Accordingly, the role of conflict and division were largely overlooked or seen to be a product of dysfunctions within the system rather than as a result of structured inequality. One of the intellectual responses to Functionalism, Symbolic Interactionism, did try to comprehend the ways that various marginalized groups negotiated their way within daily life, but as a perspective it focused more on sense-making rules, eschewing politics and power for more ontological questions (a trait that continued through Ethnomethodology). The big challenge to Functionalism came from Marxist sociological perspectives in the 1960s, refuting its post-war analysis that the new consumer societies had solved many basic social needs and therefore represented an end point of social cohesion. Marxist perspectives, dwelling on conflict, change and social division – on a global level – were both a reaction to inherent conservatism in sociology and the absence of a sufficient sense of agency or action to explain the dynamic nature of society. So, while Marxism recognized the structured nature of inequality, its willingness to analyse all situations from an economically determinist perspective (subsuming gender, ethnicity and different territorial contexts in the process) led to accusations of substituting one set of assumptions about the functions of the capitalist system with another set about historical materialist analysis.

Leaving issues of postmodernism and post-structuralism aside for now, it would be fair to say that the aforementioned assumptions of power and determination have also dogged anthropology, with more clearly recognized charges of racism, colonialism and sexism in its intellectual history. Anthropology has often been seen as an inextricable part of the era of colonial arrogance, even tacitly supporting slow genocide such as of the 'Aboriginals'³ in Australia. Early anthropology took the view that the societies being studied were akin to pre-industrial communities, part of one's own past as opposed to highly organized communities with complex codes of behaviour and strong

political frameworks that did not need to 'evolve'. As with sociology, the dominant method of enquiry has been Functionalism, motivated to document 'primitive' cosmology and its impact on kinship systems, decision-making and trading. By the 1950s and 1960s Structuralist theorists such as [Claude Levi-Strauss](#) were taking the classification systems of other cultures more seriously and comparing them to the kind of stories, taboos and morals that exist in our own cultures. Nevertheless these perspectives were often generalized and appeared to offer little sense of agency in terms of how individual cultures interpret, retell and resist these (allegedly universal) forms of communication. Furthermore, there was little idea about the dynamism that existed within primitive societies in terms of how they conducted their politics and avoided the need for State-like structures. Anarchist theorists on the other hand were already making headway in these areas with Élie Reclus' book *Primitive Folk*⁴ considering the similarities of belief, ritual and organized brutality that underpinned both advanced and primitive cultures. One of [Levi-Strauss](#)' contemporaries Pierre Clastres, pushed this further in *Society against the State*,⁵ arguing that many of the Amazonian tribes which he had studied during the 1940s allowed certain figures to be temporary delegates and authority figures when key intertribal politics were concerned, but otherwise saw no need to develop form systems of authority. Western ethnocentrism and its teleology was also challenged some years earlier by another French theorist, Marcel Mauss, in the context of so-called primitive economics, which he argued were far more socially complex than had been assumed. So, rather than there being a necessary movement from 'barter' (largely non-existent in fact) to mature capitalist market places, Mauss emphasized the centrality and endurance of the role of the 'gift', in the social life of many cultures. For some, Mauss's work not only reveals a whole hidden dimension to any society, but also provides important examples of 'counter-power'⁶ whereby anarchist enclaves and networks emerge and flourish unbeknownst to and outside of mainstream statecraft and its intellectual outriders, a central idea in the work of the English anarchist Colin Ward.⁷

These abridged versions of sociological and anthropological histories provide an indication of the different premises that underpin much non-anarchist theorizing, as well as indicating some of the likely institutional contexts and conflicts that may shape any research that stands apart from the norm. Of course, every academic discipline continually assesses its own tradition and critiques its own purpose, with the Marxist and feminist accusations against sociology and anthropology having been particularly strident at times. Alvin Gouldner famously accused his peers of becoming part of the 'military-industrial-welfare-complex' in *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*⁸ yet it is a moot point whether this was ever not the case, and certainly research agendas in the post-1980s era appeared to drift towards neo-liberal economic agendas.

In his book *Captive State: The Corporate Takeover of Britain*⁹ the investigative journalist George Monbiot finds a string of examples of the firing or intimidation of academics who have dared to challenge the research and ethics of corporations who might just be assisting the bank balance of the universities in question. Others who have trodden the same path, such as corporate crime academics Steve Tombs and David Whyte,¹⁰ have found politically sensitive research findings not seeing the light of day, and themselves 'warned off' by company executives. This by no means exceptional series of political interventions in academia has been reinforced by the clampdowns in universities since the attacks on America on 11 September 2001, with a number of controversial or activist academics being expelled or excluded from their institutions for airing unpopular opinions.¹¹ The shift from the social science philanthropy of Howard Becker's classic advocacy of the downtrodden in 'Whose side are we on?',¹² to Joe Sim's retort to the medical corporate world in 'Whose side are we NOT on?'¹³ has become all too real. Pity the idealistic anthropologist working with indigenous people opposing a dam or mine.

The influence of vested interests on academic research raises a fundamental question about the viability of some subject areas in mainstream institutional contexts, and anarchist academics can be made to feel complicit in their participation in institutions that structurally mirror the inequalities, hierarchies and philosophy that they the practitioner aim to alleviate. So, although few anarchists have managed to build their own institutions (e.g. Murray Bookchin's Institute for Social Ecology in Vermont), nevertheless a healthy international anarchist academic milieu is now evident, with real and virtual associations (e.g. the Northern American Anarchist Studies Network, the UK-based Anarchist Studies Network), refereed journals (*Anarchist Studies*, *Anarchist Developments in Cultural Studies*), a few postgraduate programmes and resources such as the Spanish-hosted 'Research in Anarchism' website,¹⁴ which is non-affiliated. Some of these formations have been galvanized, according to Randal Amster et al.¹⁵ by the wave of anti-authoritarian social movements and projects since the anti-World Trade Organisation mobilization ('the Battle for Seattle') in November 1999. In addition, as the introduction to this volume indicates, the last decade has seen no shortage of assessments of the relative health of the anarchist tradition in terms of its activism, history and philosophy.

Self-identified anarchists within the academia, however, are harder to locate (Noam Chomsky excepted!) and their interventions in major disciplines sporadic. Owing in part to the high profile work of David Graeber¹⁶ and James C. Scott,¹⁷ the anthropologists have enjoyed more visible 'success' than the sociologists, probably because the subject matter is often 'non-Western' ways of living or 'stateless societies' and there is greater acceptability of non-State-driven or corporate-orientated explanations and proposed solutions. This has built on existing interest generated by Marshall Sahlins whose *Stone Age Economics*¹⁸

posed questions regarding the better work/life balances, skill sharing and levels of happiness that existed in earlier societies. Perhaps more importantly, these developments offer ways into rethinking one's basic philosophical assumptions.

