Constituent Space: Re-theorizing the Geographies of Contestation and Control

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BY

Nathan L. Clough

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Helga Leitner, Advisor

January 2011

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the hard work and patience of my committee members Eric Sheppard, Bruce Braun, and Tom Wolfe whose gentle mentorship was utterly indispensible in this whole process. I would also like to thank Helga Leitner for years of kindness, understanding, inspiration, and engagement. I could never have asked for a more committed or giving advisor. Her willingness to let me wander theoretically, while also insisting that I make my work relevant and clear, has shaped me intellectually. I am proud to be her student. Finally, I would like to thank Ahna Brutlag for supporting me through headaches, confusion, and procrastination.

Table of Contents

Introduction: Contentious Politics and the 2008 Republican National Convention

> The idea that citizens are free to dissent is ingrained in the American mythos, a concept even older than the Declaration of Independence itself. Equally important in this value system is the conviction that no nation state can survive as a democracy unless it safeguards political expression and activity.
>
> Where does the right to dissent stand today? Throughout our history, the foundation on which dissent stands has shifted, becoming stronger or weaker in relation to a host of political and social contingencies. Today, this most fundamental democratic right is under attack. The government has exploited public fears of terrorist violence, aggravated by its own scare tactics, to enact changes to law enforcement and to crack down on a host of forms of protest and free speech. Such government tactics compel individuals into surrendering their rights. (Boghosian 2007)

In the past decade, or a little more, contentious politics in the United States has undergone dramatic shifts. After the brutal police suppression of left wing movements in the early twentieth century, the civil rights movement, and the anti-war and counter-culture movements of the 1960's and 1970's, police largely turned in their fire hoses, attack dogs, and batons in preference for a softer form of policing dissent in the last decades of the twentieth century. Termed "negotiated management policing," post-Vietnam methods of dealing with dissent were directed toward working with protest groups to ensure that they could "get their message out" while also preserving public order and a largely cooperative

and friendly atmosphere between police and protesters (Della Porta 1998). Though there were certainly many instances of tense protester/police relations during this period, the general goal of police and many protest groups was constructive engagement founded on respect for first amendment rights of freedom of speech in public space. This was especially true insofar as the forms of protest remained symbolic in nature- meaning that they attempt to convey meaning through public discourse, rather than attempting to immediately alter power relations through force.

This conciliatory vision, however, was beset with a basic contradiction. Protest groups generally seek media attention through their protest actions. In a sense, the basic idea of much protest is to insert new ideas and rhetorics into public discourse through the occupation of public space as a demonstration of political power and dedication. Activists organize protests and gather in public space in order to display their opinions to the public at large. However, within a contemporary media environment in which media organizations compete with each other for ratings there is a strong incentive to present spectacular events and to ignore those that are less titillating. Through the 1980's and early 1990's some protest groups such as the AIDS advocacy and awareness network ACT UP recognized that conventional conciliatory protest tactics were no longer garnering significant media attention and therefore were failing to introduce the protesters ideas into national discourse (Sheppard 2002). This perceived ineffectiveness of conciliatory protest, along with a renewed interest in radical

politics, paved the way for negotiated management policing to be challenged, and for a new form of contentious politics to emerge.

This new form of protest politics debuted in spectacular form in the streets outside the 1999 World Trade Organization summit in Seattle, Washington. This protest, which has since attainted a quasi-mythical status among both activists and police, initiated a new round of contentious politics in which radical activists and police viewed each other with increased antagonism (Wainwright 2006; Wainwright 2007; Solnit and Solnit 2009). As most readers will be aware of the broad contours of the events at the 1999 WTO protests I will not go into detail here. It is enough to note that thousands of activists involved with grassroots organizing networks used consensus decision-making procedures to decide on a strategy of blockading the Seattle convention center in order to make it difficult for World Trade Organization delegates to reach their meeting. This form of direct action protest operated through a different philosophy than the more conciliatory, public sphere-oriented types of symbolic protest described above. Activists in Seattle were not content merely for the world to hear their opinions; rather, the blockade was a physical act of saying “No!” to the policies of neoliberal globalization. Along with the largely peaceful blockade involving sit-ins, groups laying in the streets, and slow marches that blocked the roads, there was also a relatively small contingent of radical activists who engaged in limited and premeditated corporate property destruction, such as breaking windows in

some chain retail stores, as well as actively resisting police efforts to clear the blockades.

It was these acts of physical force, along a spectrum from the passively active resistance of refusing to move from the road to the very active resistance of breaking windows or even scuffling with police, that seem to have had a transformative effect on American protest politics. Since Seattle 1999, activists now define their style of protest in relation to what happened there. Both symbolic protest and direct action now refer back in their invocation to the events in Seattle, and groups that adopt either form of protest must grapple with the meanings and histories that are now attached to their protest tactics, and navigate the tensions that evolve from this history in their attempts to form new coalitions, movements, and sites of social resistance.

Police, too, shifted their imaginaries and practices in regards to dissent. As I argue in Chapter 3 of this dissertation, the abandonment of negotiated management by the activist community has prompted police to make distinctions between “good activists” on the one hand, who are committed to liberal speech rights, and “bad activists” on the other hand whose tactics go beyond mere speech. I argue that this bifurcation of activists into “good” and “bad” camps has been accompanied by spatial shifts in policing strategies that seek to distanciate dissent from unlawful resistance. This distancing is accomplished through spatial technologies such as so-called free speech zones, protest permit ordinances,

security perimeters, and the escalated use of less-lethal weapons[1], riot gear, and pre-emptive modes arrest of suspected radical activists. It is to these techniques that the quotation at the beginning of this chapter refers.

However, only two years after the Seattle WTO protests the 9/11 terrorist attacks altered the terrain of contentious politics in the United States once again. As Boghosian (2007) argues, laws such as the U.S.A. Patriot Act and the anti-terrorism tools permitted by this legislation, which include such techniques as increased availability of wire taps, use of undercover investigatory agents, and a recent spate of prosecutions on conspiracy charges, are increasingly utilized by law enforcement in an effort to control and dissuade direct action protesters. This appropriation of anti-terror techniques for the policing of protest is facilitated by loosely written laws, and overly broad definitions of terrorism in which any use of political force might be legally construed as constituting a terrorist threat (Boykoff 2007).

This is to say that, despite the passage of a decade, Seattle 1999 and 9/11 continue to over-determine American protest politics. Both of these shattered the equilibrium of American politics, challenging liberal norms through raising the specter of a panoply of insurgent contestations to the recently proclaimed neoliberal end of history. Both Seattle 1999 and 9/11 represented refusals to operate through the market and the public sphere, asserting instead the continuing relevance of radically diverse and divergent alternative political

[1] A rather euphemistic term for the tasers, mace, and rubber bullets typically deployed during crowd control.

imaginaries, tactics, and relations. The rhetoric of "there is no alternative" was countered first by anti-neoliberal globalization riots, then by anti-Imperial fundamentalist terrorism. The past ten years have been largely defined by the reactions of the American state to these contestations: the war on terror, the U.S.A. Patriot Act, and the Bush administration's crack down on domestic dissent. While the election of Obama signaled some shifts in governing ideology many of the above policies and practices remain in effect. Thus, any attempt to understand contemporary contentious politics in the United States must grapple with the articulation of these events and their impacts on forms of dissent.

This dissertation analyzes contemporary contentious politics through a case study of the mobilization against the 2008 Republican National Convention (2008 RNC) that was held in St. Paul, Minnesota from September 1-4, 2008. Empirically this study contributes to the emerging literatures in geography on social movements and social control. At the theoretical level this dissertation is an attempt to expound on Leitner, Peck, and Sheppard's (2007) incitement that neoliberal capitalism should be studied through its articulation with the myriad contestations that constantly emerge in reaction to, in relation with, or alongside of it. I contribute to this project through an engagement with some theoretical concepts that have been developed within the trajectory of Autonomous Marxism. In the chapters that follow I utilize these theoretical concepts in the examination of how relations of domination and contestation emerge out of the

competing spaces, practices, strategies, and tactics of police and security forces on the one hand, and social movements on the other.

In the remainder of this introduction I explain the recent history of resistance to national political conventions and introduce the major movements and actors involved in the 2008 RNC. Finally, I summarize each of the four substantive chapters that follow.

Situating the 2008 RNC

On September 27, 2006 the Republican National Committee announced that the next Republican National Convention (2008 RNC) would be held at the Excel Energy Center in St. Paul, Minnesota over Labor Day weekend, September 1-4, 2008 (GOP.com 2007). The response in the Twin Cities activist community was immediate. Several groups formed to oppose the 2008 RNC, while other pre-existing groups began to organize a massive mobilization of local and national groups to protest the convention. However the politics surrounding this mobilization and the plans of the city and federal government to police the event transcend the immediate context of the convention and are deeply intricated with the recent history and geography of protest events and geopolitics in the United States.

Security concerns since the bombing in Oklahoma City, the 1999 World Trade Organization protest (1999 WTO) and the acceleration of that concern with 9/11 have resulted in new policing strategies that arguably equate dissent with

treason, and opposition with terrorism (Boghosian 2004). These new policing strategies operate to spatially corral protest into so-called “free speech zones” that striate the city and segregate protestors from those they seek to influence, to remove prominent activists from the streets through pre-emptive arrests of protest leaders on minor charges prior to protest events, and to orchestrate mass-arrests during demonstrations (a practice that is currently the subject of various law-suits) (Della Porta 1998; Mitchell 2003; ACLU 2004; Coleman 2004; Union 2004). Additionally, during the same time period, activist tactics have shifted toward more confrontational direct action and the creation of temporary autonomous zones within the city, wherein control of urban space is sometimes forcefully taken from the authorities by activists (Klepto 2004; Fernandez 2008).

In this context “[urban] space is simultaneaously an object of contestation and part and parcel of political strategy” (Leitner, Peck, and Sheppard 2007: 19). Yet, despite the import of these new protest politics for American democracy, relatively little explicit schorlarly attention has been given to the current protest politics over/in urban space, especially in geography and other social sciences.

After the end of the Vietnam war and the relatively quiescent 1980’s there began a new cycle of struggle that is popularly associated with the so-called anti-globalization movement. The Seattle WTO protests energized the global justice movement and invigorated radical protest at the 2000 Republican National Convention in Philadelphia, in the Genoa, Italy meeting of the G8 and various other events around the world. However, the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001

put something of a damper on the vigor of these movements and, along with new police tactics honed in Miami at the Free Trade Area of the Americas protests in 2003, the energy of the global justice movement was somewhat stalled (Lakey 2000; Fernandez 2008). This is not to claim that no protests of merit occurred between 2001 and 2008, but rather to note that the global justice movement has been struggling to recapture the energy of the days following the Seattle WTO protests ever since. Many protest movements that identify with the movement that emerged from Seattle have been looking for a new victory that they can call their own. The 2008 RNC protests represent an attempt to secure just such a victory, albeit an attempt that was, whatever its other merits, unsuccesful in that regard.

National political conventions play many roles in American society. At face value, these events are a showcase of American democracy, the site where local political activists from across the nation converge to nominate the national candidates of their respective parties. They are a symbol of democracy in action. These conventions are also political spectacles where the pomp, energy, and grandeur of national politics is on display to the electorate and the world. The conventions are enormous celebrations of the political parties that seek to capture the democratic imaginations of the American people, to energize them, and prepare them for the electoral season when, it is hoped, they will vote for the candidates that were annointed at the conventions. In this manner, the conventions are a calculated tool for reproducing political power. The spectacle

and energy of the conventions enroll the people into the electoral process, representing the start of the quadrennial period when American democracy actually requires the participation of the electorate. The conventions, then, are important sites of the legitimation of American democracy insofar as they signal the beginning of the period of popular deliberation that culminates in national elections for the highest offices of the state.

But the conventions are not only political affairs, they are also deeply economic. Aside from the role of the convention spectacle in raising funds for the parties, they also provide significant economic benefits to the cities that host these gatherings. According to the 2008 RNC Host Committee (Minneapolis Saint Paul 2008 Host Committee 2008), hosting a national political convention provides single event economic benefits second only to hosting the Olympic games. As such, there is significant competition between cities vying to host one of these events. The announcement in late 2006 that Minneapolis/St. Paul had been selected to host the 2008 RNC was the culmination of years of discussion and planning between the city governments of Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Bloomington, Minnesota. Although the mayors of these cities had initially hoped to secure the Democratic convention due the overwhelming majority of Minneapolis and St. Paul city councilors and both mayors being of the relative Left (Erin Dady, St. Paul city publicist interview), when offered the chance to host the Republicans without having heard from the Democrats, the cities decided to accept the offer and host the 2008 RNC.

This decision inaugurated a complex round of rhetorics, mobilizations, security functions, and urban struggles centered on the convention. As soon as the announcement was made public, various social movements, activists, and political contingencies began jockeying for position and mobilizing to make the most of this opportunity to be on the national political stage. However, the various movements and institutions invested in this event varied widely in their political orientations, institutional forms, and goals for the convention. For the Twin Cities governments the goal of the convention was largely urban entrepreneurial. The convention was seized upon as a chance to promote the Twin Cities as a site for investment, visiting, and living. For many liberal and progressive activists the convention was a chance to air their opposition to the policies of the Republican Party and the Bush administration to a national and international audience. For the anarchist movement and other radical Leftists the convention provided an opportunity to attempt to blockade the convention and reinvigorate radical organizing in the United States, and possibly around the world.

The 2008 RNC can be understood within the framework of neoliberal urbanism insofar as the governments of the Twin Cities engaged the convention as a competitive process that promised economic development (Harvey 1989). In fact, the discourses deployed by local government officials consistently stressed an entrepreneurial logic and boosterism in order to justify the expense, hassle, and ideological friction associated with the convention. For example,

immediately after the convention Mayor Chris Coleman of St. Paul stated in the Minneapolis Star-Tribune “We have proven ourselves as a result of this convention. We have put ourselves on a map that we were not on before." In the same article other unnamed city officials are quoted as saying “the convention produced more than 8 billion "media impressions"-- readers, listeners, viewers worldwide -- the equivalent of a $330 million ad campaign. That will bring more conventions, events and business to the region” (Louwagie 2008). The Minneapolis Saint Paul RNC Host Committee also framed the convention as an entrepreneurial success in their report “Minnesota’s Conventional Wisdom Pays Off” (Minneapolis Saint Paul 2008 Host Committee 2008), where they claim that the RNC created nearly $170 million in new spending in the Twin Cities Metro area.

This economic discourse was paired with an attempt at depoliticization. “This isn’t about politics for us, it’s about business and I think that the people of the Twin Cities understand that” (Dady interview). In this sense, the economic gain to be had from the convention was posed as more important than the political opinions of politicians or city residents. Or rather, the market benefit of hosting the 2008 RNC trumped any merely political opposition to the proposal. This twin characteristic, of inter-urban competition for zero-sum events and a depoliticizing logic that poses economic interest as inherently and obviously superior to political logics is central to neoliberal urbanism (Harvey 1989; Brenner 2005). However interesting a study of how market logics came to dominate the

decision making process of Twin Cities government would have been, it would also have been missing much.

As Leitner, Peck, and Sheppard (2007: 9) suggest, research on neolibeal urbanism ought to focus not just on how neoliberalism shapes subjects and practices, but also how those subjects actively seek to create their own oppositional subjectivities and practices, and how these new creations are in themselves productive of socio-spatial change. To focus on contestation is to focus on the emergence and productivity of alternatives, with a particular eye to the promise of these processes – rather than obsessing over their innate insufficiencies or departures from teleological models of social change.

Contesting the 2008 RNC

Social movements engaged in the mobilization to protest the 2008 RNC fell into two primary categories, liberal and/or anti-war groups that advocated legal, permitted, marches during the RNC, and more radical, often anarchist groups that advocated direct action protest designed to interfere with, stop, or delay the convention. These various groups are introduced and discussed in detail in the chapters that follow, so their treatment here will be brief. Two organizations were particularly central to this study. These were the Coalition to March on the RNC and End the War (hereafter referred to as the " Coalition"), which organized a large-scale permitted march on the first day of the 2008 RNC, September 1st, 2008, and the RNC Welcoming Committee (hereafter referred to

alternatively as “the Welcoming Committee” or “the RNC WC”), a local Twin Cities group of anarchists and anti-authoritarians dedicated to facilitating a national mobilization of like-minded people to blockade the city of St. Paul in an attempt to shut down the convention.

In the year leading up the 2008 RNC these two groups emerged as the most active and visible centers of contestation around which many smaller groups revolved. Although chapters 1 and 3 are only partially concerned with the events of the 2008 RNC, both expanding the scope of the study beyond this event and restricting study to particular sorts of contestation, engagement with these two groups motivates and runs through the entire dissertation. The central dilemas faced by The Coalition and the Welcoming Committee were not unique; rather, they are general features of protest and contestation today. These dillemas are centered around the question of how communities in contestation can and should work together in the face of significant ideological, tactical, and cultural disagreements, and on how these contestations articulate with, influence, and provide alternatives to neoliberal hegemony.

The RNC Welcoming Committee was formed almost two years prior to the 2008 RNC, immediately following the official announcement that the Twin Cities would play host to the Republican Convention. The Twin Cities are home to a large and varied radical Left population, with a long history and strong communities of communists, anarchists, labor radicals, ecological radicals,

neighborhood and poor people's movements[2]. The RNC WC emerged out of discussions between various anarchist and anti-authoritarian communities that were already active in the Twin Cities. Indeed, Twin Cities anarchists had recently been engaged in high profile moblizations in the preceeding decade, including a protest of hundreds of anarchists at a meeting of the International Society of Animal Genetecists (Mayron 2000), and the occupation of a tract of land slated for development that was also sacred to the Ojibwe native peoples in 1998. This occupation, known as the Minnehaha Free State, involved activists setting up tents and living in trees for an extended period before being cleared by police in a dawn raid in what was then the largest ever mobilization of Minnesota police. This recent history of anarchist mobilizations provided a social framework from which the RNC WC was to emerge. Eventually, it was decided that the RNC WC would operate as an open organizing group, meaning that anyone could join who was willing to agree to a mutually agreed upon set of principles. These principles were stated as follows:

> "Those who work with the RNC Welcoming Committee must agree to:
>
> 1. A rejection of Capitalism, Imperialism, and the State;
>
> 2. Resist the commodification of our shared and living Earth;
>
> 3. Organize on the principles of decentralization, autonomy, sustainability, and mutual aid;
>
> 4. Work to end all relationships of domination and subjugation, including but not limited to those rooted in patriarchy, race, class, and homophobia;
>
> 5. Oppose the police and prison-industrial complex, and maintain solidarity with all targets of state repression;

[2] See the "The Struggle is our Inheritance: Minnesota Radical History" Zine for an anarchist take on this history. See Appendix A.

> 6. Directly confront systems of oppression, and respect the need for a diversity of tactics.
>
> Though the RNC-WC is focused on a specific event, we hope that our work transcends the convention by contributing to the development of anti-authoritarian movements and mutual aid networks both locally and globally. We are no more opposed to the Republican Party than we are to the Democratic Party. Affiliations and labels aside, we invite all who share our vision to join us in resistance."(RNC Welcoming Commitee 2008)

This set of principles was meant to provide a framework for like-minded individuals to come together and democratically organize, while also providing a mechanism to deny entry to those deemed too ideologically divergent from the group. These type of principles are common among anarchist communities in the United States and provide one of the basic structures for self-organizing groups to operate democratically without threat of being paralyzed by excessive differences of ideology or tactics (Graeber 2004). Although the RNC WC began as a small group of dedicated activists drawn from pre-existing communities, it soon began to draw new members only marginally connected to these groups – such as myself.

By the end of 2007 the RNC WC consisted of two-dozen relatively active members, of which approximately half attended regular weekly planning meetings. These meetings were held on Saturday afternoons and often went on for several hours. Meetings were used to bring members up to date on the activities of various sub-committees, tasked with such things as outreach to non-anarchist activists, in-reach to other anarchists across the country and world, a logistics committee in charge of finding rental locations for larger meetings, a

convergence space for activists to gather during the RNC, food for activists during the convention and sundry other tasks. Meetings were also the sites where the consensus-based approach to organizing and decision-making was employed.

The mission of the RNC WC was to build national and local anarchist organizing capacity through providing an organizational framework that anarchists from across the country could utilize in planning their resistance to the 2008 RNC. The secondary objective of the group was to "crash the convention" through large scale, but decentralized, protest (RNC Welcoming Commitee 2008).

In pursuit of these goals the RNC WC hosted two national 'consultas', or organizing meetings in Minneapolis. The first of these took place one year prior to the 2008 RNC, in the last days of August 2007. At this meeting over a hundred anarchist activists from the U.S. and Canada met and over the course of three days decided on a protest strategy. This strategy, which was arrived at through consensus procedures involving large and small group discussion, and avoided majority rule, was to blockade the 2008 RNC – in effect, recycling the methods through which the Seattle 1999 WTO meetings were scuttled. The second national consulta was held on May 3 2008, also in Minneapolis. At this meeting the attendees decided to divide the city of St. Paul into seven sections, each of which would be claimed by decentralized groups of activists who would commit to blockading their area in order to prevent Republican delegates from

reaching the convention center in downtown St. Paul. As the details of the blockade strategy are the subject of chapter 2 of this dissertation I will not go into further logistical detail here. Importantly, the RNC WC was not planning on carrying out any of its own actions at the 2008 RNC. It's sole function was to provide logistical support to other anarchists interested in protesting the RNC, and helping to organize deliberations of this action along anarchistic principles of consensus.

The second group, with which I had the most contact, was the Coalition. This group formed at around the same time as the RNC WC, but within a different activist community and with different goals. The Coalition drew from progressive, socialist, communist, and peace activist communities in the Twin Cities and had the goal of organizing a massive permitted protest for the first day of the 2008 RNC, September 1st, 2008. Core of the Coalition was a group of about a dozen dedicated activists drawn from other activist groups such as the Twin Cities' based Anti-War Committee, the Welfare Rights Committee, Women Against Military Madness, and local chapters of the Freedom Road Socialist Organization, Youth Against War and Racism, and the Troops Out Now Coalition, among others. These organizations already exhibited a high degree of overlap among their members, which is typical of liberal social movement coalitions (Della Porta 1999).

The strategy of a permitted march was meant to be maximally inclusive and therefore to promote the highest possible turnout (Jackie interview, coalition

organizer3). This decision was made locally, but was then presented to national protest organizers and activist organizations such as Act Now to Stop War and End Racism (ANSWER) and United for Peace and Justice, who agreed with this idea (Jackie interview). Once a core of local organizers was established, the Coalition moved to attain national support through hosting a national organizing conference for anti-RNC protest. This was a separate event from the consultas hosted by the RNC WC, and was more inclusive of a wider range of ideological perspectives. This conference was held at the University of Minnesota in February of 2008 and was attended by over 150 activists from around the nation.

In the year prior to the 2008 RNC, members of the Coalition put large amounts of effort into promoting their march in the media and in trying to secure a permit for a march route that would allow them to see and be seen by Republican delegates. The previous national party conventions in 2004 and 2000 had both been subject to significant security measures, which had been most visible in the sequestration of protesters from those they were attempting to protest. Most notoriously, at the 2004 Democratic National Convention in Boston, MA, protesters were restricted from demonstrating anywhere near the convention center except for a so-called free speech zone underneath a highway overpass nearly a mile from the convention site. This zone was ringed with fence and razor wire and prevented protests from being heard or seen by delegates or

[3] This name is a pseudonym, as are all other interviews with activists. I do, however, use the names of elected officials and municipal employees who gave me permission to use their names, or whose words are part of official discourse or public record.

much of the mainstream media. It was precisely this type of precedent that the Coalition hoped to avoid by securing protest permits for their march. However, for many months it proved difficult for the coalition to secure a permit due to indecision on the part of the police as to where and when a march would be tolerated. This struggle is covered to some extent in the 2nd chapter of this dissertation.

The protest plans of these two groups were potentially conflictual. The RNC WC's plan to blockade the convention ran the risk of obstructing the permitted march route, disrupting media coverage of the relatively less spectacular nature of the march, and possibly bringing police violence down on permitted marchers. On the other hand, the permitted march threatened to de-legitimate the blockade strategy through allowing police to represent marchers as 'good' or 'legitimate' demonstrators while vilifying those participating in the blockade strategy as vandals or criminals with no respect for liberal values like freedom of speech. This conflict is eminently geographical insofar as the central issues under contention are how social movement organizations with differing community support, goals, tactics, and ideologies attempted to negotiate their differences in the spaces of the city so as to minimize conflict and maximize solidarity. This is one of the central issues of this dissertation, which I explore at length and from various perspectives in the chapters that follow.

Research Methods

Methodologically, this dissertation relied on a praxis of militant research. Simliar to other forms of activist scholarship, militant research is a practice and theory for engaging with radical and revolutionary movements in a manner that seeks to advance those struggles. In this case, such a methodology involved nearly a year of observant participation in anti-RNC organizing with the Welcoming Committee, as well as participating in meetings, protests, and various actions with The Coalition during late 2007 and the first eight months of 2008. This fieldwork was primarily undertaken at Minneapolis locations where The Coalition and the The RNC WC held most of their meetings in various community spaces including the Jack Pine Center in south Minneapolis, Future Pastures collective space also in south Minneapolis, classrooms at the University of Minnesota, and eventually at the spaces rented by both groups in the month prior to the convention.

My research also involved interviews with members of The Coalition and with local policy makers, and a great deal of analysis of anarchist movement literature. I did not interview Welcoming Committee members for several reasons relating to the safety of my research subjects. First, it was clear from the beginning of my research that the Welcoming Committee was likely to be the subject of rather extensive police investigation – though at the time the level of

repression that was to be experienced would have shocked me. With this in mind I was very careful to avoid taking notes on RNC WC meetings or actions, or formal interview transcripts that could possibly be subpeoned and used to prosecute RNC WC members. Second, in attempting to work within the norms and culture of the RNC WC I was forced to confront a practice known as security culture (which is the subject of chapter 3), a technique for making radical communities safer from police repression through being very careful never to say or write anything that could be taken out of context and used against the radical community. It was out of respect for this policy and practice that I refrained from writing about the specific plans or practices of the RNC WC. Finally, I did not want my research on radical social movements to be used by state agents in their attempts to crush these movements. This meant very carefully selecting my research questions and writing topics in order to maximize usefulness for radical scholars and activists while at the same time minimizing utility for police, FBI, and other security forces tasked with crushing communities in contestation[4].

Overall, I conducted over a dozen interviews with liberal activists and local policy makers, hundreds of hours of participant observation, and analyzed a decade of US anarchist movement literature – especially that pertaining to tactics and public space. Interviews were typed verbatim and coded using an iterative process intended to generate themes. Movement literature was coded as well. Instead of taking notes after each session of participant observation, a practice

[4] Please see the conclusion of this dissertation for some reflections on the limitations these restrictions placed on this research.

that would have exposed myself and my subjects to unacceptable risks, I wrote extensive memos that dealt with themes related to the observations without referring to specific circumstances or people. In all, these methods were intended to produce ethnographic insights pertaining to practices of contestation, and the relations between those practices and the operation of the neoliberal security state as embodied in the 2008 RNC.

Chapter Summary and Roadmap

In chapter one, "Retheorizing Contestation: Struggle and Autonomous Marxism," I take up Leitner, Peck, and Sheppard's 2007 call to center studies of neoliberalism on the articulations between neoliberalism and contestation. I suggest that several concepts drawn from a Deleuzian understanding of Italian Autonomous Marxism are helpful for building a strong theoretical justification for said provocation. I suggest that the concepts of the primacy of resistance, class composition analysis, and the analytic duo of constituent and constituted forms of Power can be helpful in opening new questions regarding contestation and neoliberalism, as well as providing guidance in seeking some answers. Finally, through engagment with the geographic literaure on neoliberalism, social movements, and contentious politics, I suggest that the concept of class composition be altered to "the composition of contestation," and that

investigations of the ways that contesation is actively composed can enhance the geographic conceptualization of neoliberalism, domination, and resistance.

In chapter two, “The End of Public Space!” I argue that the contemporary focus on the diminution of public space fails to examine how some radical Left social movements engage in forms of protest that explicitly defy the public/private binary. I draw data from the writings of the American anarchist movement of the past ten years in order to argue for a consideration of what I term constituent space – a spatiality that resists the imposition of the liberal categories of public and private.

In chapter three I examine how an agreement called the Saint Paul Principles, developed by several of the most prominent, vocal, and contentious movements organizing to protest the 2008 RNC, allowed these movements to build solidarity through innovative practices in urban space and time. In effect, this agreement helped social movements to neutralize a strategy of separating direct action protest from civil disobedience that the state had used since shortly after the 1999 World Trade Organization protests in Seattle, WA. I then examine how, when confronted with this innovative use of space, the police sought to break radical-liberal solidarity through discursively positing some protesters as ‘good’ and others as ‘bad’ or ‘criminal,’ and therefore the enemies of the public. This chapter contributes to theorizations of neoliberal governmentality and activist counter-conducts.

