# An Anarcho-Pacifist Reading of International Relations: A Normative Critique of International Politics from the Confluence of Pacifism and Anarchism

ALEXANDRE CHRISTOYANNOPOULOS 🆔

*Loughborough University, UK*

Pacifism and anarchism have been until recently largely missing on the landscape of international relations (IR) theories, even though they help articulate valuable and nuanced reflections on core IR themes such as war and peace, the structure of the international order, and the multiple effects of political violence. In particular, an analysis grounded in the territory shared by pacifism and anarchism offers a focused vantage point from which an original contribution can be articulated around five main themes: the widespread fetishization of violence; the chronic sliding toward systemic militarism; the multifaceted manifestations of intersectional exploitation and domination enforced by states around the world; both current and potential alternative structurings of international politics; and reflections concerning political agency. This puts an anarcho-pacifist encounter with IR in a position to either develop further or dispute claims central to more established schools of IR theory. This article thus offers a normative reading of international politics, which adapts and develops arguments aired separately by anarchism and pacifism, demonstrates where they fruitfully overlap, develops anarcho-pacifism by extending its analysis specifically to international politics, and invites a reconsideration of established orthodoxies in IR theory by articulating a more radical, critical, and normative diagnosis of the Westphalian international order.

El pacifismo y el anarquismo han estado hasta hace poco muy ausentes en el panorama de las teorías de las RRII, a pesar de que ayudan a articular reflexiones valiosas y matizadas sobre temas centrales de las RRII como la guerra y la paz, la estructura del orden internacional y los múltiples efectos de la violencia política. En particular, un análisis basado en el territorio compartido por el pacifismo y el anarquismo ofrece un punto de vista enfocado desde el que se puede articular una contribución original en torno a cinco temas principales: la fetichización generalizada de la violencia; el desplome crónico hacia el militarismo sistémico; las manifestaciones polifacéticas de la explotación y la dominación interseccionales, aplicadas por los Estados en todo el mundo; las estructuras alternativas actuales y potenciales de la política internacional; y las reflexiones relativas a la agencia política. Esto sitúa un encuentro anarco-pacifista con las RRII en una posición que permite desarrollar más o disputar las afirmaciones centrales de las escuelas más establecidas de la teoría de las RRII. Por consiguiente, este artículo ofrece una lectura normativa de la política internacional que adapta y desarrolla los argumentos aireados por separado por el anarquismo y el pacifismo, demuestra dónde se solapan fructíferamente, desarrolla el anarco-pacifismo ampliando su análisis específicamente a la política internacional, e invita a reconsiderar las ortodoxias establecidas en la teoría de las RRII articulando un diagnóstico más radical, crítico y normativo del orden internacional westfaliano.

Le pacifisme et l'anarchisme ont été longtemps absents du paysage théorique des relations internationales. Pourtant, ces mouvements permettent d'articuler des réflexions importantes et nuancées sur des thèmes aussi fondamentaux que la guerre et la paix, la structure de l'ordre international ou les multiples impacts de la violence politique. L'analyse d'un espace commun aux mouvements pacifiques et anarchistes offre un point de vue privilégié, à partir duquel construire une proposition originale, articulée autour de cinq grands thèmes : la fétichisation croissante de la violence ; le glissement chronique vers un militarisme systémique ; les manifestations multiples de l'exploitation et de la domination intersectionnelles telles qu'exercées par les États du monde entier ; les structurations alternatives, actuelles ou potentielles, de la politique internationale ; les réflexions relatives à l'agentivité politique. Ainsi, un axe de pensée anarcho-pacifiste des relations internationales permet de développer ou de remettre en question des affirmations fondamentales émanant de courants théoriques établis. Cet article propose donc une lecture normative de la politique internationale, adaptant et développant des arguments diffusés séparément par l'anarchisme et le pacifisme et montrant les points de confluence entre les deux courants. Il déploie le concept d'anarcho-pacifisme en adaptant son analyse à la politique internationale et invitant à reconsidérer les orthodoxies de la théorie des relations internationales, au moyen d'un diagnostic plus radical, critique et normatif de l'ordre westphalien.

## Introduction

The analysis of international relations (IR) has long been informed by competing schools of thought, ranging from the dominant varieties of realism and liberalism, to social constructivism and the English School, to more critical perspectives such as feminism, Marxism, and post-structuralism. Almost entirely missing, however, is analysis informed by anarchism and pacifism, let alone the perspective grounded in the substantial overlap between the two. Yet, an anarcho-pacifist perspective presents a range of distinct lines of argument that help make sense of IR and elaborate a normative critique of the international order. The aim of this paper is to sketch out some of these main arguments.

Anarchism is a contested concept, and exactly what it has meant to thinkers and political movements has varied

across time and geographical context since its adoption as a political label in the mid-nineteenth century. At its core, however, is a critique and rejection of domination, whether in the form of political hierarchies (the state), structural economic inequalities (capitalism), power distributions and unequal outcomes based on gender or ethnicity (patriarchy, racism), or other oppressive sociopolitical norms and practices (Marshall 1993; Kinna 2005, 2019). Often maligned, it has nonetheless enjoyed a long history as a legitimate political ideology. Yet despite that, and despite the presence of plenty of critical schools of thought in IR, anarchism has for long been mostly ignored by IR scholars. This has recently started to change with the work of some key scholars and the publication of two special issues dedicated to anarchism in IR (Prichard 2010c, 2013; Havercroft and Prichard 2017). Part of the difficulty from an anarchist perspective is that IR itself "was founded as a discourse *for* states" (Prichard 2011, 1668). Moreover, the widespread use of the term "anarchy" in IR remains simplistic, contributing to ongoing misperceptions of what anarchy can mean and what anarch*ism* can contribute (which is the subject of the entire 2017 special issue). The tired association of anarchism with violence, not entirely inaccurate yet much too caricatural and often poorly informed, has also been an obstacle to wider acceptance (Falk 2010), which is ironic given how often it is based on *realist* arguments that violence is justified in IR.

The term "pacifism" was coined in 1901, even if to refer to a position with long roots in preceding centuries. Its definition has also been somewhat malleable, with its meaning often described as ranging from, at the narrower end, critical opposition to war, to a broader critical opposition to the wider dimensions of war and political violence more generally. Like anarchism, pacifism has also long been ignored in IR: Jackson speaks of it being "subjugated" in the dual sense of it being both "ignored" and "disqualified" as "insufficiently elaborated," which "works to maintain the core identity and boundaries of IR as a discipline concerned with states, war, military force, national security, coercion, alliances, strategy and the like" (Jackson 2018b, 165–66, 170). Jackson demonstrates that whether in top-ranked politics and IR journals, in major academic conferences, in politics and IR textbooks, or in normative IR theory, pacifism and its potentially pertinent contributions are systematically "neglected," "downplay[ed]," or "set up as a straw man figure" (Jackson 2018b, 163–64). Furthermore, of the forty scholars he interviewed on the subject, "most … were uncomfortable calling themselves pacifists, particularly in public IR forums," even though "they were sympathetic to pacifism and probably would fit the formal definition of a pacifist" (Jackson 2018b, 165). Pacifism is moreover often—and wrongly—treated as a naïve, single, and absolute moral position, as advocating a form of passivity, as immoral, and as ineffective. Here again, however, the recent work of some scholars, along with the publication of two special issues, has begun to articulate what a pacifist contribution can offer to IR theory (Jackson 2017b, 2018a; Jackson et al. 2020).

There is considerable overlap between pacifism and anarchism in both theory and praxis (Ostergaard 1982; Christoyannopoulos 2010, 2020b; Pauli 2015; Llewellyn 2018; Fiala 2018a). To be sure, not all anarchists are pacifists, and not all pacifists are anarchists. However, a committed critique of violence can often develop into a critique of the structures of governance that mete out much violence. And the struggle against structures of domination can often come with a commitment to nonviolence, even if not necessarily a principled endorsement of pacifism. A short historical account of the connections and interactions be-

tween anarchism and pacifism can illustrate this theoretical overlap.

When anarchism emerged and grew as a political ideology in the nineteenth century, it did so in close proximity to socialism (sometimes barely distinguishable from it), and with a strong anti-religious streak. In contrast, the tributary movements and ideas that would coalesce around what would eventually be termed "pacifism" often sprang either from religious sources—most notably, in those societies gripped by the same industrial revolution that provided the context for anarchism, from counter-cultural and reformist versions of Christianity (Brock 1972)—or their inspirations tended to be Kantian, liberal, and articulated around human rights. In addition, whereas anarchism was primarily animated by the working class, the membership of the peace societies of the nineteenth century was primarily middle- and upper-class (Cooper 1991).

Nevertheless, some activists on both the anarchist and pacifist sides could see the connection between peace and socioeconomic reform, and some did strive to facilitate a *rapprochement* between the largely parallel movements. The 1867 Geneva peace congress was specifically timed to follow the Lausanne congress of the First International, encouraging many to attend both (Cooper 1991, 36). The 1890s saw renewed attempts at outreach by peace campaigners toward socialists (Cooper 1991, 74–77). Moreover, many a socialist internationalist in the half-century to the First World War decried the interconnections between militarism, war, and the oppression of the working classes (Cooper 1991; Levy 2004). However, the kind of deeper structural socioeconomic changes that socialist radicals were seeking went much further than what most pacifists were ready to countenance or campaign for. Potential affinities were perceived, and some activists had sympathies for both radical socialism and pacifism, but the anarchist and peace movements evolved largely separate from one another for a while.