Doing Theory unto Others

One reason why anarchists may have had less visible success in sociology than anthropology is that its theoretical assumptions have appeared to legitimate authoritarian structures and utilize concepts that are potentially as much of a problem as the problems that it proposes to investigate. Consequently, anarchists may find themselves unable to work within an academic context where even the concepts themselves appear to be oppressive. This is most easily seen in the influence of Max Weber's thesis of the growth of bureaucracy and its inevitable regimentation of everyday life. The dominance of this thesis has been such that subsequent attempts to understand the workings of bureaucracy have tended to interpret the model in such a way as to perpetuate a (hierarchical) way of thinking about the impact of modernity on people and the environment the world, with little room for 'agency'.

Weber himself was not unaware of this conundrum, through his attempts to understand the conceptual shift from a traditional/feudal mindset to the rational capitalist world view. In both the introduction to *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* and in *Essays in Sociology*¹⁹ Weber shows how this capitalist perspective utilized a 'purposive rationality' (*Zweckrationalität*) – the accomplishment of a task by its most efficient means, defined by the logic of the end goal. The triumph of this form of rationality (epitomized by his famous phrase 'the iron cage of bureaucracy') was made at the expense of 'substantive' forms of rationality (where one observed the consequences of one's actions) and led to forms of 'disenchantment' as those values ebbed away or were crushed.

This position was later developed by the Frankfurt School of Critical Theory – first Adorno and Horkheimer, then Habermas and Marcuse – through the concept of 'instrumental reason', which stamped its mark on all human activities and wrought nature in the same manner. The prevalence of this sense of 'dominance' attributed to the structure (largely manifested in the culture industry) provided little sense of agency, a trait that Western Marxists shared with their Functionalist counterparts such as Talcott Parsons. Though some have tried to 'solve' the 'duality of structure and agency'²⁰ such models legitimate a view that individuals can only change society through pre-existing frameworks. This has even been true of progressive perspectives around 'risk',²¹ 'reflexivity' and 'ecological modernization',²² which tend to focus upon the cultures of institutions not the structures themselves. So, when theorists assess the values

of the institutions creating environmental damage for example, there is an implicit assumption that greater efficiency, new posts and more compassion will suffice.

That institutions can be reflexive in content but not in form reprises the critique levelled at Norman Elias's thesis developed in *The Civilising Process*²³ (1982), which attributed the emergence of benign liberal democratic states to reduced levels of societal violence, new forms of cohesion and greater tolerance. Zygmunt Bauman's response to this was to take an experience that both his and Elias's family had lived through, the Holocaust, and suggest that this was *precisely* the rationalization that Weber had been talking about. For Bauman, the *Zweckrationalität* led to genocide; for if the process of rationalization distanced one from everyday life and deprived people of their capacity to be ethical beings, they would become automatons in a structure, helplessly obeying orders in a culture of *ambivalence*.²⁴

This critique of the fragility of the Enlightenment project is also evident in terms of research methods and the aforementioned issues of academic accountability. Since Marcus and Clifford's collection on postmodern ethnographies *Writing Culture*,²⁵ Liz Stanley's *Feminist Praxis*²⁶ and Sasha Roseneil's activist positioning,²⁷ there have been plenty of attempts to avoid reifying one's research subjects, and situate the researcher in a more ambiguous, contestable role, opening actions up to self, subject and peer scrutiny.²⁸ Whether one can truly empower the 'subjects' is still open to question,²⁹ and it is entirely possible that in a subservient relationship to an academic institution or corporation, collaborative goals may not even be desirable. For the hypothetical anthropologist researching a culture whose world is about to be shattered by a dam or a mine construction, there is the additional issue of how to communicate that information and to whom, points recently raised by Thorpe and Welsh in their advocacy of more participatory knowledge systems.³⁰

Before moving onto my case study of hitchhiking as an analytical touchstone for anarchist theorizing, I need to spell out some of the potential ingredients of an anarchist sociology or anthropology.

In Search of the Great Paradigm Shift (Long Foretold)

When I was a young postgraduate, I was told that I could not graft anarchist principles on to 'sociology' to achieve a new kind of understanding of what I was studying at the time (the Earth First! direct action network), as this was (a) too political and (b) not methodical enough. In one sense this is not surprising, given the time that it took for feminist sociologies and anthropologies to emerge and suffer the same attacks, before finally becoming accepted. But, after inconclusive attempts to frame my data within various postmodern and social

movement theories, I decided to 'invent' some of my own sociological 'variables'; to locate the theory and practice of my activists within a series of political traditions extending far beyond the supposed rise of the 'new' environmentalism of the last four decades and with different views about political lobbying.³¹ These variables included: the presence or absence of concepts of 'cooperation'; 'anti-authoritarianism' as a marker of praxis and distance from other environmental groups; 'a politics of personal liberation' (through self-knowledge) and the existence of 'anarchist forms of campaigning' (consensus-based forms of non-violent direct action; the creation of 'temporary autonomous zones' and so forth).

John Griffin proposes something similar in *A Structured Anarchism*,³² using a more generic set of variables with which one could examine the social composition, structures and libertarian tendencies of a society, but concepts that make sense from an anarchist point of view. So, cutting across the classical sociological premises of Marx, Weber and Durkheim on the grounds that their theories were bound up with class, economics, status or assumed hierarchies, Griffin proposes 'anarchy', 'freedom', 'equality', 'community' as the basis of any sociology. Such suggestions posit a way forward to revisit one's own intellectual premises, most basically: 'what actually holds societies together?' Since so much of what one 'should look out for' is defined by existing intellectual traditions, it is time to stop mirroring their assumptions.