In chapter four I investigate how emotion and affect have become central categories for both anarchist resistance to capitalism and the state, and state attempts to de-escalate, intimidate and fragment anarchistic social movements. I argue that anarchist organizing depends on a particular affective structure whereby successful direct action is imagined to energize opposition to capital and the state. This gives rise to a culture of braggadocio in which the recounting of potentially illegal direct actions to other anarchists serves to cement community and build affinity. However, this also creates opportunities for the police and the FBI to infiltrate the anarchist movement and entrap activists through the use of agents provocateurs. I use examples from anti-2008 RNC organizing to demonstrate how this infiltration occurs, and to explore anarchist counter-measures to this infiltration through a practice called “security culture”. This chapter contributes to theoretical discussions in geography and autonomous Marxism on emotion and affect, and the connections between these and various forms of power and domination.

I conclude the dissertation with some reflections on de-centering neoliberalism and the strengths and weaknesses of the approach I have developed in this dissertation. As each chapter addresses different, albeit related, theoretical and empirical issues, each contains a review of relevant literature.

Chapter 1: Re-theorizing Contestation: Struggle and Autonomous Marxism

> Some scholars of neoliberalism are inclined to argue that [contestations] do not add up to very much in terms of challenging and undermining neoliberalization. We argue, however, that such an assessment of the efficacy of contestations reflects the abstract theoretical lens applied, which conceptualizes the reciprocal interaction between neoliberalism and contestation as asymmetrically favoring the former. (Leitner, Sheppard, Sziarto, and Maringanti 2007:22)

One of the goals of this dissertation is to build a conceptual bridge between the study of domination and the study of contestation. In geography the study of domination has, in the last decade, largely focused on describing and theorizing neoliberalism – the hegemonic form of globalizing capitalism[5]. The attention given to the study of contestation and resistance has been less, and much that has been done poses resistance as reactive, or even futile. This is rather symptomatic of both Marxian and Foucauldian strands of critical geography which tend to represent social action as, respectively, a dichotomy between class-based organization and militant particularisms on the one hand (see Harvey 1996 and Featherstone 2005 for examples), or as an omnipresent reaction to the rationalities of domination on the other(Keith 1997).

In this chapter I utilize concepts from Autonomous Marxism in order to provide a theoretical foundation for the study of social movements and contestations of neoliberalism. I argue that these concepts provide a strong

---

[5] I take neoliberalism to be the present form of capitalism, not something entirely new and different in itself. Rather, neoliberalism refers to a form of capitalist regulation that Jessop has referred to as a Schumpeterian Post-national Workfare Regime typified by state adoption of market logics for internal and external operation, the promotion of citizens as consumers, and a hollowing out of the national states' regulatory capacity along with the up and down-scaling of that capacity to local and supra national bodies respectively (Jessop 2006).

theoretical foundation for the study of contestation as primary rather than reactive. I proceed from a brief engagement with calls from prominent geographers to decenter neoliberalism as domination. I then give a brief history and overview of Autonomous Marxism and explain the concepts of the primacy of resistance, composition analysis, and the social factory, and demonstrate how these concepts might advance the project of decentering neoliberalism.

Getting past accounts of domination

In a 2003 guest editorial in Environment and Planning D, Wendy Larner argues that neoliberalism has replaced globalization as a catch-all concept with a problematic tendency to elide divergent processes under an over-arching narrative (Larner 2003). In essence, by seeing neoliberalism everywhere academics substitute an imaginary grand narrative for investigations of situated phenomena. She argues that the idea of neoliberalization as a totalizing and hegemonic process threatens *a priori* to erase the significance of non, or counter-neoliberal processes.

Larner traces this theoretical proclivity to the renewed dominance within geography of Marxian and neo-Marxian approaches to political economy and suggests that a stronger emphasis on post-structural theorizations would allow geographers to appreciate not only the dominating qualities of neoliberalism, but also the techniques and technologies through which subjects are produced and

resistances are enacted (Larner 2003). She argues for integrating Foucauldian and Marxian perspectives because "if we privilege one approach over the other, even unwittingly, our efforts to analyze the nature and implications of neoliberalism will be blunted, as will our attempts to develop relevant and effective political strategies" (Larner 2003: 511). Larner further suggests that this critical project "would overcome the fear and hopelessness generated by monolithic accounts of the 'neoliberal project'" (Larner 2003: 512).

Another critique of the focus of geographers on domination has come from the collaborative work of J.K. Gibson-Graham. They argue that critical discourses within geography (and beyond) employ a capitalocentric vision of power in which all processes are understood through the logic of capital. This has led to a crisis of credibility for non-capitalist alternatives in the eyes of critical theorists who are unable or unwilling to examine these contestations on their own terms (Gibson-Graham 2006). This is not to argue that capital does not represent an important vantage point in critical study, but rather to claim that the view of capital does not exhaust our potential critical understandings of the social field. In their interventions Gibson-Graham argue for a need to take non-capitalist systems seriously and on their own terms as part of a project of seeking alternatives to capitalist political economics.

Also recognizing the necessity of stepping outside the logics of domination, Leitner, Peck, and Sheppard (2007) argue that attempts to de-center neoliberalism should focus on the articulation between neoliberalism and its

myriad contestations. They argue that such an approach places neoliberalism into a more contingent position, recognizing the historical fact that even neoliberalism itself was once nothing more than a contestation of the then-hegemonic Keynsianism (Leitner, Peck, and Sheppard 2006).

However, while Leitner, Peck, and Sheppard (2006) give a strong political and pragmatic reason to study articulation, i.e. so as not to blind ourselves to the real contingency of neoliberalism, they do not attempt to square such an approach at the theoretical level with those abstract theoretical lenses that are currently in vogue in geography. Although they note that regulation theoretic geography tends to focus on the operation of capital at the expense of contestations (Leitner, Sheppard, Sziarto, and Maringanti 2007), and that governmentality approaches pose resistance as reactive rather than active, we are left with little sense of how this project draws on, and diverges from the theoretical bases of geographic approaches to neoliberalism. It is my argument that precisely these base assumptions of geographic theory need to be altered, in order for geographers to take up these calls while also remaining theoretically consistent.

Additionally, I argue that Larner's suggestion that we combine Marxian and Foucauldian perspectives is inadequate to the task of providing such a foundation. One cannot just pick up the scraps of Marxism and Foucauldianism and jam them together willy-nilly. Rather, such an articulation requires a theoretical bridge that can place Marxism and post-structuralism into meaningful

relation with each other. Further, even if we could simply articulate the Foucauldian and Marxian theories most often employed in geography, such a combination would not be sufficient to de-center neoliberalism and open radical political possibilities. Rather, this articulation would, at best, give us a better understanding of neoliberalism's operation as a dominating system.

In the remainder of this chapter I suggest that a series of concepts borrowed from autonomous Marxism provide a conceptual tool for thinking and investigating the articulation between domination and contestation in contemporary contentious politics. These concepts, the primacy of resistance, the relation of recuperation and excess between the capitalist socius and living labor, and class composition analysis, are useful in centering contestation as the site of transformative social movement and critical scholarship. After introducing these concepts I argue that some alteration is necessary to bring them into concert with contemporary geographic thought. I then introduce my modified concept of "the composition of contestation" as an improved theoretical construct for thinking the relation between domination and contestation in geography.

Resistance is Primary!

> Several generations of Marxists have given us the habit of perceiving the mechanisms of domination. What we need now is to use Marx to help us discover the mechanisms of liberation. (Cleaver in Negri 1991: Pg xx)
>
> Over the years Marxism has been all but sterilized by being reduced to a critique of capitalist hegemony and its 'laws of motion.' The fascination of Marxists with capitalist mechanisms of despotism in the factory, of cultural domination and of the instrumentalization of working-class struggle has blinded them to the presence of a truly

> antagonistic subject. The capitalist class is the only subject that they recognize. When they do see working-class struggle, it is almost always treated as a derivative of capital's own development. The true dynamic of capitalist development is invariably located in such 'internal' contradictions among capitalists as competition. (Negri 1999: xxi)

In geography, as in the above critiques of much Marxism, there has been a long-standing tendency to theorize the dominating power of capital at the expense of contestation[6]. As Harry Cleaver might say, these forms of theory take the perspective of power (be that capital or the state) and generalize that perspective to account for the whole of relations within the social system (see Cleaver 1979, especially chapter 1).

Although little known in Anglo-American geography, the broad trajectory of theory sometimes known as Autonomous Marxism has close parallels to contemporary critical geographic theory. Like the neoliberalism literatures mentioned above, Autonomous Marxism advocates an analytic methodology that is centered on contestation. Unlike other trajectories of Marxism with which it was contemporaneous, Autonomism concerned itself not with explaining how capital survived the near revolutions of 1968, but rather with developing a materialist and revolutionary account of the new forms of militant revolt in Italian society that were antagonistic to the capitalist state, the Fordist system, as well as the Communist Party and the traditional institutions of official worker's politics (Schukaitis 2007).

[6] There are of course myriad exceptions to this including the work of Leitner, Peck, and Sheppard (2007) and the contributors to their volume, as well as labor geographers such as Andy Herod.

Beginning in the late 1950's and early 1960's, a small group of Italian theorist/activists began to develop a dissident form of Marxist theory that diverged significantly from, and was dramatically to the Left of, the Gramscian orthodoxies of the Italian Communist Party (known by the acronym PCI). This group attempted to understand the workers movements of heavily industrialized northern Italy, whose practices and views were quite different from those advocated by the PCI and the official Unions. This initial group, and the movement that it contributed to, came to be known by the name of their flagship publication Potere Operaio, Worker's Power.

Spearheaded by the writings of Mario Tronti, Potere Operaio concerned itself with creating theory that was adequate to the working class militancy that they observed in the factories of Italy. Potere Operaio studied how radical and militant workers struggles operated autonomously from, and often in conflict with, the official bodies of working class struggle, i.e., the unions and the PCI. Potere Operaio worked to theorize the new relations of workers' struggle through the 1960's, until the early 1970's when workers struggle in the factories ceased to be the driving force in Italian social struggle.

The early 1970's saw an explosion of social movements outside of the factory. As the counter-culture took hold in Italy, students, the unemployed, feminists, and racialized minorities joined with the workers in their demands for a new society (Hardt 1996). Following the energy of social struggle, Potere

Operaio dissolved and the trajectory of Autonomia was born amidst, and in order to theorize, the generalized social struggle and shifting economy of the moment.

As Hardt (1996) describes it, this period of Autonomous theorization and struggle was focused on understanding the movement of militancy from the shop floor to the social field. Rather than viewing the movements of post-1968 as a retreat from working class politics, the Autonomists saw an expansion of capitalist logics out from the factory and into the totality of society (Schukaitis 2007). Unlike much of the rest of Europe and the U.S., in Italy 1968 did not represent the culmination of a cycle of protest, rather it was a beginning. Over the next ten years social struggle in Italy increased, and Autonomia was at its forefront.

In 1978, an armed faction of the struggle, known as the Red Brigades, kidnapped and murdered a leading Italian politician who had been spearheading the effort to create a coalition between the PCI and the Christian Democrats. In retaliation for this action the State implemented extraordinary laws that allowed tens of thousands of activists, militants, and intellectuals to be imprisoned for up to twenty years on charges that amounted to little more than guilt by association (Hardt 1996). This effectively crushed the social movement of Autonomia, but autonomous theory survived and is now undergoing internationalization, due largely to the popularity of the writings of Antonio Negri.

Autonomous Theory

Autonomous Marxist theory is typified by its antagonism to the state, its insistence on placing contestation at the center of analysis, and its inspiration in the Marx of the Grundrisse and post-structural French thought. Rather than seeing the internal contradictions of capital as the motor of historic change, Potere Operaio insisted on the primacy of working class struggle as the engine of capitalist creativity and crisis (Cleaver 1979, Negri 1981, Virno and Hardt 1996). This commitment, that working class struggle drives capitalist development, inverts the traditional power dynamic of most Marxism, providing what Read (2008) calls an "alternative ontology of power," that requires a radical methodology centered on the analysis of actually existing struggles. As Schukaitis and Graeber (2007; 26-27) put it:

> One of the greatest achievements of autonomist theory has been to remove class struggle from the back burner of social theory. Generations of political Marxists have tended to give lip service to the notion that it should be important, and then go on to write history as if the real driving force in almost anything --- imperialism, the factory system, the rise of feminism --- was the working out of contradictions within capital itself. Capital was always the prime actor in the historical drama; workers' organizations were left to scramble to adjust to its latest depredations. Against this, Mario Tronti, one of the first theorists of Italian workerism, proposed what he termed a "Copernican shift." "Let us, he said, re-imagine history from the assumption that resistance is primary and it is capital that must always readjust (Tronti cited in Schukaitis and Graeber 2007; 27).

In the early 1960's with the publication of "Operaio e Capitale" (Workers and Capital), Mario Tronti inverted the orthodox supposition of the primacy of domination. This move had radical and emancipatory implications for both the study and practice of social change because it asserted that the basic attribute of capitalism is not the dominating relation, but rather the relation of workers revolt, the continual expression of the revolutionary and antagonistic energy of the working class (Tronti 1966). His argument is that the organization of the working class as a class in-itself and a class for-itself necessarily precedes the organization of capitalists as a class. According to Tronti (1964,1966) the working class is therefore prior to, and autonomous from the laws of motion of capital.

> We too have worked with a concept that puts capitalist development first, and workers second. This is a mistake. And now we have to turn the problem on its head, reverse the polarity, and start again from the beginning: and the beginning is class struggle of the working class. At the level of socially developed capital, capitalist development becomes subordinated to working class struggles; it follows behind them, and they set the pace to which the political mechanisms of capital's own reproduction must be tuned (Tronti 1966).

When an individual capitalist buys the labor time of a group of workers these workers are immediately thrown together as an objective class whose equivalence to the capitalist (they are all labor power of generic quality) posits them as a group (Marx 1973; 498, 694 etc). As soon as workers enter into the

wage relationship “The working class confronts its own labor as capital, as a hostile force, as an enemy – this is the point of departure not only for the antagonism [between workers and capitalists at the base of the capitalist system], but for the organization of the antagonism” (Tronti 1966; 1). The cooperative antagonism of the workers drives individual capitalists to enter into alliance with each other, thereby jumpstarting the second contradiction of capitalism, the disjuncture between inter-capitalist competition and the interests of the capitalist system as a whole. Therefore, the first contradiction, between workers and capitalists, pre-exists and drives the second contradiction, inter-capitalist competition. Workers struggle then emerges as the driving force of capitalism as a system, while the organization of the capitalist class arises as a dialectical strategy of containment of working class struggle (Negri 1991).

Tronti’s thesis suggests that we should understand the formation of the capitalist class as a strategic political act aimed at repressing and co-opting working class struggle. In this manner, Taylorism may be understood as a response to the individual and collective resistances of the workers on the production line. As living labor they held (and still hold) the key to surplus value for the capitalist; labor is the only commodity that can produce more value than it contains (Marx 1990; Ch. 6). Though the capitalist purchases labor time (extracted at an average societal rate), labor power or actual work is withheld both individually and collectively in a direct action that appropriates time from the capitalist in the form of sociability, foot-dragging, sabotage, and being lazy on the

line. The capitalist then submits 'his' labor time to technologies of intensification that coerce and extract the vital force of labor from the workers, thereby raising the rate of extraction and increasing profits. The laziness of labor (read, the revolutionary desire of workers to be more than just labor) is the force that makes innovation necessary. Tronti and associated figures such as Panzieri, Negri, Berardi and others placed living labor as both the subject and object of class struggle, and therefore at the core of any analysis that sought to overthrow the capitalist system.

The struggle between workers and capitalists is political from inception and cannot be contained by economic means alone, instead political control is also required in order to regulate the class struggle such that capitalism may be reproduced. In Tronti's analysis the capitalist class dominates the working class politically through the state, and technically through the development of machines and processes of production that extract labor from the bodies of workers (Panzieri 1961; Tronti 1966). As Thoburne (2003) summarizes this process: "Capital proceeds from the imposition of machines to structure and control workers…towards an ever increasing socialization (real subsumption)." This process of subsumption and political control culminates in what Tronti refers to as "The democratic phase of capitalist class dictatorship" (Tronti 1964; 4).

For the early adherents of the movement that would eventually be referred to as autonomous Marxism, the official interpretations of Marx that were embraced by the Italian Communist Party and other 20th century Marxist-

Lenninisms made several mistakes that made their political strategy counter-revolutionary. First, the party-line analysis focused on state planning of the labor process to reduce exploitation in the productive process (Wright 2002). This focus on exploitation missed the ways in which the capitalist relation is not predicated merely on exploitation, but rather on the imposition of work, the requirement that the populace be subjected to wage-labor, and the reduction of the working class to mere living labor from which a surplus could be coerced. Exploitation was secondary to the creation of the working class through the imposition of work (Tronti 1966). Theorists such as Tronti and Panzieri argued that the history of capitalist development was driven by the autonomous refusal of the working class to work, and that the development of machines, scientific management, and the bourgeois state were all techniques to submit workers bodies to work. This implied that the route to communism would not come from workers' self-management, nor from constitutional reform, but rather from the refusal of the working class to work, and the destruction of the class relation that would result from that refusal (Tronti 1966; Thoburne 2003).

The second major mistake made by the communist establishment was the teleological strategy derived from their analysis of exploitation. The party promoted industrial development and full employment as a route to communism, supposing that the becoming-proletarian of the population would pave the way for a future dominated by the communist new man (Wright 2002). Practically, this meant that the party told workers what to do in a centralized fashion,

reserving political strategy for the intellectuals in the party. The early autonomists disagreed with this interpretation, insisting that workers' refusal of work developed politically at the grassroots level – that it was the ongoing struggles in the factory that drove class struggle. This commitment to the primacy of struggle was expressed in the concept of "class composition" – the idea that working class self-activity and organization was always ongoing and always forcing capitalists to respond to contain working class activity within the capitalist relation (Wright 2002).

Although struggle was omnipresent and basic, there were also cycles of working class organization and capitalist counter-attack that could be understood as moments of composition in which the working class organized itself politically, de-composition in which capitalists responded, and recomposition wherein the workers took up the capitalist challenge and twisted it to their own rebellious ends. When viewed in this manner capitalist adjustment to workers' struggle and cooptation of workers' goals can be understood as at least a partial victory for workers'. In other words, these cycles of recomposition thus pose the problem of cooptation as a challenge to capitalist hegemony, rather than an insurmountable problem for working class organization. At a methodological level this reformulation suggests that radical intellectuals should neither spend their time telling the working class what to do, nor merely analyzing the machinations of capitalist development, but should rather study how the working class is always

already composing itself as an anti-capitalist force in order to aid in the efficacy of emerging forms of composition.

Other members of the broad Autonomous movement contributed further to the emerging theorization based on shifts in the terrain and subjects of radical struggle. With the crisis of Fordism both the spatialities and subjectivities of rebellion and control were irreversibly altered. This was conceived by the Autonomists as the destruction of Fordism by the revolutionary refusal of the working class to be defined as mere labor, and the explosion of identity and issue-based subjectivities that forced capital to abandon the Keynesian accord (Hardt 1996). Additional concepts were reformulated or emerged from this crisis such as immaterial labor, class composition analysis, the social factory, the general intellect, and auto-valorization (for good working definitions and some context, see the glossary at the end of Hardt and Virno 1996).

The development of these concepts, which emerged from close engagement with the radical Left social movements of the Italian 1970's, permitted an extension of the definition of the working class beyond the bounds of the industrial proletariat to include practically everyone who was A) subordinated to the wage relationship, B) engaged in the reproduction of the working class through housework etc, and C) not a capitalist. This included the student and unemployed populations as well as the emerging precarious and feminized workforces of the post-Fordist economy. Struggle was understood as both active and passive contestation of the capitalist system, anything from

shirking one's duties, to calling in sick to work, to industrial sabotage, organized political protest, or political violence (I think this definition fits neatly with that used by Leitner, Peck, and Sheppard 2007). Class becomes something contingent that is actively produced through struggle rather than a category that is given by the structure of capital and class composition is the process through which the autonomous activity of workers expresses itself politically through the creation of new antagonistic subjectivities, movements and alliances.

Neoliberalism then, can be understood as the counter-attack of capital in the face of the refusal of the populace to be just workers. The demands for freedom from the factory were met and co-opted by de-industrialization (Negri 2008). The demand for creative and stimulating work was met with governmentalities of entrepreneurial individualism capable of harnessing the artistic and scientific interests of the populace in order to drive the new knowledge economy (Virno 2004). The insistence that women be freed from patriarchal domination was met with the inclusion of women in parts of the workforce that were then made precarious (Dalla Costa 1975).

These were all victories of expansive working class struggle. The fact that aspects of these rebellions were recuperated by capitalism and turned toward the reproduction of a new mode of regulation should not diminish the power of the workers to shift the system, and the challenges that such power throws up in the face of capital. In this manner, the assumption of the primacy of resistance emphasizes the ways that domination and contestation articulate through a focus

on the attempts of capital to react to working class activity, all the while insisting that it is the movement of contestation that drives this articulation.

While a post-Marxist, neo-Gramscian approach to neoliberalism would see the politics of contestation as semi-autonomous from the structures of capital, and an orthodox reading might understand revolutionary movement as at once bound to the forms of capital and at the same time made impossible by those same forms (for example Harvey's fear of militant particularisms), an autonomist understanding of neoliberalism affirms that revolt is primary, that capital is the reactive agent, and that all forms of social struggle may now legitimately be considered anti-capitalist. Contestation comes first, and it is everywhere.

The Capitalist Socius

Deleuze and Guattari's concept of the capitalist socius can help to elaborate this relationship between the primacy of workers struggle and the co-optative function of capital. According to Deleuze and Guattari, capitalist society works as a type of abstract machine that produces value through the continual interpellation of subjects within a complex assemblage of apparatuses of capture (Deleuze 1983). This abstract machine operates through a generalized movement of decoding and deterritorialization (Deleuze 1983). As Thoburne (2003: 91) explains, this movement operates through the continual manipulation of two primary flows, workers who are free to sell their labor, and abstract value

in the form of money. The movement of these two flows continually poses barriers to the reproduction of the machine, at the same time that these barriers pose new lines of flight that allow capital and contestation to move (Thoburne 2003). Capital both structures the subjectivities of workers and presents them with forms of being that exceed those structures, but whose excess also provides avenues for capitalistic expansion.

Building on Tronti's reversal of perspective, Deleuze and Guattari present the capitalist socius as at once parasitic and productive (Casarino 2008). According to Agamben, an apparatus of capture is best understood as "literally anything that has in some way the capacity to capture, orient, determine intercept, model, control, or secure the gestures, behaviors, opinions, or discourses of living beings" (Agamben 2009). Though this is quite a broad description it is operative at a wide variety of scales. When the living labor of the populace is viewed as primary then the socius is seen as parasitic upon that primacy, drawing on the energy of living labor and struggling to direct that energy toward the reproduction of this specific form of capture – capitalism. The desiring production of the populace, the living labor of the workers, feeds the apparatus of capture, that is the socius. The turning of human potential into an abstract equivalence that can be harvested and turned to the logics of 'profit for profit's sake' provides the basic energy of the social machine, and defines the contours of both control and escape (Thoburne 2003).

Essential to the expansion of this abstract philosophical understanding of the actually existing political economy of capitalism is the Autonomist's interpretation of Marx's theory of real subsumption. In the Grundrisse, in the so-called "Fragment on Machines," Marx argues that capitalistic production moves from a stage of formal subsumption within which artisanal forms of work are merely incorporated within capitalist production, to a stage of real subsumption within which the logics of capital fully imbue the production process, alienating the laborers and subordinating them to their abstract function as living labor. Rather than using implements and tools in a creative process of individual production, the workers enter a position of working for the machines that are set over them (Panzieri 1961). The state of being really-subsumed is both destructive of workers' freedom and productive of their position as proletarians whose incorporation into the logics of capital opens the revolutionary possibilities of communist-becoming (Virno 2004).

The Autonomists took up this point of subsumption, arguing that the late twentieth century was a period in which the logics of the factory were evacuated into the whole of society, creating the social factory (Negri 1991). As workers revolt made Fordism more and more untenable within the industrialized core, capital was forced to expand beyond the walls of the factory and to subsume that space within its expansive logics (Terranova 2004; Tronti updated pamphlet). Workers denied that they were merely workers, so capital, in a desperate bid for control, has moved to make all of life into a factory (Tronti 1964).

But when all of life becomes capitalist then all of capital is opened to immediate contestation via the spheres of life that if has subsumed. The factory need no longer be the privileged site of workers struggle. To the contrary, anti-capitalist struggle is now set free and at large within the socius. Whereas theorists of neoliberalism often see the contemporary structure of capitalism as a foreclosure of class politics, autonomous Marxism views this same development as an enormous proliferation of the spaces of anti-capitalist struggle.

The Composition of Contestation

The questions that emerge from a commitment to the primacy of contestation are "what are the present forms of workers struggle? Where are they arising? And to what effect?" The radical methodology of class composition analysis attempts to answer these questions and to chart out the ways that the working class is composing itself as a challenge to capital. In particular, Autonomous theory understands contestation as a cyclical process in which the struggles of the working class converge through the circulation of struggles, producing times of positive composition – times when working class struggle is growing in complexity, effectiveness, and interconnection. This is opposed to periods of decomposition in which working class organization breaks down under pressure from capitalist counter-offensives (Zerowork 1975). Studying emerging forms of composition is helpful for radical politics because it

encourages the circulation of struggles between places and groups, spreading knowledge of effective anti-capitalist struggles to other groups and thereby potentially aiding in composition. The Zerowork collective, an American Autonomous Marxist group, has defined the most important areas for composition analysis as:

1) The study of working class struggles including case studies of particular forms of contestation.
2) "the dynamics of the different sectors of the working class: the way these sectors affect each other, and thus the relation of the working class with capital" (Zerowork 1975)
3) the relation between the working class and its official institutions and organizations, including the labor unions, workers parties, etc.
4) the relation between all these aspects and the plans, strategies, structures, and modes of capital in a given time and place.

While this focus on class may seem old fashioned, I would like to insist on its centrality to the study of neoliberalism and contestation. Though the above statements refer to the working class in a somewhat restricted manner, I think that we ought to read these statements in light of a more expansive definition. If we consider neoliberalism as the present form of the capitalist socius, and the working class in an expansive sense within the social factory, that is as a position that is fluid and contested under generalized conditions of the real subsumption

of society to capital, then all forms of non and anti-capitalist contestation can be viewed as working class struggles. This view must explicitly eject any traces of class essentialism or assumptions as to the "correct" operations of working class struggle (Laclau 1985) and of orthodox teleology, at the same time that it rejects capitalocentricity (Gibson-Graham 2006).

In order to make clear this commitment to anti-essentialism I adopt the phrase "the composition of contestation." In doing so I agree with Leitner, Sheppard, and Sziarto's (2008) assessment that contestation provides a wider description of political antagonism than social movement or resistance, while also maintaining the autonomous focus on composition. In other words, by considering contestation within an autonomous framework, a wide array of rebellious practices by a wide array of actors may be considered anti-capitalist, primary, and in need of study. The concept of the composition of contestation signals an ontological commitment: that struggle is primary. From this assertion it follows that critical academics should attempt to map out the ways that contestations compose themselves in relation to the capitalist socius in different times, places, and across scales. Radical academics committed to mapping the composition of contestation can aid in the amplification of such struggles through their writing and analysis, through which new modes of struggle might be relayed to, and adopted by other people engaging in contestations. We might be helpful in accelerating the circulation of struggles (Schukaitis 2007).

If we consider the vast majority of work in radical geography on neoliberalism we will see that this literature is largely dominated by accounts of the fourth area of composition analysis – the structural movements and strategic positions of capital. My research aims to address the other three areas, and their relation to the fourth, through a case study of protest politics. In the following chapter I examine how certain social movements are composing their contestations around the destruction of public space. In the third chapter I examine how questions of spatial tactics impact the relations between anti-authoritarian movements and protest groups that represent some of the institutions of contestation. Finally, in the fourth chapter I examine how these novel compositions of contestation are mapped onto the bodies and emotions of activists at the point where they intersect with the operation of the security state as the juridical arm of capital.

Chapter 2: The End of Public Space! Direct Action and Constituent Power

> Stories of decline almost always contain elements of truth, but they are very selective, for the gains that went along with the losses and the dark sides behind the façade of a transfigured past usually remain unmentioned (Siebel and Wehrheim 2006).