At the same time, from the 1880s onward, Leo Tolstoy became a vocal and relentless advocate of an anarcho-pacifism rooted in curiously both Christian and rationalistic grounds. He was read widely across the international intelligentsia from Russia to the United States, feared for his appeal by both Lenin and the Tsar, and he inspired numerous conscientious objectors, but his absolutist rejection of all violence proved too extreme for most anarchists and pacifists alike (Alston 2014; Christoyannopoulos 2014, 2020a, 2020b).

By the early twentieth century, the terrorist tactics adopted by some anarchists were proving a failure, and neither pacifists nor socialists, whether moderate or radical, could prevent the advent of two cataclysmic world wars. These wars would be remembered by some anarchists and pacifists as stark illustrations of the extent to which profiteering and opportunistic elites could be willing to go to advance their interests to the detriment of the suffering many (Brock and Young 1999; Levy 2004; Fiala 2018b; Adams 2019).

Meanwhile, in the background, momentum was growing for an Indian independence campaign led by an activist who counted Tolstoy as one of his major inspirations. Gandhi, however, took from Tolstoyan pacifism a committed rejection of violence, but transformed and operationalized it into a range of strategies and tactics of nonviolent resistance. Whether central elements in Gandhi's thought and practice bear substantial resemblance to anarchist proposals is a subject of debate (Marshall 1993, 422–27; Ostergaard and Currell 1971; Mishra 2013), but what is not contestable is that Gandhi's nonviolent tactics have been a source of inspiration for many activists since, including

many anarchists (Brock and Young 1999; Pauli 2015). Most of the anticolonial struggles of the Cold War had their violent wings, but many, sometimes expressly inspired by Gandhi's movement, had their nonviolent campaigners too. Their ideological language, however, generally contained not anarchism but varying mixtures of nationalism and communism, not least given the central role of the Soviet Union in the Cold War context.

Yet, as the New Left distanced itself from Soviet communism in the 1950s onward, student movements, antinuclear campaigns, and anti-Vietnam War activism provided fertile terrains for renewed cross-pollination between anarchism and pacifism (Pauli 2015; Ostergaard 2016). Activists with pedigrees in either tradition found common ground in opposing militarism, neo-colonial commerce, and neo-imperial geopolitics using creative tactics of nonviolent dissent—so much so that by the 1990s, some anarchists decried the near-hegemony of nonviolent preferences in the movement, making the case for a "diversity of tactics" instead (Churchill 2007; Gordon 2008). Into the twenty-first century, the list of examples of campaigns of nonviolent resistance has continued to grow (Chenoweth and Stephan 2011). So has too, it seems, the popularity of anarchistic ideas in both some of the content and some of the processes adopted by waves of protests such as the alter-globalization movement at the turn of the century, the Occupy movement in the early 2010s, or the environmental activism of the 2020s (Graeber 2002; Gordon 2008; Galián 2019).

It is perhaps unsurprising therefore that the scholarship on anarchism, pacifism, and nonviolence has been growing of late, exploring their overlooked histories and their potential contributions to contemporary debates. Also perhaps unsurprising is that much remains to be done. My aim here is not to dwell further on the rich history of pacifism and anarchism, but instead to articulate a reading of international politics that builds on and organizes the kinds of arguments and observations that have been sketched by voices that have coalesced around their overlap. Whether in socialist internationalism, Tolstoyan anarcho-pacifism, Gandhian activism, Cold War antimilitarism, or more recent anticapitalism, arguments have been advanced that fuse, lean on, or resonate with variants of both anarchism and pacifism. My aim here is to identify and develop some of these claims in order to demonstrate my central contention, which is that an analysis of IR rooted in the terrain shared by anarchism and pacifism offers an insightful, frequently overlooked yet original angle of normative and critical analysis.

This makes it an original contribution to scholarship for several reasons. First, for one, there is neither a single pacifist theory of IR nor a single anarchist theory of IR. Pacifists tend to be focused on denouncing war, but they come to such a stance from a diversity of deontological, consequentialist, and virtue-ethical arguments, and without necessarily broadening their analysis to a deeper critique of the Westphalian premises of the international order. Anarchists focus their attention on various overlapping hierarchies and structures of domination, meaning that their critique often ends up centering on "the state"—its structuring, its oppressive organs, its history, varieties of it, etc.—without necessarily devoting considerable attention to official international relations *between* states. The space where pacifism and anarchism overlap, however, provides a distinct vantage point from which to present as coherent and compelling a particular and legitimate selection of complementary arguments offered by each perspective concerning IR. Articulating a cogent anarcho-pacifist con-

tribution thus requires the prioritizing and redeveloping of some of the central claims put forward by each.

Second, such an endeavor also helps draw the attention of pacifists to where their arguments resonate with anarchists, and vice versa, thus affirming and enriching the overlap of these schools of thought to those historically more familiar with either (as well as of course to those familiar with neither).

Third, indeed, although anarchism and pacifism have converged to some extent in some twentieth-century contexts (building on more theoretical roots dating back to the nineteenth), dedicated and detailed anarcho-pacifist analysis remains to be articulated for a range of topics in politics broadly defined. In other words, anarcho-pacifism offers an angle of analysis that is potentially fruitful but yet to be fully mapped and cultivated. By adapting, reorganizing and developing anarchist and pacifist lines of argument, this article clarifies what an analysis grounded in their overlap provides for themes central to IR (war, militarism, the distribution of power and wealth, and more generally the Westphalian order, its structure and its evolution), thereby providing an example of the kind of contribution that anarcho-pacifism can offer as a school of thought.

Fourth, this helps expose similarities and differences between anarcho-pacifism and more established schools of IR theory. Some of the arguments articulated by anarcho-pacifists are labored to some extent by other schools of thought, but rarely with the same commitment to questioning fundamental and hegemonic assumptions about the international order. In particular, anarcho-pacifism goes further in both its critique and proposals than liberal and Marxist theories of IR, based as it is on a more radical commitment to move away from both direct and structural violence and toward a less unequal and oppressive world order. The most glaring similarities and differences with established IR theories are therefore drawn out below as the argument progresses.

Building on claims that have emanated from anarcho-pacifists in the past and strengthening them with further mutually compatible analysis by anarchists and pacifists, five main anarcho-pacifist arguments about international politics are identified and developed in this article. The first, drawing especially on the pacifist pillar of anarcho-pacifism, is a critique of the fetishization of violence. The second builds on both pacifism and anarchism to articulate a warning about chronic sliding toward systemic militarism. The third and fourth draw more on anarchism to denounce the multifaceted manifestations of exploitation and domination enforced by states around the globe, and to reflect on both current and potential alternative structurings of international politics. The fifth borrows just as much from anarchism as pacifism to reflect on political agency. Together, these five elements capture the main arguments that have tended to emerge in the aforementioned historical and contemporary contexts when anarchism and pacifism have cross-pollinated, and that are also here, where appropriate, developed and strengthened further by incorporating the latest compatible scholarship on anarchism, pacifism, and anarcho-pacifism. The final section firms up the position of this anarcho-pacifist normative critique on the landscape of IR theories by drawing out further what it accepts or disputes from some of the core claims of established IR theories.

It is easy to forget that both anarchism and pacifism are concerned not only with preaching specific alternative models of political interaction, but also and in the first place with denouncing the current order—its violence, its

domination, its injustice. Pacifism, anarchism, and thus anarcho-pacifism offer a diagnosis about the world that is analytically separable from what they propose to do about it. What follows is primarily such a diagnosis, although it does include some discussion of its implications regarding what might be done about it.

### Fetishizing Violence

Pacifists and anarcho-pacifists argue that violence is much too fetishized as a means to get to one's preferred political ends. In war, in terrorism, but also in counter-terrorism, in border control, in the deployment of drones, and indeed in domestic order maintenance, direct physical violence or the threat of it is much too quickly and often resorted to as an instrument of policy.

Yet, it is far from clear that such violence is as instrumentally effective as its fetishization would assume (Frazer and Hutchings 2008; Dexter 2012; Howes 2013). Violence "rarely achieves either its strategic or normative goals" (Jackson 2018b, 169). Using it against an oppressor can threaten the very civilians it is adopted to protect (Wallace 2018). Violent counter-terrorism often backfires or generates more problems than it addresses (Argomaniz and Vidal-Diez 2015; Jackson 2017a, 258–361; Zulaika 2009). Armed insurgencies fail much more often than they succeed (Chenoweth and Stephan 2011). And belligerent states with greater military capacity increasingly struggle to convert that superiority into clear victories (Biddle 2004).

Moreover, there is growing evidence that nonviolent methods can in fact often be just as effective, if not more. Nonviolent resistance succeeds more often than violent resistance (Chenoweth and Stephan 2011). Unarmed peacekeeping and nonviolent civilian defense initiatives can be successful (Salmon 1988; Julian and Schweitzer 2015; Wallace 2017; Julian 2020). Even in the high politics of classic interstate IR, the nonviolent methods of diplomatic engagement, negotiations, and confidence-building can often be effective in achieving strategic and political goals. Besides, what nonviolent methods do, but violent methods do not, is "[force] us to wrestle with the humanity of our adversaries" (Wallace 2020, 53). Nonviolent methods are more humane. They aim "not at the obliteration of the antagonist but at reconciliation" through "transformed human relationships" (Pauli 2015, 74).

Violent methods appear to offer quick and visible courses of action, but, beyond the immediate and apparent success of inflicting such violence, it is not clear that they achieve the strategic aims for which they are deployed. What they do generate is plenty of collateral grief in the process. Policymakers and politicians—especially those informed by realist thinking—can fetishize violent options because they produce visible effects and help project an image of them "doing something about" whatever is seen as a problem, but they can often backfire and complicate genuine and longer-term resolutions of political problems. What a comparison of the evidence for violence and for nonviolence therefore suggests is that it is "the practitioners of violence," not the pacifists, who "are more often the tragic idealists" (Howes 2013, 438). "When the war broke out in 1914," Cooper for example observes (Cooper 1991, 140), "no Continental peace activist was taken by surprise"—it was, rather, the proponents of militarism who proved deluded about the efficacy of the strategy that they had been selling vigorously to their compatriots. It is the fetishization of violence that is naïvely optimistic, and its consequences tragic and brutal.