The anthropologist Harold Barclay, whose books *People without Government* and *The State* provide examples of how 'primitive cultures' deal with problems of authority, collective identity and participation without recourse to the emergence of states, notes the pervasive mythology that supposes the services and functions provided by the state are synonymous with what holds 'societies' together.³³ Sociologists have often looked to the European Renaissance as being a key ingredient in the emergence of the modern state, which shows how recent the idea of territorial sovereignty actually is. Go back more than 6,000 years and there are no states of any sort, and 'societies' are based around local knowledge systems and forms of community building, many of which, according to James C. Scott, disappear or are subsumed by the gradual centralization of power.³⁴ At a time when many nineteenth- and twentieth-century states are breaking up as a result of political and ethnic tensions – in Europe, the former Soviet Union and in Africa – it is also worth remembering the regions of the world that have experienced forms of collective organization and self-governance and have been 'outside' the history of modern nation states. In *The Art of Not Being Governed*, Scott conducts a massive investigation into the history and culture of 'Zomia', an upland area of Southeast Asia like the size of Europe, where hundreds of generations have conducted their own social, economic and political affairs despite repeated attempts by states and landowners to coerce, tax or enslave them.³⁵

If the anthropological record tends to amplify the point that forms of anarchism always exist in some shape or form, then the sociological traditions that emphasize statecraft and *Zweckrationalität* can allow us to consider forms of association and action outside those frameworks. Such formations have been particularly visible in recent decades in terms of opposition to neo-liberal economics. In particular, the 'global justice' or 'alternative globalization' movement, formalized through the Seattle protests of November 1999 but with its roots in the 1994 Zapatista uprising in the Chiapas region of Mexico, comprises of so many international networks, that traditional sociological theorizing in terms of state, class, party, ethnicity, gender, models of consumerism or new generic terms like 'multitude' does not really work. Neither do the strategies and rationales of these alliances of peasants, radical trade unionists, women's groups and environmentalists easily align with sociological concepts premised on mobilization to influence governments. Instead, a different conceptual realm, based on the complexity sciences is evoked to discern the self-organizing, fluid and temporary associations of these movements, many of which coalesce around international trade summits and their alternatives (e.g. World Social Forum).³⁶

Here it is important not to proffer theoretical analysis that is misleading. The movements against neo-liberalism are not anarchist per se, although there are connections; the point being that its *process* reveals a different 'order' to the movements than one might suppose from either traditional analyses or elite ideology. Graeme Chesters and Ian Welsh utilize complexity theory in this way, to understand the emergence, composition and dynamism of these movements, thereby moving beyond the rigidity of Functionalism, Structuralism and Marxism as explanations which have more fixed reference points, analyses and teleology. However, for all of the language of flux and indeterminacy, complexity theories themselves will not necessarily identify new forms of oppression, or uncover anti-authoritarian or cooperative currents. All of which begs the question whether a 'paradigm shift'³⁷ is a purely conceptual matter or whether it also implies massive social and political transformations?

In 'Paradigm Crash, Paradigm Shift' Thomas S. Martin takes the view that anarchism has always been better placed than most theoretical perspectives to realize the notion of a pivotal intellectual upheaval, since it understands the folly of dichotomous and hierarchical thought, and sees the self-organizing nature of the human and non-human worlds more clearly.³⁸ Echoing Petr Kropotkin³⁹ and Murray Bookchin,⁴⁰ Martin suggests that an anarchist philosophy of action is homologous with this more integrated notion of the natural and human worlds. Conversely, the dominant epistemologies of modernity – liberal capitalism and Marxist socialism – work against this, utilizing concepts that reify natural and human ecosystems, and view them from an agenda of control and governance. Anarchist epistemologies, by contrast,

need to explain grass-roots self-organizing phenomena on their own terms, identify the myriad uses and applications of power within a society or group and investigate those things in a sensitive, accountable and mutually beneficial manner.

One way of accomplishing this is to return to our hitchhiker, who as a constantly persecuted figure in all kinds of historical and imaginative situations, can remind us just how many forms of power can exist concurrently within a society. Furthermore, hitchhiking also reveals the kind of aforementioned hidden cultures and networks that evade sociological eyes, and provides insight into the alternative economics of 'gift exchange'.

A Hitchhiker's Guide to Nomads and Gift Economics

Although the first identifiable 'intentional' hitchhiking of an automobile took place in the second decade of the twentieth century, probably in the United States,⁴¹ historians of the activity play a surreal game among themselves to locate the earliest literary example of the activity. Amidst amusing claims for Jonah and the Whale and Sinbad the Sailor, through to examples from Charles Dickens and Mark Twain, there is a more serious point that relates to the historical relationship between modes of transport and instances of mutual aid. It is very easy to forget that before modern market economies and the heavily regulated, taxed and mass-produced forms of transport that have come to increasingly dominate the planet, humankind actually shared, bartered and negotiated all kinds of goods and services in exchange for passage across deserts and oceans for countless millennia. Even today, on a global scale, car ownership and plane travel are far from universal, and have limited use in many parts of the world. One might suggest that, as with the aforementioned work by Harold Barclay and James C. Scott on alternative societies outside the reach of states, so it is also possible to think about alternative mobilities that operate along different economic and cultural lines.

Peter Lamborn Wilson⁴² would agree with this, judging from his glamorized reflections on the small self-organizing 'pirate utopias' which existed in parts of the Caribbean, the Mediterranean and in Madagascar, during the 'golden age' of piracy (1660–1720) complete with their own trade networks and social structures. These associations of itinerant sailors, vagabonds and peddlers of (stolen) wares, possessed their own complex codes of reciprocity around transportation too, thus 'working a passage' from one pirate enclave to another, would entail the same kind of negotiating that stateless peoples had always done. The point here is that forms of mutual aid happen everywhere and 'hitching a lift' is just one point on an informal continuum of assisted movement, whether negotiated from quaysides, 'staging posts', truck-stops or via Twitter.

The long view from anthropology suggests the battles waged by modern states on migrants and nomadic peoples are in fact part of an age-old conflict between static communities, which are generally speaking relatively 'recent', and migratory cultures, which comprise the vast majority of human history. In his cultural history of North American nomads, *Ghost Riders*,⁴³ Richard Grant's list of those of who have struck out from civilization over the last 500 years is extensive: renegade conquistadors, trappers and mountain men, rodeo cowboys, indentured labourers who chose to live wild and free with the indigenous people, contemporary freight-riding hobos, hippy drifters and hitchhikers, lorry drivers who cannot settle down, alternative tribes such as the Rainbow People, even retired 'Middletown' couples in recreational vehicles constantly following the seasons. For Grant, the fact that nomadic existence is chosen contributes to a different vision of American history, belying the official mythology of America as a 'fixed' acquisitive society. It is only when an educated person 'inexplicably' 'drops out' and ends up becoming a cult figure such as hitchhiking wanderer Chris McCandless did after his death in the Alaskan wilderness in 1992, that mainstream society begins asking questions which have been in culture for a long time.⁴⁴