The so-called "end of public space thesis", that urban public space is becoming less public, has become well nigh ubiquitous. Critical accounts of urban life have, for the past twenty-odd years, analyzed and agitated against the declining publicity of urban space (Sennett 1976; Harvey 1989; Mitchell 1995; Mitchell 2003; Mitchell 2005; Schaller 2005; Clough 2006). In these accounts public space is a site of special importance for democratic politics because it is where "the public" may be addressed through accessing the public sphere. A decline in the publicity of public space is therefore feared to indicate a decline in the possibility of broad democratic participation in society.

At first, the blame for the devolution of public space was placed at the feet of neoliberal urban entrepreneurialism (Harvey 1989), the colonization of the public by private profit motives (Habermas 1991), the rise of privatized suburban shopping centers and the correlative decline of city centers (Cohen 1996), and the gentrifying and sanitizing force of the neoliberal urban renaissance (Smith 1996; Brenner 2002; MacLeod 2002; Ward 2006). Then, in the post-9/11 period, this critique was supplemented with a focus on reactionary and authoritarian

policing and a culture of intolerance toward dissent and difference (ACLU 2003; Bovard 2003; Boghosian 2004; Coleman 2004; Chappell 2006; Boykoff 2007). Thus, public space and the prospect for a more democratic politics have been presented as under siege by both capital and the state.

While there is much truth to these arguments, and the points made by the end of public space literature are politically vital, I want to suggest that such accounts are in some ways inadequate because their focus on public space as an analog for the public sphere tends to assume inclusion in the body politic as the goal of contentious politics. While this is often the case, there are also many social movements for whom inclusion is not the goal. Rather, some radical movements, active in protest politics have a deeply ambivalent relationship with public space and its relationship to the public sphere. This is because liberal conceptions of public space and contentious politics take protest as a form of discursive or symbolic action. While many political uses of public space do operate in this manner, as discursive and symbolic interventions into the public sphere, other political uses of public space explicitly refuse symbolic action targeting the public, insisting instead on taking direct action designed to immediately alter power relations in an emancipatory manner (Gelderloos 2007). In this chapter I examine how the anarchist protest movement actively struggles against the legitimating function of public space, employing illiberal protest tactics and a politics of force that complicates the end of public space thesis. I further suggest that the state reacts to anarchist direct action by attempts to shore up

public space as a corollary to the liberal public sphere. This is accomplished through rhetorically excluding anarchists from "the public" and through separating direct action from symbolic protest. This suggests that, contrary to the claims of the end of public space literature, public space is actually often an instrument used by the state to stifle radical political change.

Drawing on Negri's (1999) theorization of constituent power, I argue that much anarchist direct action protest contests the publicity of public space and its connection to the public sphere, producing in its place an illiberal spatiality that I term constituent space. Constituent space complicates the end of public space thesis through insisting that the end of public space is sometimes precisely the goal of radical politics, rather than the result of neoliberal privatization or neoconservative assaults on dissent. I also draw on Deleuze, Foucault, and Agamben in arguing that public space operates as an apparatus of capture for constituent power, using that power to legitimate the capitalist socius through spatialized forms of political subjectivation. The recognition of constituent space as a radical antagonist to public space also opens up new spaces for a consideration of politics beyond the liberal spatialities of public and private – perhaps opening lines of flight and political imaginaries capable of transcending inherited binaries.

In making this argument I first examine theories of public space and the relation of public space to the public sphere, before conducting a brief review of the end of public space literature. I then elucidate my theoretical framework,

developing a theory of constituent space to problematize these two categories and their relations. Finally, I analyze a series of anarchist direct action protests starting with the 1999 World Trade Organization protests in Seattle and ending with the 2008 Republican National Convention protests in St. Paul, Minnesota in order to demonstrate how anarchist direct action protest constructs public space and "the public" as targets of Left revolt. I conclude that public space is not just an all-inclusive spatiality, nor the site and goal of struggle, nor merely the opposite of the private spaces of capital and the family. Rather, it is an essential aspect of the liberal capitalist dialectic that makes "dissent safe for democracy" (Mitchell 2003).

Public space and the public sphere

Public space is at the center of debates around social control and dissent because it is a privileged site of publicity, or publicness, in contemporary American society (Low 2006). Nonetheless, this category of space is multidimensional and riven by contradictions and can be conceived in several ways. First, public space is an ideological abstraction that undergirds liberal democratic ideals and legitimates representative democratic forms of government and sovereignty. This is the public sphere function of public space in which certain concrete spaces stand in for the abstract spaces of Habermasian deliberation.

Public space operates as a proxy for the public sphere insofar as it is the site of communicative action to the public at large. As Habermas (1991) discussed in detail, the concept and category of 'the public' and its corresponding sites of the public sphere and public space are distinctly bourgeois liberal categories. In the pre-and proto-capitalist states of Europe from whence much American political thought derives, the concept of 'public' referred to the body of the sovereign, who literally embodied in his or her corporeality the body politic (Habermas 1991; 10). Against this formulation, the bourgeois revolutions replaced the public body of the sovereign with the public sphere, the space of deliberation and communication between private individuals, autonomous from the state, relating to each other as ostensive equals regardless of their hereditary or class positions (Ibid). This model was fomented by the rise of capitalist equivalence against hereditary sovereignty. Capitalism assumes equivalence, your money is as good as mine when it is thrown into production or exchange. It does not matter whose money is at work because it is a real abstraction of generalized social relations rather than a marker of essential distinction (Idib). The equivalence of money was mapped onto the equivalence of argument, the marketplace of commodities was transposed onto the field of politics and public opinion emerged from the cacophony of the differentiated multitude – the unsubsumed 'many' that pre-exists the 'one' of the public. This displaced the category of the public from the sovereign to that segment of the populace capable of engaging in deliberation as formally equivalent individuals.

Historically, the public sphere first emerged through the medium of literary magazines, cafes, and salons in which educated men would debate the events and policies of the day (Ibid). These forums explicitly attempted to operate without recourse to rank or title for authority – the best argument was supposed to carry the day regardless of who uttered it. This was obviously partial at best, since myriad forms of social difference did, and continue to, striate access to such fora and the weight that individual opinions and arguments carry (see Fraser 1992). For example, women were fully excluded from the spaces of the early bourgeois public sphere (Fraser 1992), while the homeless and other groups are excluded from the public spaces of the city that serve as the physical sites of access to the public sphere (Mitchell 2003).

Nonetheless, the model of the bourgeois public sphere remains hegemonic in the public at large, operating as one of the central legitimating fictions of liberal democracy (Mitchell 1995). Representation in government is predicated on the access of the public to the public sphere in which opinion can be formed and representatives legitimately directed to act on behalf of their constituents (Sennett 1976). Without a reasonably operative public sphere there can be no legitimate representation because representatives and constituents cannot be a discursive community (Habermas 1991; Warner 2002). Because access to the official institutions of the public sphere, such as the mass media, is mediated through hegemonic power relations and interpreted through the powerful editorial functions of public figures such as politicians, media

personalities, etc. the official public sphere cannot be said to operate democratically (Habermas 1991). Public space then comes to operate as the alternative site of publicity where the voices of those excluded from the official public sphere can vie for inclusion through being seen and heard (Iveson 2007). Public space is thus cherished by many on the relative Left as the legally protected space where non-hegemonic groups can have a reasonable chance of conveying their ideas to the public at large and thereby joining in public deliberation (Mitchell 2003; Staeheli and Mitchell 2008).

As Mitchell (1995) and Marston (1990) point out, this makes public space an ideological project, the universalizing rhetoric of public space open to all, legitimating representative democracy through hiding the fact that access to and influence over the public sphere is highly striated across lines of gender, race, class, ethnicity, ability, nationality, and sexual orientation. Critical scholars are well aware that actual public spaces rarely live up to their ideological construction, and many have pointed out that it is precisely the friction between universalizing fiction and the exclusive reality that has given marginalized groups a strategic claim to inclusion in what counts as “the public” (Marston 1990; Fraser 1992; Mitchell 1995; Ruddick 1996). The active presence of groups in public space who are not included as part of “the public” can act as an immanent criticism of the unevenness of American society, and, in cases such as the civil rights movement, may lead to formerly excluded groups being officially included in the body politic.

Public space, then, can also be conceived as a type of spatiality that is produced through political action. That is to say, we may consider a space to be public if political actions directed through the public sphere toward the state, or the public at large, take place therein. This is the inclusion function of public space in which it is conceived as a site autonomous from the state where exclusions are made political and claims to inclusion are made to the public.

We may also take public space to be opposed to private space. In this sense public space is the space of the state and civil society, as in the "public sector". This is the juridical form of public space, a category of space that is held *by the state* for the legitimate political and recreational use of the people (Mitchell 2005). In this sense, public space becomes public not through immediate action by the people, but rather through being held by the state in legal proxy.

Public space, then, is the site where one can speak truth to power, contest inequality, and participate in democratic debate. But it is also the place where the legitimate forms of these actions are policed and negotiated. "Public space is where legitimate citizens take part in legitimately public activities and, in so doing, reaffirm their relationship to a state that defines those very boundaries: between the legitimate and the illegitimate, the properly public and the private" (D'arcus 2005). As the property of the state, public space interpellates its occupants with state power through enrolling space into the ideological function of constructing the public vis-à-vis liberal citizenship and state power. To be in public is to be in relation not only with the public sphere, but also with the state.

One's actions or identities in public space, therefore, work continually to produce and reproduce the relationship of liberal subjects to the state.

To recap, though public space plays many functions it is also always a space in which the many are engaged in a relation to the state and the construction of an ideologically driven conception of "the public". Public space is, indeed, essential to liberal democratic politics, but its operation is two-sided. It is not only the case that public space makes public opinion and the state accesible to users of the space, it also places users of the space in a position that helps to legitimate the very system that some of them may be appearing in public to oppose. In so far as protesters are acting in the public to operate on the public this conceptualization of the public may be analytically sufficient. However, in cases where the operation of the liberal democratic system is itself the object of contestation, then the category of the public may be insufficient to understand these actions.

Symbolic protest and direct action

Though there are many forms of being in public space, I focus on the explicitly political category of protest. This is not to belittle or marginalize the importance of the everyday experiences of exclusion and struggle that constitute American public space. Rather, I focus on protest because it is extraordinary, and as such it has the capacity to make plain relations that otherwise might be

less observable. Protest is a concerted form of collective political action that seeks to change power relations extra-institutionally, or from outside formal political instutions. Rather than using formal political channels, protest politics operate in civil society, because those undertaking protest lack the resources and connections for more formal political action (such as marginalized populations), or because the topic of protest is outside the accepted scope of governmental action (cultural politics), or because the goals of the protest somehow exceed the sphere of official politics (Della Porta 1999). Protest very often, though not exclusively, is undertaken in public space in order to acquire publicity (Low 2006). For the purposes of this chapter there are two primary varieties of protest, symbolic protest and direct action.

Symbolic protest, such as marching and holding a sign to promote some position, operates largely as a form of political discourse modelled on a quasi-Habermasian liberal public sphere. Symbolic protest attempts to intervene in the public sphere through staging a show of support for a given position, hopefully attracting the attention of the media and the public at large, and thereby shifting public debate, deliberation, and opinion. This form of intervention, at least partially, operates as though politics were a form of rational deliberation among power holders and the public at large. This discursive aspect of protest is often described in terms of making an issue political though making it visible to the public (Mitchell 2003; D'arcus 2005; Iveson 2007). Public space is thus a prime avenue toward making a formerly private grievance into a public issue.

Protest actions that attempt to intervene in public discourse through symbolic actions in public space may be termed 'liberal' protests because their object of action is the liberal public sphere. Liberal protest actions seek to produce space so as to maximize the public sphere function of public space in order to more effectively intervene in public opinion. This might include actions such as occupying space in high traffic areas, attempting to capitalize on large-scale events and coopt media coverage, or creating media spectacles designed to dramatize injustice or inequality. Of significance here is the integral role public space *qua* public sphere plays in liberal protest politics. Without a place to be seen, symbolic protest becomes utterly ineffective because it has no ability to influence public opinion. In lieu of other routes to access the public sphere, public space is thus integral to liberal protest.

However, in addition to liberal protest there are also many forms of contentious politics such as blockade, refusal to participate, riot, terrorism, vandalism,property destruction, or open insurgency, that attempt to intervene in oppressive power relations directly rather than discursively. I will, following activist usage, refer to these forms as direct actions. In contemporary American society direct action is largely the provinence of the anarchist protest movement (Graeber 2004). The primary distinguishing feature of direct action is the desire to immediately alter power relations. This is not to say that direct actions do not, also and at the same time, operate through the public sphere. Rather, direct action is not *primarily* concerned with publicity and public opinion. For example,

a direct action protest might involve activists releasing animals from a testing laboratory or taking up residence in a giant sequoia tree scheduled to be cut down. Both of these actions will likely draw public attention due to their unusual and spectacular nature, but the media attention is secondary to freeing the animals and preventing the tree from being cut (Gelderloos 2007). Public space is not of primary importance to these types of politics. This is not to argue that publicity is unimportant, but rather to stress that, when protest is posed in terms of public space such actions are often constrained by the liberal mandates of the public sphere that protest operate as discourse rather than force. In fact, when framed in terms of public space or the public sphere, such actions often appear distinctly illiberal because they resist the monopoly on legitimate force that the state claims to hold, preferring instead a politics of force.

These forms of dissent rest uneasily alongside liberal forms of protest. Often occuring in similar times and spaces, symbolic protest and direct action confront state power with divergent forms that must be parsed, the state must sort them out and respond to each. While liberal forms of protest operate within their prescribed space of dissent as discourse, illiberal forms such as direct action operate immediately as a politics of force that attempt to wrest power from formal representation and reinvest it directly into actions on the street. Both of these types of protest produce space differently and to different effect. Symbolic protest participates in the production of public space as public sphere, as a way to alter to public opinion, and via opinion to influence the state. Anarchist direct

action on the other hand agitates against the public sphere function of public space, and against the concept of the public sphere in general, preferring instead to occupy and sieze space as a site of immediate liberation (more on this later).

Although much of the geographic literature has focused on the role of dissent in producing public space ((Mitchell 1995; Low 2006; Iveson 2007), the state also struggles to produce public space, and it does so in order to make protest as non-threatening as possible (Mitchell 2003). It is the very function of public space as a proxy for the public sphere that creates the need for state management. At the same time that tolerating certain forms of dissent strengthens and legitimates liberal democracy (Habermas 1991), the public sphere function of public space makes actions taken therein potentially threatening of the liberal order – protest actions carry the constant potential to evolve into shows of force instead of discursive pleas (D'arcus 2005). This tension illustrates the extent to which line between liberal protest and direct action is tenuous, it must constantly be redrawn by the state. This sets up constant struggles at a variety of scales to produce space as public, or as a space of force, and these struggles in turn constantly shape the spaces of the city and the forms of social control and resistance.

Don Mitchell refers to the constant and necessary struggle over the production of public space, between dissenting groups and the state, the "dialectic of public space" (Mitchell 2005). Mitchell sees dissenting groups attempting to implement a vision in which "public space is taken and remade by

political actors; it is politicized at its very core; and it tolerates the risk of disorder…as central to its functioning" (Mitchell 2003: 128). Whereas the state and the capitalist ruling class attempt to produce public space that "is planned, orderly and safe. Users of this space must be made to feel comfortable, and they should not be driven away by unsightly homeless people or unsolicited political activity " Mitchell 2003: 128).

The dialectic of public space is immanent to the liberal democratic state form -- liberal democracy requires a public sphere and contemporary society locates an avenue of access to the public sphere in public space. While the state must allow some forms of dissent in order to preserve liberal democracy it must also work to make dissent orderly and non-threatening. For example, a liberal protest advocating universal health care through petitions and carrying large signs during a permitted march legitimates liberal political forms through appealing to democratic institutions such as the U.S. Congress. However, a direct action protest such as a blockade of a city hosting a trade liberalization summit operates through unlawfully denying summit participants the ability to meet. This action is difficult for the state to incorporate into liberal norms because it contests the right of the state to operate as a sovereign authority. Of course, many protest actions fall between these examples, such as civil rights era sit-ins, unpermitted marches, and various forms of civil disobedience that may break the law in relatively unthreatening ways –in such situations the response of the state varies greatly from tolerance to outright repression (Boykoff

2007). Actions that cannot be made to legitimate the system must either be ignored or repressed depending upon which route is least likely to delegitimate the system as a whole (Boykoff 2007).

It is through this iterative process of repression, cooptation, and tolerance that the boundaries of legitimate action in public space are established (D'arcus 2005). Forms of protest that were once brutally repressed have, in some cases, through the struggles of social movements, become routinely tolerable by the state (Mitchell 2005). At the same time, events such as 9/11 actively shift the terrain of what counts as acceptable dissent and what constitutes illegitimate force. It is through this back and forth negotiation, mediated through struggle, that the parameters of "the public" are set. Just as much as public space defines the legitimate relations between protest and the public sphere, it also defines the relations between dissent and the state.

The End of Public Space?

During the second half of the twentieth century critical scholars developed a significant body of work that noted a deline in the quality, accessibility, and function of public space and its democratic function as spatial corrolary to the public sphere. To be brief, this literature argued that public space had entered a period of decline due to a host of factors including but not limited to urban renewal (Jacobs 1961), the development of private shopping malls (Cohen 1996,

Goss 1993), the militarization and fortification of central business districts (Davis 1990), gentrification (Lees 2008, Smith 1996), raced and gendered power differentials (Schaller and Modan 2005, Staeheli, Mitchell, and Gibson 2002), and neoliberal privatization (Clough and Vanderbeck 2006). This literature has largely functioned to point out the exlusive nature of much contemporary public space and has hinged on the concern that the essential democratic function of public space is in danger due to its apparently rising exclusivity.

Prominent geographic accounts of this process have focused on the impact of business-led revitalizaiton on the ability of the homeless and various minorities to inhabit urban public space (Mitchell 2003, Mitchell and Staeheli 2005, Schaller and Modan 2005, Ward 2006, Weber 2002, Wilson 2004). In these cases it is the dynamic force of neoliberal capital that colonizes and takes over public space, altering terrains of resistance such that there is less and less opportunity for true democratic participation and inclusion in the neoliberal city. In the words of one scholar "Sociologists, geographers, architects, and political theorists have exhaustively examined the increasing privatization of urban public space under neoliberalism. Scholarship bemoaning the ways that urban centers are becoming more like shopping malls— depoliticized, focused on consumption, partially-privatized, and heavily policed—has become so common as to be a cliche´" (Feldman 2009).

Since Seattle 1999 and 9/11 there has been an additional focus on explicitly political action in public space. Whereas the literature on the end of

public space largely locates the mechanisms responsible for this trend in the abstract logics of capitalist urbanism in its articulation with raced, classed, and gendered residential and consumption patterns, the post-9/11 literature is primarily concerned with the ways that domestic security and legal norms as well as a neoconservative federal government have actively sought to contain and suppress dissenting movements through restricting the spaces and times that such movements may occupy.

According to the ACLU, since 9/11 “Some government officials, including local police, have gone to extrordinary lengths to squelch dissent wherever it has sprung up, drawing on a breathtaking array of tactics – from censorship and surveillance to detention, denial of due process and excessive force (ACLU 2003). After Seattle 1999 and 9/11 the control of public space aquired a new importance. State security was manifested spatially through restricting access to various places and stepping up the exclusivity of public spaces.

As Low and Smith (2006:1-2) put it in the introductory paragraphs to their collection of essays on the politics of public space, “This is a pivotal moment for examining the politics of public space. The broad decay of American liberalism provides the crucial context for the restructuring of what counts as public space today.” They cite as especially important the post-9/11 “U.S. Patriot Act and related legislation , which produced a wholly unprecedented circumscription of popular uses of public space… Public behavior once seen simply as eccentric, or even protected by First Amendment rights, is now routinely treated as a potential

terrorist threat." Additionally, in the 2004 National Lawyers Guild report "The Assault on Free Speech, Public Assembly, and Dissent", Boghosian writes that "abuses [by the U.S. government] have been so aggressive that rights of free assembly and free speech guaranteed by the First Amendment of the United States Constitution are simply no longer available to the citizens of this country… the Justice Department under John Ashcroft [G.W. Bush's appointee as Attorney General] has systematially (sic) encouraged these abuses and acted as a cheerleader for government officials using excessive force and abusing their authority against citizens engaged in free speech" (Bohosian 2004:1). In a 2007 follow-up report entitled "Punishing Protest: Government Tactics that Suppress Free Speech," Boghosian goes on to explain how police and federal security officials have utilized a variety of tactics to control and suppress free speech and protest. These have included a large number that explicitly target public space as a site and technology for social control, including free speech zones, containment pens, mass arrests, and the development of protest permit systems[7] (Boghosian 2007).

At the same time that protest permit systems requiring dissenters to gain official permission to occupy public space for political purposes were proliferating around the country, Mitchell and Staeheli observed that "The permit system seems to be in the process of being replaced by a geography defined by the corralling of protesters, an urban landscape marked by fences, checkpoints,

[7] These technologies for the control of public space are a topic of discussion in chapter 3 of this dissertation.

fenced-off ‘no-protest’ zones… and the establishment of official ‘protest pens’ to hold all those who may disagree with the actions of their government or other powerful public players” (Mitchell and Staeheli 2005: 811). Indeed they claim that there is “a new geography within liberal democracies where even the pretence of tolerating dissent seems to be withering away” (Mitchell and Staeheli (2005:811).

Thus, the impoverished publicity of neoliberal urban space is supplemented by a rationality and practice of neoconservative security through the control of public space. As Wendy Brown (2006) argues, when neoliberalism and neoconservatism collide the result is a dramatic and sophisticated de-Democratization of society, at least partially through a de-democratization of space. Although this narrative of the dual decline of public space does describe a real phenomenon, it also underplays the power of dissenting groups in this process. Further, most liberal and radical critiques of the decline of public space ignore the illiberal nature of some protests in favor of examining illiberal state action. Thus, public space is presented as being in decline while Left movements are imagined to be working to protect what little public space remains.

But, as I argued above, public space is not neutral nor is the expansion of public space necessarily always a desirable condition from the perspective of Left radicalism. One of the roles of public space is to actively shape the forms and possibilities of legitimate extra-institutional political action. Specifically, public space operates to capture dissent and mold it to forms available to the

state for inclusion through cooptation, or what is sometimes referred to as recuperation(Schukaitis forthcoming). Dissent becomes an object of social control in public space through the establishment of clear parameters of acceptable action (Boykoff 2007). The analog between public space and the public sphere maps discursive norms onto political practices such that the only legitimate forms of dissent in public are symbolic and discursive. The imposition and maintenance of publicity in public space constantly works to limit and enroll political action into symbolic forms. If public space is to serve as a viable proxy for the public sphere, then it too must eschew force in favor of discourse. I argue that this quality of public space, as a spatial form that enforces liberal modes of dissent, exposes the ways that public space operates as a technology for social control.

The Concept of a Crisis: Constituent Power and Public Space

In this section I draw on Negri's theory of constitutent power in order to demonstrate how public space operates as an apparatus of capture that produces "the public" as an ideological construction of a unitary political body. First I explain the concept of constituent power, then I spatialize the concept through articulating it with pubic space. I also build on this argument to develop a theory of constituent space that addresses the moments of rupture when that abiliy to produce the public is fractured.

Since Macchiaveli and then Hobbes, political theory has recognized the necessity for the sovereign to form the multitude of political subjects into a coherent group, the people. The concept of the people operates ideologically to orient the mass of social subjects as governable. It works to produce a relation of subjection to the state though turning the differentiated 'many' of the multitude into the 'we' of the people – turning the populace into the public (Negri 1999).

Negri's contemporary thought draws on the arguments of the Autonomists presented in the previous chapter, but his theory goes beyond the somewhat narrower Marxism of those earlier theorists. Moving beyond the political economic categories of much previous Marxism and into the realm of juridical thought, Negri transforms Autonomist Marxism from a class analytic to a larger theory of struggle and power (Casarino 2008). At the heart of this project lies Negri's appropriation of Spinoza as a revolutionary materialist thinker and his articulation of this Spinoza with the Marx of the Grundrisse. Following Tronti in his reconceptualization of the capitalist dialectic not as an objective feature of history, but rather as a particular mechanism for the capture of labor power by capital, Negri mobilizes Spinoza's metaphysics as a philosophical base capable of abandoning teleology and essentialism while putting struggle at the very center of existence (Negri 1991, Read 2007).

In his 1999 study, "Insurgencies: Constituent Power and the Modern State," Negri develops a sophisticated argument on the theoretical priority of what he terms constituent power over Constituted Power. We can think of

constituent power as the founding authority of the secular state, it is the revolutionary potential of the populace to rise up and create a new political form on the ashes of the old. Constituent power is the creative energy of the multitude of political subjects that pre-exists the forms of its capture by constituted power (ie, the molding of the populace into 'the people').

To put it another way, constituent power is the expression of a necessary contradiction immanent to liberal democracy. It is the tension that arises between the power of the populace and the power of the state as the institution that embodies popular power. If liberal democratic states gain their authority to govern through representing the people, then a crisis emerges when and wherever state power comes into conflict with the populace, or when the populace refuses to act as a cohesive and rational social body. Constituted power is sovereign power – and insofar as the state is the political wing of capital tasked with reproducing the conditions necessary for the reproduction of the capitalist relation, constituted power is also the power of capital (Negri 1999).

In the case of American representative democracy, state power is legitimated through its appeal to the historic revolution – the subjects of the British Empire rose up, gathering their constituent power to overthrow despotism and investing their authority as free people into their Constitution (Negri 1999). The Constitution captures and embodies the power of the populace to rise up and constitute itself as a political subject (Negri 1999). Therefore, Constituted Power (in this case The Constitution and the institutions that rely on this

document for legitimacy) is both the result of constituent power, but also potentially its antagonist. Whenever an excess of constituent power threatens to exceed The Constitution it becomes the enemy of Constituted Power and therefore must be captured, crushed, or otherwise neutralized. This movement between capture and excess forms the dialectic of the crisis that is called constituent power (Negri 1999).

Of course, constituent power is always copresent with constituted forms, what is at question is the forms that arise out of this dialectic, and the continual recompositions of power that occur through the struggles over excess. However, there are moments when constituent power briefly breaks free of the forms of its constitution, producing new configurations of power and altering old diagrams through novel compositions of struggle (Negri 2008). When this happens order must be restored or a new order must be constituted, engaging the new forms of constituent power and enrolling them into a new constitution.

In the contemporary United States, the U.S. Constitution is just one obvious example of constituted power, there are many others. Constituted Power is the power of institutions such as the government at all its scales and guises. It is the power of formalized systems such as the capitalist economy, or the authoritarian communist economies they opposed during the Cold War. Constituted Power is also embodied in the physical forms of space. The city as a planned and controlled machine for production and reproduction is an aspect of Constituted power. Constituted Power operates through specific and contingent

techniques and technologies that are effective at various times and places in reproducing the forms of power. Constituted Power, then, is the form that is given to the basic energy of the populace.

To make this more clear a couple of analogies are helpful. We might consider living labor to be analogous to constituent power, and real subsumption to be the expression of Constituted Power. Just as capitalism is nothing but the capture of living labor for the production of profit for profit's sake, forms of constitution enroll and mold constituent energies into the production and reproduction of whatever system is at question. Capital cannot exist without living labor. In fact, it is composed of a certain arrangement of living labor – that arrangement whereby living labor is enslaved to dead labor. Yet, without living labor there can be no capitalist system, no profit, no dynamic and innovative force (Marx 1990; Negri 1991).

Similarly, constituent power is analogous to Deleuze and Guatrari's desiring production, which undergirds and fuels the capitalist socius (Deleuze 1983; Thoburne 2003). Desiring production is taken up, used, molded, coopted and recuperated by the socius, but the system itself is constantly threatened by that from which it takes its form. This is to say, that Constituted Power is an apparatus of capture for constituent power. Just as living labor constantly threatens capital through its refusal to be JUST labor, so too does constituent power threaten all the forms of its constitution – precisely because constituted forms owe their legitimacy and their substance to nothing except a constituent

power that consistently exceeds the boundaries and mechanisms of its own recuperation. Of utmost importance here is the assertion that Constituted Power has no ontological basis outside of constituent energy (Negri 1999). That is to say, Constituted Power cannot exist without that which makes up its content.

The operation of the crisis that is constituent power can be made more clear through the case of elections, the moment when constituent power is explicitly mobilized by the state. Parties attempt to mobilize the populace to give acclamation to their respective policies, but the sites of conventions and political events are also prone to becoming sites of protest and rebellion. The political energy of the populace exceeds the prescripted site of its participation – the ballot box. In the words of an anarchist brochure distributed prior to the 2008 RNC "our dreams won't fit in your ballot boxes" (Unconventional Action, 2008). The trouble for the state is that the same foundational legimitimacy undergirds both voting and revolution – it is the basic attribute of constituent power to determine its own conditions of constitution (Negri 1999).