Not all pacifists and anarcho-pacifists are committed to an absolute "holier than thou" rejection of violence in all possible circumstances (Rossdale 2019b, 192). Along the continuum of pacifist positions, some identify more as contingent pacifists, or as pacifists who would still take up arms in an extreme emergency (Cady 2010; Jackson 2017b; Parkin 2018; Fiala 2018a). What pacifists of all stripes nevertheless do share is deep circumspection about violent methods, and they all articulate a variety of arguments against violence and in favor of nonviolent alternatives. Pacifism thus contributes a rich and nuanced critique of the violence of the international system, which helps interrogate the fetishization of violence of traditional readings of IR and invite serious consideration of alternative options.

Some, liberals in particular, might contend that when it comes to war, in other words the standard application of violence by states in the international arena, "just war" principles often impose considerable and generally sufficient restraint, and their institutionalization in the structures of the international order ensures some legal enforceability (Walzer 1977; Williams 2005). These principles do indeed, in theory at least, impose substantial constraints on when and how violence is to be deployed. In reality, however, the list of conflicts that have been justified through ostensible appeals to just war principles is extensive. Admittedly, few recent wars ever did fully meet just war criteria, but that is precisely one of the issues with the way the just war tradition is negotiated in the actual practice of international politics (Fiala 2008; Ryan 2015; Holmes 2017; Finlay 2019). Appeals to just war criteria are made when it is politically expedient, only for them to be quietly ignored when that becomes more expedient politically, strategically, and tactically. The institutionalization of just war principles in the UN Charter and in the Hague and Geneva Conventions has not prevented many a conflict from breaching those principles even when sometimes pretending to respect them.

In a sense, liberals and pacifists have similar concerns about violence, but liberals are softer and more trusting of international institutions than pacifists, whose critique runs deeper and is more radical. The peace movement was itself quite moderate and liberal in the nineteenth century (Ostergaard 1982). However, after the traumatic violence of the early twentieth century, in light of emerging evidence in favor of more radical nonviolent alternatives, and in the context of a postwar global order intoxicated by nuclear weapons and gripped by anticolonial struggles, many pacifists concluded that liberal solutions have proved too weak and insufficient. For pacifists in the early twenty-first century, both the scholars and the practitioners of liberal IR concede too readily to rationalizations of violence. There are plenty of important and constructive criticisms and debate, among peace and conflict scholars and practitioners including within the liberal tradition, about "responsibility to protect," about "humanitarian interventions," about "peacekeeping" and "peacebuilding" projects, and more generally about liberal international institutions, but for pacifists and anarcho-pacifists these often just do not go far enough in questioning the instrumental utility of violence (Ryan 2015; Jackson 2018c; Moses 2020).

### Sliding to Systemic Militarism

Beyond the question of whether violence is a worthy instrument either in principle or in reality, pacifists and anarcho-pacifists are also concerned with the way in which "war takes a life of its own" and generates a deadly military–industrial complex (Ryan 2019, 23). Classical realists like to

project the hypothetical self-defense impulses of individuals onto states, personifying states to argue that war is an inevitable consequence of human nature writ large (Christov 2017; Jespersen 2020). Indeed, one typical charge against pacifists consists in pointing to the apparent inconsistency between their presumed likelihood to defend themselves when attacked and their opposition to war (Jackson 2018b).

However, leaving aside the questionable assumption (which pacifists dispute) that the only rational and effective human response to fear or even attack would have to be violence, states are simply not sentient beings with animal instincts. War is "not a natural phenomenon but a human institution" (Ryan 2015, 34). It "requires extensive preparation, major social organisation, the institutionalisation of a permanent military force, a supporting economic base (or military-industrial complex)" and "the construction of a violence-supporting culture (including the cultivation of enmity sufficient for mass killing)" (Jackson 2017b, 216). Indeed, there are "immense political and material interests invested" in the "military industrial complex" (Jackson 2017a, 366; see also Christoyannopoulos 2021). The machinery of war therefore works differently from what goes on within a human being under attack, and there is a danger that what can begin as seemingly innocuous preparations for war as an insurance policy can soon enough slide toward increasingly deeply embedded, systemic militarism. The resulting military–industrial complex then tends to "lubricate" the "slippery slope … towards unjust wars" (Fiala 2012, 100). Preparing for war certainly has considerable institutional effects that can be overlooked when we insist on ascribing to states the biological characteristics of independent human beings.

Indeed, the very process of state-building seems to have in fact been driven by war-making. That is, preparing to try to win the next war is what drove the very construction of the modern state: conscription to staff the army, taxes to pay for the cost of running and arming it, up-to-date population censuses to monitor available resources, roads to reach every corner of the land to extract those resources, the police to ensure compliance, even welfare policies to secure consent, and so on (Tilly 1985; Ryan 2019). War-making in late medieval and early modern Europe is what accelerated the emergence of the modern state.

This is one of the areas of "affinities" between pacifism and anarchism because many pacifists worry about how "predatory political power" results from the "centralisation" of "killing for political ends" (Ryan 2019, 14). Moreover, once that political power with its ability to mete violence is constituted, it can be deployed to protect and maintain other hierarchies of oppression and domination—hierarchies based on class, race, or gender, for example (Fiala 2018a; Honeywell 2021). It is also worth paying attention to what the establishment of a permanent army does to a society: the moral damage to citizens who are conditioned into soldiers, the risk of *coups d'état*, the attracting of preemptive attacks, the consequences of ill-advised militaristic hubris, and the leaking of militaristic mindsets onto civilian life and culture (Dobos 2020). More generally, "violence is never purely instrumental, but rather is *constitutive* of identities, ethics, practices and, consequently, politics" (Jackson 2017a, 360; see also Dexter 2012, Jackson 2017b; Ryan 2015).

Therefore, by reflecting on how war is a "social practice" that "shapes our perception of the world," pacifism and anarcho-pacifism here again raise deeper questions than just war theory tends to tackle (Reeves-O'Toole 2020, 8; see also Ryan 2018). The just war tradition pays insufficient

attention to the "constitutive" nature of "war as a condition" (Reeves-O'Toole 2020, 9). In fact, it arguably "strengthen[s] the military–industrial–entertainment complex" by giving it ostensibly legitimate purpose, instead of questioning the powerful dynamics that feed it and that constitute us as war-ready societies (Kustermans et al. 2019, 3). Just war theory also overlooks "the injustices of *war building*": the "repression," the "elimination[s]," the "rights violations" (Ryan 2019, 22). Just war thinking does not prevent the entrenchment of a military–industrial–entertainment complex that generates glorified narratives about war-fighting, produces a readiness to fight, and becomes tempting for politicians to invoke. Pacifists and anarcho-pacifists, however, are alert to this, and can thus bring specifically anarcho-pacifist observations to reflections about the just war tradition.

Hence, to the growing critical literature in IR on militarism (Stavrianakis and Selby 2013; Stavrianakis and Stern 2018; Rossdale 2019b), an anarcho-pacifist approach contributes both anarchist questions about the state and pacifist questions about violence. That is, from an anarcho-pacifist perspective, an analysis of militarism is overlooking a significant dimension if it does not consider critically how war and militarism have driven the very creation and legitimation of modern states, and it is too timid if it is not open to reflecting on whether violence is actually effective instrumentally, and whether therefore any institutionalized readiness to inflict it is ultimately really necessary.

## State-Enforced Multifaceted Exploitation

Anarchism is sometimes oversimplified as simply "opposition to the state." Although that is of course a central feature, anarchists usually oppose not just "the state," but also a broad range of structures of domination and oppression—such as capitalism, patriarchy, and racism—which are often in turn underpinned by state violence. Anarchists denounce all such structures of domination, reflect on the potential for alternative structurings of political and economic relations, and articulate an analysis of the potential for political agency independent of the Westphalian state. Those reflections apply as much to the international arena as to domestic politics, and therefore guide the next three sections of this article.

An anarchist analysis of IR echoes Marxist IR theories such as world-systems theory when it comes to denouncing the political economy of domination and exploitation in the international order, but develops the argument in further directions. To depict the analysis that anarchist and Marxist IR share in broad and somewhat colloquial strokes: the capitalist global political economy runs on the ongoing exploitation of the twenty-first century proletariat and precariat by the interests of capital; the middle classes are both exploiter and exploited, seizing some of the product of labor of lower classes while also enslaving themselves to the wheels of neoliberal capitalism through debt and wage slavery; and a small minority rakes astronomical profits at the very top, which it can shield in secretive tax havens or partly reinvest in self-interested lobbying. There are of course plenty of variations of this depending on local contextual factors and the extent of integration into the global political economy. And the situation has been getting steadily worse since the 1980s wherever the doctrines of neoliberal capitalism have been imposed. However, all these local and regional contexts are interconnected and economically integrated into one globalized political economy. As Marxist IR explains, the various global sites of the economic core exploit

those at the periphery, and on the whole the Global North exploits the Global South, although there are of course both exploited classes and elites across the globe (Wallerstein 1979).