All folk traditions have their 'vagabond' figures and mysterious stranger archetypes from the medieval European folk tale of the 'Wandering Jew' (believed to be Cain) to modern urban myths around 'vanishing hitchhikers'.⁴⁵ Some of these coincide with significant economic shifts or political upheavals, as in the case of the 'masterless men' thrown off the land as feudalism gave way to early capitalism, with huge numbers of nomads creating fear in the ruling classes across seventeenth-century Europe.⁴⁶ These tales appear to fulfil a collective psychological function of determining social and geographical boundaries, yet probably assisted the development of anti-vagrancy legislation in many countries. The United States, which has a long history of applying vagrancy, has experienced many cultural anxieties about its itinerant freight-hopping agricultural workers (the word 'hobo' is literally 'hoe-boy') with an official Tramp Menace declared in 1873 by respectable society. Yet various periods of 'happy hobo' stereotyping and a spirited effort to recruit for World War I when it suited the government and press barons also followed. The reality of a substantial migrant populace created problems for the government during the Great Depression, with a Transient Bureau set up complete with hundreds of shelters and soup kitchens to cater for the million plus people regularly by the roadsides or in the freight yards; yet officials also bowed to rail and bus company pressures that had existed since the 1920s, and formalized anti-hitchhiking legislation. The longevity of the scourge of the mobile, particularly the young mobile, comes through in Jeremy Packer's *Mobility without Mayhem*,⁴⁷ which catalogues an 8-year history of moral panics in America, including hitchhikers, motorcycle gangs, CB radio-wielding anti-authoritarian truckers, African

American Cadillac drivers, and, at various times, women drivers: all an indication of the complex anxieties of authority where mobility is concerned, most recently embodied in new surveillance of transport systems framed by the politics of the 'War on Terror'.

Most transport systems historically *have* embodied the power relations of the societies that they have emerged from, with the emergence of modern states formalizing many of the aforementioned processes of 'ambivalence' and 'purposive rationality' (*Zweckrationalität*). Consider how one might interpret a given journey as indicative of power relations: most forms of mobility involve forms of social segregation along lines of ethnicity, class, gender and age; the rich frequently travel further and faster than the poor which often increases life chances; geographical zoning in cities has been known to actively prevent mobility and reduce social mixing, especially where public transport is concerned; solitary travel by one's 'personalized' motor vehicle is not only an isolating experience that uses disproportionate amounts of resources than other modes of transport, but it is also the apex of 'commodity fetishism'; similarly, the organization of mass leisure reifies both the environmental spaces and cultures that it transports people across or over. Here, if anywhere is the place to introduce the theoretical legacy of post-structuralism (alluded to earlier), which shares an anti-authoritarian heritage with anarchism, chiefly related to the premise that power resides everywhere, and, as Foucault et al. would have it, particularly through 'discourse' and our everyday embodiments of the power relations within 'it' (sometimes called 'bio-power').⁴⁸

So, if one considers the typology of representations of hitchhiking discussed by Packer in *Mobility without Mayhem*, one can map out the ways in which particular authoritarian 'discourses' of control, division, hierarchy or surveillance coalesce around it (and other forms of marginal mobility) at particular times. Packer suggests that first there is an early 'Civic Samaritan' phase which corresponds to the wartime/collective shortages of the 1930s/1940s evident in popular media, which in the 1950s consumer boom develops into the 'Homicidal' killer figure who has failed to keep up with the times. The 1960s becomes the era of the Kerouac beatnik and hippy, evoking the eternal 'Romance of the Road' before the countercultural dream sours in the 1970s with the 'Asking for it' phase, as conservative forces re-emphasized 'stranger danger' in the context of the greater numbers of women hitchhiking. Packer is one of a very small number of academics who have taken lift-seeking seriously,⁴⁹ noting that it is/was unique in terms of creating new forms of community and fostering a cultural idea of freedom not easily framed within the language of liberal 'rights'.

It is in the dozens of 'journey of a lifetime' hitchhiking autobiographies, that one glimpses the possibility of a world where economics can be based on reciprocity, trust and the sheer adventure that sharing time with a complete stranger can sometimes bring. Prior to 1990, the Polish government used

to regard hitchhiking as something to broaden young Communist minds⁵⁰ a position that no Western government has ever really come close to, even when encouraging car sharing during World War II. The realization of a culture based on different forms of exchange is evoked in the mainstream film *Pay it Forward*⁵¹ – which starts with a character giving a car away – whereby any recipient of a good turn, should instead of reciprocating it, advance a gift to three complete strangers (by implication transforming the society). As Lewis Call has noted in his work on the alternative economics in contemporary science fiction, there is incredible potential in the power of the gift to challenge the very fabric of capitalist reality, with the strongest blow coming from ‘the gift without return’.⁵²

Weighed down perhaps by models of economic rationality, sociologists have been a little slow on the uptake in terms of gifts. What Ray Pahl’s much cited work on the ‘informal economy’ on the Isle of Sheppey (UK) revealed,⁵³ perhaps more than a complex blurring of work and social roles during a recession, was something which anthropologists may well have called ‘primitive’ in other contexts, and which anarchists might just call another form of ‘gift economics’. The reluctance to see beyond one’s categories is also evident in the academic treatment of the ‘symbolic economy’ practiced by the Trobriand Islanders in the Western Pacific, long a favourite example for undergraduate teaching. ‘Discovered’ by Bronislaw Malinowski⁵⁴ this constituted a way for the indigenous peoples to maintain good relations within an extensive archipelago, through the circulation of a series of necklaces and bracelets by canoe (necklaces in one direction, bracelets in the other). Keeping the shells in circulation facilitated forms of kinship as well as enhancing trading networks.

Malinowski did not ascribe too much intelligence to these transactions, but Mauss preferred to interpret this and other forms of exchange as illustrative of a different order to that of the logic of the commodity within the free market West. His book *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*⁵⁵ charted a range of complex gift-giving practices across many small island societies, each with different notions of ‘obligation’, some of which required the receiver to reflect for a length of ‘time’ before reciprocating.

Hitchhiking of course is rooted in the gift economy and largely bypasses formal monetary transactions or administration, with cross-generational reciprocity evidenced by the hitchhikers of one era becoming the lift givers of the next (the World War II hitchhikers later helped the ‘baby boomers’, etc.). Principally, the opportunity to assist a journey is being exchanged with a gift of conversation and company, but the range of actual gifts that may be exchanged in this potentially libratory arrangement are numerous and difficult to catalogue. As with the Polynesian cultures that Mauss investigated, hitchhiking also exchanges the gift of ‘time’, in that driver and hitcher deliberately chose to socially invest in moments outside of the everyday flow of ‘clock time’⁵⁶ Thus to embrace the

notion of 'hitching time', as a way of experiencing other lives and cultures on their own terms, without reifying them as a result of speed ('I don't have time to talk to you') or superior values ('I have no interest in where you live or what you think'), is to position oneself within a different symbolic economy altogether.