In this manner, I argue that the concept of the public can be seen to operate as a particular technique for the capture of constituent energies within an overarching project to reproduce the legitimacy of the liberal state. This is due to the position of the concept of the public that exists in a relation of subordination to Constituted Power. If the construction of 'the public' is a political project at the heart of modern liberal sovereignty, as scholars from Hobbes to Habermas and Negri suggest, then the public is a concept in the service of Constituted Power.

However, this subordination is only ever partial, constituent power continually exceeds the capacity of Constituted Power to capture it. The politics of recuperation and legitimation undertaken by the state to contain constituent energies within the bounds of affirmation, therefore, become a central site in the operation of the reproduction of constituted forms of power.

This struggle is also a spatial struggle, over the production of space. Because public space is always, though not only, a technology for the constructon of the public, the production of public space emerges as a process vulnerable to the crisis that is constituent power. Public space, as the liberal space of sanctioned dissent, is constantly threatening to devolve into a space of constituent power. Riots, refusal to cooperate with police, and property destruction, are all instances of constituent power exceeding the bounds of liberal political action through refusing the public sphere function of public space. In fact, as I argue below, such actions deny "the public" altogether, rejecting sovereign control of space and asserting unmediated constituent force.

At this point I would like to introduce the concept of constituent space as a theoretical tool for parsing the differences between public space as a technique of Constitution and spaces where excess constituent power is expressed. Constituent space is the illiberal spatiality of those forms of dissent and social struggle rising from the populace that deny or exceed liberal spatialities. Geographers, and the broad literature on the end of public space, have largely ignored what I term constituent spaces in favor of analyses and defenses of

public space – a liberal spatiality constructed as a form of Constituted Power. Because public space is multifaceted, a site of real publicity, but also a site of recuperation, cooptation, and molding toward liberal forms and spatialities, analyses of contentious politics need an analytic that is not trapped within liberal forms. In situations where the state attempts the construction of space as public while radical social movements contest that designation, an analytic based in publicity is ill-equipped to explain the variety of struggles enacted in these spaces. In other words, analyzing contentious politics as a defense of public space can sometimes obscure the ways that publicity is at the service of the state.

In the next section I examine how anarchist direct action activists have opposed symbolic protest and the strictures of public space since the 1999 World Trade Oranization protests in Seattle, through subverting what is known as 'negotiated management policing'. I also examine some tactics developed by the state to overcome this challenge and to reproduce public space as a site of civil discourse.

Negotiated Management Policing

According to Della Porta (1998), policing strategies and social movement protest repertoires underwent a series of significant changes over the past half century. During the labor militancy of the late 19th and early 20th century, police

responses to strikes, agitation, and organizing were violent and often deadly (see Mitchell 2008 for example on the Haymarket Affair, or consider the history of the 1934 Minneapolis Teamsters strike in which violent confrontations between union members and police led to dozens of serious injuries and several deaths). However, by the time of the civil rights movement the adequacy of escalated force policing was put into question by the adoption of non-violent civil disobedience. In the case of Rosa Parks or actions led by Dr. Martin Lurther King and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, brutal police repression of non-violent protesters served largely to sway public opinion toward the position of the protesters (Boykoff 2007).

The success of non-violent movements prompted a reconsideration of police tactics and the development of the so-called *Negotiated Management* approach to the policing of dissent (Della Porta 1998). Under this schema police attempted to work with most protest groups in a conciliatory manner, allowing minimal civil disobedience to occur in exchange for cooperative protester behavior. It was, and indeed still is, not uncommon for protesters to work with police in planning protests, to decide on acceptable tactics with police input, and to negotiate with police the consequences for breaking the law before the protest has occurred. For example, when planning an act of civil disobedience, certain protest groups might notify the police that they intended to march down several blocks of a major street without a permit, at the end of which 10 marchers would lie down in the road for five minutes. Police might agree to this so long as the

protesters then leave the road. The ten people laying down would know that they would be arrested and charged with a misdemeanor which would later be dropped (example given by a protest organizer during interview). This allows protesters to achieve some media coverage without putting their participants in serious danger; it also allows police to know ahead of time what actions are going to occur and to cultivate a friendly and non-oppositional relationship with dissenting citizens – which builds social ties and bonds of mutual accountability between protesters and cops.

Negotiated management, then, is a tool for the recuperation of dissent, it is a means of molding dissent to forms and norms that legitimate the political system through discursive appeal to the public sphere and the state. Further, negotiated management works to produce public space as JUST an analog to the public sphere, positioning any form of force that goes beyond the discursive as transgression. By enrolling protesters in their own policing as liberal political subjects with a right to public space, negotiated management naturalizes liberal categories of political action and public space.

However, this model is heavily contested by anarchists and other Left radicals for several reasons. First, in addition to acting as a recruitment forum for social movements, symbolic protests are directed at changing the minds of onlookers, the audience, and as such are a form of liberal discourse directed at a putative public sphere. The audience can either be present at the action or remotely connected via the media. But capitalist media who are in the business

of selling advertising space have an incentive to cover spectacular events over those that are cooperative (Boykoff 2008). This means that media are likely to give significantly less coverage to a peaceful protest than they are to a riot because a riot is exciting and more likely to increase ratings or sales. Protesters cooperating with police, therefore, face a structural disincentive toward cooperation – if they cause a scene they are more likely to get their voices out into the public sphere, although coverage of confrontational protests tends to be condemnatory rather than investigative (Boykoff 2006). Protest groups, then, face a double-bind. If they operate in a cooperative and conciliatory fashion with police they are unlikely to garner much media attention and their symbolic protest is unlikely to be particularly successful. However, if they take a confrontational stance the media coverage they do get is likely to center on the confrontation itself rather than on the issues being protested.

Second, a politics of conciliation between protesters and police assumes a specific positionality and orientation for both. By posing police as allies or neutral protectors of equal rights, negotiated management policing reproduces the police as the legitimate mediators of political conflict. This is problematic on a number of grounds. From the perspective of some radical Left theory, especially that popular among anarchist participants in direct action, the police are often concieved as class-traitors, the armed wing of domestic capitalist class rule (Gelderloos 2007).

> [I]t is nearly always the case that those who enact this repression on behalf of the powerful are working class themselves. Soldiers, policemen, bailiffs, prison officers, and border

control officials are amongst those who perform jobs antithetical to the interests of the working class. The inherent contradiction is in the fact that these people share the plight of the workers whilst being the most powerful instruments of established power to maintain that plight…The fact remains that they represent institutions antagonistic to working class interest, enforcing the borders, territorial expansion, property rights, prisons, and limitations on dissent that define our society and entrench its ruling class (Dickens 2010).

From this perspective the role of the police is to de-escalate working class and other oppressed people's dissent so as to protect the hegemony of the liberal democratic form of white, patriarchal, capitalist dictatorship. If the role of the police is to discourage radical struggle, then any action taken in cooperation with the police risks cooptation. Cooperation with police is also a dubious proposition in terms of racial politics. The suggestion that police are impartial peace-keepers would likely come as something of a surprise to radical people of color movements, whose communities face immense violence at the hands of the law and its appointed agents (for Black Panther perspectives on race and police authority, see (Cleaver 2001).

Cooperation with police, then, ignores the history of oppositionality embodied by radical struggles. Class struggle, anti-racist struggle, even radical feminist and queer struggles have often been expressed as struggles against the agents of the state. When civil rights activists marched in the streets it was police operating at the service of the racist state that beat them. When workers marched for the eight hour day and held public meetings in Haymarket Square it

was police who gunned them down. When queer men rioted at Stonewall it was the police they battled for enforcing homocidal laws. Small wonder, then, that many radical activists have not seen cooperation with police as a blessing, but rather as a sad necessity or even something to be resisted. For the anarchist movement in particular, and for other Left activists as well, negotiated management policing is often confronted as a system that works to depoliticize resistance and to promote social control through the conciliatory rhetoric of the liberal public sphere.

Anarchist Direct Action Against Public Space

> It may be that we don't need to succeed in actually shutting down the [Republican National] convention in St. Paul this summer to deal a blow to our enemies and seize the attention of the world; we need only provoke a serious confrontation with the police (CrimethINC 2008).

> There are those who speak of property damage as a tactic, as an implement in the activist's toolbox. We are not among them. They'd like to coerce us into this utilitarian relationship through the edifice of politics; we'd prefer not to. The rioting on Monday [the first day of the 2008 RNC] despite its limitations, materialized our inclinations as exploited and alienated individuals to gouge at the eyes of both capital and politics. We make these attacks because we wish to improve our conditions immediately and to do so in way (sic) that violates the peace treaty signed by the managers of politics (Anonymous 2008).

Anarchist direct action operates as a form of confrontation with the state and other forms of oppressive power. This confrontational politics operates on a deeply spatial basis. Just as the control of space is at the center of state strategies for social control, so too is it at the center of anarchist direct action politics. The anarchist struggle for the control of space has two primary components. The first is the liberation of space from control by the state and capital. This liberatory spatiality is an assualt on public space ,as a form of ideological state space that is fully subsumed to capitalist and authoritarian logics. The second is the construction of constituent space, the type of spatiality where horizontal and equitable relations can be built, however briefly. In this schema, as a variety of state space, public space is inherently undemocratic and oppressive, subsuming individual and mass desire to the forms and strictures of liberal political society. Constituent space, on the other hand, is the space of freedom and equality unmediated by the oppressive structures of society, including capital and the state as well as identity-based inequalities. Although there are many more varieties of constituent space than those produced during mass mobilizations, such as the democratic spaces of anarchist spokescouncils or the spaces of Food Not Bombs[8] free food giveaways, in this section I focus on mass demonstrations due to their high visibility and the way the state targets

[8] Spokescouncils are a directly democratic form of consensus-based decision making widely employed by anarchists. Food Not Bombs is, essentially, a loosely organized anarchist practice in which activists gather edible food that is going to waste (usually food past its prime that supermarkets have thrown away in dumpsters) and distribute it freely to anyone who wishes to eat.

them for concerted action. The very publicity of mass demonstrations allows for an examination of the interplay between the dialectic of public space and the desire for constituent space.

In the remainder of this paper I examine anarchist strategy and tactics since Seattle in order to demonstrate the antagonism of anarchist direct action to the category of public space, and to develop a better understanding of the relationship between public space and constituent space. I do this primarily through analysis of anarchist movement publications called 'zines. Anarchist direct actions of significant size are usually followed by "after-action reports" prepared by organizers and participants in the protests. These attempt to learn lessons from the successes and failures of the campaigns, and to insure a variety of counter-institutional memory within the broad anarchist movement. I have chosen four protests to examine due to their importance to contestations of public space. These are the 2003 Miami Free Trade Area of the Americas summit protest (FTAA), the 2004 Democratic National Convention in Boston, MA, and the 2004 Republican National Convention in New York City, and the 2008 Republican National Convention in St. Paul, Minnesota. I will also describe how the state attempted to deal with these anarchist tactics at each event, taking care to clarify the ways that public space was used to mold dissent into acceptable forms, or to crush any unrecuperable constituent spaces that might appear.

Blockades and Property Destruction

On November 30th, 1999 tens of thousands of activists assembled on the streets of Seattle, Washington to oppose a meeting of the World Trade Organization. While most activists opted for traditional, sanctioned forms of dissent including legal permitted mass marches, other protesters from the more radical Left engaged in a blockade of the city center, catching the Seattle police unawares and succesfully shutting down the city, denying WTO delegates the ability to convene their meetings, and opening a new chapter in American protest politics.

These protests in Seattle hold an almost mythic place as the imaginative birthsite of the alter-globalization movement and a source of inspiration and energy for radical activists across the world (Solnit and Solnit 2009). The direct action tactics utilized at the Seattle protests, especially the strategy of blockading the city and shutting down meetings, morphed into a kind of revolutionary best-practice to be deployed whereever Imperial capital reared its head (Sheppard and Hayduk 2002).

Direct action at the Seattle WTO protests consisted primarily of two types. The first was the official plan of the Direct Action Network (DAN), a collection of largely anarchist and anarchistic domestic radicals in partnership with third world NGOs, to prevent the summit from occurring through blockading access to the center of the city. This plan, which was put into place over a period of several months leading up to the WTO, consisted of autonomous groups taking

intersections in the downtown core and non-violently occupying those spaces to shut down traffic, making it difficult for WTO delegates to get to the summit (Sheppard 2002). The blockade happened at the same time as the largescale permitted labor march, which caused the police to split their attention between suppressing one action while attempting to marshall another.

> What exactly happened during the crucial hours of the Battle in Seattle is shrouded in confusion and controversy, but the broad outlines can be discerned. The street action falls into three distinct phases: first, the Direct Action Network (DAN) protesters seized and held a handful of strategic intersections, immobilizing the police. Second, the police strategy fragmented over two contradictory goals: suppressing the DAN protests and allowing the labor parade. Third, the labor parade failed in its goal of controlling and diverting the DAN protesters away from the Convention Center. The influx of reinforcements who abandoned the labor parade and joined the DAN protests left the streets more firmly in the control of the protesters, despite the use of tear gas by police since around 10 a.m. By approximately 3p.m. Tuesday, the battle was decided and the Direct Action Network had prevailed in their goal of shutting down the conference.... The battle continued for several days, spreading into other areas of the city (Armond 2001).

The second form of protest that is often conflated with the DAN organized blockade, and which many non-violent activists are at pains to distance themselves from, was the targeted property destruction undertaken by autonomous affinity groups during the blockade. I quote at length from the words of the Black Bloc ACME collective in order to provide a sample of direct action rhetoric.

> We contend that property destruction is not a violent activity unless it destroys lives or

causes pain in the process. By this definition, private property--especially corporate private property--is itself infinitely more violent than any action taken against it. Private property should be distinguished from personal property. The latter is based upon use while the former is based upon trade. The premise of personal property is that each of us has what s/he needs. The premise of private property is that each of us has something that someone else needs or wants. In a society based on private property rights, those who are able to accrue more of what others need or want have greater power. By extension, they wield greater control over what others perceive as needs and desires, usually in the interest of increasing profit to themselves. Advocates of "free trade" would like to see this process to its logical conclusion: a network of a few industry monopolists with ultimate control over the lives of everyone else. Advocates of "fair trade" would like to see this process mitigated by government regulations meant to superficially impose basic humanitarian standards. As anarchists, we despise both positions. Private property--and capitalism, by extension--is intrinsically violent and repressive and cannot be reformed or mitigated. Whether the power of everyone is concentrated into the hands of a few corporate heads or diverted into a regulatory apparatus charged with mitigating the disasters of the latter, no one can be as free or as powerful as they could be in a non-hierarchical society. When we smash a window, we aim to destroy the thin veneer of legitimacy that surrounds private property rights. At the same time, we exorcize that set of violent and destructive social relationships which has been imbued in almost everything around us. By "destroying" private property, we convert its limited exchange value into an expanded use value. A storefront window becomes a vent to let some fresh air into the oppressive atmosphere of a retail outlet (ACME Collective 1999: 2).

Different as they may appear on the surface, and despite the controversies that have raged within the radical protest community since the WTO, both forms

of protest, blockade and property destruction, operate as a challenge to the category of public space and an attempt to escape the dialectic of public space. The blockade lays claim to urban space which is formally public and wrests control of that space from both the state which serves as the steward of the public, and from other public users of the streets, such as motorists. The struggle to institute a blockade is not done in the pursuit of forming a public, rather it is a show of force. Although the blockade received a great deal of media attention, and certainly had an impact on public opinion, it did not do so through rational deliberation. Rather, the blockade intervened directly in the ability of transnational governance to forward the neoliberal agenda of free trade. Compare this with the labor marches of the day that sought to express their opposition to further free trade deals, contributing to public deliberation through a reasoned discourse that respected liberal process. This is not to suggest that the labor march was bad or even ineffective, that is a different question. Instead, the distinction is analytic; the blockade was an expression of force, while the march was primarily symbolic.

On the other hand, the targeted property destruction engaged in by black bloc activists sought to directly intervene in the reproduction of consumer society and spectacular capitalism, if only briefly, through breaking windows and fighting with police. Such actions arguably kept the police so busy and caught them so off guard that the blockade had a chance to be effective (CrimethINC 2005). The assault on private property, and the critique of private property relations

referenced by the ACME collective above, clearly makes the connection between private property and the public sector embodied in the neoliberal state. For anarchists, the distinction between private property and state property is a dubious one, since the protection of private property is one of the primary functions of the state (see for example (Proudhon 1970). If property is theft, then public property is no less so.

Both of these actions were varieties of struggle *in* public space, but neither of them were struggles *for* public space. As Mitchell (2005) argues, *rights* to public space are gained through struggle. But struggles in public space for control over that space are not always struggles in the name of the public. The public is a unitary conception, it makes one out of many, the multitude becomes the people in their relation of subjection to the sovereign. Anarchist direct action refuses to exist within the unitary conception of the people, emerging instead as a differentiated multitude against both public and private. By refusing the relation of subjection that public space produces, anarchist direct actions also constitute a refusal to positioned as members of the public. By refusing to address the public sphere, refusing to participate in symbolic protest, and refusing the authority of police to control the spaces of the city, anarchist direct action poses itself as external to the categories of liberal politics, and as external to the liberal populace, the public.

(Re)Constituting Public Space

In the face of this struggle against public space the police were quick to develop counter-measures capable of frustrating the plans of direct action activists. Specifically, police attempted to leverage disputes between liberal and more direct action activists in order to turn the one against the other. The Direct Action Network (DAN), a coalition of tactically aggressive groups whose goal was to prevent the WTO from convening by blockading the site of the ministerial, was significantly estranged from the Labor movement and from those participating in Black Bloc actions. While the Labor movement rejected the illegality of the DAN's approach to blockading and did not want to be associated with such tactics, Black Bloc anarchist protesters who would not pledge non-violence and reject property destruction as a legitimate tactic were excluded by DAN leadership (Levi and Murphy 2006). Labor worked with the government in order to keep their participants out of the downtown core and therefore out of contact with the blockade. Additionally, 'non-violent' activists directed police toward acts of property destruction by Black Bloc anarchists, and even physically confronted activists engaged in targeted window smashing (CrimethINC 2005).

"This separation, negotiated with the state by labor and environmental NGOs, enabled the coalition to avoid 'mixing' with more radical downtown protests. But by agreeing to a division of the physical space of resistance, labor and environmental groups also solidified a political and ideological distancing from the downtown crowd, thereby losing their capacity to support --- and build

face-to-face alliances with – those protesters who adopted a more confrontational position" (Wainwright 2000: 6). In effect, the separation between symbolic protesters and direct action activists allowed the police to impose a 'good activists/bad activists' frame on the protest. This is unfortunate because this frame is one that is widely mobilized already by the media and was therefore ideologically acceptable to the mainstream media as an explanatory discourse (Boykoff 2006).

As Wainwright (2000) argues, the spatial separation between differently oriented protest groups operated as a technique of political distancing in an attempt to present liberal protest grievances as separate from those of radical activist groups. Although such separation may be operationalized in the pursuit of solidarity or through respect for differences (as I demonstrate in the following chapter), in this case separation worked as a tactic for the molding of dissent to liberal norms. The target of this spatial distancing was twofold; first, it was conceived to signal ideological distance to the media organizations covering the protests and thus to protect the message of liberal protesters from being conflated with the demands of more radical elements. Second, spatial separation also served to signal differentiation to the police, allowing security personnel to make relatively clear judgments as to which groups could be trusted to obey the law, and which groups could be safely designated criminal. In this case, the desire of liberal protesters for publicity through the public sphere function of public space placed them at strategic odds with direct action activists,

though they were likely already at ideological odds before the protests even began.

In the case of Seattle, the non-violence mandate agreed to by most groups participating in the Direct Action Network blockade and the Labor marches did not protect non-anarchist protesters from police violence, which was post-hoc justified by police on the basis of limited property destruction in some parts of the urban core (Sheppard and Hayduk 2002). Although protester violence was the primary rhetoric used by police to justify the offensive use of teargas, rubber bullets and other less lethal weapons, there is some disagreement as to whether property destruction began before or after police escalated their tactics (Fernandez 2008, Sheppard and Hayduck 2002, Starhawk 2002). It would seem that police violence was more of a response to the success of the non-violent blockade than it was to the breaking of windows (Boykoff 2006).

After Seattle, police used the spectre of riots and widespread violence as a strategic trope for the destabilization of radical protest movements, as well as a tool for the legitimation of previously unpopular preemptive militarized escalations of force. In the aftermath of the WTO, Seattle police were roundly criticized not for the violence they unleashed on protesters, but rather for being unable to contain and crush protest movements (Heffelfinger and Lugar 2008). Eventually the chief of police as well as the mayor of Seattle both lost their jobs because

they had proven incapable of maintaining public space as a site of merely discursive struggle.

Avoiding the fate of Seattle has become a driving force in American protest policing and the politics surrounding conventions and summits. As a report on the 2008 RNC put it “no police department since 1999 wants to be responsible for another WTO” (Heffelfinger Lugar 2008:26). One result of this was a significant escalation of police violence at summits around the world, which culminated in the 2001 Genoa, Italy protests in which police killed a young protester as anti-G8 protests turned into riots and streetfighting. Increasingly, police began to plan for violent confrontations with protesters, and the techniques and technologies through which they prepared for these confrontations mirrored this expectation.

Importantly, this escalated force is a technique to maintain the publicity of public space through preventing urban space from being appropriated and produced as a constituent space of political force. In order for police to effectively use widespread violence in the defense of public space, those responsible for challenging publicity must be excluded from the purview of what counts as the public, which is made all the easier since these radical groups have already been at pains to make exactly this distinction themselves.

In pursuit of this exclusion, police and security agencies have developed and refined a discursive strategy pre-emptively blaming anarchists for police violence and over the top security at national protest events (Fernandez 2008).

By mobilizing the fear of 'out of town radicals', police attempt to differentiate between 'legitimate', 'local' protesters with a strong 'respect for the rule of law' and 'local values' and 'bad, out of town violent anarchists' who they equate with terrorists. Indeed, this rhetoric has become best-practice (Fernandez 2008).

Although police tactics were continually evolving post-Seattle, being refined through national best practice networks and expert studies by, among others, the Rand Corporation, three events stand out as examplars that led up to the 2008 RNC. These are the 2003 Miami Free Trade Area of the Americas summit/protests, the 2004 Democratic National Convention in Boston, MA, and the 2004 Republican National Convention in New York City.

In activist circles the Miami Model refers to the aggressive, pre-emptive, militarized policing of the 2003 Free Trade Area of the Americas Summit protests, in which police rolled out a cohesive new version of pre-emptive escalated force policing. This new model was an explicit attempt to react to the new prevalence of direct action tactics that debuted in Seattle. When activists arrived in Florida to protest the FTAA they were met by a heavily armed and armored police force of over 3000 officers trained and psyched up to 'defend' the city against 'violent anarchists' and re-establish police hegemony over public space.

When direct action groups decided in Miami to attempt a blockade similar to that accomplished in Seattle, the police were ready for them. Police established cordoned off march routes lined with riot police, blocked intersections

and directed the protest marches away from the fence surrounding the summit. When protesters tried to leave the march route or to tarry too long in public space they were met with significant police violence including rubber bullets, concussion grenades, and tear gas (Wainwright and Ortiz 2006). Police secured the space early, sending out patrols of heavily armed police in the days leading up to the summit in order to maintain control of the city at all times and prevent activists from ever getting the upper hand.

Most important to this analysis is the fact that police used escalated force pre-emptively, and despite a clear lack of violent behavior by protesters. Rather than attempting to handle the protests using conventional techniques first, and only then turning to escalated force if such techniques failed, police in Miami immediately confronted protesters as though they were criminals rather than legitimate dissidents. This militarized pre-emptive policing sought to establish a zone of control within the city in which protesters were subject to intimidation, corralling, and violence. The central business district in the Miami model then operated as a space of exception, and unauthorized presence therein marked one as suspect, potentially criminal, and subject to coercive physical methods of control.

In addition to massive shows of police force, Miami is also notable in that the Miami city council adopted restrictive legal provisions exclusively for the week of the convention that prohibited protesters from carrying a variety of items that might be used as weapons. This included obvious weapons, but also extended

to practically any objects that could conceivably be used as bludgeons or projectiles (anything hard enough to hit someone or small enough to be thrown), a rather large, ambiguous, and highly subjective set of categories. According to Fernandez (2008) the law gave police wide leeway in deciding what counted as a potential weapon and gave them authority to stop, search, and detain protesters essentially at will. The ordinance also made public assemblies of eight or more persons, gathered for more than thirty minutes in public space, illegal (Fernandez 2008: 72). Finally, this law was rescinded three months after the protest, clearly indicating the exceptional nature and special status of the protests. Both of these techniques, pre-emptively militarized police presence and exceptional protest laws, seek to gaurantee the publicity of some public space by forcefully excluding any political action that exceeds discursive symbolism.

The activists' attempt to shut down the FTAA through tactics similar to those employed in Seattle was an utter failure. This was in part due to an agreement between anarchists and labor unions that no organized direct action would take place during official labor marches, giving police free reign to deal with anarchists with the full brunt of their force and free of the fear of accidently punishing legitimate protesters (CrimethINC 2005). Police tactics of tightly controlling urban space prevented activists from establishing a blockade. Activists also lacked the element of surprise that enabled such a stunning victory in Seattle. The story of Miami, then, is one of increased policing and violence

directed against radical activists, while also separating direct action from symbolic protest.

At the 2004 Democratic National Convention in Boston, so-called free speech zones (sometimes mockingly referred to by activists as 'free speech cages') achieved widespread notoriety. These zones corral dissent into delimited spaces where any politics of force may be excluded. In a way, free speech zones encapsulate the public sphere function of public space, while at the same time ensuring that they do not devolve into constituent spaces. Free speech zones restrict dissent to discursive forms through material caging, as such they are a concretization of the failure of negotiated management to contain the constituent energies of the anarchist movement, or the terrorist threat.

The case of the Boston DNC was particularly egregious – police designated a free speech zone out of sight and speech range from the convention, located over 450 feet from the convention center underneath a highway overpass, surrounded by a tall fence topped with razor-wire (Heffelfinger and Lugar 2009). Although this cage was challenged in court by the ACLU and various protest groups, its constitutionality was upheld by a judge citing the extraordinary threat of terrorist violence in post-9/11 America. Although the judge called the free speech zone "a grim, mean, and oppressive space whose ominous roof is supported by a forest of girders that obstruct sight lines throughout as the tracks slope toward the southern end. The overall impression created by the DZ (designated speech zone) is that of an internment camp" (Judge Douglas

Woodcock cited in Heffelfinger and Lugar 2008: 28), he ruled in the end that it was the fault of direct action protesters that the rights of 'good protesters' should be infringed.

> Two aspects of the DZ situation make the circumstances irretrievably sad. First, the many who wish vigorously but peacefully to express their dissent are inhibited in their abbility to reach their intended audience because the recent experience has shown that there is a reasonable likelihood that an aggressive few will insist on expresssing themselves through the use of violence. We have come to a point where it may be anticipated, at this and similar national security events, that some significant portion of the demonstrators, among those who want the closest proximity to delgates or participants, consider assualt, even battery, part of the arsenal of expression (Judge Douglas Woodcock cited in Heffelfinger and Lugar 2008: 29).

This rhetoric of violence elides direct action protest and property destruction with terrorism, using the horror of the latter as a tool for the suppression of the former.

Political protest emerged as an object of post-9/11 security concern, which was resolved through the spatial segregation of protest from its target, and its seclusion from centers of power through the technology of free speech zones. The creation of free speech zones refined the Miami techniques of spatial control by creating sites for protest which defacto defined the rest of the city as an un-free speech zone. This innovation allowed the generalized state of exception to be lifted, and for it to be localized. Presence in the city center did not automatically make one a criminal, however any protest behavior outside of the free speech zones could be legitimately shut down. Rather ironically, few

activists protested in Boston, likely due to disagreements between anarchist organizers advocating a diversity of tactics and liberal groups advocating non-violence, as well as anticipation of a Miami-like reception.

Finally, at the 2004 RNC in New York City the NYPD utilized several techniques for the suppression of dissent that have contributed to continuing struggles between protesters and police. First, officials in New York employed an enormous survellience apparatus aimed at radical organizers in the US and around the world for a year prior to the RNC (Dwyer 2007). Extensive infiltration and surveillence of protest groups, attempts by police to keep files on protesters' political beliefs, as well as illegally taking fingerprints of protesters arrested for minor crimes are all indicative of the centrality of intelligence to post-Seattle, post-9/11 protest policing (NYCLU 2005). As surveillance is the topic of a latter chapter of this dissertation, I will not go into it in detail here. Suffice it to say that the surveillance and infiltration of protest groups is of increasing importance for state strategies for the control of direct action protest. Of more immediate concern to this chapter, police engaged in pre-emptive mass arrests of activists prior to the RNC, as well as the prolonged detention of those activists during the RNC itself.