Anarchism pushes further than Marxism in two main areas. The first is in scrutinizing the role of the state in underpinning this. International political maps convey an impression of a world more fragmented than is its economy, but what they do also indicate implicitly is that every space on Earth offers a different flavor of enforced regulation, different variations in the sovereign monopolies of violence, different uniforms, and different languages with which the interests of the elite will be protected with whatever variety of violence is deemed necessary. Political maps also show the borders within which most people, especially poorer ones, are increasingly expected to remain—boundaries within which they are expected to be contained and exploited by ongoing legacies of structural exploitation, or which they can cross at their peril only to then often find themselves exploited and discriminated against anew upon arrival (Honeywell 2021). Behind the different colors on a political map of the globe therefore lie different translations of essentially the same basic model of state violence to enforce an unequal distribution of wealth and exploitative modes of production. Anarchists stress that economic exploitation is everywhere enforced by states—sometimes with the help of corporations or vigilantes but, even then, in collusion with the state.

The second way in which an anarchist reading of IR pushes further than Marxist IR is in paying more attention to the intersectionality of state-backed capitalist exploitation with other oppressive hierarchies. That is, what states also enforce is a broader cultural and social order with a wider range of inequalities and categories of discrimination, including racism and sexism in particular. Anarchist theory and practice has long been engaged with, has learned from, and has integrated arguments from a broader range of emancipatory theories including "feminism, critical race theory, post-colonial theory, queer theory, humanist and gestalt psychologies, transformational justice, ecofeminism and animal liberation" (Honeywell 2021, 18). These theoretical perspectives enrich the anarchist reading of IR as a space where numerous systems of domination intersect and interact, ultimately underwritten by Westphalian states. The international system is therefore one "embedded within … social systems … which reproduce a range of (gendered, racial, class-based, colonial) relations of domination" (Cudworth and Hobden 2010, 399). And for anarchists and anarcho-pacifists, "what states do to their people" and how this "constrains the very possibility of progressive politics" are at least as concerning as "what states do to each other" (Prichard 2010b, 30).

Hence "[t]he state does not overcome violence," but rather "imposes a particular form of order maintained through normalized, organized, and professionally-administered violence" (Turner 1998, 37). IR scholars worry about war, with realists preaching militaristic policies for protection and liberals preaching trade and institutional integration to disincentivize escalation, but for anarchists and anarcho-pacifists "the emergence of the sovereign state does not put a stop to war but simply captures it, calibrates it through law and government, and turns it against society" (Newman 2012, 265). The "peace" of the global neoliberal order is premised on the violence of "liberal pacification"—on the violence that structures and constitutes the social and political world (Baron et al. 2019; see also Ford 2020; Christoyannopoulos 2020b). For many citizens in the ne-

oliberal world order, the state is thus in fact not a guardian against, but a chief source of, violence, fear, and insecurity (Rossdale 2019a).

Anarchists draw attention to this, but it is worth noting that this is also what some pacifists have been gesturing toward when reflecting on structural and cultural violence (Galtung 1969, 1990). Indeed, one of the main areas of "overlap" between "varieties of anarchism and pacifism … is in their rejection of domination and critique of power" (Fiala 2018a, 158). And it is in part precisely because they broaden their analysis of violence to structural violence that anarcho-pacifists go further than the liberal pacifists of the nineteenth century (Ostergaard 2016). For such varieties of pacifism, to insist on peace without justice is to risk defending a form of structural violence. If "in one way or another you are the beneficiary of harms suffered by some others and the beneficiary of a culture that depicts those harms as necessary and just or that hides them from sight," then you might be enjoying peace but at the expense of violence and injustice upon others (Honeywell 2021, 25).

This is a concern across political borders. Violence, oppression, and domination in today's globalized political economy will not be successfully eradicated through policies made by states either to ostensibly defend citizens from menacing Others (as realist thinking tends to advise) or mainly by building trust and stronger links through economic and institutional integration (as liberals recommend). Realist solutions are based on false nationalistic divisions—our "loyalty" should be to humankind as a whole (Newman 2012, 266). Neoliberal schemes strengthen the *existing* order by giving it a semblance of moral legitimacy wrapped in elusive promises for a better tomorrow. As Prichard puts it, "You do not have to be an anarchist to see that the state and neo-liberal market logics sustain regimes of domination, but few other than the anarchists have argued that to reform these within the purview of either is to replicate and legitimise these structures by our habitual actions" (Prichard 2010c, 377–78). The modern state is a fundamental part of the problem, a violent guarantor for these structures of domination and exploitation. Political maps give impressions of sovereignty and independence, but so long as the international order is imagined only through the prisms of Westphalian states, the responsibility for the execution of any proposed solution to exploitation and domination will be handed over to the structural agents whose origins and whose enduring raison d'être are to underpin those hierarchies and serve the interests of the global elite (Llewellyn 2018). Anarchists and anarcho-pacifists insist that we need to think outside the state.

## Structurings of International Politics

Anarchists have long articulated extensive reflections on varieties of political structures. One of their core claims is that the way we have a habit of structuring political organizations like states hurt us, and that there are other ways of organizing for political ends. In the local to global political and economic structures of the Westphalian order, because of the way these organizations are structured, all those who reach positions of power come to behave roughly the same. Even well-intentioned individuals end up reproducing similar structural pathologies. Hence, the anarchist claim that "[o]ur enemies are not human beings, but the institutions and routines that estrange us from each other and from ourselves" (CrimethInc. 2018). The problem is not with particular individuals but with structures, that is, with the way

we have a habit of structuring our political and economic relations.

Of particular concern to anarchists is centralization and lack of accountability: anarchists have been warning "with foresight" (and "have been killed … for their troubles") about the dangers of centralization, unification, and the nation state (Prichard 2010a, 451). That is why anarchists call for "subsidiarity" and "multilevel governance" just as many liberals do, but they argue that the autonomy claimed by states in the international system ought to be "*a model for the autonomy of all social groups*" (Prichard 2010a, 453, 458). That means that the kind of multilevel structuring of "governance" preferred by anarchists is not a delegating down or up sanctioned magnanimously by the ultimately sovereign state, but a more radically bottom-up layering constituted by autonomous and genuinely sovereign individuals. This is one of the reasons why anarchists find unacceptable the granting of ultimate sovereignty and the consequent monopoly over allegedly legitimate violence to the state.

Anarchists want power to be much more "diffused," and in this sense embrace anarchy as "a *solution*" rather than "the crux of the *problem*" (Booth 1991, 541, 545). More specifically, they envision a complex federation of "neo-medieval" allegiances (Prichard 2011, 1659) to various overlapping "collectivities" (Falk 1978, 71), in other words a "federated, bottom-up form of governance" based on "the principle of subsidiarity" (Prichard 2007, 642). Anarchism is therefore "not … incompatible with the need for some form of global organization," but central to it is "maximum participation in decision-making processes" (Weiss 1975, 2, 4). The idea that somehow all groups, collectives, and organizations must ultimately submit to the supreme authority of the state grants the administrators of that layer of governance too much arbitrary power. One of anarchism's central disputes with mainstream political thought is after all "the Hobbesian assumption that hierarchy [and] chains of command … are inevitable, natural and necessary" (Honeywell 2021, 2). People can be trusted to organize from the bottom up—and if people cannot be trusted then there is no reason to foolishly entrust the most ambitious with the powerful levers of the Westphalian state (Christoyannopoulos 2020b).

The traditional structuring of the state also absolves too easily of any sense of moral responsibility the frontline agents of morally reprehensible state actions, because they tend to rationalize their actions by reminding themselves that the decision was not theirs but coming from above (Christoyannopoulos 2020b, 74–77). Similarly, the consumers of products whose production involved violence, the producers of implements manufactured for such violence, the citizens invited to vote every few years to bless the system with their consent, all tend to shift away any lingering sense of moral responsibility to the professional politicians who operate the state. Reenvisaging politics from the bottom up instead, with sovereignty, responsibility, and accountability for federated layers of governance ultimately rooted in the people, means that every citizen, every political and economic actor bears their share of moral responsibility. The violence inflicted to others partly away from our sight but partly because of our own behavior is no longer only someone else's responsibility.

Also related to this is the deep anarchist suspicion of nationalism, which instils Westphalian projects with powerful emotions, but which anarchists consider deceitful and dangerous (Gordon 2018; Levy 2019; Christoyannopoulos 2020b; Kinna 2021). Anarchists do sympathize with struggles for emancipation, and they do see the people as sovereign, but framing this in nationalist terms oversimplifies the fluidity of ethno-cultural identities, masks socioeconomic identities, essentializes differences between peoples, and offers demagogues much too tempting a specter to conjure up and exploit in order to justify opportunistic power grabs. Nationalist hype can also all-too-easily facilitate the dehumanization of others—an important ingredient in the rationalization of violence against enemies in war. Nationalism bloats the importance of one particular layer of identity, helps legitimize one particular political structure, and instils a myopic devotion to a sense of community that could just as well be "imagined" differently (Anderson 2006).

An anarchist and anarcho-pacifist analysis of IR thus echoes the voices in post-structuralist and social constructivist IR that are interested in the practices and performances of global politics, how they establish particular structures, identities, and power relations and how these are not immutable but can be transformed (Wendt 1992; Edkins 1999). We are all born into particular contexts in which politics has come to be performed in particular ways, but other ways of structuring international politics *are* possible. The Westphalian order is what all the human beings who constitute it "make of it."

Moreover, it is interesting to observe how "a variety of contemporary phenomena," including "international organizations; … national separatist movements; … international terrorist organizations; … multinational corporations … and international nongovernmental organizations," are "straining the traditional state-centric system" (Turner 1998, 28). Many of these movements bring attention "to problems that are not amenable to direct policy responses" by states and "not oriented" toward states (Turner 1998, 30). In a sense, this "global civil society" resembles the anarchist networks, associations, and federations envisioned by anarchists such as Kropotkin (Turner 1998)—except of course that for now it is subservient to the Westphalian order, which it ultimately respects and serves.