These alternatives to the real and imagined workings of the (nascent) capitalist state have always existed, and it is the job of the anarchist theorist to get close to these cultures to posit sociological or anthropological opinions with a difference. During the Great Depression, self-organizing societies formed through a network of 'hobo jungles' on the edge of North American cities, and the trains themselves were safe spaces for outcasts, political radicals, homosexuals, as well as labourers. It was a difficult life and is often over-eulogized, but the strength of their codes of etiquette and depth of their own publications, songs and hieroglyphic language (to indicate the likely facilities of a town) is perhaps revealing of the ease within which societies can rediscover their migratory roots.

Closer in time, the hitchhiker of the last few decades is less visible than the freight-riding hobo, but an alternative culture has nevertheless always existed, from roadside ethics, dozens of guidebooks, do it yourself sociologies and photographic anthropologies portraying the 'road' from a point of view not usually realized in mainstream society. As hitchhiking has declined in Western countries so the 'culture' has sprung up elsewhere, with the centre of world hitchhiking now probably Lithuania or Latvia, and it is certainly well supported in Russia. International hitchhiker gatherings abound, as do various competitions and research organizations such as the Academy of Free Travel, assorted hitchhiking historians and collections of oral history.⁵⁷ Despite the dearth of sociological or anthropological research, hitchhiking does creep into the cultural studies literature of 'non-places'; those ordinary transitory spaces not thought of as 'belonging' to any particular groups: motorway service stations, roadsides and 'interstices' – isolated tracts of land around motorway stanchions, or beneath overpasses – which are used by communities who want to exist outside the usual perimeters of society.⁵⁸

In Search of Re-enchantment

Writing about his American hitchhiking experiences of the 1960s and 1970s, the evolutionary psychologist Steven Pinker doubted that such an era could exist now owing to the difficulties of maintaining such a clearly identifiable community.⁵⁹ Whether or not he was aware of hitchhiking's new geographical centres or its thriving virtual culture (www.digihitch.com) is unclear, however, its continued low profile is still an interesting touchstone for a number of closing remarks regarding the theorizing of marginal communities.

The question of what is researched, for whom and how one might go about doing so, is as I have said, a profoundly political one, and there may well be institutional obstacles to the development of anarchist perspectives in sociology and anthropology. Beyond the practical barriers to anarchist epistemologies, dominant theoretical perspectives within the social sciences inevitably locate marginal cultures in terms of their own hierarchical assumptions about purpose, than as indicative of differently configured and intentional communities or associations.⁶⁰

As we have seen, some intellectual traditions reinforce this, with Structuralism, Functionalism (and some forms of Marxism) having constantly been accused of reifying marginal groups and 'primitive' cultures, by positioning them within dichotomous (either/or) categories or within a teleological model of assumed human progress. While many a non-anarchist theorist has likened modernity to a juggernaut, few have seen themselves as active participants in keeping it on the road through their own theoretical premises. A century or more ago, Max Weber mourned the disappearance of substantive human values, in the face of *Zweckrationalität*: yet his eventual hopes for a 're-enchantment of the world' now show signs of emerging in feminist and ecological work in sociology and anthropology. Conceptually, some of these works reintroduce a sense of (emotional) agency within theory, but they also shape it in such a way as to recognize the dynamism, fluidity and non-deterministic nature of real human action and culture, as it develops according to its own needs. Here the current fascination with complexity theory has ensured the introduction of new concepts of interconnectedness, autopoiesis, self-organization, as well as non-linear models of cause and effect. The notion that culture unfolds organically and that real and conceptual hierarchical structures merely brutalize the process, leading to tyranny, environmental degradation and bad philosophy, is something that anarchism has always tapped into, and is particularly evident in the cited work of Murray Bookchin. According to Thomas S. Martin this positions anarchism closer to a 'paradigm shift' in human consciousness, of the sort that will recognize the dominant Western paradigm (capitalist modernity) as being a paradigm rather than the objective truth.⁶¹

The further one moves from instrumental rationality, and its eschewing of process in its drive for efficiency and results, the greater possibility to uncover sociological and anthropological data of the sort discussed above in the context of Barclay, Clastres and Scott. Here the adoption of alternative analytic variables is crucial, in order to examine the authoritarian configuration, assumed political boundaries and likely ecological impact of human societies on a much broader evolutionary scale. An anarchist anthropology or sociology must, according to David Graeber,⁶² be dynamic and activist driven, so that the researcher can think outside of the categories dreamed up by state intellectuals and also explore 'sensitive' cultural areas beyond the usual remit of the academic. Here

the figure of the hitchhiker is the ideal anarchist theorist, actively engaged in social interactions at the point of least mediation through the normal structures of work, leisure, location and mobility – drifting easily between cultures and classes – yet also vulnerable to regulatory violence and social prejudice of those more conventional aspects of life. The hitchhiker is well placed to witness the full range of ideological forces as they vary over time, coalescing around the particular ‘needs’ of a society, be this to exclude or include mobile populations. The hitchhiker therefore constitutes one possible springboard from which to assess the relative levels of authority, liberty, equality and cooperation within a society, and to assist the uncovering of hidden social networks and forms of exchange outside the formal monetary economy.

There are also sociologies of ‘space’ at issue here, in terms of the relationship between power and location. In Bruce Chatwin’s accessible anthropology *The Songlines* one learns about the complex cultural meanings attributed to the wilderness by different tribes as they pass through Australia singing the landscape and their own sadly vanishing histories. Although very different, the social history of hitchhiking, even in the age of the internet, seems in danger of vanishing too, yet should someone choose to publish a global ‘atlas’ of hitchhiking, it would provide a visual representation of many of the concerns of anarchist anthropologists and sociologists. For instance, we would learn much of treatment of migratory peoples through details of how various states have provided for hitchhikers as contrasted with those that have anti-hitchhiking legislation or are notoriously racist, sexist or homophobic. Identification of all of the assorted clubs, associations, gatherings and more formal ‘lift-share’ schemes would trace out an alternative geography of transport gift economics, as would the journeys of various ‘world’ hitchhikers⁶³ become ‘gift lines’, linking people and places of mutual aid despite the existing power relations. In addition, ‘hitching trails’ of the many hundreds of songs or books, to reference journeys by thumb might be etched across the continents and oceans: extra evidence that the question *what actually holds societies together?* is very much dependent on one’s starting premises.