The mass arrests targetted suspected radicals and protest organizers. For example, on Aug. 27th, 2004 police arrested over 250 people participating in a critical mass bike ride on the eve of the convention and held them for an excessive period that interfered in their ability to participate in protests and likely

intimidated some from engaging in protest actions (NYCLU 2005). In this case, and others during the convention, police surrounded protesters, or cyclists in this case, with orange safety netting, trapping them, ordering them to disperse and, when they were unable to do so due to the fences, immediately arresting them for failure to disperse or presence at an unlawful assembly. In all, over 1800 people were arrested during the 2004 RNC, the most arrests ever at any political convention in the United States (NYCLU 2005).

Once these protesters were arrested police held them for an inordinantly long time. "Of the approximately 1,800 people arrested during the Convention, nearly 1,500 were charged with minor offenses such as parading without a permit or disorderly conduct. Under New York law, these offenses are not even considered crimes but instead violations. Under standard NYPD procedure, people charged with violations generally are not held for arraingment before a judge but instead are given what is known as a desk appearance ticket or a summons. Under either procedure, the person under arrest usually is released in a few hours. When someone is to be arraigned, the person is supposed to be presented to a judge within 24 hours of arrest" (NYCLU 2005: 14). Of those arrested in connection with the RNC almost all were held for arraignment despite the less serious nature of their alleged violations. According to research by the NYCLU, up to 40% of those arrested were held for 36 hours or longer. These figures have led some to conclude that the NYPD purposively dragged its feet in

processing RNC arrestees in order to illegally prevent them from joining in legal protests (NYCLU 2005).

Additionally, police at the 2004 RNC employed the discursive tactic of vilifying anarchist and direct action protesters, stirring up fear among the public through equating protesters with terrorists. The New York Post reported a "'top level source' with knowledge of police intelligence gathering as saying 'these people are trained in kidnapping techniques, bomb making and building improvised munitions'" (quoted in NYCLU 2005: 19). Additionally, an FBI official was quoted in the August 19th Daily News as saying that some activists were "plotting bloody confrontations during the Republican National Convention" (quoted in NYCLU 2005: 19). This rhetoric appears to have been deployed as an attempt to set the groundwork for repressive police actions that might otherwise be seen as unsavory by the public.

Finally, at the 2008 RNC in St. Paul, Minnesota police and federal security agencies developed a melange of the above techniques that was notable not so much for its innovation, but rather for the level of violence unleashed by police on protesters in an attempt to prevent the development of constituent space in the downtown core. Though the events of the 2008 RNC are the subject of extensive analysis in the following chapters I will here summarize the highlights of policing strategy and tactics.

These practices included months of foot dragging on issuing protest permits, the development of a large free speech zone/exclusion zone around the

perimeter of the convention center, the provision of a stage and sound system for public speaking that was under the control of the police and that served to encourage discursive dissent and delegitimate direct action, preemptive raids on the homes of protest organizers and arrests of leading activists, the use of terrorism charges against protest organizers, extensive infiltration of anarchist protest groups as well as undercover surveillience of activist meetings, a concerted campaign to break radical-liberal solidarity (see chapter 3), and the extensive use of less-lethal weapons against a variety of protest groups. In fact, out of an estimated 10,000 participants in the anti-RNC protests police made nearly 850 arrests, nearly half of them on felony charges. Whereas the NYPD arrested a mere 1500 activists out of half a million protesters, the arrests in St. Paul represented a significant proportion of protesters (nearly 8.5%). The scale of arrests and police violence at the 2008 RNC shocked Twin Cities activists and challenged the solidarity between protest groups (which I deal with in the following chapter).

Conclusion

After Seattle “police have begun to secure space, erect barricades, create security (or frozen) zones, and engage in mass arrests. This refinement in tactics is the state’s response to radical protest groups’ refusal to respect the norms of public space. Instead of relying on negotiations and permits to engage protesters, it has moved to control the physical landscape around a protest, aiming to prevent another Battle of Seattle” (Fernandez 2008: 93). The crackdown on protest in public space, what has been understood as an assualt on free speech, dissent, and the possibility of a democratic public sphere, is actually largely a reaction to new protest tactics. It is not mere dissent that so threatens the liberal state, it is non-recuperable constituent power, in this case anarchist direct action. The blockade in Seattle expressed popular power as force, the summit was prevented against the wishes of the state. This event challenged the power of the state to effectively govern, it also challenged state legitimacy in a manner that did not contribute to the reproduction of the representative political system.

The state responded to this popular power with violence and spatial systems of social control that were designed to prevent autonomous social power from being expressed while protecting recuperable forms of dissent, albeit in somewhat confined spaces. Public space had to be insulated from radical infiltration while also remaining open to at least the image of liberal protest qua discourse in public. The point here is that an examination of the articulation between protest and policing reveals, contrary to dominant narratives from the

relative Left, that the crackdown on dissent was the result of the autonomous power of radical social movements, not merely an authoritarian attempt to quash liberal dissent. In the next chapter I examine how liberal and radical protest groups at the 2008 RNC appropriated the police's technology of separation as a form of counter-conduct that again put security forces on the defensive.

Chapter 3: Governmentality and the Spatialities of Contestation and Control

> Disciplinary space tends to be divided into as many sections as there are bodies or elements to be distributed. One must eliminate the effects of imprecise distributions, the uncontrolled disappearance of individuals, their diffuse circulation, their unusable and dangerous coagulation; it was a tactic of anti-desertion, anti-vagabondage, anti-concentration. It's aim was to establish presences and absences, to know where and how to locate individuals, to set up useful communications, to interrupt others, to be able at each moment to supervise the conduct of each individual, to asses it, to judge it, to calculate its qualities or merits. It was a procedure, therefore, aimed at knowing, mastering and using. Discipline organizes an analytical space. (Foucault 1977)

In the previous chapters I have argued that studies of contentious politics should center the articulation between domination and contestation (Ch. 1) and that public space is a liberal spatiality that is sometimes contested by social movements (Ch. 2). In this chapter I build on the previous two by looking at how the crisis of public space that was created through the anarchist rejection of negotiated management policing has been countered through a set of techniques of governance aimed at preserving freedom through the functional segmentation of public space that sorts activists into "good" and "bad" populations to be identified, monitored, and operated upon. I also examine how activists have responded to these new techniques by developing their own counter-conducts that contest the plans of the state and resist the imposition of liberal spatialities –

separation and categorization in the pursuit of governance -- in favor of a space of solidarity – an activist appropriation of separation as a technology for building radical solidarity against the state.

In what follows I first give a brief explanation of Foucault's concept of governmentality. I then provide two examples of how, in the post-Seattle 1999 era, state rationality seeks to know protest groups such that they can be operated on. I then discuss how police working to prepare for the 2008 RNC mobilized a place-based discourse of "Minnesota nice" in an attempt to cultivate liberal dissenting subjects in the place of radical militancy. Finally, I examine how a broad coalition of protest groups developed a set of guidelines called the Saint Paul Principles that contested liberal forms of governmentality in favor of new techniques for producing inter-group solidarity, or what the late Foucault might term the development of counter-conducts.

Governmental Rationality

Governmentality is a rationality of constitution; it is a liberal ordering mechanism that cultivates liberal subjects through the provision and mechanism of freedom. Protest permits, police liaisons, and free speech zones are technologies for the cultivation of liberal dissent in the face of insurgent constituent power in the guise of Black Blocs, terrorist threats and various illiberal movements. It is through governmental techniques that these threats are

identified, categorized, ordered, and ultimately made available to be worked on by constituted power. However, the story of governmentalities as methods of domination needs to be supplemented with an account of the techniques of rebellion, the technologies of constituent power. Foucault terms these rebellious operations “counter-conducts” (Foucault 2007).

Governmentality is the logic of conducting the conduct of the populace, of guiding action and subjectivity at a distance through certain techniques and technologies (Gordon 1991). The tactics, techniques, and technologies of government are aimed at the ‘correct’ disposition of people and things (Foucault 1991). This ‘correct’ disposition is immediately spatial. In terms of locational coordinates it is the aim of governmental rationality to know those objects over which it rules, including where they are, so that they may be ordered. Ordering is done in such as way as to maximize the common good, which is defined rather circularly by the state as subjection to sovereignty (Foucault 1991). In order to maximize the common good there must be techniques and technologies capable of accurately identifying and locating the subjects and objects that are ruled. Historically, these tools have included the development of mapping, statistics, and censuses, each of which provided information as to the quantity, quality, intensity, and location of the subjects and objects of government. The sovereign must also make the relations between things and people known. The associations between subjects and objects must become an object of sovereign inquiry so that good relations can be encouraged and less productive relations

can be reformed (Foucault 1991). While Foucault is concerned with the birth of the liberal era and the techniques through which liberal subjects were created, governmentality did not cease to develop and operate with the ascension of liberal hegemony. To the contrary, governmentality is continually constitutive of modern forms of rule (Rose 1996).

Governmentalities, at least in part, actively constitute political imaginaries and life-worlds through the continual shaping of the private self's relation to itself and others. The disciplinary spaces of the prison and the school, for example, actively form some subjects as criminals and others as students, and yet others as students likely to become criminals. These techniques are not immutable, they change dramatically through time and space and are deeply embedded in social change and stasis – one may even say that they constitute change and stasis through structuring the conditions of possibility for various subjects to understand and operate in the world. Of particular importance to the present chapter is the shifting governmentality of protest and social control in post-Seattle/post-9/11 America in which the conduct of contestation has undergone significant shifts – and is being actively shaped by the interaction of activists pushing the bounds of dissent, and police and security agencies' attempts to use anti-terrorist and anti-anarchist techniques to mold contestation into liberal dissent.

Freedom is a key component of liberal governmentality that is mobilized to operate on contestation and dissent. In the case of protest and dissent, the

freedom to speak becomes one of the prime motivators for liberal political practice. A form of political engagement becomes illegitimate when it interferes with the free speech of another person. Through this mechanism the freedom of persons to speak becomes the limit mechanism of the rights of another – I can say whatever I like insofar as my speech does not infringe upon the freedoms of another. So, along with freedom to act comes responsibility to police one's own actions and to act in accord with the constituted forms of participation. Failure to abide by these limits is perceived as anti-social, immature, and, indeed, illiberal. A politics that goes beyond speech then comes to oppose free speech. The application of force in protest politics, or of constituent power, becomes the anti-thesis of freedom because the protesters force inhibits the freedom of others to their own expression. For example, the 2008 RNC blockade was roundly criticized by government officials, journalists, and portions of the public for denying the Republicans their own rights to freedom of speech and assembly.

Though many studies have discussed the crackdown on freedom of speech and assembly in post-Seattle/9/11 America, few have investigated the ways that social movements have actively contested this process. In this chapter I examine the articulation between governmental technologies for the socio-spatial control of protest and the Saint Paul Principles, an agreement between social movement organizations designed to push back against state security and de-escalation measures at the 2008 RNC. I argue that one of the central modes of the social control of dissent since Seattle 1999 has been the separation of

liberal protesters from radical direct action groups in the spaces and times of the city. The Saint Paul Principles contest this technology of social control through appropriating separation as a tool for the construction of solidarity instead of the reproduction of fractured resistance.

Contemporary technologies for the social control of dissent operate to segregate resistance into places custom-made for discipline and control. Zick (2005) refers to these as “tactical places”, places designed specifically for the control of political speech and action. As Wendy Brown argues in relation to the proliferation of security walls in Israel/Palestine and the US/Mexico border, these physical barriers built to materially control populations are indicative of the breakdown of modern governmentality, populations can no longer be trusted to police themselves. Rule through freedom is in some cases failing, requiring more brute modes of social control (Brown 2008). In the past decade various forms of constituent power have staged assaults on liberal democracy. From the anti-globalization mobilization of the putative multitude, to the terrorism of al-Qaeda, to the tactics of patriarchal anti-choice movements who blockade clinics and murder doctors, the liberal state has been forced to create new tools to control these constituent expressions that it cannot or will not co-opt.

Legacies from all three of these trajectories of constituent uprising are increasingly manifested in the technologies for social control that are deployed in public space. Anti-abortion fundamentalism has given us free speech exclusion zones around important sites. Originally designed to protect the rights of women

to access healthcare without being assaulted, anti-protest bubble laws have been applied to all manner of protest-able events where dissent might be uncomfortable or potentially dangerous (Mitchell 2005). The precedent of the right of women to enter abortion clinics unharassed has led to a valuation of people's right to be left alone as higher than the right of dissent to be heard (Mitchell and Staeheli 2005). This right to be left alone has been adopted in contemporary spaces of dissent, which are built around the strategy of preventing dissent from unduly inconveniencing the actions of those who are protested against, or those in the vicinity who may be going about their everyday business (Mitchell 2005).

The legacy of Seattle 1999 lies in the now best practice of segregating "peaceful" protesters from more aggressive direct action activists, as well as in the practice of pre-emptive mobilization and escalation of police force (see chapter 2). Finally, 9/11 continues to impact the creation of spaces for dissent through a massively increased security economy (mammoth funding increases for security at all manner of dissent-worthy events), as well as new anti-terrorism laws and tools available for the use of law enforcement, even in situations that have little prospect of involving terrorism (ACLU 2003). The combination of these legacies has produced a new spatiality of discipline and control that has variously been referred to as "interdictory space" (Flusty 2001), "tactical space" (Zick 2005), and the production of "defensible locations" (Fernandez 2008). What these conceptualizations have in common is the pre-emptive and pervasive

physical control of spaces of dissent by the state. These spaces represent active governmental responses to the shifting forms of dissent in the present era.

In order to avoid being made the enemies of freedom, activists struggling against the state must develop counter-conducts capable of redefining freedom and legitimate action both in their own eyes, and in the eyes of their putative allies. It is the process of operating on one's own subjectivity, or developing new ways of understanding protest, as a form of resistance to governmentality that defines the concept of counter-conduct.

In his lectures at the College De France that are compiled in "Security, Territory, Population", Foucault (2007) expands his project of investigating the techniques through which power creates subjects toward the study of resistance and the development of counter-conducts. The refusal of systems of conduct is accomplished through "revolts of conduct" (Foucault 2007), in which the production of subjects who comport themselves along the lines of governmental reason becomes itself the object of contention. Although this can happen as a mere individual refusal to be a good liberal subject, for example, petty criminality, vagabondage, etc, refusal can also operate as a political contestation of the conduct of conduct.

For the purposes of this chapter, counter-conducts will be defined as resistant practices that seek to contest the governmental conduct of conduct. Such practices are at once individual and social insofar as they require altering a subject's relation to him/herself, their relations to resistant groups, and those

groups' relations to authority and society. Counter-conduct describes "these forms of resistance that concern, set their sights on, and have as their objective and adversary a power that assumes the task of conducting men (sic) in their life and daily existence" and that "struggle against the processes implemented for conducting others" (Foucault 2007). Counter-conducts, then, are practices designed by individuals and communities in resistance to alter the scope of legitimate conduct and thereby challenge the ability of governmentality to reproduce the bounds of government through freedom.

Making Dissent Visible to the State

As I argued in chapter 2, the physical and ideological separation of protesters into "good" and "bad" categories, and into different spaces and times in the city, is a principal technique through which protest is understood and operated on in the contemporary U.S. In this section I examine some of the ways that this separation is accomplished through the production of protest as an object of state knowledge that can then be made the target of various interventions aimed at producing liberal speech as the hegemonic category of political participation.

In order to divide protest groups into "good" and "bad" categories the government must first have mechanisms for making the variety of protest groups known to intelligence and bureaucratic centers. Protest permits and sub-

contracted intelligence operations are two manners through which this is accomplished. Below I first examine protest permits in the context of the 2008 RNC, then I examine the particular case of a leaked intelligence report on anti-RNC protest organizing that was produced for the Department of Homeland Security by a private industry group, the American Transportation Associations' program Highway Watch.

Protest permits are a quickly proliferating municipally based legal mechanism for the spatial organization of dissent into city spaces and times that make protest as easily containable and police-able as possible. Though protest permits have a long history stretching back at least a century, in the contemporary period the expansion of protest permit legislation has been prompted by the success of direct action protest, and the lead taken by Washington, D.C. to require protest groups to register with the city to prevent security problems and locational conflicts (Borum 2005; Mitchell 2005). This is done through requiring that organizers of "first amendment" activities declare themselves to police and obtain a permit from the municipality that governs when, where, and in what fashion protests may be held (Mitchell 2005). By providing a legal avenue to gain protest rights, legal protests become clearly identifiable from illegal demonstrations that spurn the permit process. Any demonstration that occurs without a permit shows distain for the law and is therefore suspect.

Protest permit schemes also foster an ethos of separation between permitted and unpermitted demonstrations by forcing protest organizers to make cooperation with local police or resistance to the permit scheme a fundamental element of their demonstrations. In effect, protesters who obtain permits are announcing their respect for liberal protest norms while those who refuse to obtain a permit are announcing their contempt for at least some of these norms. This impulse to separate divergent forms of dissent allows police to rationally plan and distribute their resources to prevent Seattle-like situations from arising. As Mitchell and Staeheli (2005) have pointed out, in the past decade protest permit ordinances have become best-practice in the United States and models for initiating such schemes are continuously adopted and adapted by municipal governments, making protest permits particularly apt as a study in contemporary governmentalities.

In addition to ordering dissent in public space, protest permits also have a significant information gathering function, requiring permit applicants to provide law enforcement with contact information for group leaders, estimated attendance, protest type, protest location, and various other information. Some permit ordinances also require that protest organizers obtain liability insurance before they can obtain a permit, or requiring protest organizers to post a hefty deposit to pay for possible damages incurred if the protest were to turn violent or disruptive.

As Mitchell and Staeheli (2005) have argued, protest permits are a technique for regularizing dissent and incorporating it within the legal structure of the liberal state. This is done through a three-part operation; first applicants must supply the state with in-depth information regarding the proposed protest and its organizers. Second, protest permits allow the state to easily and pre-emptively allocate certain spaces for protest while keeping other spaces dissent free. Finally, through requiring protest organizers to contact and work with city government and the police in planning their protests, the institution of negotiated management policing is bolstered and protest is constructed as something that is done with the state rather than against it. This three-fold operation is paradigmatic of governmental techniques for the cultivation of conduct insofar as it works to locate and define the subjects of intervention, to correctly order those subjects in time and space, and to inculcate a subjectivity of docile self-rule in those it operates upon.

Permitting the 2008 RNC

In Saint Paul, Minnesota, since 2006, gatherings of more than 25 people in public space require a permit issued by the police department (City of Saint Paul 2009). Gathering without such a permit is unlawful and subject to dispersal. Failure to disperse is a crime. Section 366A of the Saint Paul City Code reads ”No person shall engage in or conduct any parade, race or public assembly

without a permit issued by the chief of police." Additionally, "*public assembly* means any meeting, demonstration, picket line, rally or gathering of more than twenty-five (25) persons for a common purpose as a result of prior planning in or upon any street, sidewalk or other public grounds in a place open to the general public" (City of Saint Paul 2009). Applicants for a parade permit are required to submit the following information:

> (1) The name, address and telephone number of the person seeking to conduct such parade, race or public assembly; this person should be the person in charge or chairperson of the parade, race or public assembly;
> (2) The names, addresses and telephone numbers of the headquarters of the organization for which the parade, race or public assembly is to be conducted, if any, and the authorized and responsible heads of the organization;
> (3) The requested date of the parade, race or public assembly;
> (4) The location of the parade, race or public assembly and the route to be traveled, including the starting point and the termination point;
> (5) The hours when such parade, race or public assembly will start and terminate;
> (6) The statement as to whether the parade, race or public assembly will occupy all or only a portion of the width of the streets proposed to be traversed;
> (7) The location by street of any assembly areas for such parade, race or public assembly;
> (8) The time at which units of the parade, race or public assembly will begin to assemble at any such area;
> (9) The intervals of space to be maintained between units of such parade or public assembly;
> (10) If the parade, race or public assembly is designed to be held by, or on behalf of, any person other than the applicant, the applicant for such permit shall file a letter from that person with the chief of police authorizing the applicant to apply for the permit on his behalf;
> (11) The type of parade, race or public assembly, including a description of activities planned during the event;
> (12) A description of any sound amplification equipment to be used in

connection with the parade, race or public assembly;

(13) The approximate number of participants (spectators are by definition not participants), including the type and number of animals and vehicles;

(14) The approximate number of spectators reasonably anticipated;

(15) A designation of any public facilities or equipment to be utilized; and

(16) Where the event is in an area covering two blocks or less of sidewalks, streets or other public property, the addresses of any properties that abut the location of the parade, race or public assembly;

(17) Where the event is in an area covering two (2) blocks or less of sidewalks, streets or other public property, a signed statement by the permit applicant stating that all the addresses of any properties that abut the location of the parade, race or public assembly, have received notification of the event.

(18) Any additional information that the chief of police finds reasonably necessary to a fair determination as to whether a permit should issue. (City of Saint Paul 2009)

This exhaustive information requires that legal protests be systematically planned and controlled by the organizers who stake their reputations with the city on the compliance of those participating in their protest action. Such a requirement mobilizes citizens in the policing of their own actions by staking their claims to lawful dissent on compliance with municipal code. This enrolls the protest organizers in policing the compliance of the protest that they have organized. In essence, protest organizers are positioned as the unofficial hand of the police in guaranteeing a lawful practice of dissent[9].

This positioning has been productive of tensions within the anti-

[9] As I discussed in chapter 2, this need to police themselves is further encouraged by the propensity of the media to disregard the message of protests and focus on any unlawful or spectacular elements instead. Liberal protest groups therefore are under pressure to carefully manage their marches and demonstrations such that the media is not so distracted by the medium that they forget the message entirely.

globalization movement since at least the 1999 WTO, when liberal protesters assaulted anarchists engaged in window smashing in an attempt to enforce legal compliance on direct action activists (ACME Collective 1999). In terms of the 2008 RNC, police attempted to portray groups that sought out permits as "good", law-abiding liberal citizens whose rights to freedom of speech and assembly were threatened by the illiberal actions of "bad" anarchist militants.

However, the scope of protest permits in making dissent visible to the state, and in rendering protesters their own agents of policing, is held back by an internal limitation; protest permits only make known those protesters who are willing to declare themselves to the state. Clearly, protesters who are engaging in potentially illegal forms of protest are unlikely to register their plans with the local police department. Other mechanisms are thus necessary to make these potentially criminal groups known and therefore operable on.

Neoliberal "Intelligence"

In the case of the RNC Welcoming Committee, which had no plans to register its strategy with the police in order to acquire a permit, a seemingly new form of neoliberal intelligence gathering was rolled out, though with limited success. After 9/11 the U.S. security apparatus underwent a dramatic restructuring which included the creation of the Department of Homeland Security as the federal agency in charge of domestic security. Homeland

Security made considerable attempts to enroll the public in its intelligence gathering operations (Office of the Inspector General 2008). One of the ways that this was accomplished was through partnership with industries that were deemed critical to domestic security, including the American trucking industry. The result was the founding of the Highway Watch Information Sharing and Analysis Center under the joint auspices of Homeland Security (DHS), the Transportation Security Administration (TSA), and the American Trucking Association (ATA) – the anti-union industrial organization of the American private trucking sector. This public-private intelligence amalgam was designed to:

> enhance homeland security through increased vigilance and awareness on highways. As mandated by Congress, since FY 2004, the Highway Watch® program trains segments of the Nation's surface transportation community in how to detect and report security threats on highways, how to avoid becoming a target for terrorist activity, and how to recognize potential highway safety hazards (Office of the Inspector General 2008)

Though the ATA had first created Highway Watch in collaboration with the Department of Transportation in 1998 in order to allow truckers to report dangerous conditions, accidents and crime to a centralized node, the anti-terror fervor of post-9/11 governance served to reorient Highway Watch toward a security-based mission that would enroll truckers in the protection of the 'Homeland'. Though this project was of limited value due to the philandering of

funds among anti-union groups, lack of oversight, and a proliferation of racially motivated, but otherwise baseless, security tips (Office of the Inspector General 2008), Highway Watch did manage to collect information on the RNC Welcoming Committee.

Because the RNC WC was promoting a strategy of road blockades to disrupt the Republican National Convention, Highway Watch produced a non-classified "For Official Use Only" and "Law Enforcement Sensitive" report on anti-RNC organizing. This document was leaked to the public on the website wikileaks.org, which allows people to anonymously upload confidential government documents so as to hide their identities and avoid retribution. The first paragraph of the document states:

> It contains information that may be exempt from public release under the Freedom of Information Act, (5 U.S.C. 552). This document is to be controlled, handled, transmitted, distributed, and disposed of in accordance with DHS policy relating to FOUO [For Official Use Only] information and is not to be released to the public, the media, or other personnel who do not have a valid "need-to- know" without prior approval of an authorized DHS official. No portion of this report should be furnished to the media, either in written or verbal form. Any requests for further dissemination outside of the intelligence and law enforcement community should be referred to the HWW- ISAC. (Kutcher 2008)

It is not known who released this report in violation of DHS rules. The Highway Watch report is entitled "Plans to Target Transportation Infrastructure Surrounding Republican National Convention " and is dated 27, March 2008.

The report is an analysis of the threat posed to domestic security by the RNC WC. At the time, Highway Watch employed three analysts with "intelligence backgrounds" to sort through the information that they received on potential threats and to analyze and distribute that information to state and local Fusion Centers (another DHS creation where local law enforcement, state officials, and federal security agencies share information and resources). All of the intelligence in the report appears to have been gleaned from publicly available Internet sites maintained by the RNC WC and its affiliates. This distinguishes the Highway Watch report from the protest permit information gathering capacities since it goes beyond gathering only information that is volunteered to the police and expands that to information that is on the internet – a much broader, and potentially less verifiable source of intelligence.

Though the report contains basic information that was available to anybody who cared to peruse the RNC WC's website, certain features of the report bear comment. First, the Highway Watch analysts consistently employ a rhetoric of terrorism when discussing RNC WC activities. These discursive framings construct the RNC WC as a threat to domestic security rather than as a protest group with legitimate grievances. In particular, the report describes the networked structure of anarchist organizing as "following the pattern of most terrorist networks" (Kutcher 2008). This report demonstrates that the "good" versus "bad" protester discourse is not just deployed by the state for public consumption, but is also integral to some governmental understandings of

political protest that goes beyond liberal speech.

However, as I hint above, the intelligence in the Highway Watch report is also rather unreliable. In describing the tactical repertoire of the RNC WC, the report states:

> The group [RNC WC] has also announced that they are purchasing tasers for its entire membership. Even though the *RNC-WC* denies that it is reacting to the St. Paul Police Department's recent purchase of similar non-lethal devices, or that the tasers are for anything other than personal protection, this announcement should not go unnoticed by law enforcement in the area, now or during the convention. Though they are accepting donations in person and via the Internet, it is unknown whether the group has the financial resources to buy such devices on a large scale since they range in price from $300 - $1000 (Kutcher 2008)

The above claim, that the Welcoming Committee was going to buy tasers for protesters, is a reference to a joke press release written by RNC WC members in an attempt to shame the City of St. Paul for spending millions of dollars on less-lethal weapons. In a post-9/11 irony, a playful attempt to politicize the political economy of terror that provided St. Paul with a 50 million dollar security budget and access to a huge variety of weapons for use on its own citizens is taken up and mischaracterized as a security threat by another organization funded by this same political economy of security. This report was apparently distributed to local and federal law enforcement agencies that were busy preparing security for the RNC. For a

policing amalgam of agencies flush with $50 million in federal security funding, and in the midst of training for possible terrorist assaults, one wonders what effect the “intelligence” contained in this report might have had. This is unknowable. What is clear, however, is that federal intelligence that was distributed to local law enforcement contained false information that mischaracterized anti-RNC organizing, equated anarchists with terrorists, and suggested that the RNC WC had plans and possibly means to harm law enforcement officers. In this case, neoliberal intelligence was, quite literally, a joke.

The public-private partnership nature of the Highway Watch program is typical of neoliberal governance schemes. By enrolling the anti-union industry group of truckers into national security operations the Highway Watch project set in motion a predictably biased mechanism of intelligence gathering. Whether it was gross incompetence or disingenuity that led to the taser claim being repeated as a security threat is not possible to know. However, the recitation of such a claim in an official security report certainly fits within the discursive framing of direct action activists as terroristic. In this case, the attempt to know protest groups and to make them visible also involved misrepresentation and construction of the group under study. Governmentalities make subjects at the same time that they identify them. Under the politics of security initiated by 9/11 and mapped onto post-Seattle organizing, the security and intelligence apparatus confronts challenges to the

status quo as threats. In the next section I turn to consideration of how Minnesota police officials developed a place-based discourse that reinforced the "good" vs "bad" activist binary. This discourse operated through a separation of "good" from "bad", cemented through an appeal to Minnesota Nice.