What this tends to suggest is that "anarchy," or this kind of dynamic and organic bubbling up of various organizations with dedicated aims and functions not necessarily mapped onto states, might actually be "ontologically prior" not just for IR, but for all group formation and interaction in social and political life, and therefore that a focus on a "mythical, personified, Westphalian state" distorts our thinking about that (Prichard 2017, 373–74). From this perspective globalization does not call for global governance in the liberal sense, but for a rethink "about the nature of global order and the virtues of anarchy therein" (Cerny and Prichard 2017, 378). Because public perceptions are dominated by a conceptualization of state control and an assumption that states must be the agents of political action, our imagination concerning how the international order operates and can operate is constrained. The challenge is to think of new ways to constitutionalize the new anarchy, or even to constitutionalize our relations politically in better harmony with the bottom-up and organic needs for coordinated political activity (Cerny and Prichard 2017). The current Westphalian international order is poorly equipped to respond to this ontological reality of human challenges. Imposing it as a straitjacket is enforcing an obsessive one-dimensional framing, which is constrictive and which only reinforces the hierarchies of domination that drive so many of our common human challenges to begin with.

## Reconsidering Political Agency

Any critical and normative analyst is confronted with the question of what to do about what has been diagnosed as

problematic. Anarchists, pacifists, and anarcho-pacifists are no exception. Their reflections on the matter encourage a radical reconsideration of the nature of political agency. We might be used to particular structures and performances that we reproduce, but from an anarcho-pacifist perspective it is in everyone's power to produce different ones.

Anarchists do not expect solutions from centralized power, nor do they work for results through it. They are suspicious of what Rossdale calls the "hegemonic ontology of agency," according to which political agency is understood to only be effective if delivered by "a single … agent or form" (Rossdale 2019a, 69). That is, if responses to a hegemonic world order are themselves guilty of a "reliance on a hegemonic imaginary," in other words of expecting change to succeed only when a dominant agent can be convinced to implement a more progressive agenda, then this "is liable to merely replace one state with another" (Rossdale 2019a, 71).

Anarchists often cite the following quote from Gustav Landauer (1910):

> The state is a social relationship; a certain way of people relating to one another. It can be destroyed by creating new social relationships; i.e., by people relating to one another differently. The absolute monarch said: I am the state. We, who we have imprisoned ourselves in the absolute state, must realize the truth: we are the state! And we will be the state as long as we are nothing different; as long as we have not yet created the institutions necessary for a true community and a true society of human beings.

Anarchists thus advocate "contracting alternative relations of agency" both to work toward specific political goals and to undermine the position of the oppressive state in the process (Rossdale 2010, 487). They preach "a quintessentially global praxis realised in and through micro-contexts" (Prichard 2010c, 378). Anarchism "resituate[s] the political dimension away from the state and the principle of state sovereignty; the space of the political is now claimed *outside the state and against it*" (Newman 2012, 278).

This is why Falk argues that an anarchist lens sees "non-state actors as the bearers of emancipatory potential" (Falk 2010, 391). Moreover, against realist mindsets, an anarchist angle considers non-state actors (whether emancipatory or otherwise) as just as potentially important "international" actors as states: not only non-state organizations, but also corporations big and small, political associations, and protest movements are all significant actors in the story of world politics. Many such organizations nowadays operate within Westphalian parameters and, when they lobby and campaign for change, are ultimately oriented toward states. However, from an anarchist perspective, this need not be the only way of writing that story. Non-state organizations and movements often emerge organically, from the ground up, and can often organize particular goals better than states. They need not ultimately be subservient to Westphalian overlords, and they demonstrate the potential for organizational capacity independent of states. Examples of such organizations abound. Those whose work is most aligned with anarchism include Earth First!, Food Not Bombs, the Industrial Workers of the World, and the Zapatista Army of National Liberation (Rossdale 2010; Honeywell 2021). However, focusing only on the political agency of formal organizations would again be to reproduce "dominant ontologies of agency" and thereby risk overlooking internationally significant "non-traditional" political agents, such as more informal emancipatory initiatives and broader social movements on issues ranging from anti-

militarism, affordable housing, and environmental justice to actions against sexual abuse, racism, and police brutality (Rossdale 2010, 484). In short, plenty of political aims are already being advanced across the world by political agents independent of Westphalian states.

At the same time, of course not every non-state actor helps build the kind of alternative global order free from domination that anarchists envision. Anarchists are also very attentive to the risk of recreating practices and habits of domination within non-state organizations, which is why they seek "to avoid the flaws of representation and mediation and [prefer] direct action, delegation and prefiguration" (Prichard 2010c, 376). It is therefore important, for anarchists, to pay attention to the way any structure is organized. The state is organized hierarchically. Multiple structures of domination are organized in ways that already bake injustice into their very way of organizing. What anarchists want is a federation of democratically run "natural groups" (Prichard 2007, 642), not a civil society of undemocratically run campaign groups and political organizations. This also means keeping vigilant about the potential for problematic practices to emerge even within horizontal organizations, because "structureless" groups can be "tyrannical" too—especially when hierarchies are hidden from official view (Freeman 1973).

This points to another area of overlap between anarchism and pacifism: the importance of prefiguration, that is, of the compatibility of ends and means. For anarcho-pacifists (and indeed most anarchists and pacifists), "means are end-creating or ends-in-the-making" (Ostergaard 1982, 16; see also Pauli 2015, 74–76), that is, "the means that are used … will be reproduced in the outcome" (Honeywell 2021, 10). That is also why a less authoritarian and violent international order cannot be pursued through structures that are authoritarian and violent. And that is why an international order free from Westphalian shackles of dominance and exploitation cannot be achieved through the agency of Westphalian states. The new global society must be prefigured and constituted "within the shell of the old" (Industrial Workers of the World 2020) by political actors whose aims are already embodied in their campaigning methods. Concretely, this is a call for global citizens to give up any lingering expectations that Westphalian states can sort things out for them, to organize their local communities from the ground up to provide what is needed, and in the process to mold new identities (Murray 2010) and to experiment with and refine models of organization that do not reproduce hierarchies of violence and domination.

What that means for IR theory is that, from an anarcho-pacifist perspective, the state is indeed a dominant player in the international order, the violent guarantor of the status quo, but also an institution that can be rendered redundant by supplanting it with a more organic network of federalized and democratically run organizations. Like many theories critical of realism, anarcho-pacifists consider a range of actors aside from the state to be just as important as states. However, where liberals for example tend to focus especially on economic agents, anarchists also pay particular attention to citizens, activists, and the wide variety of organizations whose political agency operates largely independently from states.

## Positioning Anarcho-Pacifism among Established IR Theories

An exhaustive and systematic anarcho-pacifist theory of all things political has yet to be written. Drawing on and

building upon some of the main arguments developed by pacifism, by anarchism, and guided by voices already grounded in their overlap, the more modest aim of this article has been to flesh out an anarcho-pacifist normative analysis focused specifically on international politics. If the tone has sometimes been political, it is to reflect the urgency and the passion with which anarcho-pacifists tend to convey their normative critique. What has emerged is a different story about the international order than is provided by established IR theories. An anarcho-pacifist critique of IR however also generates specific normative arguments with which to complement or dispute some of the key propositions of these more established theories.

For example, an anarcho-pacifist interpretation can only view classical realist assumptions that humans are naturally egotistical and inevitably inclined to violence as a convenient, but simplistic and erroneous, essentialization (Christov 2017; Jespersen 2020). Human beings may have an instinct to defend themselves when under physical attack, but that cannot be extrapolated onto states to anthropomorphically justify inter-state conflict. For one, what is often presented as in "the national interest," as if the interest of a uniform body of millions of people, often happens to really be primarily in the interest of the political and economic elites. Besides, from an anarcho-pacifist perspective, if there is a natural inclination that guides most human behavior, it is one for peace, and justice. Most people interact peacefully and fairly with each other most of the time. Therefore, from an anarcho-pacifist perspective, classical realist assumptions about human nature are suspicious and need destabilizing, as does the personification of the state prevalent in several strands of IR theory (Prichard 2011, 2017).

Neorealists shift the grounding for realist policy advice from human nature to the "anarchic" structure of the international order. From an anarcho-pacifist's angle, however, for one, Waltz's concept of anarchy is indulging in "the popular stereotype of relative chaos and disorder" (Cudworth and Hobden 2010, 401). The absence of a single global sovereign need not trigger violent "anarchy": anarchists have shown that plenty of orderly collaboration and ad hoc bottom-up organizing can flourish without the oversight of an omnipotent hierarch. In fact, plenty of cooperation and collusion also happens among the elites: as Newman puts it, "rather than international politics being 'anarchic' as the realists claim, it is highly ordered, structured around the interests of political and economic elites whose true enemies are not one another, but rather the revolutionary capacities of the international working class" (Newman 2012, 266). Indeed, for all the fears of conflict and chaos conveyed by the positing of "anarchy" as the structural characteristic of the international order, states have shown a remarkable inclination to collaborate and engage in "polite" diplomacy despite the absence of an overarching authority (Kazmi 2012). Hence, far from being "anarchic" in the Waltzian sense, the "international arena" is "a constellation of and a competition between various rules, norms, hierarchies, and ordering principles, rather than a world devoid of any of those features" (Sjoberg 2017, 330). At any rate, the international order is more complex and less fixed than Waltz would have it (Cudworth and Hobden 2010). Plenty of cooperation does happen independently from state administration, and the international order has evolved over decades and centuries and will continue to do so.