Anarchists have frequently drawn inspiration from more visible moments of mutual aid and community self-organization than hitchhiking: for instance, those that occurred in response to the collapse of the Argentinean economy in 2001, saw people’s assemblies, worker occupation of factories, food distribution centres and so forth.⁶⁴ In the wake of the global financial meltdowns of summer 2008, a new discourse of frugality began to percolate through UK politics, some of it unhelpful, yet amidst the talk of allotments and credit unions, the hitchhiker reappeared as a motif of the times. Almost exclusively positive in tone, journalists interviewed hitchers on radio and television,⁶⁵ tried it again themselves⁶⁶ (Stephen Moss in *The Guardian*, 28 May 2009 and Josephine Moulds in *The Times*, 23 April 2009) and reported back to their readers, with considerable

interest in online feedback. Other ventures such as the annual Link Community Development (charity) mass hitch from the United Kingdom to North Africa, and various individuals 'twitchhiking' for charity or finding an interesting way to get to the football World Cup also received decent coverage.

While I may be guilty of the usual overenthusiastic anarchist's need to find evidence of mutual aid, what this brief moment of hope nevertheless represents is the fragility of the assumed belief that power necessitates division and conflict. Since so much social science research appears to be premised upon this notion, with governing structures acting upon their findings, stating evidence to the contrary must be done at every opportunity.

One of Jacob Holdt's lifts, a playboy millionaire, was so impressed with the idea that 'security is being on the road with no money' that he parked his Jaguar on the interstate and hitchhiked off for 7 years, ending up in Africa, where he made his first black friend. Holdt himself still tours his 'vagabond sociology' around the world, constantly updating his slideshow. According to his website we are all welcome to drop by his house (as many still do). Now equipped with a van, he says that he has no time for hitchhiking, but some people suspect he is desperate to get out there again.

Notes

1. This chapter provides only a flavour of the intellectual shifts within sociology and anthropology that may interest anarchists, rather than comprehensive treatment or well-rounded answers. I am very grateful for the incisive observations and support from Ruth Kinna and my fellow hitchhiker-in-crime James 'Bar' Bowen.
2. Jacob Holdt, *American Pictures* (Copenhagen: American Pictures Foundation, 1985).
3. Bruce Chatwin notes in *The Songlines* (London: Pan, 1988) that this generic term is inappropriate and makes no conceptual sense, given the complexity of the different tribal cultures, range of dialects and cosmology.
4. Elie Reclus, *Primitive Folk* (Kessinger Legacy Reprints, 2010).
5. Pierre Clastres, *Society against the State: Essays in Political Anthropology* (New York: Zone, 1987).
6. David Graeber, *Fragments of an Anarchist Anthropology* (Chicago, IL: Prickly Paradigm Press, 2004).
7. Colin Ward and David Goodway, *Talking Anarchy* (Nottingham: Five Leaves, 2003).
8. Alvin Gouldner, *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology* (London: Heinemann, 1970).
9. George Monbiot, *Captive State: The Corporate Takeover of Britain* (London: Macmillan, 2000).
10. Steve Tombs and David Whyte (eds), *Unmasking the Crimes of the Powerful* (New York: Peter Lang, 2003).
11. Spencer Sunshine, 'The Divided Forecast for Academic Anarchism in America', *Anarchist Studies*, 14 (2006), 92–4.
12. Howard Becker, 'Whose Side Are We On?' *Social Problems*, 14 (1967), 239–47.
13. Joe Sim, 'Whose Side Are We Not On?' in Steve Tombs and David Whyte (eds), *Unmasking the Crimes of the Powerful* (New York: Peter Lang, 2003), pp. 239–60.
14. <http://raforum.info>.

15. Randall Amster et al. (eds), *Contemporary Anarchist Studies: An Introductory Anthology of Anarchy in the Academy* (New York: Routledge, 2009).
16. Graeber, *Fragments* (2004).
17. James C. Scott, *The Art of Not Being Governed* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009); James C. Scott, *Seeing Like a State* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998).
18. Marshall Sahlins, *Stone Age Economics* (Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press, 1972).
19. Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1976); ed. H. Gerth and C. W. Mills, *Essays in Sociology* (London: Routledge, 1948).
20. See Anthony Giddens, *The Constitution of Society: Outline of a Theory of Structuration* (Cambridge: Polity, 1984).
21. Ulrich Beck, *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity* (London: Sage, 1992); Ulrich Beck, Anthony Giddens and Scott Lash, *Reflexive Modernization* (Cambridge: Polity, 1994).
22. Gert Spaargaren and Arthur Mol, 'Ecological Modernization Theory in Debate: A Review', *Environmental Politics*, 9 (2000), 17–49.
23. Norbert Elias, *The Civilizing Process* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1982).
24. Zygmunt Bauman develops these ideas over two books: *Modernity and the Holocaust* (Cambridge: Polity, 1989); and *Modernity and Ambivalence* (Cambridge: Polity, 1991).
25. George Marcus and James Clifford, *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography* (Berkeley, CA: University of California, 1986).
26. Liz Stanley (ed.), *Feminist Praxis* (London: Routledge, 1990).
27. Sasha Roseneil, *Disarming Patriarchy: Feminism and Political Action at Greenham* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).
28. Wanda Pillow, 'Confession, Catharsis or Cure?: Rethinking the Uses of Reflexivity as Methodological Power in Qualitative Research', *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 16 (2003), 175–96.
29. Dana Williams, 'Searching for an Anarchist Sociology', *Anarchist Studies*, 17 (2009), 105–8.
30. Charles Thorpe and Ian Welsh, 'Beyond Primitivism: Towards a Twenty-First Century Anarchist Theory and Praxis for Science and Technology', *Anarchist Studies*, 16 (2008), 48–75.
31. Jonathan Purkis, *A Sociology of Environmental Protest: Earth First! and the Theory and Practice of Anarchism* (PhD thesis, Manchester Metropolitan University, 2001). Also available from the author at jonathanpurkis@yahoo.co.uk.
32. John Griffin, *A Structured Anarchism* (London: Freedom Press, 1991).
33. Harold Barclay, *The State* (London: Freedom Press, 2003); Harold Barclay, *People without Government: An Anthropology of Anarchy* (London: Kahn and Averill, 1990).
34. Scott, *Seeing Like a State*, pp. 333–9.
35. Scott, *The Art of Not Being Governed*, passim.
36. These include 'autopoiesis', 'rhizomes', 'webs', 'weak ties', 'swarms', 'strange attractors' and so forth (see Starhawk 2002; Notes from Nowhere 2003; Chesters and Welsh 2006).
37. Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1967).
38. Thomas S. Martin, 'Paradigm Crash: Paradigm Shift', *Anarchist Studies*, 13 (2005), 130–46.
39. Petr Kropotkin, *Mutual Aid* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1939).
40. Murray Bookchin, *The Ecology of Freedom* (Palo Alto, CA: Cheshire Books, 1982).
41. Jonathan Purkis, *On Hitchhiking: A Cultural History of an Ideal* (forthcoming, 2013).
42. Peter Lamborn Wilson, *Pirate Utopias* (New York: Autonomedia, 1997).