Minnesota Nice: Place-based rhetorics and the construction of "out of town anarchists"

In the Twin Cities, city governments and policing agencies (at least the St. Paul Police Department) pledged that the RNC would be a showcase of civility that would usher in a new St. Paul model of respectful dissent and pleasant policing. The liberal populace and local Democratic hegemony meant that local liberal politicians wanted to distance themselves from the Bush Presidential regime and Republican Party, while also reaping the entrepreneurial benefits of the convention and free air time on dozens of national and global media networks that would occur as a result of the convention[10]. By pledging a kinder and gentler

[10] On the surface, the decision to site the Republican National Convention in the Twin Cities was a bit counterintuitive – Minnesota is a famously liberal place. In Minneapolis there is a democratic mayor with roots in social movements and a city council comprised exclusively of Democrats and third-party Greens. In Saint Paul there is also a Democratic Mayor and a center-left council. Further, the previous democratic Mayor of St. Paul, Randy Kelly had recently lost his seat in a landslide due to a primary challenge from now Mayor Chris Coleman after Kelly had endorsed President Bush for a second

convention the St. Paul Police Department (PD) tried to roll back the clock on the last ten years of protest history and remake cops as the friends of protesters. They wanted to return to negotiated management policing, though in the end their ability to do so was hindered by the refusal of protest groups to be categorized and separated according to police plans.

Local officials seem to have been well aware of the potential for citizen unrest that could arise with the decision to host the 2008 RNC and took steps to portray the event as a sound business choice rather than a political issue. Local Democrats mobilized neoliberal discourses of urban entrepreneurialism in order to explain their seeming friendliness with the neoconservative Republican party. Additionally, public officials mobilized the language of the liberal public sphere as a challenge to those angry that the Repulican Party would have its convention on oppositional turf. Finally, police attempted to de-escalate protest through an appeal to Minnesota Nice, a colloquial expression referring to the supposedly friendly and welcoming qualities of Minnesotan culture. In this respect police promised a "St. Paul model" of protest policing that was explicitly posed against the escalation of violence model that had emerged as best practice since Seattle 1999 – what is sometimes referred to as the Miami model.

"This is not Miami, this is not New York." These were the words of Assistant Chief of Police, St. Paul P.D. Matt Bostrom at a panel discussion on

---

term. Additionally, St. Paul has not elected a Republican Mayor in over fifty years. At the height of the unpopularlty of the George W. Bush regime there was a sense of wonderment among many Twin Cities activists that the Republicans would be welcome at all.

Republican National Convention preparations on October 23rd, 2007 at the University of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minnesota, which I attended as a participant observer. The panelists at this meeting including Assistant Chief Bostrom[11], another officer from the St. Paul police department named Tom Smith, and two faculty members in the Peace and Justice Studies program at St. Thomas University. The audience included approximately 80 community members, most seemingly drawn from various activist communities, but also including a few active St. Paul residents. Outside the doors of the event were several members of the RNC Welcoming Committee handing out flyers denouncing the event because no direct action protest organizers were allowed to be on the panel, which had been organized by the Department of Peace Studies at St. Thomas University.

Bostrom was the officer in charge of RNC planning and security, and he had just been asked if the St. Paul P.D. was going to adopt the above mentioned Miami model of policing and security. He was quick to tell the audience that the St. Paul P.D. had studied the way that policing had operated at the 2003 Miami Free Trade Area of the Americas meeting (FTAA), as well as at the 2004 Republican and Democratic convetions in New York and Boston. Bostrom counterposed the militarization of police, the use of designated free speech zones, and the putative criminalization of protest at those events with what he

[11] Who in 2010 defeated Sheriff Fletcher for the office of Ramsey County Sheriff.

described as a new St. Paul model – which he envisioned as setting the new national best-practice for policing and security.

Grounding this appeal to the exceptionality of St. Paul was Bostrom's allusion to his own St. Paul roots. "I was born in St. Paul. I still live in St. Paul. I've been 25 years in the St. Paul police force." By rooting himself in the city of St. Paul Bostrom appealed to a latent "us" vs. "them" mentality that troubled traditional radical analyses of the police as the enemy at major protests, especially since Miami. He went on to say "When I was first assigned to be the officer in charge of the RNC I thought that it would be a disaster, but now I think it's an opportunity. I want the convention and the protests to go well and for St. Paul to be reflected well in this."

Thus, the impetus for the policing of the convention was presented as a sort of place-patriotism derived from the officers' pride in St Paul's special urban qualities. While it is impossible to know the intention behind his rhetoric, Bostrum's appeal to place posed the police and the protesters on the same side, as proud citizens of St. Paul confronted with an opportunity to demonstrate their reasonable liberalism in the face of both Republican officials and a history of violent protest at similar recent events in other locations. Among the assurances and appeals made by Bostrom that night were the promises that police at the Convention would be under local St. Paul control, that police would wear their normal uniforms rather than intimidating riot gear, that the entire city would be a free speech zone, and that protesters would have ample opportunity and space

to protest within full sight and sound of the Xcel center where the RNC was to be held.

Grounding these promises was the claim that St. Paul was a distinctive space with a cultural predilection toward respect and tolerance. Police in St. Paul employ a community policing model in which officers are assigned to neighborhoods and encouraged to make connections with residents, in an attempt to forestall crime and build a working relationship between cops and urban populations. Police discourses drew on their community policing practices as a route toward a conciliatory protest atmostphere. Bostrom repeatedly stated that he wanted a peaceful city during the RNC and promised police cooperation with protest groups in order to accomplish this. The attempt to frame the RNC as a conciliatory and civil space of representative democracy met with some applause, but also significant disbelief. Audience members posed questions to Bostrom and others on the panel about statements by the Hennepin County Sheriff, Bob Fletcher, that the county would be prepared for the arrests of up to 3,000 protesters, or rumors that large-scale protest pens were being secretly manufactured. To these questions Bostrom replied that the Sheriff's comments were "neither representative of police consensus nor helpful" in creating a peaceful event.

When a woman who lives in St. Paul and runs a Democrat-oriented blog asked what citizens should do to forestall violence from other presumably more radical demonstrators, Bostrom said that police would develop a system of

signals with ‘peaceful’ protesters whereby they could report ‘violent’ protesters to the police without having to confront said protesters themselves. The assitant chief then went on to say that he and many of the other police “lived in St. Paul” and “loved St. Paul”, and that keeping the peace and preventing violence during the RNC was both personally and professionally important to them. This he counterposed to “out of town knuckleheads coming here to cause trouble”, apparently an allusion to the anarchist mobilization against the RNC. The other officer on the panel stressed that the St. Paul police department had great respect for freedom of speech, and that they intended to protect the rights of both Republicans and protesters, but that people who planned on being “violent” or destroying property were not exercising rights. Rather, such activists were criminals who would be dealt with accordingly.

Additionally, when the same woman from the audience stated that her neighbors were fearfull of “Seattle-style” protesters coming in and “ruining” ‘their’ city, the panelists responded by framing the upcoming protests in terms of non-violent resistance, urging attendees to eschew physical force and embrace a very specific trajectory of civil disobedience and non-violence. Indeed, non-violent resistance was presented as central to a morally just mobilization. The first speaker lectured the assembled audience on the principles of non-violent resistance. He stated that the fervor of anti-Bush sentiment made the RNC a dangerous time and suggested that people might get carried away, provoking violence which in turn would drown out ‘the message’ to the media. He also

suggested that the moral key to non-violent resistance was respect for, and submission to, the law. He argued that Gandhi always held himself accountable to the law, and that accepting punishment is part and parcel of resisting the state. His talk discursively marginalized forceful protest tactics and the politics of anonymous property destruction, positioning them as antithetical to liberal values and probably immoral because those engaged in such actions seek to evade legal responsibility for their actions.

The second professor on the panel cautioned the crowd about agents provocateurs, and warned that protesters acting in a violent manner were likely police in disguise. He went on to discuss cases in which the police have infiltrated protest groups and been caught attempting to incite violence, and promised that he would lead a team of trained activists during the protests whose job would be to identify and neutralize agent provocateurs. The first professor then added that it was the responsibility of "peace groups to police themselves in non-violent ways. Even if you don't trust the police we need to find ways to keep the peace."

Officer Smith then added "A few years back the KKK [Ku Klux Klan] came to the state capitol. It had bad potential, but good citizens helped to identify trouble-makers. It was easy to tell who was doing what and no one was hurt – We've always done things differently here." Protesters were thus urged to actively police themselves and their comrades in the protest movement as an act of local pride and through an appeal to widely esteemed trajectories of non-

violent struggle. To allow "violent" protest to occur in their midst would be to fail to live up to their heritage as St. Paul residents and philosophical descendants of Gandhi and Martin Luther King in their struggle against such villains as the KKK.

The statements of the police and academics built on respect for liberal free speech and non-violent protest through a pre-emptive discourse directed at the de-escalation of the anti-RNC mobilization. The rhetoric used by the police mobilized praise of non-violence in order to delegitimate other forms of struggle. The suggestion made by the Peace Studies faculty member, that protesters utilizing more forceful methods of resistance might be undercover cops, seems to have had two functions. First, this discourse posed non-violence as an acceptable mode of dissent. Second, it expanded the appeal of non-violence beyond those already committed to such actions by implying that "violent" protesters might be police in disguise. This was an attempt to break solidarity between protest groups by sowing seeds of distrust.

In the activist imaginary of post-Seattle protest, a wide coalition of activist groups confronted the police and were succesful in their mobilization. However, in the discourse of St. Paul police and the St. Thomas Peace Studies faculty the police and local activists were united in their liberal tolerance of Republicans and against the illiberal tactics of "violent" activists. This discourse was complicated by the reference to agents provocateurs, which maintained the police as a source of anti-activist antagonism, as it likewise displaced non-non-violent resistance as the enemy of reasonable mobilization.

Both the police statements and those by the professors evinced a fear of violence at the RNC. However, the term “violence” was never defined, though several statements by police, panelists, and audience members suggested that violence to property and violence to persons were both included under the broader umbrella term. One of the police on the panel stated the duty of police to protect persons and property during his introductory comments. Additionally, the professor who had mentioned agents provocateurs also cited property destruction as the sort of action that undercover police might incite protesters to. Finally, the reference made by the Demoncratic blogger in the audience to “Seattle-style” violence was latter clarified as she referenced broken windows and overturned garbage dumpsters. In these cases, and many others, violence against private property and violence against persons were elided and the differences between the two minimized.

This rhetoric positioned Saint Paul liberals in opposition to radical out of town trouble-makers. The discourses of violence versus place-pride that emerged from this event posed liberal protesters and police as members of the same group -- good, liberal citizens of Saint Paul. At the same time, the rather vague enemy was posed as shadowy figures, perhaps out of town radicals, perhaps agents provocateurs, intent on inciting violence and sabotaging the opportunity to showcase Minnesota values. In this case place-connection and place-meaning were mobilized as a governmental trope to enroll citiziens in their

own policing, and to aid in controlling the conduct of those around them in accordance with supposedly local values.

The propagation of these “good” vs. “bad” activist categories is strategically important to post-Seattle 1999 policing because it forecloses the possiblity of effective large-scale direct action, such as the blockade of the World Trade Organization, which depended on he coexistence of liberal and radical actions in the same times and adjoining spaces of the city (see Ch. 2 for a discussion of this logic). If liberal activists preparing a legal march on the RNC distrusted radical direct action activists and were dedicated to working with the police to stymie direct action tactics, then police would relatively easily be able to “protect” the speech rights of liberals while simultaneously cracking down on radicals who would be spatially distinct from liberal events.

Separation needed to operate both ideologically, making clear distinctions between legal and illegal, moral and immoral, local and outside, and spatio-temporally, ensuring that these populations did not intermingle so as to allow the police to protect one population while arresting the other. This separation would allow police and the city of St. Paul to succeed in their neoliberal marketing agenda, enroll liberal support in the policing of radicals, and thereby defuse the volatile situation of inviting the Republicans to meet in a Democratic city. In this manner, making clear social and spatio-temporal distinctions between “good” liberal dissent and “bad” “violent” direct action was essential to ensuring that the 2008 RNC turned out to be a successful entrepreneurial venture with few

negative consequences for city officials. However, these attempts were actively complicated by a strong solidarity campaign between radical and liberal protest groups. Experienced protest organizers quite well aware of these police strategies developed counter-strategies in turn . These counter strategies minimized the effectiveness of police outreach and fearmongering from the start through orgnanizing novel forms of radical/liberal solidarity that pushed back against the 'good/bad' strategy and promoted intergroup conhesiveness as opposed to cooperation with police..

The Saint Paul Principles: Separation as Counter-Conduct

Despite the best efforts of the St. Paul police department, large numbers of prominent Twin Cities activists and several of the most visible groups organizing against the RNC resisted the attempt to separate liberal and radical protesters and enroll protesters in the policing of dissent. This was accomplished through an innovative agreement called the St. Paul Principles that were developed and agreed to by the RNC Welcoming Committee and the Coalition to March on the RNC and End the War. As has been previously explained, the RNC Welcoming Committee was the main anarchist organizing body for the mobilization against the RNC. The Welcoming Committee was attempting to orchestrate a blockade on the first day of the 2008 RNC, designed to prevent Republican delegates from travelling from their hotels to the Excel Energy Center

in downtown St. Paul where the 2008 RNC was being held. As the locally-based organizer of a national convergence, the Welcoming Committee was tasked with setting conditions under which the blockade could be maximally successful. The other primary group organizing against the 2008 RNC was the Coalition to March on the RNC and End the War (the Coalition). This was a very broad coalition of local and national liberal, progressive, and radical groups who banded together to organize a massive, legal, permitted march on the first day of the 2008 RNC that would bring tens of thousands of protesters within sight and sound of the Excel Center. At the local level the primary groups composing the Coalition were the Anti-war Committee, Communities United Against Police Brutality (CUAPB), and Women Against Military Madness (WAMM), though it also included dozens of other local and national groups that were somewhat less involved in the day to day operations of the coalition.

The Anti-war Committee is a Twin Cities-based political organization that uses civil disobedience and non-violent direct action to protest U.S. military actions. Some prominent members of this group are long-time activists with roots in the 1990's mobilization against the Gulf War and the movement against U.S. military operations in central America, as well as being veterens of the anti-nuclear campaigns of the 1980's. Additionally, some of those same leaders are members of the Freedom Road Socialist Organization, a revolutionary communist group. CUAPB is a local group that runs cop-watch programs, lobbys city and state government for police accountability reforms, and engages in

occasional acts of civil disobedience such as occupying city hall or disrupting city council meetings. Finally, WAMM is also a local organization that has been active for at least two decades in the Twin Cities. It is a women's organization that participates in weekly pickets against war, as well as occasional marches and demonstrations for various anti-war causes[12].

The RNC WC and the Coalition were mutually aware of each other's plans at least a year prior to the 2008 RNC. They were also aware of the possibility that their respective plans could conflict with each other. For example, it was possible that an effective blockade might prevent Coalition members from reaching downtown St. Paul for their scheduled march, or that the media uproar around the blockade might drown out the message of the somewhat less spectacular march. Additionally, anarchist organizers were aware that Coalition members would be under significant pressure to work with police to identify and immobilize blockade participants if this came to pass.

Prominent activists from the RNC WC and the Coalition recognized the 2008 RNC as an opportune time to have a protest with a great deal of impact, due to the public sentiment against the Republican Party in the run-up to the 2008 elections. These activists also drew inspiration from the history of struggles deriving from the Seattle 1999 WTO protests. The potential conflict between the

[12] Generally speaking, the Anti-war Committee engages in more illegal protests than the other two groups, although the leadership of Communities United Against Police Brutality often engage in verbal confrontations with power holders. WAMM's action repertoire is more discursive and passive than is that of the Anti-war Committee or CUAPB, and it has had a somewhat fraught relationship with more confrontational direct action groups in the past.

two demonstrations, as well as the shared desire to have a historic demonstration during this opportune time, provided a common ground for these groups to cooperate.

The result of this drive to cooperate was a set of principles developed by the Coalition and the RNC WC that were mutually agreed upon by both organizations and designed to allow a relatively united front against the Republicans and the police. Whereas police strategy involved separating the protest movement into "good" vs "bad" elements, activist strategy appropriated separation as a strategy to build solidarity. The Saint Paul Principles (St.P.P.) are as follows:

1. Our solidarity will be based on respect for a diversity of tactics and the plans of other groups.
2. The actions and tactics used will be organized to maintain a separation of time or[13] space
2. Any debates or criticisms will stay internal to the movement, avoiding any public or media denunciations of fellow activists and events
4. We oppose any state repression of dissent, including surveillance, infiltration, disruption and violence. We agree not to assist law enforcement actions against activists and others.

[13] The first copy of these rules distributed by the Coalition read "time and space" rather than "time or space". The relevance of this distinction is discussed further below.

These principles were designed to address the different needs of, respectively, liberal protesters, anarchist direct action organizers, and anti-police brutality activists. These groups did not come to this process with a pre-made consensus, and the hurdles they faced in creating the St. P. P. ranged from tactical disagreements, to ideological oppositions, and personal and subcultural conflicts. Months before the St. P. P.'s had been created, intra-movement challenges to the spirit of the agreement had already been expressed in a variety of ways.

Typical of the inter-group fighting was an internet exchange based on an article posted on indymedia.com. The original article was a brief description of a town hall planning meeting run by the Coalition six months prior to the ratification of the ST.P.P. At this meeting representatives from various groups including the Anti-War Committee and the Welcoming Committee presented their protest plans to an audience of local activists with the hopes of winning new recruits and community support. When the article describing the town hall organizing meeting was posted to Bay Area (CA) indymedia, a series of comments were posted by anarchists ridiculing the organizing being done by the Coalition to March on the RNC and End the War. These criticisms were fairly typical anarchist critiques of symbolic protest and of the non-anarchist Left; their tone was dismissive and viscerally antagonistic. For example, following the story a site administrator wrote:

> I hope that some local anti-authoritarians are going to the meetings of this group and sniffing out the scum from ANSWER and the ISO[14]. If the 2008 convention protests are going to be effective, everybody needs to confront and get rid of the authoritatian (sic) asshats who will take over the protest organizing. If all groups involved, including the liberal ones, make an effort to keep the organizing horizontal, then everything should be all right. But if the shitheads from ANSWER or the ISO show up, things will suck quickly (Leftspot.com 2007). [15]

This quotation is illustrative of the antagonism between anarchist and communist/socialist radicals in the United States, and the widespread distrust that exists between anarchists and members of some communist organizations, who are often referred to as "authoritarians." As this quotation suggests, the fear that certain revolutionary socialist groups might attempt to coopt organizing attempts by other groups hindered attemps at unity and solidarity. While some revolutionary socialist groups in the U.S. are fairly notorious for attempting to take over the initiatives of their putative allies, such reactions fail to discern differences between non-anarchist groups, eliding many practices across a broad category and foreclosing possibilities for meaningful solidarity. Another quotation from the same exchange connects the distrust of other Left organizations to a critique of protest tactics:

---

[14] ANSWER is the acronym for Act Now to Stop War and End Racism, ISO is the International Socialist Organization. Both are Marxist-Leninist organizations much hated by many in the American anarchist movement due to their perceived authoritarian ideologies.

[15] These quotations were reproduced on the Leftspot.com Blog as part of the post condemning the comments. Leftspot is a Freedom Road Socialist Organization affiliated site.

> Mahkno: Does anybody else think it's kind of sad that the "liberal asshats" are planning a protest at all, over a year in advance? That is just an implicit admission of defeat and political impotence - they don't really believe they can stop the war (or anything else), so they focus their energy and attention on these ritualized, symbolic, feel-good actions that the authorities and the public at large can safely ignore, or treat as just another spectacle of the moment."
>
> Administrator: My words about the liberal asshats are way to (sic) kind. I hope people pick up with my criticism and direct it at these asshats who are in serious need of spine surgery. Actually, they need a spine.
>
> These liberal asshats are probably the kind of liberals who have been whining for years about Bush being a "fascist". They probably include a few of those 9-11 numbskulls who preach about the all-powerful Bush regime, but don't do anything about removing the Bush regime from office. The best these liberal asshats can do is whine about "impeachment."
>
> Come on, people. Get a fucking spine. You don't need to get a permit to have a protest march. You are not going to be sent to Guantanamo if you step off the sidewalk at the same time. If you have more than 10,000 people at your march, you don't need a fucking permit. The cops won't stop a large group of people from marching down the street. If you are truly outraged by the Bush regime, the LEAST you can do is march down the street without getting a permit (Leftspot.com 2007).

Presumably, the anarchist activists who made these posts were unaware that the RNC Welcoming Committee was working with the Coalition to March on the RNC and End the War, and of the attempts to forge solidarity in the Twin

Cities. Possibly they simply disapproved of these attempts as ideologically tainted or a waste of time. Alhough this rhetoric is surely not representative of the views of all anarchists, in my experience it is quite common for anarchists to diparage other Left groups as authoritarian or liberal, and to mock symbolic protest as ineffective, weak, and cowardly. These attitudes were significant hurdles for anti-RNC organizers committed to the Saint Paul Principles because they sowed distrust and challenged solidarity. It was exactly this type of discord that the St. Paul Principles were designed to counter-act. In the following section I examine how the principles emerged and what they were designed to accomplish.

Diversity of Tactics

The specific wording of the St. P. P. is indicative of the tensions that they sought to address. The text of the principles was worked out in several meetings early in 2008. Representatives from the RNC WC and from the Coalition, including members of the Anti-War Committee and Communities United Against Police Brutality, came together to create a set of principles that would allow cooperation while protecting the interests of each individual group. Specifically, the plans of the coalition to organize a large-scale permitted march coincided with the plans of the Welcoming Committee to organize a blockade of the RNC

on September first. If a credible agreement were not reached the consequences could be damaging to all.

March organizers feared that anarchists might infiltrate their march and use it as cover for illegal activities, a tactic that would likely lead to a police crackdown on the march and subject marchers to police violence. The RNC WC feared that other activist groups would denounce their actions and encourage media demonization of anarchist activities, which in turn would allow prosecutors a free hand in charging anarchist activists. Meanwhile, organizers involved with Communities United Against Police Brutality were worried that many protest groups might cooperate with the police, thus giving the police added credibility in the public sphere and setting back attempts to bring police brutality to the fore as a political issue.

Importantly, acceptance of a diversity of tactics was the condition of possiblity for a meaningful agreement to be reached. This led to the adoption of the first of the St. Paul Principles, a diversity of tactics. The near guaranteed presence of activists intent on confronting police and engaging in property destruction provided a clear incentive for non-violent groups to accept a diversity of tactics. Without such an agreement no claims could be made upon such groups not to infiltrate the march, bringing police violence down on marchers. While some in the Coalition to March were uneasy about this alliance, others were committed to a diversity of tactics due to previous activist work they had

engaged in, primarily against the Gulf War in the 1990's (Interview with Coalition organizer).

The leadership of the Coalition was heavily composed of members of Freedom Road Socialist Organization (FRSO) who often carried out protests involving confrontational tactics, but also maintained mass protest as a tool in raising public consciousness and pressure. It was their dual position as organizers of a liberal march, but also radical agitators, that permitted diversity of tactics to emerge as the common ground of protest organizing. These activists had already worked for years in the Twin Cities to build a radical movement that could also work with mainstream progressives. They had developed connections and trusting relationships with leaders of more liberal organizations such as Women Against Military Madness (WAMM) and Veterens for Peace – two groups that were very hesitant to agree to a diversity of tactics because they feared that association with property destruction or violent protest would hinder their mainstream organizing efforts (Interview Coalition organizer). FRSO organizers leveraged their trust with these groups to forward the diversity of tactics agenda, calm the fears of liberal organizers, and cultivate solidarity between anarchists and the rest of the relative Left.

Separation in space or time

The second of the St. Paul Principles, the separation of diverse tactics in space or time, emerged to protect the march from infiltration or elision with more confrontational protests. This was an attempt to make a clear differentiation to the media, the public, and the police between law-abiding symbolic protest and whatever other tactics were being employed in the city. The intent was to ensure, insofar as might be possible, both the physical safety of march participants and the power of the media message of the march "Stop the War Now!" When this principle was first adopted it read "a separation in space **and** time" between diverse tactics. When this was brought back to the Welcoming Committee for consensus by the group it was decided that the WC could only agree to this is it were changed to "a separation in space ***or*** time."

This insistance derived from the recent history of protest organizing, particularly the example of the Miami FTAA protests in which an agreement between labor activists and anarchist organizers stipulated that anarchists refrain from any direct action protest that coincided temporally with the labor marches. At the time this was interpreted to mean that it would be a violation of the agreement for anarchists to undertake any action on the day of the labor march. This gave the police a free hand in allowing the permitted march and then violently cracking down on anarchists the following day secure in the knowledge

that the “good” activists were not intermixed among the “bad”. This led to greatly heightened police brutality because the cops were sure that anybody who was in the streets on that day was there with ‘violent’ intentions (CrimethINC 2005). The RNC WC feared that if the St.P.P. read “time and space” instead of “time or space” that they would be subject to just such a clear separation that would lead to similar results. The Coalition agreed to this change, with Anti-war Committee members arguing to the rest of the Coalition that this was always, anyways, the spirit of the agreement.

Keeping Criticism Internal

The third principle, “Any debates or criticisms will stay internal to the movement, avoiding any public or media denunciations of fellow activists and events,” was designed to keep inter-group squabbling from taking over the media message. If groups did not have to continually differentiate themselves from other protest groups when talking with the media they would have more time to press their own messages. This principle was popular among protest organizers and paved the way for the RNC WC, the Coalition, and the Poor People’s Economic Human Rights Campaign to host joint press conferences during the RNC.

Opposition to state oppression

The final of the principles, "We oppose any state repression of dissent, including surveillance, infiltration, disruption and violence. We agree not to assist law enforcement actions against activists and others," was adopted at the behest of Communities United Against Police Brutality. It was designed in solidarity with communities of color who are daily subject to police violence, and also gave anarchist organizers confidence that they would not be targeted and pointed out to the police by members of the Coalition.

Together these principles provided both a grounds for solidarity in the face of disagreement and difference as well as a platform on which groups could resist police attempts to control and corral dissent through the separation of protest groups. In fact, the St. Paul Principles actively co-opted the police strategy of physical separation as a technique of ideological distancing, turning separation into a technique for the cultivation of inter-movement solidarity.

Implementing the Saint Paul Principles

However, agreeing to the principles was only the beginning of the process of actually implementing them. There were also substantial ideological and cultural differences that remained to be negotiated as the specifics of how the

principles were to be applied were worked out. These tensions were present in the everyday interactions of the RNC WC and the Coalition. One of the primary challenges of organizing solidarity around a diversity of tactics was negotiating intergenerational and cross-ideological differences and promoting common ground to build trust. One of these is demonstrated in the below dialog between myself and an activist I call Rene, who was a prominent younger member of the Coalition as well as a leader of the Anti-war Committee.

> Nathan: Have there been a lot of anxieties about diversity of tactics and what might be going on during the march?
>
> Rene: People are not confident in the commitment to separate time and space. People think that confrontational tactics or violence are hurtful to the cause and dangerous to participants. There are some cross cultural communication snafus that happen too. Because of my age and orientation I'm not confused. Some of the older folks get upset when people roll their eyes during meetings (Reference to WC anarchists).
>
> I do think there's a stupid 'space or time' thing, it's stupid how people fight about it. There was a meeting with folks from the Welcoming Committee, the Anti-War Committee, etc, and folks and the WC went and talked about it and wanted this one word changed [and' to 'or'] and my view was always that that was the spirit of the agreement. And some people in the coalition were like, what? they want to change what? And I was like, I don't think this is a substantial change in what we talked about. But there were a number of times when folks from the WC have emphasized that change as though it were a kind of loophole victory, like they were sneaky and got something.

> And I've seen that happen a lot and it erodes trust. It was very trusting for people in a meeting… to just say 'ok'. And I dunno, I think I've seen it treated not right and it's hurt trust and irritates people the most. The 'and' vs. 'or' agreement is so profound, is space 3 feet or time 3 seconds? Are people going to abide by the spirit of the agreement or just its letter now? The way the change has been referred to erodes trust and makes people doubt whether it is substantive. These are only as good as the actual agreement between the folks using them. It could say the sky is green but if none of us believe it then it doesn't matter. I think that there needs to be more emphasis on the importance of the agreement being real and not just documentation. And I don't want to overstate that. I think lots of the WC are very sincere, [but] a lot of people in the coalition feel like it's a trick. Tricks have no place here. I don't think that's what most people meant when the change was made but it doesn't help when people snicker (Interview with Coalition Organizer).