Like liberal IR theory, anarcho-pacifism breaks open the "black box" of the state. However, informed by its socioeconomic analysis, anarcho-pacifism would modify the liberal institutionalist argument that economic integration and interdependence build in incentives against war, by noting that this might indeed be so in particular because economic integration creates *elite* interdependence. It was never in the interest of the masses to be turned into cannon-fodder to feed the geostrategic and profiteering greed of the political, economic, and infotainment elite. What economic integration does do is temper elite temptations to stoke up nationalist animosities or gamble with escalations to war because such moves would hurt now-interdependent profit margins. Economic integration also offers those elites plenty of tempting new opportunities to instead gain from new trading regimes, deregulation, outsourcing, and new markets. In any case, to the extent that economics does indeed matter, so does a fair distribution of resources as well as a playing field that is much more equitable (across both international and socioeconomic boundaries) than the one produced by today's neoliberal order. The architects of neoliberal constructions have too often quickly forgotten about the victims of their economic policies, leaving them behind to be later exploited by demagogues who in turn ultimately advance an agenda that continues to benefit roughly the same overall elite. (Hence, for instance, how the American elite could work just as well with Clinton, Bush, Obama, or Trump, but felt particularly threatened by Sanders.) In short, what anarcho-pacifism brings to liberal institutionalism is an insistence on the importance of class.

Anarcho-pacifists also place little hope on the more classical liberal aspirations to prevent war mainly via the formation of overarching intergovernmental or supranational institutions (Ryan 2015). For one, the "idea of centralizing all power" in a "world government" is for anarchists "a fearful prospect" (Booth 1991, 540). As for more intergovernmental designs, they leave largely unchallenged the domestic power of states. They also often lack proper democratic accountability. Either way, solutions that continue to be underpinned by Westphalian states cannot suffice in eradicating either interstate conflict or structural violence within states. For some anarcho-pacifists, the road to perpetual peace, if ever that can be achieved, is one of moral transformation and bottom-up organizing rather than Westphalian treaties and institutions (Atack 2018). Liberal constructions underwritten by states *have* modified the international order, but violence remains fetishized, systemic militarism is insufficiently challenged, and state-enforced multifaceted exploitation continues even with a veneer of liberal respectability.

As for more critical IR theories, the arguments they develop are ones that an anarcho-pacifist reading of IR can often build upon and complement. For example, as noted above, an anarcho-pacifist angle echoes Marxist dependency and world system theories, but broadens the analysis to intersectional structures of domination and exploitation, encourages a deeper rethink of organizational structures, and warns against the temptation of compromising with violent methods of emancipation. Just like Bakunin put it to Marx in the late-nineteenth century (Kinna 2005), an anarcho-pacifist analyst of IR today would caution socialists against the strategy of seeking to capture the reigns of the Westphalian state to achieve political change.

And change is indeed possible. An anarcho-pacifist reading of IR is compatible therefore with social constructivist arguments according to which ideas matter and cultures and identities are subject to long-term change, but anarcho-pacifism brings to this a specific normative diagnosis and direction.

An anarcho-pacifist stance is also compatible with, and can be enriched by, post-structuralist IR theories. Anarchist scholars and activists have been incorporating post-structuralist arguments in their anarchist critiques for decades, whether it be concerning, for example, the nature and functioning of power, the historical contingency of what many have come to see as "natural," the violent binaries of language, or micropolitical practices of resistance (May 2018; Newman 2019). Most of these insights developed where anarchism meets post-structuralism add further weight to an anarcho-pacifist interpretation of IR and thereby echo some of the contributions that have already been made by post-structuralist scholars more generally in IR.

Anarchists have long subscribed to feminist analysis, whether for example of patriarchy, intersectionality, or gender normativity, coming at it from an angle that predictably pays particular attention to the role of the state, and typically seeking radical rather than more gradual emancipation—although anarchists have sometimes also had to adjust to feminist criticisms of their own movement (Jeppesen and Nazar 2018; Kinna 2018; Kowal 2019). The interactions between pacifism and feminism have similarly happened on multiple levels, with plenty of common ground such as on peacebuilding and denouncing militarism, as well as more critical engagement such as regarding gender norms and the division of labor in the peace movement (Pierson 1987; Poe 2018; Kling 2019). A systematic critical engagement of anarcho-pacifism with feminist IR has yet to be written, but it seems plausible to expect, building on existing conversations between feminism and both anarchism and pacifism, a potential mutual enrichment of arguments, for example, where feminist analysis of patriarchy and gender identity would be brought in conversation with anarcho-pacifist arguments about the fetishization of violence and systemic militarism (Duncanson 2019; Rossdale 2019a, 2019b). Moreover, the aforementioned multifaceted exploitation enforced by states notably includes gender-based discrimination, therefore anarcho-pacifists will be attentive to how inclusive, equal, and transformative alternative forms of political agency are. In short, the sympathy for feminist arguments among pacifists and anarchists would seem to pave the way for potential fruitful conversations with anarcho-pacifism.

Similarly, conversations between anarcho-pacifism and postcolonial IR theory would presumably generate interesting analysis, building on existing anarchist works on imperialism and post-colonialism (Laursen 2019; Ramnath 2019). To post-colonial critiques of colonial legacies, for example, an anarcho-pacifist angle adds warnings about inherited inclinations for Westphalian models of governance and associated assumptions about the inevitability and effectiveness of state violence (Laursen 2020). Moreover, anarcho-pacifists bring to any analysis of colonialism a set of reflections about powerful states as expansionist war machines (Ryan 2021). Anarchists and pacifists have also long been interested in examining and learning from pre- and post-colonial political practices that are less violent and free from Westphalian encasings (Kurlansky 2006; Schock 2013; Johnson and Ferguson 2019; Kauanui 2021).

Finally, anarchists have for long taken on the ecological emergency as one of their rallying calls (Weiss 1975), therefore demonstrating considerable affinities with green theories of IR—especially the "deeper" variants of ecologism that diagnose the broader capitalist system and its imperialistic past as central to grasping the problem. What anarcho-pacifists would also particularly insist on when it comes to responses to the ecological breakdown is for them to be nonviolent and organized with bottom-up subsidiarity and accountability.

The list could go on, and in many cases the analysis of the tensions and consonances between anarcho-pacifism and competing theories mentioned above would of course be enriched by deeper engagement with the many and more sophisticated arguments emanating from each of those traditions. The main point here remains that an anarcho-pacifist angle provides a different voice to those familiar to scholars and students of IR. "Much of this terrain has" indeed "been opened up by feminist, Marxist and post-structuralist IR theory" (Prichard 2010c, 380), but an anarcho-pacifist angle builds on these and aligns arguments central to pacifism and anarchism to unveil an original and radical normative critique and horizon of ethical and political imagination for those analyzing international affairs (Prichard 2011; Jackson 2017b). It is an angle that is particularly critical of realism and most sympathetic to critical theories of IR, but it develops a range of fresh arguments on its own, too.

In a sense, anarcho-pacifism radicalizes and triangulates liberal and Marxist theories. Liberty and equality are often described as pulling in different directions, with liberalism prioritizing the former and socialism the latter. One of the original contributions of anarchist thought and practice is that it tries to elevate both, and it insists on them being accessible to all, especially the hitherto disenfranchised. It is thus vehemently both antiauthoritarian and egalitarian. To this, pacifism adds a commitment to remain perceptive about violence and to keep working to avoid it. What this means overall is that anarcho-pacifists are "generally … inclined toward world-order values: peace, economic equity, civil liberties, ecological defense" (Falk 1978, 78). Anarcho-pacifism is therefore not as wild and counter-cultural as might first seem since it embodies values shared by many the world over. However, it does commit to these values more insistently than many and follows them as far as they will go in critically analyzing the international order. An anarcho-pacifist reading of IR is therefore explicitly normative and emancipatory, and it seeks to "liberate the imagination" from Westphalian encasings (Weiss 1975, 3).

Neither every anarchist nor every pacifist will agree with all the arguments that can be developed from the overlap of their schools of thought, but this article demonstrates that this overlap exists and provides a fruitful angle of analysis especially when it comes to diagnosing the ills of the international order. One does not have to be committed to anarchism or pacifism to see the usefulness of reflecting with anarcho-pacifists on these "world-order values," on how different governance structures affect them, on the problems with the Westphalian order, and on who currently benefits from it. My aim with this article was not to convey anarcho-pacifist solutions as much as to begin to articulate an anarcho-pacifist normative critique of the global arena and its various institutions. From an anarchist perspective, to join mainstream institutions administering international affairs today is to consent to and reproduce the existing international system, including its structures of domination and oppression. Even if one does opt to work within the parameters of the Westphalian international order, it seems ethically irresponsible (even if culpability-appeasing) to turn away from reflecting on the violence, exploitation, and domination that are often reproduced through it.

One particular characteristic of anarcho-pacifism that differentiates it from most other IR theories is that it ultimately addresses every citizen of the world directly, rather than states. If it makes "policy" recommendations, it is primarily

to individuals and communities—to resist nonviolently structures of global oppression, to desist from participating in them, and to question organizational structures local to international. Unlike most IR theories, it is not interested in working through Westphalian states. Instead, it affirms the sovereignty of the people and calls us all to do what we can to help build a better world from the ground up, or at least not to turn away from the violence and injustice from which, if we are honest, we know many of us benefit. An anarcho-pacifist reading of the international order is therefore one that is addressed not only to students and scholars of IR, but also to every member of the human community, including perhaps especially those in relatively comfortable positions in today's international order. If anarcho-pacifists are correct in their diagnosis of the international order, then it is for us all to do what we can, collectively and from the bottom up, to refashion our local to global political communities such that a less violent and unjust order can be passed on to the next generation.