43. Richard Grant, *Ghost Riders: Travels with American Nomads* (London: Abacus, 2003).
44. Jon Krakauer, *Into the Wild* (London: Pan Macmillan, 1998). A film of the same name in 2007 directed by Sean Penn also generated substantial media debate.
45. Jan Harold Brunvand, *The Vanishing Hitchhiker* (New York: Norton, 1981).
46. Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas during the English Revolution* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1982).
47. Jeremy Packer, *Mobility without Mayhem: Safety, Cars and Citizenship* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2009).
48. Post-structuralism's relationship with anarchism is controversial. Some key texts such as Todd May's *The Political Philosophy of Post-Structural anarchism* (Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994) demonstrates little knowledge of post-war anarchist theory. As Moore (1997) notes, a second wave of anarchism already existed (e.g. Debord, Perlman and Zerzan) by the 1980s without the 'help' of Foucault, Lyotard and Deleuze.
49. The exceptions to this are: Mario Rinvolucri, *Hitchhiking* (self-published in 1974) and accessible online at www.alumni.aitec.edu.au/~bwechner/Documents/Hitch/Mario; Graham Chesters and David Smith, 'The Neglected Art of Hitch-Hiking: Risk, Trust and Sustainability', *Sociological Research Online*, 6(3) (2001), available at www.socresonline.org.uk/6/3/chesters.html.
50. Simon Calder (ed.), *Europe: A Manual for Hitch-Hikers* (Oxford: Vacation Work, 1985), p. 179.
51. *Pay it Forward* (Warner Brothers, 2000).
52. Lewis Call, *Postmodern Anarchism* (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2003), p. 99.
53. Ray Pahl, *Divisions of Labour* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1984).
54. Bronislaw Malinowski, *Argonauts of the Western Pacific* (London: Dutton, 1961).
55. Marcel Mauss, *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*, trans. Ian Gunnison (New York: Norton, 1967).
56. Jay Griffiths, *Pip Pip: A Sideways Look at Time* (London: Flamingo, 1999), pp. 11–15.
57. Recent examples include: the research archive of Bernd Wechner, available on the www.digihitch.com website, as well as his *Anywhere but Here: Memoirs of a Hitchhiker* at www.alumni.aitec.edu.au/~bwechner (available from 1997); Elijah Wald, *Riding with Strangers* (Chicago, IL: Chicago Review Press, 2006); Simon Sykes and Tom Sykes (eds), *No Such Thing as a Free Ride?* (London: Cassell Illustrated, 2005); Irv Thomas, *Derelict Days* (AuthorHouse, 2004); and Barbara Noske, 'Thumbing it: A Hitchhikers Guide to Wisdom' (not available in English).
58. Tim Edensor, 'M6-Junction 19–16: Defamiliarizing the Mundane Roadscape', *Space and Culture*, 6 (2003), 151–68; Joe Moran, *On Roads: A Hidden History* (London: Profile, 2009), pp. 139–41.
59. Sykes and Sykes, *No Such Thing as a Free Ride?* p. 15.
60. Graham Chesters and Ian Welsh, *Complexity and Social Movements* (London: Routledge, 2006), pp. 86–9.
61. Thomas, 'Paradigm Crash: Paradigm Shift', 132.
62. David Graeber, *Fragments*, pp. 93–5.
63. André Brugiroux, *One People, One Planet: The Adventures of a World Citizen* (Oxford: One World, 1991); Kinga Freespirit, *Led by Destiny: Hitchhiking around the World* (Pelplin, Poland: Bernardinum, 2004).
64. Ezequiel Adamovsky, 'Pots, Pans and Popular Power: The Neighbourhood Assemblies of Buenos Aires', in Notes from Nowhere (ed.), *We Are Everywhere: The Irresistible Rise of Global Anticapitalism* (London: Verso, 2003), pp. 422–8.
65. BBC Radio 2, *Jeremy Vine Show*, 2 June 2009; Michael Smith's *Drivetime*, BBC4 television, 26 March 2009.

66. Stephen Moss in *The Guardian* (28 May 2009) and Josephine Moulds in *The Times* (23 April 2009) reported back to their readers, with considerable interest in online feedback. (A single letter from myself to *The Guardian* on 2 June 2009 generated 30 replies!)