Entering into coalition with the anarchists was percieved as a significant risk and leap of faith by Coalition members. The above quotation illustrates the work that Coalition leadership engaged in to counter the fears of their members and the challenges that existed in building trust with the RNC WC. This was further complicated by the perception among many non-anarchists that the RNC WC had a lack of respect for liberal activists and their protest tactics. In addition to the organizer quoted above, many non-anarchist organizers I spoke with emphasized feeling disrespect from anarchists, which impeded trust that anarchists would abide by the St. Paul Principles. The lack of respect referred to

by the Coalition organizer was also apparent to me during my fieldwork. At WC meetings, for example, the allies associated with the Coalition were frequently referred to as “the liberals.” It was clear from the manner that this was said that it was disparaging and used as a way to signify the speaker as an exemplary radical through suggesting that anyone who wanted to organize a permitted march at the RNC was insufficiently radical. This rhetoric and positioning carried over into meetings, with the aforementioned eye-rolling when protest partners raised points that suggested they were concerned over potential for violence, or when they wanted to talk about the particulars of how a separation in space or time would actually operate on the ground.

Spaces for Organizing and Negotiating

The work of organizing across ideological and tactical difference took place in a variety of venues through a variety of forms. In addition to the negotiations that occurred at the local level, national protest organizers had to be convinced to abide by the St. Paul Principles. At the February 2008 conference, organizers associated with the Welcoming Committee carried out consciousness raising sessions with conference participants on the question of what types of action constitute violence. This workshop, offered as one choice out of several optional workshops and discussion groups at the conference, was designed to start conversations between activists committed to non-violence and those

espousing a diverstiy of tactics. It was hoped by conference organizers that participants would take home the lessons they learned at the workshop and that a national tolerance for diversity of tactics might thereby be fostered in the national anti-war and peace and justice movements. According to my fieldnotes approximately 35 activists took part in the violence/non-violence workshop facilitated by two Welcoming Committee activists.

When activists arrived in the room for the workshop they were given a handout entitled “Controversies in Nonviolent Action Theory” (Shivers, 1988). The two sided sheet contained a series of divisive propositions within the protest movement, each with two answers. The questions or dilemmas included “Is non-violence a principle or a technique”, and “Persuasion vs. Coercion”. But most important to this discussion was dichotomy number eight “Property destruction and sabotage: yes or no.” Under this question there were two possible answers:

> Pro yes: Sabotage destroys property, not people. Property is not important in a revolution intending to create humane social values. Therefore, it is OK to use sabotage. It is appropriate as a means of or (sic) coercion. We can make sure that no one is hurt, so it is nonviolent. Some property should not exist, such as some corporation files or some forms of military equipment. There, we are justified in destroying them.
>
> Pro no: Property destruction escalates the struggle in such a way that allows activists to have less control over the struggle than if property had not been destroyed. Property destruction gives clear justification for greater oppression by the opposition. It frightens potential allies and creates a bad image of the campaign for the uncommitted. Because planning is done in secrecy, property

> destruction creates two classes of people – those who know and those who do not know. Property destruction is easy to spill over to a destruction of people. There is always the problem of accidents. Finally, property destruction creates a climate of violence, counter-productive in a struggle (Shivers 1988: 2).

When the room was full and the appointed time came, one of the organizers opened the meeting by asking people to give their names and where they were from. When this was done she directed discussion of the pamphlet, attempting to get a range of reactions from the workshop participants. Opinions on the question of violence ranged from principled pacifism to advocacy of large-scale insurrection and property destruction. Next, the room was cleared of chairs and participants were asked to envision that their location in the room was an indication of their position on questions posed. Standing to the far left of the room indicated complete agreement with a statement, while standing on the far right indicated complete disagreement. She began the exercise by stating that disagreeing with someone was violent. Everyone in the room moved to the right to indicate disagreement. Next she stated that yelling at someone with whom you disagreed was violent. This time participants spread out a bit more toward the left, though with the majority still firmly positioned on the side of the room indicating their belief that yelling was not violent – but the spectrum was trending toward an admission of some violence. Next she stated that blocking the path of those attempting to do something bad without causing that person pain or fear was violent. Again, most activists tended to believe that this was not a violent act.

This exercise continued through several more steps with the examples of breaking a window to make a point and then running away, and sabotaging nuclear weapons publicly then waiting to be arrested being the final cases. It was in the case of breaking a window versus sabotaging weapons that the most interesting divisions emerged. Many more participants thought that breaking a window and running away was more violent than sabotaging a nuclear weapon and allowing oneself to be arrested in protest. This led to discussions on the need for accountability in direct action protest tactics, but disagreement over to whom that accountability was to be made. Some thought that activists should to be accountable to the state, a position reminiscent of the position argued by the Professor of Peace Studies at St. Thomas University described above. Others thought that the greatest accountability had to be to one's compatriots in the movement. As the workshop session ended, small groups of activists were engaged in discussions of exactly what types of force were acceptable to use in the service of social change and under what circumstances. Though considerable differences of opinion existed, the fact that the visceral divide between non-violence and a diversity of tactics had been bridged enough to allow conversation was deeply important to the construction of solidarity in months that followed.

This pamphlet and the exercises operated as a technique for the cultivation of new radical subjectivities and new norms for strategic relationships between protest groups. This attempt to recompose strategic action outside of

the bounds of liberal speech rights directly countered the attempts by law enforcement to divide the protest population into separate groups that could be easily identified and differently operated on. Whereas liberal protest norms produce dissent and public space as a constituted system of legitimate political opposition, these exercises sought to problematize and rework those systems of conduct. The Saint Paul Principles were an alternative set of propositions regarding the legitimate conduct of dissenting groups, but they were insufficient without additional techniques that could begin to rework the relations of dissenting subjects to each other, and to the police and the state. In particular, these exercises were an attempt to shift discussions of (non)violence from the register of liberal moral commitment to the register of strategic action. Rendering the choice of tactics strategic rather than morally fixed was a condition of possiblity for the actual acceptance of a diversity of tactics. Those whose concept of acceptable action was fixed as a moral absolute would otherwise be entering into a morally hazardous terrain if they allied with those who might act against moral certitude. But the discussions at the workshop permitted associations to be made and alternative commitments explored, as well as overlapping analyses brought to the fore.

The Saint Paul Principles, then, operated as a technology for the construction of a counter-conduct, for the development of new modes of rationality that took the separation of diverse tactics as a tool for constructing solidarity instead of fractiousness. As is the case with governmentalities as well,

simply writing the new rules is insufficient to establish a new regime of truth and configuration of power. It took many months, difficult meetings, and a significant leap of faith for the counter-conduct of the Saint Paul Principles to become more than a list of suggestions, it took face to face meetings and heartfelt disagreement and discussion for people to believe that these ideas might be operable and to begin to trust each other. Hard work and considerable amounts of time were required for these counter-conducts to be operationalized. As Foucault was often at pains to point out, power does not eminate from the center out, nor from the top down. It is, rather, developed through diffuse networks of understanding and feeling (Foucault 1991).

Approximately six weeks before the RNC, representatives of the Welcoming Committee and the Coalition had a meeting to iron out the on-the-ground particulars of how diversity of tactics would work. This was suggested by Coalition leaders in order to calm the anxieties of some of their partner organizations, and to create accountability between groups by making clear guildelines for what type of conduct did or did not fit into the St. Paul Principles. At this meeting there were four representatives from the Coalition, including activists from Women Against Military Madness (MADD) and the Anti-War Committee, as well as approximately ten members of the Welcoming Committee. The topic of the day was to create an agreement on what kind of separation in time or space was sufficient between those employing the blockade strategy and the permitted march. Although the meeting was interrupted several times by off-

topic arguments between WC members and Coalition members regarding rumors that one side or the other wasn't treating the other with respect, a rough agreement was eventually worked out that the WC members agreed to bring back to their group and to encourage affinity groups to abide by.[16] However, the snide comments of some anarchists as well as the apparent scorn with which they treated liberal concerns caused some harm to solidarity through undermining trust.

This was further exacerbated by a contentious history between WAMM and local anarchists dating back over a decade. During the first Gulf War WAMM was protesting a military recruitment station when anarchists associated with the Revolutionary Anarchist Bowling League (RABL) lobbed a bowling ball through the window of the recruiting office. This action came as a surprise to WAMM activists who felt that the anarchist action endangered WAMM activists and subverted their non-violent message. Reportedly, the leader of WAMM remained angered by this incident for years, eschewing any cooperation with anarchist groups (interview with long-time WAMM activist). Several activists associated with the Coalition and with WAMM brought up this decade-old incident as a reason for the distrust between groups, despite the fact that none of the activists associated with RABL were involved in WC organizing. It was only through

[16] This was made more delicate due to the fact that the WC wasn't actually in charge of anyone who was coming to protest and could not, therefore, force anyone to abide by the rules. Anarchist organizing is decentralized and consensus based, so the local organizing group could not tell other groups what to do, they could only stress that the St. Paul Principles were important to local organizing efforts and ask that others respect those rules if possible.

continual face to face meeting and the support of the Anti-War Committee and others for a diversity of tactics that WAMM was induced to abide by the principles, thought they never officially endorsed them.

Tensions were further managed and solidarity built through the decision to hold joint press conferences every day of the RNC. The Welcoming Committee, the Anti-War Committee, and the Poor People's Economic Human Rights Campaign agreed to these joint press conferences as a demonstration of solidarity. It was hoped that such joint press conferences would make it more difficult for police and media to mobilize the 'good activists vs. bad activists' discourse and the divide and conquer strategy if it were quite apparent that all major protest groups were working together, even if they did espouse different strategies and tactics. This also increased communication and coordination between groups and facilitated solidarity.

Through all of this preperatory work and positioning the St. Paul Principles remained untested, until three days before the RNC when officers under the command of Ramsey County Sheriff Bob Fletcher executed search warrants on the convergence space rented by the Welcoming Committee and three homes in the Twin Cities owned or occupied by prominent anarchist organizers. The violence with which these raids were carried out and the absurdity of the terrorism charges levelled against the RNC 8, as well as the police violence against all of the major protest groups significantly aided solidarity due to the pre-existing bonds between groups. If they had not worked together for a year prior

to the protests it is doubtful that the groups would have pulled together so effectively after the crack down.

Conclusion

Contemporary governmentalities for the control of dissent operate through a logic of separation that distinguishes “good” liberal protesters from “bad” anarchists. In practice this separation relies on the creation of ideological and physical distance between these two groups such that the speech of liberals might address the public sphere and anarchists might be arrested without interfering in the rightful operation of power, governance and legitimate dissent. However, the Saint Paul Principles are an example of emergent froms of illiberal counter-conduct that oppose themselves to liberal forms of rule and social control through a refusal to separate liberal protest from illiberal force and the acceptance of a diversity of tactics. Refusing to restrict their dissent to symbolic forms or direct action, the activists who developed the Saint Paul Principles coopted the logic of separation from the state, using it to build solidarity rather than to break it. This meant strategically engaging with certain state practices such as was the case when the Coalition to March on the RNC and End the War applied for the protest permit, while avoiding others such as the call by the police and liberal professors for a categorical appeal to non-violence.

However, this attempt to cultivate counter-conducts also ran into significant inter-personal and inter-sub-cultural problems during its development.

The process of developing counter-conducts across differently positioned subjects is a process that is fraught. This also required the development of counter-technologies for fostering the subjective orientation that the Saint Paul Principles called into being. Solidarity cannot just be announced, it must be built through trust born of knowing each other. The workshops and meetings between protest groups, as well as attempts to overcome subcultural differences such as the dispute about “separation in time and space” or “separation in time or space”, was pushed to a near crisis due to a perceived lack of respect for liberals by anarchists.

By highlighting the ways that counter-conducts undermine and actively contest governmentalities this chapter has sought to demonstrate the subversive and productive strength of constituent movements. Much of the governmentality literature in geography focuses very heavily on the production of consent to neoliberal forms. This chapter does not discount such accounts, but it does contest the posing of activists as mere subjects to be operated upon, highlighting instead the active self-activity that is involved in the development of counter-conducts. Governmentality does shape subjectivities. But those subjects also have the power to engage in radical contestations, and to mold their own conduct through new forms of being together.

In the next chapter I examine the role of affect in both police strategies to control dissent, and in protester strategies to bulid trust and evade the state’s surveillance apparatus. This argument articulates with recent accounts of affect

and emotion in geography, as well as connecting this literature to contemporary autonomist theorizations of a “fully biopolitical stage of capitalism” (Hardt 2000).

Chapter 4: Affect and the Biopolitics of Rebellion and Control

On Friday August 29th, 2008, at 9:15 pm, several dozen police wearing tactical gear and wielding drawn weapons used a battering ram to break in the door of the St. Paul convergence space[17] – an old theater that had been rented by the RNC Welcoming Committee as a site for those protesting the 2008 RNC to gather, have meetings, eat food, and make signs and puppets. Acting on a no-knock warrant and ostensibly looking for bomb-making supplies, the police burst into the space shouting at shocked activists to get down on the floor and to put their hands behind their heads. In shocked confusion the seventy-odd activists inside who had just finished dinner and were sitting down to collectively watch a documentary about the 1999 World Trade Organization protests in Seattle, were searched, handcuffed with plastic zip ties, and made to lie on the floor on their stomachs, with their hands behind their backs, for up to three hours as they were interrogated and released one by one. Some cried out in fear and surprise when the doors were broken down, others sobbed or talked or sang as they lay there on the floor. The five year old son of an activist who was there cried the entire time, and an activist who sang to him to calm his fears was told to "shut the fuck up" by a riot-gear clad officer brandishing a gun[18].

---

[17] Although Paul Routledge (2003) used the term "convergence space" as a site where diverse groups come together in a non-hierarchical manner, I use the term here in common activist parlance, as a physical space rented or occupied by protesters that is used to host meetings, spokes-councils, meals, and entertainment during a protest action.

[18] This narrative is based on informal discussions in the days following the RNC with activists who were present at the raid.

I had just left the convergence space, an hour before the raid, having spent the day cleaning, handing out fliers, and chatting with activists as they arrived at the space. I was shocked to hear of the raid, but sure that it would result in nothing serious, as we had been very careful to ensure that no illegal activities took place in the space. The next morning at 7:30am I was riding my bike to St. Paul to participate in a joint press conference with the Poor People's Economic Human Rights Campaign and the Coalition to March on the RNC and End the War, which had been called at late notice to condemn the convergence space raid. As it turns out, no one was arrested, but the police closed the space due to an alleged fire-code violation, which was investigated by St. Paul fire marshals and found to be without merit the next day. As I neared the appointed site of the press conference I received a panicked cell phone call from a friend in the RNC WC who told me that police had simultaneously just broken down the doors to three RNC WC organizer's houses, dragged people out of bed, and arrested several members of the group. Stunned, I read a prepared statement to the press and then beat a hasty retreat to try and find out what was going on, who had been arrested and on what grounds. I was terrified, and so were the other activists I spoke to. Paranoid, we decided to cease all cell-phone communication out of fear that we may have been the targets of wiretaps.

Isolated from each other, and incommunicado, Internet and television reports started to trickle in. That night on the local evening news, Ramsey County Sheriff Bob Fletcher held a press conference with the contents of raided

houses displayed in front of him as evidence that RNC WC were “criminals” and “violent anarchists bent on destruction”. He displayed buckets of grey water that environmentally conscious activists collected from their sink to reuse in the toilet and for watering plants. He claimed that these were full of stockpiled urine that was to be used by “criminal anarchists” to throw on police. He displayed a hatchet and an old machete, bicycle locks, amateur mountain climbing gear, empty beer bottles, rags, and a little bit of gasoline in a can from the garage where it was stored next to the landlord’s lawn mower. He claimed that these items were to be used for various nefarious purposes such as Molotov Cocktails, and for fighting with police. Despite the fact that these materials, by and large, could be found in any house in the United States, when in the possession of radical activists and anarchists they were presented as proof of criminal intent and used to justify holding seven members of the RNC WC and one member of Unconventional Action[19] in prison for the duration of the 2008 RNC on charges of Terrorist Conspiracy to Destroy Property and Terrorist Conspiracy to Riot – the first use of the Minnesota version of the U.S.A. Patriot Act. These activists came to be known as the RNC 8.

As the convention started, the numbers of arrestees rose, eventually surpassing 800. 3,500 police, many clad in riot gear, patrolled the streets of St. Paul deploying tasers, rubber bullets, tear gas, and industrial capacity containers of mace. Protesters, concert-goers, members of the media, and downtown

[19] Unconventional Action was another national anarchist organizing network set up to facilitate planning for, and mass mobilization against the 2008 RNC.

residents were rounded up and arrested, beaten up, and brutalized, exposing middle class Minnesotans to a spectacle of state violence that is usually practiced only in the marginal spaces of the city, on the marginal bodies of minorities.

In the months that followed the convention, at community meetings and city council investigations, activists and residents of the Twin Cities testified at the shock, horror and fear that they experienced immediately prior to, and during the 2008 RNC. Yet, even in the face of this fear, activists worked to created affinity, trust, and new connections between individuals and communities, and to protect those connections from being broken by the police.

In this chapter I examine the biopolitical aspects of the composition of contestation surrounding anarchist protest. I argue that the affective structure of anarchist organizing – a concept I describe below -- places the emotions and interconnections between activists at the center of both activist counter-conducts and police strategies for de-mobilization and suppression.

The structure of the paper is as follows. I first provide a brief review of emotional and affective geographies and articulate this work with Negri's version of Biopolitics. I then argue that anarchist political organizing consists of a particular mode of connecting emotion to organizational forms, through the practice of affinity-based organizing and the central trope of heroic action in the anarchist imaginary. I then demonstrate how this particular relationship between affect and organizing employed by anarchists makes them particular targets of

state strategies of social control. Finally, I argue that security culture, a practice that attempts to preserve affinity and organizational capacity through developing new cultural practices, is a substantive model for pushing back against the affective control of the state.

Affect, Emotion, Biopolitics

The last several years have seen an explosion of affective theory in geography. I contribute to this theoretical milieu through an exposition that demonstrates the centrality of emotion and affect to Left politics and explicit forms of repressive social control. The work in geography on emotion and affect has been weakly differentiated. At times affect and emotion are used synonymously, at other times they refer to, respectively, individual conscious feelings, and precognitive bodily dispositions (Pile 2010). I have little stake in parsing these definitions. In what follows, when I use the term emotion I am referring to consciously experienced feelings, such as love, hate, fear, exhilaration. When I refer to affect I am employing the term in a Spinozan register that indicates the ontological relation of bodies coming together to increase their capacity to act (Negri 1991; Spinoza 2008). As such, though I use a similar language I diverge somewhat from non-representational theory in geography and its focus on the pre or ante-cognitive dimensions of life -- primarily because I am most interested in illustrating the connections between

emotion, radical organizing, and emerging state security strategies. What concerns me is how these connections can form the basis of biopolitical struggles that occur between activists who attempt to build their capacity to act – in part through the construction of a certain form of emotional bond called affinity -- and the state that attempts to intervene in this emotive/affective coupling.

As has been pointed out by several commentators, work on affect in geography has tended to privilege the ways that power operates on subjects, producing them as predisposed to certain positions and proclivities (Barnet 2008; Pile 2010). This has produced something of a blind spot when it comes to the other side of the coin, the production of rebellious subjectivities and the articulation of those subjects with affective forms of control. In particular, little work has rigorously examined the ways that particular forms of emotional connection are consciously built as a strategy for rebellion, nor how these bonds form the basis for expanding the power of social movements. In part, this blind spot is due to a lack of theorizing in geography that connects subjective processes such as emotion with larger-scale processes such as movement building, and does so without reducing one to the other.

I think that it is essential to develop a theory of affect, social movement and power that is capable of connecting the subjective with the structural in a manner that permits the articulation between constituent and Constituted power to take center stage. In many ways this project has been most fully developed by contemporary descendents of Autonomous Marxism who theorize the present as

a fully biopolitical mode of capitalism (Hardt 2000). Of absolute centrality to this project has been the insistence not only that individual subjects are formed through their interpellation with capitalist structures (for example Lyotard or Baudrillard etc) but also that contemporary capitalism depends upon the affective capacities and emotional labor of individual subjects (Virno 2004). This is most clear in accounts of immaterial labor and the social factory that emerged from Autonomous critiques of the shifting post-Fordist mode of regulation in which the rebellions of workers forced capital to expand its purview from the factory floor to all of life (Hardt 1996). This theorization, which I touch upon in the first chapter of this dissertation, was developed to explain the real subsumption of social life to the requirements of capital, and to explore the revolutionary potentialities that this expansion created. Of particular importance here is the manner in which the emotions and affective states of the population as workers are incorporated into capitalist accumulation strategies through both selling emotion (the smile on the face of a barrista or Disneyland employee) and harnessing desire (advertising etc). The inner life of the capitalist subject becomes a site of intervention for capital, which means that it also becomes a site of class struggle and revolutionary potentiality. Just as capital seeks to mold and harness the affects and emotions of its subjects, revolutionary organizers must also focus on affect and emotion as arenas of social struggle. This centrality of affect and emotion to class struggle needs to be theorized, lest scholars of social struggle mistakenly

obviate these contentious connections. In other words, we need a framework for understanding the relations between affect, emotion, and social struggle.

This relation between movement growth and affect can be understood theoretically through Negri's appropriation of the Spinozan concept of love as the driving force of constituent power. In Spinoza's monist ontology, all that exists is of a single substance, endlessly entering and re-entering into combination with itself (Spinoza 1951). The forms of the substance have a guiding desire to increase in interconnection, this is called conatus (Spinoza 1951). Power is gained through entering into authentic connections (connections whose connectivity does not disguise its nature) with other aspects of substance. The ultimate form of power is what Spinoza refers to as "the intellectual love of God" (Spinoza 1951). This is a form of understanding one's place within the larger system without illusion – also referred to as "cupiditas", love. Love is correct knowledge of the systematicity of desiring to increase in power. This conception of love is valuable precisely because it constructs desire, knowledge, and power as integrally related and immanent to each other. Cupiditas is a form of love without illusion, but it is also a material process for the construction of power through combination. Love brings social actors together, and in coming together it increases their capacity to act, and to exert force upon systems and structures. Love, then, is at the heart of radical power.

In Negri's spinozan Marxism, love emerges as a kind of class hatred, a desire to increase the power of the working class through a firm understanding of

reality alongside a desire for a growing interconnectivity (Casarino 2008). As such it is parallel to a kind of class-consciousness that eschews fetishization.

But Love is also a biopolitical concept. It is intimately concerned with the conceptual site where the power of the socius intersects with the bodies of the populace and the operation of class power. For Foucault, the biopolitical encapsulates two movements: first is the movement of governmental rationality to direct the population as an abstract entity. Second, is the operation of state techniques on human bodies (Foucault 2007). Negri agrees with this multiscalar aspect of biopolitical rationalities, but he also creates a further bifurcation. In his own words:

> I feel it is necessary, in fact, to introduce a distinction within the very concept of biopolitics, to distinguish between two different and antagonistic aspects or tendencies of that concept: Biopolitics, on the one hand, turns into bio-Power [biopotere] intended as the institution of a dominion over life, and, on the other hand, turns into biopower [biopotenza] intended as the potentiality of constituent Power. In other words, in Biopolitics intended as biopower, it is the bios that creates Power, while in Biopolitics intended as bio-Power, it is Power that creates the bios, that is, that tries alternately either to determine or to annul life, that posits itself as Power against life (Casarino 2008).

Biopolitics, then, corresponds to the movement of life as constituent power (see ch. 1), while bio-Politics corresponds to the movement of constituted power as it attempts to mold, subtract from, and redirect constituent energy into the reproduction of the capitalist socius (again, see

chapter 1 and 2 where I introduce these concepts in-depth). Biopolitical forms of Love, then, are the forms of relation that are cultivated toward the achievement of working class power, toward the freedom of constituent power. In the case of this chapter, such a form will be explored as the relation of affinity between militant activists. The conceptual terms of bio-Politics and biopolitics are mobilized below to aid in the distinction between forms of rationality that, respectively, operate on the Love between individuals as a mechanism for Constituted Power, or conversely that operate on those relations in the pursuit of Love and the amplification of excess constituent power – revolutionary praxis.

In the next section I connect the theoretical concept of love in pursuit of class power to the affective connections integral to anarchist organizing. I do this in order to demonstrate how love becomes the target for both biopolitical struggle and bio-Political forms of social control.

Affinity and the Affective Structure of Anarchist Organizing

> affinity |əˈfinitē|
>
> a spontaneous or natural liking or sympathy for someone or something, a similarity of characteristics suggesting a relationship, esp. a resemblance in structure between animals, plants, or languages :
>
> **1** *her affinity with animals and birds* | *an affinity for opera* empathy for, rapport with,

sympathy for, accord with, harmony with, relationship with, bond with, fellow feeling for, closeness with/to, understanding of/for; liking of/for, fondness of/for; informal chemistry with.

Antonym aversion, dislike.

(Oxford English Dictionary 1.2 2006).

The anarchist subculture is built around a particular affective structure based in affinity. The terminology of "affective structure" refers to the ways that anarchist organizational forms and aspirational politics are both rooted in a system, through which individual emotions and interconnections are self-consciously tied to political actions and goals. In effect, anarchist organizing relies upon affinity as an interpersonal feeling of connection and as a mode of political action based in consensus decision-making. Though the definition above stresses the spontaneous nature of affinity born from a natural attraction or similarity, in anarchist usage deriving from the organizational structure of anarchist brigades during the Spanish Civil War, affinity is something that is strategically constructed as a form of lived libertarian socialism (Bookchin 1991). Based in a commitment to prefigurative politics, the concept that means of revolutionary social change should be identical to the ends advocated, and that anarchist practices should be adhered to in the present rather than waiting for some future revolutionary moment; affinity is a political and emotional connection between members of the anarchist group characterized through mutual opposition to oppression, commitment to liberation, and a bond of mutual aid

(Anarchist FAQ Editorial Collective 2009). Affinity, then, is both the necessary precondition for, and the hoped for goal of, anarchist politics. As an anticapitalist organizational form committed to building emotional bonds between activists in order to increase their capacity to effect social change, affinity is also an intensely biopolitical praxis, posing closeness, trust, and consensus as weapons against bio-Political control.

Anarchist organizing operates through the development of a certain set of emotional connections and imaginaries that structure the relationships of anarchist activists into prefigurative forms. These structures of relations are connected to the capacities of anarchists to operate as a group. According to David Graeber, arguably the pre-eminent scholar of contemporary anarchism, the anarchist sub-culture is characterized by a commitment to direct action in social change and consensus-based directly democratic decision-making practices (Graeber 2004). These two characteristics emerge from complex historical roots, but are deeply influenced by what Day (2004) calls the "logic of affinity." In addition to the more mainstream definition of affinity that I provided above, Day's affinity is an anti-hegemonic concept that explicitly rejects formal politics, the state, and capital, and insists on the primacy of individuals coming together as voluntary collectives, operating democratically, and creating change through concrete acts rather than through appeals to power (Day 2004). Affinity is a feeling of harmonious co-existence, of sympathetic and purposive being-

together that is built through working together for freedom. At the same time it is a practice of calling into being new forms of power through interconnection.

Whereas 'solidarity' may conjure up notions of ideological duty based in universalizing categories such as class struggle, affinity suggests rapport, closeness and understanding that is intrinsically interpersonal and collective (Wilde 2007). Affinity is constructed, but out of love, not out of duty. Such feelings, however, rarely emerge serendipitously; rather, they are the result of shared visions and experiences. In the case of anarchist affinity politics, such bonds are the result of struggling together for a common cause.

Practically speaking, large-scale anarchist organizing is usually based on horizontally networked groups of friends and comrades called affinity groups. Affinity groups are composed of anywhere from several individuals to several dozen self-selected people who join together in order to plan and execute direct actions, to support each other, and to engage in democratic decision-making, usually through a consensus process[20] (Graeber 2004). The consensus process is scaled up when necessary through the organizational form of spokes councils

[20] This consensus process of decision making is one of the central cultural practices of contemporary anarchists (Graeber 2004). Anarchists see majority-rule voting systems as coercive; consensus is a way of making decisions that avoids divisions based on votes. During a consensus meeting any member can raise points for consideration, those points are discussed and altered until such a time that the group can agree unanimously to act upon the point. Rather than voting 'yes' or 'no', anarchist consensus depends upon a tripartite system of 'yes', 'stand-aside', or 'block'. A yes vote is self-evident. A stand-aside vote means that the individual does not necessarily endorse the idea, but that they do think it is in keeping with the goals of the group. A block vote occurs when an individual thinks that an idea is contrary to the goals and philosophy of the group. A single block will kill a proposal, causing it to be modified until it can pass.

in which participating affinity groups will send designated representatives called ‘spokes’ to a larger council. Spokes do not have any power over their group, and cannot make any binding decisions without the consensus of their group. Rather, spokes are empowered to coordinate and carry out the democratic decisions of the affinity groups. Thus, spokes council decision-making involves an iterative process of consultation between the affinity group and council scales. This form of organizing is typically viewed as both a practical necessity given the often-illegal character of direct action protest, and a particularly good form for refining egalitarian modes of interaction (Anarchist FAQ Editorial Collective 2009).