## References

ADAMS, MATTHEW S. 2019. "Anarchism and the First World War." In *The Palgrave Handbook of Anarchism*, edited by Carl Levy and Matthew S. Adams, 389–407. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

ALSTON, CHARLOTTE. 2014. *Tolstoy and His Disciples: The History of a Radical International Movement*. London: I.B. Tauris.

ANDERSON, BENEDICT. 2006. *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso.

ARGOMANIZ, JAVIER, AND ALBERTO VIDAL-DIEZ. 2015. "Examining Deterrence and Backlash Effects in Counter-Terrorism: The Case of ETA." *Terrorism and Political Violence* 27 (1): 160–81.

ATACK, IAIN. 2018. "Pacifism and Perpetual Peace." *Critical Studies on Security* 6 (2): 207–20.

BARON, ILAN ZVI, JONATHAN HAVERCROFT, ISAAC KAMOLA, JONNEKE KOOMEN, JUSTIN MURPHY, AND ALEX PRICHARD. 2019. "Liberal Pacification and the Phenomenology of Violence." *International Studies Quarterly* 63 (1): 199–212.

BIDDLE, STEPHEN. 2004. *Military Power: Explaining Victory and Defeat in Modern Battle*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

BOOTH, KEN. 1991. "Security in Anarchy: Utopian Realism in Theory and Practice." *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944 -)* 67 (3): 527–45.

BROCK, PETER. 1972. *Pacifism in Europe to 1914. Vol. 1: A History of Pacifism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

BROCK, PETER, AND NIGEL YOUNG. 1999. *Pacifism in the Twentieth Century*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

CADY, DUANE. 2010. *From Warism to Pacifism: A Moral Continuum Paperback*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

CERNY, PHILIP G., AND ALEX PRICHARD. 2017. "The New Anarchy: Globalisation and Fragmentation in World Politics." *Journal of International Political Theory* 13 (3): 378–94.

CHENOWETH, ERICA, AND MARIA J. STEPHAN. 2011. *Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict*. New York: Columbia University Press.

CHRISTOV, THEODORE. 2017. "The Invention of Hobbesian Anarchy." *Journal of International Political Theory* 13 (3): 296–310.

CHRISTOYANNOPOULOS, ALEXANDRE. 2010. *Christian Anarchism: A Political Commentary on the Gospel*. Exeter: Imprint Academic.

———. 2014. "The Golden Rule on the Green Stick: Leo Tolstoy's Postsecular International Thought." In *Towards a Postsecular International Politics: New Forms of Community, Identity, and Power*, edited by Luca Mavelli and Fabio Petito, 81–102. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

———. 2020a. "Leo Tolstoy's Christian Anarcho-Pacifism: An Exposition." In *Essays in Anarchism and Religion*, vol. 3, edited by Alexandre Christoyannopoulos and Matthew S. Adams, 71–118. Stockholm: Stockholm University Press.

———. 2020b. *Tolstoy's Political Thought: Christian Anarcho-Pacifist Iconoclasm Then and Now*. Abingdon: Routledge.

———. 2021. "A Pacifist Critique of the Red Poppy: Reflections on British War Commemorations' Increasingly Hegemonic Militarism." *Critical Military Studies* 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/23337486.2021.2014237.

CHURCHILL, WARD. 2007. *Pacifism as Pathology: Reflections on the Role of Armed Struggle in North America*. Edinburgh: AK Press.

COOPER, SANDI E. 1991. *Patriotic Pacifism: Waging War on War in Europe 1815–1914*. New York: Oxford University Press.

CRIMETHINC. 2018. "To Change Everything: An Anarchist Appeal." Accessed March 24. https://crimethinc.com/tce.

CUDWORTH, ERIKA, AND STEPHEN HOBDEN. 2010. "Anarchy and Anarchism: Towards a Theory of Complex International Systems." *Millennium* 39 (2): 399–416.

DEXTER, HELEN. 2012. "Terrorism and Violence: Another Violence is Possible?" *Critical Studies on Terrorism* 5 (1): 121–37.

DOBOS, NED. 2020. *Ethics, Security, and the War-Machine: The True Cost of the Military*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

DUNCANSON, CLAIRE. 2019. "Masculinities, War and Militarism." In *Routledge International Handbook of Masculinity Studies*, edited by Lucas Gottzén, Ulf Mellström, Tamara Shefer, and Marinette Grimbeek, 467–76. London: Routledge.

EDKINS, JENNY. 1999. *Poststructuralism and International Relations: Bringing the Political Back In*. London: Lynne Rienner.

FALK, RICHARD A. 1978. "Anarchism and World Order." In *Anarchism*, NOMOS XIX, edited by J. Roland Pennock and John W. Chapman, 63–87. New York: New York University Press.

———. 2010. "Anarchism without 'Anarchism': Searching for Progressive Politics in the Early 21st Century." *Millennium* 39 (2): 381–98.

FIALA, ANDREW. 2008. *The Just War Myth: The Moral Illusions of War*. Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield.

———. 2012. "Just War Ethics and the Slippery Slope of Militarism." *Philosophy in the Contemporary World* 19 (2): 92–102.

———. 2018a. "Anarchism and Pacifism." In *Brill's Companion to Anarchism and Philosophy*, edited by Nathan Jun, 152–70. Leiden: Brill.

———, ed. 2018b. "Pacifism in the Twentieth Century and Beyond." In *The Routledge Handbook of Pacifism and Nonviolence*, 30–42. London: Routledge.

FINLAY, CHRISTOPHER. 2019. *Is Just War Possible?* Cambridge: Polity.

FORD, KIERAN. 2020. "A Pacifist Approach to Countering Extremism." *Global Society* 34 (1): 112–27.

FRAZER, ELIZABETH, AND KIMBERLY HUTCHINGS. 2008. "On Politics and Violence: Arendt Contra Fanon." *Contemporary Political Theory* 7 (1): 90–108.

FREEMAN, JO. 1973. "The Tyranny of Structurelessness." Accessed March 30. https://www.jofreeman.com/joreen/tyranny.htm.

GALIÁN, LAURA. 2019. "Squares, Occupy Movements and the Arab Revolutions." In *The Palgrave Handbook of Anarchism*, edited by Carl Levy and Matthew S. Adams, 715–32. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

GALTUNG, JOHAN. 1969. "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research." *Journal of Peace Research* 6 (3): 167–90.

———. 1990. "Cultural Violence." *Journal of Peace Research* 27 (3): 291–305.

GORDON, URI. 2008. *Anarchy Alive! Anti-Authoritarian Politics from Practice to Theory*. London: Pluto.

———. 2018. "Anarchism and Nationalism." In *Brill's Companion to Anarchism and Philosophy*, edited by Nathan Jun, 197–215. Leiden: Brill.

GRAEBER, DAVID. 2002. "The New Anarchists." New Left Review, January-February.

HAVERCROFT, JONATHAN, AND ALEX PRICHARD. 2017. "Anarchy and International Relations Theory: A Reconsideration." *Journal of International Political Theory* 13 (3): 252–65.

HOLMES, ROBERT L. 2017. *Pacifism: A Philosophy of Nonviolence*. London: Bloomsbury.

HONEYWELL, CARISSA. 2021. *Anarchism*. Cambridge: Polity.

HOWES, DUSTIN ELLS. 2013. "The Failure of Pacifism and the Success of Nonviolence." *Perspectives on Politics* 11 (2): 427–46.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD. 2020. "Preamble to the IWW Constitution." Accessed March 30. https://iww.org.uk/preamble/.

JACKSON, RICHARD. 2017a. "CTS, Counterterrorism and Non-Violence." *Critical Studies on Terrorism* 10 (2): 357–69.

———. 2017b. "Pacifism and the Ethical Imagination in IR." *International Politics* 56 (2): 212–27.

———. 2018a. "Introduction: Rethinking the Relevance of Pacifism for Security Studies and IR." *Critical Studies on Security* 6 (2): 155–59.

———. 2018b. "Pacifism: The Anatomy of a Subjugated Knowledge." *Critical Studies on Security* 6 (2): 160–75.

———. 2018c. "Post-Liberal Peacebuilding and the Pacifist State." *Peacebuilding* 6 (1): 1–16.

JACKSON, RICHARD, GRIFFIN LEONARD, AIDAN GNOTH, JOSEPH LLEWELLYN, AND TONGA KARENA. 2020. "Introduction: The Return of Pacifism to IR." *Global Society* 34 (1): 1–3.

Jeppesen, Sandra, and Holly Nazar. 2018. "Anarchism and Sexuality." In *Brill's Companion to Anarchism and Philosophy,* edited by Nathan Jun, 216–52. Leiden: Brill.

Jespersen, Maija. 2020. "Challenging Hobbes: Is War Inevitable?" *Global Society* 34 (1): 21–35.

Johnson, Kahala, and Kathy E. Ferguson. 2019. "Anarchism and Indigeneity." In *The Palgrave Handbook of Anarchism*, edited by Carl Levy and Matthew S. Adams, 697–714. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Julian, Rachel. 2020. "The Transformative Impact of Unarmed Civilian Peacekeeping." *Global Society* 34 (1): 99–111.

Julian, Rachel, and Christine Schweitzer. 2015. "The Origins and Development of Unarmed Civilian Peacekeeping." *Peace Review* 27 (1): 1–8.

Kauanui, J. Kēhaulani. 2021. "The Politics of Indigeneity, Anarchist Praxis, and Decolonization." *Anarchist Developments in Cultural Studies* 2021 (1): 9–42.