Bibliography

- Amster, Randal, Abraham Deleon, Luis Fernandez, Anthony J. Nocella and Deric Shannon (eds), *Contemporary Anarchist Studies: An Introductory Anthology of Anarchy in the Academy* (New York: Routledge, 2009).
- Barclay, Harold, *People without Government: An Anthropology of Anarchy* (London: Kahn and Averill, 1990).
- , *The State* (London: Freedom Press, 2003).
- Bauman, Zygmunt, *Modernity and the Holocaust* (Cambridge: Polity, 1989).
- Beck, Ulrich, *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity* (London: Sage, 1992).
- , Anthony Giddens and Scott Lash, *Reflexive Modernization* (Cambridge: Polity, 1994).
- Becker, Howard 'Whose side Are We On?' *Social Problems*, 14 (1967), 239–47.
- Bookchin, Murray, *The Ecology of Freedom* (Palo Alto, CA: Cheshire Books, 1982).
- Brugiroux, André, *One People, One Planet: The Adventures of a World Citizen* (Oxford: One World, 1991).
- Brunvand, Jan Harold, *The Vanishing Hitchhiker* (New York: Norton, 1981).
- Calder, Simon (ed.), *Europe: A Manual for Hitch-hikers* (Oxford: Vacation work, 1985).
- Call, Lewis, 'Anarchist Gift Economies in Contemporary Science Fiction', *Anarchist Studies*, 10(2) (2002), 119–44.
- , *Postmodern Anarchism* (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2003).
- Chatwin, Bruce, *The Songlines* (London: Pan, 1988).
- Chesters, Graham and Ian Welsh, *Complexity and Social Movements* (London: Routledge, 2006).
- Chesters, Graham and David Smith, 'The Neglected Art of Hitch-Hiking: Risk, Trust and Sustainability', *Sociological Research Online*, 6(3) (2001), available at www.socresonline.org.uk/6/3/chesters.html.
- Clastres, Pierre, *Society against the State: Essays in Political Anthropology* (New York: Zone, 1987).
- Cohen, Robin and Paul Kennedy, *Global Sociology* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000).
- Edensor, Tim, 'M6-Junction 19–16: Defamiliarizing the Mundane Roadscape', *Space and Culture*, 6 (2003), 151–68.
- Elias, Norbert, *The Civilizing Process* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1982).
- Frespirit, Kinga, *Led by Destiny: Hitchhiking around the World* (Pelpin, Poland: Bernardinum, 2004).
- Giddens, Anthony, *The Constitution of Society: Outline of a Theory of Structuration* (Cambridge: Polity, 1984).
- Gouldner, Alvin, *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology* (London: Heinemann, 1970).
- Graeber, David, *Fragments of an Anarchist Anthropology* (Chicago, IL: Prickly Paradigm Press, 2004).
- Grant, Richard, *Ghost Riders: Travels with American Nomads* (London: Abacus, 2003).
- Griffiths, Jay, *Pip Pip: A Sideways Look at Time* (London: Flamingo, 1999).
- Griffin, John, *A Structured Anarchism* (London: Freedom Press, 1991).
- Hill, Christopher, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas during the English Revolution* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1982).
- Holdt, Jacob, *American Pictures* (Copenhagen: American Pictures Foundation, 1985).

- Hurley, Kieran, *Hitch*, play performed (Leeds: The Carriageworks, 16 April 2010).
- Krakauer, Jon, *Into the Wild* (London: Pan Macmillan, 1998).
- Kropotkin, Petr Prince, *Mutual Aid* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1939).
- Kuhn, Thomas S., *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1967).
- Luhmann, Niklas, *Observations on Modernity* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998).
- Malinowski, Bronislaw, *Argonauts of the Western Pacific* (London: Dutton, 1961).
- Marcus, George and James Clifford, *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography* (Berkeley, CA: University of California, 1986).
- Martin, Thomas, S., 'Paradigm Crash: Paradigm Shift', *Anarchist Studies*, 13 (2005), 130–46.
- Mauss, Marcel, *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*, trans. Ian Gunnison (New York: Norton, 1967).
- Monbiot, George, *Captive State: The Corporate Takeover of Britain* (London: Macmillan, 2000).
- Moore, John, 'Anarchism and Poststructuralism', *Anarchist Studies*, 5 (1997), 157–61.
- Moran, Joe, *On Roads: A Hidden History* (London: Profile, 2009).
- Notes from Nowhere, *We are Everywhere* (London: Verso, 2003).
- Packer, Jeremy, *Mobility without Mayhem: Safety, Cars and Citizenship* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2009).
- Pahl, Ray, *Divisions of Labour* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1984).
- Pay it Forward* (Warner Brothers, 2000).
- Pillow, Wanda, 'Confession, Catharsis or Cure?: Rethinking the Uses of Reflexivity as Methodological Power in Qualitative Research', *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 16 (2003), 175–96.
- Purkis, Jonathan, *A Sociology of Environmental Protest: Earth First! and the Theory and Practice of Anarchism* (PhD thesis, Manchester Metropolitan University, 2001).
- , *On Hitchhiking: A Cultural History of an Ideal* (forthcoming, 2013).
- Reclus, Élie, *Primitive Folk* (Kessinger Legacy Reprints, 2010).
- Rinvoluceri, Mario, *Hitchhiking* (self-published, 1974) and online at www.alumni.aitech.edu.au/~bwechner/Documents/Hitch/Mario.
- Robbins, Tom, *Even Cowgirls Get the Blues* (New York: Bantam, 1976).
- Roseneil, Sasha, *Disarming Patriarchy: Feminism and Political Action at Greenham* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).
- Sahlins, Marshall, *Stone Age Economics* (Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press, 1972).
- Scott, James, C., *Seeing like a State* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998).
- , *The Art of Not Being Governed* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009).
- Sim, Joe 'Whose Side Are We Not On?' in Steve Tombs and David Whyte (eds), *Unmasking the Crimes of the Powerful* (New York: Peter Lang, 2003), pp. 239–60.
- Spaargaren, Gert and Arthur Mol, 'Ecological Modernization Theory in Debate: A Review', *Environmental Politics*, 9 (2000), 17–49.
- Stanley, Liz (ed.), *Feminist Praxis* (London: Routledge, 1990).
- Starhawk, *Webs of Power: Notes from Global Uprising* (Gabriola Island: New Society, 2002).
- Sunshine, Spencer, 'The Divided Forecast for Academic Anarchism in America', *Anarchist Studies*, 14 (2006), 92–4.
- Sykes, Simon and Tom Sykes (eds), *No Such Thing as a Free Ride?* (London: Cassell Illustrated, 2005).
- Tombs, Steve and David Whyte (eds), *Unmasking the Crimes of the Powerful* (New York: Peter Lang, 2003).
- Thomas, Irv *Derelict Days* (AuthorHouse, 2004).

- Thorpe, Charles and Ian Welsh, 'Beyond Primitivism: Towards a Twenty-First Century Anarchist Theory and Praxis for Science and Technology', *Anarchist Studies*, 16 (2008), 48–75.
- Wald, Elijah, *Riding with Strangers* (Chicago, IL: Chicago Review Press, 2006).
- Ward, Colin and David Goodway, *Talking Anarchy* (Nottingham: Five Leaves, 2003).
- Weber, Max, *Essays in Sociology*, ed. H. Gerth and C. W. Mills (London: Routledge, 1948).
- , *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1976).
- Wechner, Bernd, *Anywhere but Here: Memoirs of a Hitchhiker*, available at www.alumni.aitech.edu.au/~bwechner (available from 1997).
- Williams, Dana, 'Searching for an Anarchist Sociology', *Anarchist Studies*, 17 (2009), 105–8.
- Wilson, Peter Lamborn, *Pirate Utopias* (New York: Autonomedia, 1997).