Kazmi, Zaheer. 2012. *Polite Anarchy in International Relations Theory.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kinna, Ruth. 2005. *Anarchism: A Beginner's Guide.* Oxford: Oneworld.

———. 2018. "Anarchism and Feminism." In *Brill's Companion to Anarchism and Philosophy*, edited by Nathan Jun, 253–84. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2019. *The Government of No One: The Theory and Practice of Anarchism.* London: Pelican.

———. 2021. "What is Anarchist Internationalism?" *Nations and Nationalism* 27 (4): 976–91.

Jennifer Kling, ed. 2019. *Pacifism, Politics, and Feminism: Intersections and Innovations.* Leiden: Brill.

Kowal, Donna M. 2019. "Anarcha-Feminism." In *The Palgrave Handbook of Anarchism*, edited by Carl Levy and Matthew S. Adams, 265–79. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kurlansky, Mark. 2006. *Nonviolence: The History of a Dangerous Idea.* London: Jonathan Cape.

Kustermans, Jorg, Tom Sauer, Dominiek Lootens, and Barbara Segaert. 2019. "Introduction: Why Pacifism?" In *Pacifism's Appeal: Ethos, History, Politics*, edited by Jorg Kustermans, Tom Sauer, Dominiek Lootens, and Barbara Segaert, 1–7. Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Landauer, Gustav. 1910. Weak Statesmen, Weaker People!" *The Anarchist Library.* Accessed March 30. https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/gustav-landauer-weak-statesmen-weaker-people.

Laursen, Ole Birk. 2019. "Anti-Imperialism." In *The Palgrave Handbook of Anarchism*, edited by Carl Levy and Matthew S. Adams, 149–67. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

———. 2020. "'Anarchism, Pure and Simple': M. P. T. Acharya, Anti-Colonialism and the International Anarchist Movement." *Postcolonial Studies* 23 (2): 241–55.

Levy, Carl. 2004. "Anarchism, Internationalism and Nationalism in Europe, 1860–1939." *Australian Journal of Politics & History* 50 (3): 330–42.

———. 2019. "Anarchism and Cosmopolitanism." In *The Palgrave Handbook of Anarchism*, edited by Carl Levy and Matthew S. Adams, 125–48. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Llewellyn, Joseph. 2018. "Building Emancipatory Peace through Anarcho-Pacifism." *Critical Studies on Security* 6 (2): 259–72.

Marshall, Peter. 1993. *Demanding the Impossible: A History of Anarchism.* London: Fontana.

May, Todd. 2018. "Anarchism, Poststructuralism, and Contemporary European Philosophy." In *Brill's Companion to Anarchism and Philosophy*, edited by Nathan Jun, 318–40. Leiden: Brill.

Mishra, Prem Anand. 2013. "Political Theory of Anarchism in Gandhi's Writings." *The Indian Journal of Political Science* 74 (3): 453–62.

Moses, Jeremy. 2020. "Why Humanitarianism Needs a Pacifist Ethos." *Global Society* 34 (1): 68–83.

Murray, Daniel. 2010. "Democratic Insurrection: Constructing the Common in Global Resistance." *Millennium* 39 (2): 461–82.

Newman, Saul. 2012. "Crowned Anarchy: Postanarchism and International Relations Theory." *Millennium* 40 (2): 259–78.

———. 2019. "Postanarchism." In *The Palgrave Handbook of Anarchism*, edited by Carl Levy and Matthew S. Adams, 293–303. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ostergaard, Geoffrey. 1982. "Resisting the Nation State: The Pacifist and Anarchist Tradition." *The Anarchist Library.* Accessed March 4, 2021. https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/geoffrey-ostergaard-resisting-the-nation-state-the-pacifist-and-anarchist-tradition.

———. 2016. "Nonviolent Anarchism: The Convergence of Pacifism and Anarchism." Accessed March 4, 2021. http://www.satyagrahafoundation.org/nonviolent-anarchism-the-convergence-of-pacifism-and-anarchism/.

Ostergaard, Geoffrey, and Melville Currell. 1971. "Sarvodaya: Indian Anarchism." In *The Gentle Anarchists: A Study of the Leaders of the Sarvodaya Movement for Non-Violent Revolution in India*, 32–45. Oxford: Clarendon.

Parkin, Nicholas. 2018. "Conditional and Contingent Pacifism: The Main Battlegrounds." *Critical Studies on Security* 6 (2): 193–206.

Pauli, Benjamin J. 2015. "Pacifism, Nonviolence, and the Reinvention of Anarchist Tactics in the Twentieth Century." *Journal for the Study of Radicalism* 9 (1): 61–94.

Pierson, Ruth Roach, ed. 1987. *Women and Peace: Theoretical, Historical and Practical Perspectives.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Poe, Danielle. 2018. "Feminism and Nonviolent Activism." In *The Routledge Handbook of Pacifism and Nonviolence*, edited by Andrew Fiala, 268–80. London: Routledge.

Prichard, Alex. 2007. "Justice, Order and Anarchy: The International Political Theory of Pierre-Joseph Proudhon (1809–1865)." *Millennium* 35 (3): 623–45.

———. 2010a. "David Held is an Anarchist. Discuss." *Millennium* 39 (2): 439–59.

———. 2010b. "Deepening Anarchism: International Relations and the Anarchist Ideal." *Anarchist Studies* 18 (2): 29–57.

———. 2010c. "Introduction: Anarchism and World Politics." *Millennium* 39 (2): 373–80.

———. 2011. "What Can the Absence of Anarchism Tell Us about the History and Purpose of International Relations?" *Review of International Studies* 37 (4): 1647–69.

———. 2013. *Justice, Order and Anarchy: The International Political Theory of Pierre-Joseph Proudhon.* London: Routledge.

———. 2017. "Collective Intentionality, Complex Pluralism and the Problem of Anarchy." *Journal of International Political Theory* 13 (3): 360–77.

Ramnath, Maia. 2019. "Non-Western Anarchisms and Postcolonialism." In *The Palgrave Handbook of Anarchism*, edited by Carl Levy and Matthew S. Adams, 677–95. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Reeves-O'Toole, Olivia. 2020. "The Subjugation of Pacifism in UK Parliamentary Discourse: Analysing the 2015 Debate on Bombing Syria." *Global Society* 34 (1): 4–20.

Rossdale, Chris. 2010. "Anarchy is What Anarchists Make of It: Reclaiming the Concept of Agency in IR and Security Studies." *Millennium* 39 (2): 483–501.

———. 2019a. "Anarchism and Critical Security Studies." In *The Anarchist Imagination: Anarchism Encounters the Humanities and the Social Sciences*, edited by Carl Levy and Saul Newman, 62–80. Abingdon: Routledge.

———. 2019b. *Resisting Militarism: Direct Action and the Politics of Subversion.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Ryan, Cheyney. 2015. "Pacifism(s)." *The Philosophical Forum* 46 (1): 17–39.

———. 2018. "The Pacifist Critique of The Just War Tradition." In *The Routledge Handbook of Pacifism and Nonviolence*, edited by Andrew Fiala, 125–41. Routledge.

———. 2019. "War, Hostilities, Terrorism: A Pacifist Perspective." In *Pacifism's Appeal: Ethos, History, Politics*, edited by Jorg Kustermans, Tom Sauer, Dominiek Lootens, and Barbara Segaert, 11–40. Cham: Springer International Publishing.

———. 2021. "Nation-States, Empires, Wars, Hostilities." *Ethics & International Affairs* 35 (3): 367–79.

Salmon, Jack D. 1988. "Can Non-Violence Be Combined with Military Means for National Defense?" *Journal of Peace Research* 25 (1): 69–80.

Schock, Kurt. 2013. "The Practice and Study of Civil Resistance." *Journal of Peace Research* 50 (3): 277–90.

Sjoberg, Laura. 2017. "The Invisible Structures of Anarchy: Gender, Orders, and Global Politics." *Journal of International Political Theory* 13 (3): 325–40.

Stavrianakis, Anna, and Jan Selby, eds. 2013. *Militarism and International Relations: Political Economy, Security, Theory.* London: Routledge.

Stavrianakis, Anna, and Maria Stern. 2018. "Militarism and Security: Dialogue, Possibilities and Limits." *Security Dialogue* 49 (1–2): 3–18.

Tilly, Charles. 1985. "War Making and State Making as Organized Crime." In *Bringing the State Back In*, edited by Peter Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer and Theda Skocpol, 169–86. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Turner, Scott. 1998. "Global Civil Society, Anarchy and Governance: Assessing an Emerging Paradigm." *Journal of Peace Research* 35 (1): 25–42.

WALLACE, M.S. 2017. *Security without Weapons: Rethinking Violence, Nonviolent Action, and Civilian Protection.* Oxon: Routledge.

———. 2018. "Standing 'Bare Hands' against the Syrian Regime: The Turn to Armed Resistance and the Question of Civilian Protection." *Critical Studies on Security* 6 (2): 237–58.

———. 2020. "Wrestling with Another Human Being: The Merits of a Messy, Power-Laden Pacifism." *Global Society* 34 (1): 52–67.

WALLERSTEIN, IMMANUEL. 1979. *The Capitalist World Economy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

WALZER, MICHAEL. 1977. *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations.* New York: Basic.

WEISS, THOMAS G. 1975. "The Tradition of Philosophical Anarchism and Future Directions in World Policy." *Journal of Peace Research* 12 (1): 1–17.

WENDT, ALEXANDER. 1992. "Anarchy Is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics." *International Organization* 46 (2): 391–425.

WILLIAMS, ANDREW. 2005. *Liberalism and War: The Victors and the Vanquished.* Abingdon: Routledge.

ZULAIKA, JOSEBA. 2009. *Terrorism: The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.