Putting affinity into practice

Affinity-based organizing is indissociable from the most visible forms of anarchist direct action, blockades like the one that stopped the Seattle WTO meeting in 1999, and Black Bloc riots. These two forms of struggle are often conflated in the media, but they are distinct. Blockading is a form of direct action that attempts to deny those in power from specific sites through making the site inaccessible. This is often done through various forms of civil disobedience, such as sitting down in the middle of the street, or a group of activists chaining themselves to the doors of a building. Black Bloc is another anarchist tactic, that involves a group of people all dressing in black and wearing masks over their

faces in order to be anonymous. This anonymity allows Black Bloc activists to engage in more confrontational and offensive tactics with less worry of being arrested, because each individual is very difficult to identify. Both types of action have been important to anarchist identity building and very often co-exist – if sometimes uneasily because Black Bloc tactics are seen as a tactical escalation that risks bringing police violence down on everyone in the blockade. Further, the militancy that is cultivated through trust based in tight bonds of affinity is imagined as essential to further constructing those same bonds (trial by fire), and as a central form of propaganda aimed at potentially sympathetic publics.

However, the tight structure of anarchist practice often poses significant hurdles to movement growth (Graeber 2004). Organizing based on affinity and through complex consensus-based processes requires significant knowledge and feelings of connection – both of which take time and commitment to develop, especially if prospective group members do not have pre-existing similarities to the sub cultural group. Anarchists are often stereotyped as young, white, disaffected punks, and people who are different from this stereotype in various ways might face significant challenges finding an anarchist group where they feel affinity. Additionally, the strong militancy of anarchist groups seems to alienate potential allies at least as often as it helps to radicalize them.

The relationship between direct action activism and consensus-based decision making is also complicated by the interaction between state strategies for social control and anarchist strategies for opposing the state. In practical

terms, the required secrecy of some direct action tactics employed by some anarchist groups, such as property destruction or riot, create situations where affinity is difficult to develop. However, rather paradoxically, stories of rebellion and the reputation of anarchists for uncompromising resistance serve as one of the primary ways that anarchism is imagined by anarchists to grow, as well as being a prime source of inspiration and morale building.

Mythology and Movement Building

The idea and practice of rebellion is deeply tied to the love that creates affinity through the inspirational retelling of heroic tales of opposition, which are propagated in the foundational mythologies of the contemporary anarchist movement. Tales of heroic resistance to capital and the state are enshrined and held up as paragons of anarchist virtue. The Zapatista rebellion, the Seattle World Trade Organization blockades, the daring escapades of the Earth Liberation Front or Earth First!, and the adventures of protesters at the 2008 RNC are told and retold in anarchist circles as exemplary actions that at once liberate individuals from the restrictive governmentalities of dissent, and build new communities in rebellion. In this section I argue that heroic tales of forceful resistance, often in the form of retellings of Black Bloc riots, are central to anarchist self-conceptions and to predominant strategies for growing the movement. I refer to these heroic tales as foundational myths because these

experiences are romanticized and retold in order to galvanize further radical action, to mobilize current movement members and to recruit new radicals to the cause. In effect, whether or not such accounts accurately capture the experiences of anarchist direct action, they form a common story that aids in the formation of rebellious subjects and spurs anarchists to action.

Anarchist pamphlets and 'zines (self-published magazines popular among anarchists) continually exhort their readers to "take a flying leap" and reject bourgeois norms of behavior and political participation in preference for a new political subjectivity based in direct participation instead of representation, immediate action rather than long-term strategizing, and a rejection of authority and power in all its forms. Anarchists are continually reminded that "we are the only thing holding ourselves back!" (O'Nimmity 2008). As much as anything, the object of anarchist direct actions is the subjective experience of anarchists. Taking action is seen as an important site of affirmation and radicalization in which bonds are made that are imagined as otherwise un-makable.

Grindon (2007) writes "joy, desire, and mythic moments of potent affect" are central to "the global justice movement's understanding of itself and its actions." These moments of potent affect play a strong role in the way that (at least part of) the anarchist movement imagines radical action and affinity-building to occur, through inspirational acts of self-liberation, breathlessly recounted as an inspirational tale. This self-understanding of emotional highs experienced by individuals and collectives in rebellion is imagined as a potent source of

radicalization and movement building, through providing examples of what radical communities are capable of.

The following quotation is an excerpt from a pamphlet distributed approximately one month after the 2008 RNC. Its form and tone mimic 'zines and pamphlets produced after the 1999 WTO protests that hold an almost iconic place in the anarchist subculture.

> Our joy and malice intertwine as another crowd fuses with us and becomes-rioting. Desire moves our appendages, and objects are released through the imaginary field constructed between law and order. Someone runs on top of a moving police car and exposes that the state too is made of sinew and fiber. In moments a lonely police car is located, and with force a body stomps a perfect "pop" through its windshield. Each of us sheds our polite veneer, and we reveal the social conflict that is the shared experience of our conditions.
>
> We stress that no one has felt a comparable pleasure in America in the last five years. No amount of bodily fluid, missed with syrup, swirled together to the sound of Lil' Wayne's "A Milli" could concentrate the joy felt when stones collapsed bank windows. Ecstasy was the vandalized cop car. Music was the hissing of tire punctures. Glee was the foot inserted into the gendarme's paunch. Like we freed our companions from the police's grip, our collective force will rip words from restrictive reference. From here on, beauty, decadence, and orgy can only connote immediate destruction… (Anonymous 2008)[21].

[21] Becoming-riot was an anonymously written zine that was published on the internet and distributed through anarchist social networks in the weeks following the 2008 RNC.

In this zine, desire to rebel and throw off liberal forms of participation is presented as a means of personal and group liberation from dominating norms. Expressing violent desire is a means to joy, even ecstasy. The language of "shedding our polite veneers" refers to an imagined condition of exposing one's authentic self that is unrestrained by formal political norms, by the public sphere, or by cares for symbolic representation – in this way bodily rebellion is presented as an immediately political radical act that directly creates freedom, essentially *de novo*. That is to say, the references to the joy of rebellion position anarchist direct action as a path to emotional freedom that is unrecuperable by the capitalist socius. This joy and imagined freedom are precisely anti-social insofar as the social and the public operate as machines for the capture of constituent energy (as I argued in Ch. 2).

Further, direct physical violence against the agents of the state and its supporters is presented as a sort of heroic narrative of oppositional power:

> A lone cop, albeit a large one, has the gall to grab one of us. One of them and fifty of us. After countless experiences of being on the defensive at demonstrations or simply on the streets of our hometowns, we will take advantage of any opening we find. A hooligan sneaks up behind the cop catching him with a well-placed kick between the legs and runs back into the loving arms of the mob. As the cop releases a shower of pepper spray into the crowd, another person surges forth, body checking the cop with a flying leap. The pig hits the ground and our comrade is freed…
>
> A hammer cracks two windows, and a good citizen dashes from the sidewalk in pursuit. He grabs the young man with his right hand, a "Let Out Soldiers Win!"

> sign in the other. He wants to be a cop, a hero, but he's made a mistake. This isn't a peace march; this is the thrashing body of a wrecking machine. The man is rushed from behind, knocking him off balance just long enough for someone to slide their arms around him. He receives a swift kick to the side, and his do-gooder momentum is redirected into the pavement, dropping him like a dead weight…((Anonymous 2008)

These narratives stress the emotional experience of rebellion, and provide a narrative of freedom that functions as a form of constituent propaganda. The experience of taking a flying leap, of flinging oneself from the precipice of sanctioned behavior and into the unknowable abyss of being-otherwise, is imagined as a kind of radical trial by fire. Letting loose and going on the offensive with a group of comrades differentiates the group from liberal and symbolic forms of resistance. As part of this imaginary, "symbolic action" is conceived a-priori as ineffective and weak, and those who engage in such actions are portrayed as counter-revolutionaries or political dullards.

> A large group leaves the state capitol equipped with PA systems and led by the colorful coeds of "Funk the War." The crowed walks straight in to a line of bike cops; it is still weak. They are hosed in pepper spray and stripped of their dignity. We are separated from our comrades and left to wander the surreal territories of a city where the state has materialized. Every block a squad of riot cops –some tense and shaking, others confused and afraid. We find our friends; we are powerful again. Soon after, a black bloc emerges from the crowd, ready to unleash its hate. With physical barriers present we continue to move –within the confines we find mobility…

> The management of Funk the War begins to recognize our intentions of commandeering their decomposing endeavor. Our momentum necessarily severs from any objectives outlined in any spokes council. Aspiring bureaucrats shed tears for their failure to regulate, and the politics of impotency reveals an impotency of politics. With unabashed sincerity and intensity, the dead weight is cast aside, holding only its precarious career and a falsified notion of failure within its palms. The corpse of activism begs for rejuvenation, but to no avail (Anonymous 2008).

The emotions of the cops, fear and confusion, are elided with those of Funk the War, another anarchist group that is nevertheless presented as weak and liberal in this narrative because of their desire to confront the state symbolically rather than violently. Both are presented as tools of constituted forms, as tools of bio-Power or bio-political control. This is contrasted with the above joy experienced by the more militant demonstrators bent on limited property destruction and confrontation with the cops.

This, of course, has a significantly fragmenting effect on pan-Left unity. In the quote from above, the black bloc activists who wrote the pamphlet recount how they joined a symbolic march called “Funk the War” that was organized by Youth Against War and Racism (YAWR). This march was a moving dance party designed to impart a festive feel to the protests at the same time that it participated in the blockade strategy. The Black Bloc joined the march for some time before urging “Funk the War” from its prescribed route and attempting to get YAWR participants to join in property destruction. In the weeks and months

following the RNC the co-optation of the YAWR march caused considerable in-movement rancor, and the actions of the black bloc led to considerable discussion within the anarchist movement of how responsibility to other movement members and respect for varying levels of resistance should co-exist with the types of actions advocated in the 'zine "Becoming-riot".

Black bloc participants in the anti-RNC protests wrote the above pamphlet as an anonymous 'after-action report'. The tone of the pamphlet is at once celebratory and didactic. This type of publication seeks to instill new energy in radical exploits through propagating tales of daring-do at the same time that it provides an kind of anti-moral moralizing recipe for 'legitimate' opposition to state power. By glorifying property destruction and limited violence against reactionary onlookers and police (the kick in the "gendarme's paunch"), the 'zine builds upon a discourse of revolutionary glee. The insistence on the pleasure derived from acts of brazen rebellion locates the affective characteristics of urban insurrection as one of the prime motivators of such actions. Again, from the same zine:

> It's been far too long since a black mask has corresponded to rioting in this country. Our tried and true tactic, our insidious uniform, has been co-opted by capital, regurgitated as a mere fashion symbol. Something for today's disempowered youth to splay across the internet in their false communities as a false declaration of rage. That day when our festive button down shirts disappeared to reveal the classic team color of the anti-everything squad, the kid's eyes blinked in confusion. The black mask is not something to play dress up in. To take back the mask means to actualize our desires, blood and glass and a street filled with us… (Becoming-riot 2008).

In this text, the rioters oppose their own radicality to the ostensibly weak actions of others who they conceive as 'pretending' to be anarchists. Taking on the costume of the Black Bloc is presented as a political act that draws firm lines as to who counts as an anarchist and who doesn't. The affect of confusion is attributed to those unprepared for rioting or charged with stopping it, while joy and hatred bind the rioters together. The affects of joy and hatred are further compounded by the anonymity of the black mask, which allows individuals to be subsumed into the crowd, unable to be differentiated by the ordering gaze of the state. The black mask depersonalizes activists, the effect of being unidentifiable increases the affect of the group as a forceful unit. In this manner, being together as an inscrutable group furthers the bonds of affinity.

What is particularly important here is the conjunction between the experience of the emotions associated with rebellion, such as joy and hatred, and the phenomena of rebelling bodies coming together as a form of force that exceeds liberal bounds of political action. In the discourse of "Becoming-riot" it is the ability of anonymous rebellious bodies to operate as a bloc with individuals subsumed into the black-clothed mass, that gives anarchist direct action its power to defy the police, build the movement, and occasionally, however briefly, to alter power relations in certain contained spaces of the city – as when the single cop faced fifty Black Bloc rioters. It is this ability to effectively take over space, if only temporarily, that gives the anarchist movement significant joy, that functions as a foundational experience and mythology, and that flags anarchist

demonstrators as particularly dangerous in the eyes of the police and security forces. These small anarchist victories are experienced as significant ecstatic events, the experience of which is repeatedly shared with any other radicals who will listen. The repetition of the narrative of anarchist liberation of selves and spaces through rebellion serves to differentiate anarchists in their own eyes from those that they disparagingly refer to as 'liberals', 'aspiring bureaucrats', or 'citizens'.

In the next section I analyze how the affinity-based structure of anarchist organizing, along with the sub-cultural predilection for heroic tale-telling, makes anarchists particularly vulnerable to state infiltration, placing relations of affinity at the center of social control.

Disrupting Affinity: How the State Targets Affective Relations to Break Trust and Spread Fear

The ability of the anarchist movement to grow and thereby become more effective at changing society is significantly restricted by the need to undertake direct actions in secret. Many of the actions recounted above in the "Becoming-riot" zine constitute felonies. Assaulting an officer, resisting arrest, breaking windows and fighting with passersby, even sneaking onto private property in order to harvest discarded food from the dumpster, are all actions that could land one in prison. The state, as the guarantor of law, has a vested interest in trying to stop these types of actions and to apprehend those responsible. This is done

through a variety of tools including infiltration, surveillance, and spreading paranoia and dissent among such groups (Boykoff 2007). Recently, anarchist activists and organizations have been the targets of extensive FBI investigations, covert intelligence programs, and significant suppression. The “Green Scare” is the name given to this current phase of suppression by radical eco-activists who have been aggressively pursued by Federal agents since the mid-late 1990’s when a rash of tree spiking, targeted arson against animal testing labs, Hummer dealerships, and luxury housing developments near wilderness areas, earned eco-anarchists the distinction of being placed at the top of the federal domestic terrorism threat list.

In addition to the presence of riot police and raids on the houses of activists, police and federal security agencies have targeted their efforts at suppressing the anarchist movement at the emotional level through disrupting relations of affinity between activists. Security and policing programs targeting anarchist organizing have attempted to sow distrust among anarchists and anarchist groups and between anarchists and other protesters, to prevent recruitment of new members and diminish the affective capacity of existing groups. This strategy exploits the affinity based organizing model to gather intelligence, and counter-acts the relative anonymity of Black Bloc tactics. In effect, anarchist organizing is counter-acted by attempts to undermine its condition of possibility, the development of affinity within and between groups.

> For any movement which is serious about trying to challenge the hideous objectives of the most powerful imperialist empire that has ever existed, there is a difficult contradiction to handle well. On the one hand, how not to easily get set up or entrapped and do this without falling over into creating an atmosphere of suspicion and paranoia. The former is aimed at destroying the movement from the outside and the latter would essentially destroy it, but from the inside (Rose 2009).

In the aftermath of the 2008 RNC, the American anarchist movement was reeling from revelations of the extent of police and FBI infiltration of organizing and affinity groups. Two cases rose to special prominence. The first is the case of Brandon Darby, a prominent anarchist well known throughout the nation for his work in New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina. Darby, it turns out, was working for the FBI and his testimony and actions led to the incarceration of two men for building Molotov cocktails. The second case involved Andrew Darst, known within the anarchist movement as “Pandy”. Darst was a member of the RNC WC who was involved with the “Action Faction”, the short-lived tactical wing of the Welcoming Committee, as well as being responsible for gathering on the ground intelligence of the geography of St. Paul and providing it to non-local affinity groups coming to town for the RNC blockade. Darst turns out to have been a paid police informant working for the Ramsey County, MN, sheriff’s office.

Infiltration of protest groups has long been a tactic of the state in attempts to de-escalate, intimidate, prosecute, and spread fear among dissenting groups. According to Boykoff (2007:109) the FBI uses infiltration as its most common

technique of domestic intelligence gathering. While infiltration is often done explicitly to gather intelligence that can be used as evidence in trials, it is also done with the aim of instilling distrust and fear among activists (Boykoff 2007). The constant fear that the government is watching an activist group creates an atmosphere of apprehension, breaking bonds of trust and serving to reduce/disrupt the organizational capacity of the group. For example, during the era of the U.S. government's COINTELPRO (Counter Intelligence Program), investigations of American Left movements such as the Communist Party, USA, the Socialist Workers Party, the Black Nationalist Movement, and the New Left were all targeted for systematic repression that included such techniques as infiltration, paying agents provocateurs to incriminate activists, and targeted public defamation campaigns based on government lies (Select Committee To Study Governmental Operations 1976).

As many scholars of social control have pointed out, among the primary goals of Left movement infiltration is discouraging and scaring group members, inhibiting recruitment of new members, and turning movement energy toward defense of its membership instead of advocating social for change (Marx 1988; Churchill 1990; Boykoff 2007). The anarchist movement is particularly susceptible to this type of action, due to the stress on taking direct action measures, and due to the necessity of trust for effective anarchist practice such as consensus-based decision making.

Infiltration has emerged as one of the primary concerns of anarchist organizers in the U.S. due to several recent high profile cases in which state agents posing as anarchists for extended periods of time have entrapped activists through goading them to commit illegal acts. The most famous of these cases is that of “Anna”, a young woman working for the FBI who infiltrated a group of eco-radicals, pushing them to undertake illegal actions through socially pressuring them and using sexual advances to manipulate them. She used FBI funds and technologies to provide a surveilled space where their conversations could be recorded, and was eventually instrumental in sending several activists to prison (Boykoff 2007). This case has become paradigmatic because of the long-term nature of the infiltration needed to gain the trust of the anarchist organizers, and because of the active role played by “Anna” in encouraging others to undertake illegal actions. Essentially, infiltrators like “Anna” take on a persona in order to build trust with activists, they gather activists around them and use radical rhetoric much like that deployed by the Black Bloc activists in the previous section in order to encourage their new “friends” to commit crimes that will be extensively documented. Infiltrators who successfully gain access to affinity groups often use their emotional connections with activists to incriminate movement members. Pushing activists to undertake dangerous and illegal tactics effectively diminishes the movements’ affective capacity through landing members in prison.

The radical posturing and the small affinity group structure of the anarchist movement permit state agents to effectively *create* an affinity group in the interest of betraying the trust it is based on, manipulating revolutionary rhetoric, and entrapping those who join up. When street credibility is derived largely from public acts of quasi-anonymous direct action pared with revolutionary myth-building, movements are ripe for infiltration and manipulation. In essence, all that an infiltrator must do to move to the center of a group of anarcho-activists is to adopt their rhetoric and attend sufficient meetings to be accepted. In effect, by advocating criminal activity infiltrators ostensibly prove their radical credentials, moving beyond reproach within the action-centric anarchist community. What makes this especially dangerous is the affective centrality of tales of illegal direct action in anarchist movement building. When recounting tales of violent resistance is imagined as a powerful instrument for recruitment and capacity building, and when being a 'real' radical is synonymous with taking confrontational direct action, the anarchist movement becomes very vulnerable to agents provocateurs and entrapment.

In terms of the 2008 RNC it was the Ramsey County sheriff's department that engaged most aggressively in infiltrating local anti-RNC organizing groups, while the FBI infiltrated activist groups from other locations including Austin, Texas, the home of two activists who would be convicted on charges brought through the work of an infiltrator.

Two young men from Texas paid a high price for their willingness to trust a well-known radical who also happened to be an infiltrator in the employ of the FBI. Brandon Darby preyed on the radical insecurities of two young anarchists who had been regaled with direct action mythologies that posited the only true route to liberation as being through acts of physical resistance. The FBI informant, Brandon Darby became well known in the national anarchist community through his work in post-Katrina New Orleans, where he was an influential member of an anarchist organization working to organize those left destitute by the storm for mutual aid. At some point during that work, when exactly is unclear, Darby broke with the anarchist movement and started working for the FBI (haloka 2009). By February of 2008 Darby had begun working with a group of young anarchists in Austin, Texas who were preparing to travel to St. Paul for the RNC. The two young men most closely involved in this group, besides Darby, were David McKay and Bradley Crowder, both 23 years old.

The three arrived in the Twin Cities in the week prior to the RNC with a trailer full of shields that they had made out of construction barrels that were to be used in the RNC protests to deflect rubber bullets and tear gas. When police discovered these barrels prior to the protests, officers gained a warrant to search the home of an activist with connections to the Texas affinity group. In that house police found eight Molotov Cocktails, firebombs that had been built by Crowder and McKay. The two were arrested and it quickly became clear that their apparent erstwhile friend was at the heart of their prosecution. According to

the testimony of both men, they looked up to Darby as an experienced and respected radical. They trusted him and tried to emulate him.

One of the reasons that Darby was so well known was due to his revolutionary rhetoric. Darby was known as a rabble-rouser and proponent of revolutionary violence in New Orleans. In the past his propensity for violence had caused significant concern among anarchist organizers. According to a man who worked with Darby in New Orleans, "In Darby's 'revolutionary rhetoric' over the years he tried to get numerous people, including myself, to do the things the two men were eventually taken down for. I believe now he tried to set me up in 2006 to firebomb a bookstore called Brave New Books in Austin. I was NOT interested at all and thought it was stupid. I tried to talk him out of it. The event never happened. He was allowed to change his mind and move on. What if the Feds had raided him at the time?" (Dykes 2009).

During his trial at the Ramsey County Courthouse in St. Paul, MN, McKay claimed that Darby entrapped him and that he never would have done what he did were it not for the urging of the respected older activist. The trial resulted in a mistrial. However, before the retrial McKay dropped the entrapment defense under immense pressure from prosecutors. In a sense, Crowder's power over the other two men derived from their desire to be good anarchists. Their desire to liberate themselves from bourgeois political engagement, as well as their trust for, and desire to impress Crowder, put them in a position in which they could be

easily manipulated and prosecuted by the state, while Crowder's zeal for revolutionary change disguised his true position as an agent provocateur.

Surveillance, and the threat of surveillance, also plays a disciplinary function. Intensive infiltration of anarchist organizing groups and well-known cases of entrapment create an atmosphere in which activists know that they could be being watched at any moment. Just as Foucault (1977) describes in Discipline and Punish, the constant possibility of being watched by the police creates the need for subjects to police themselves preemptively. The highly publicized cases of "Anna" and now of Brandon Darby make real the possibility that any action could be immediately visible to state agents, and thus subject to disciplinary recourse (jail). The disruption of trust through the possibility of infiltration renders potential comrades suspect, and renders trust relations personal rather than communal. Rather than a community in resistance, infiltration produces insular groupings whose coming together is now always fraught with the possibility of being made immediately visible to state power.

Infiltration, then, is a technique through which the state gains access to the emotional connections between organizers, which it then uses to disrupt affective capacity. Attempts by the state to infiltrate and disrupt anarchist affinity groups rely upon the cultivation of intense interpersonal emotions, from hero-worshipping emulation in the case of Darby, friendship in the case of "Pandy", to lust in the case of "Anna". Cracking these emotional bonds has been a central state strategy toward the end of diminishing anarchists' affective capacities to riot

and engage in direct actions. The connections of trust between anarchists have thus become a target of bio-Political power, and therefore constitute a discrete area of radical struggle.

If anarchist organizing is quite susceptible to infiltration and manipulation due to its particular affective field, organizers are not unaware of this liability. In fact, awareness of the possibility of and susceptibility to infiltration often borders on outright paranoia, expressed through a rather extreme obsession with security. In order to protect from the dangers of infiltration, the anarchist community has developed two major defense mechanisms; first is the offensive technique known as *security culture*. Second is a tendency to fragment into very small affinity groups for any kind of potentially illegal action, while maintaining larger groups for arguably less risky organizing.

Security Culture and the Contradictions of Direct Action Under a Microscope

> Stay safe, practice security culture, and only work with people you trust!
> (RNC Welcoming Commitee 2008).

> Welcome to Minnesota, friends, enemies and double agents! We're glad you're here. Well, most of you, anyway. We hope that you enjoy your stay here, and that you don't get into any trouble you aren't looking for. That said, our jail

> support number is 651.356.8635. Write it on your body and know that we're here for you, come what may! Stay safe out there! Keep it smart, keep it strategic, and, if the cops show up, keep your fucking mouth shut!
>
> Love and Solidarity,
>
> Coldsnap Legal Collective[22]
>
> (Coldsnap Legal Collective 2008)

Due to known threats to anarchist organizing, such as the case of the notorious "Anna", the mobilization against the 2008 RNC was characterized by a significant anarchist investment in security. The above quotations, the first from the RNC Welcoming Committee Welcome Guide, which was printed to be distributed to protesters at the convergence space in St. Paul – but was seized by police before that could happen—and the Coldsnap Legal Collective's legal advice booklet entitled "Need to Know Basis," both emphasize the dangers of infiltration and suggest ways for activists and affinity groups to protect themselves from infiltration and prosecution. Though it sounds like an academic description of post-9/11 society, security culture is actually a term that has been deployed by anarchist movements seeking ways to maintain affinity despite significant legal pressure and police harassment. The term seems to have arisen in popular usage among anarchists since about 2003, and represents part of the

[22] Coldsnap is an anarchist legal collective that worked closely with the National Lawyers Guild to educate protesters about their rights and state legal tactics to suppress dissent. They were based in the Twin Cities and consisted both experienced and relatively new anarchist activists with interest in law.

retooling of anarchist tactics in the aftermath of the Seattle and Miami protest actions.

> A security culture is a set of customs shared by a community to help ensure that safety of its members, the practice of which minimizes risk and combats a culture of fear and paranoia. It is especially important for groups whose members may engage in higher-risk or illegal activities, but it is a practice that should be employed by all organizing groups. Having a security culture in place saves everyone the trouble of having to work out safety measures over and over from scratch, and can help offset panic in stressful situations. The difference between protocol and culture is that culture becomes unconscious, instinctive, and thus effortless; once the safest possible behavior has become habitual for everyone in the circles in which you travel, you can spend less time and energy emphasizing the need for it, or suffering the consequences of not having it, or worrying about how much danger you're in, as you'll know you're already doing everything you can to be careful. If you're in the habit of not giving away anything sensitive about yourself, you can collaborate with strangers without having to agonize about whether or not they are informers; if everyone knows what not to talk about over the telephone, your enemies can tap the line all they want and it won't get them anywhere. (Coldsnap Legal Collective 2008)

At its most basic, security culture refers to cultivating a new anarchist practice that eschews the bragging about radical acts that makes it so easy for police and security agencies to target and convict anarchist activists. It does not entail giving up confrontational tactics, only giving up the culture of braggadocio that surrounds such acts. The first rule of security culture is to always assume

that you are under surveillance and therefore never to say anything that could be used against you or your comrades – even in jest.

> The most important principle of all security culture is that people should never be privy to any sensitive information they do not need to know. The greater the number of people who know something that can put individuals or projects at risk — whether that something be the identity of a person who committed an illegal act, the location of a private meeting, or a plan for future activity — the more chance there is of the knowledge getting into the wrong hands. Sharing such information with people who do not need it does them a disservice as well as the ones it puts at risk. (Coldsnap Legal Collective 2008)

This aspect of security culture attempts to make anarchist organizing impervious to relatively casual infiltration. For example, a community that is practicing good security culture will not incriminate itself if officers or informants overhear conversations or attend meetings, tap telephones or hack into email accounts, since such practices will only be discussed in detail in very small groups and never in larger settings such as spokes councils where actions are discussed in general. However, such tactics are less able to counter-act the danger of long-term informants, such as Brandon Darby or “Anna”, who infiltrate small and trusting affinity groups. Other aspects of security culture, such as the practice of vouching activists into sensitive groups and meetings are also somewhat effective at preventing infiltration. That is to say, these practices seem to be effective at making somewhat casual surveillance more difficult, but are inadequate for countering more long-term or sophisticated state practices. For

example, during anti 2008 RNC organizing there were two national organizing meetings called “consulta’s” that were held by the RNC WC. The first of these drew over a hundred participants from across the country. In order to attend this event activists had to supply the names and contact information of at least three people who had known them for at least a year, and could vouch that the applicant was neither a cop nor working for police or security agencies, and was attending the meeting to participate in organizing. Vouchers also had to verify that the vouchee was representing their intentions honestly and was not at the meeting in the capacity of a member of the media – media reports of a consulta would be a gross violation of security culture. Vouching enables activists from distant locations to enroll their social networks in verifying their identities and intentions, and thus enables trust and affinity to be built despite the near-surety of police surveillance. Again, however, this offers little protection from the likes of Brandon Darby, a long-time activist with verifiable ties in the activist community.

Within the broad anarchist movement there is also a concern that the only conceivable defense against turncoats such as Darby is to prevent movement members from becoming disenchanted and embittered against the wider movement, and to protect them from being coerced into snitching. If an activist becomes disillusioned, as apparently happened with Darby, close bonds with other anarchists would presumably dissuade them from snitching on their friends. This problem is countered by attempts to create a maximally inclusive community

that will be less likely to create disgruntled turncoats, and by education on jail solidarity and legal tactics. As the following quotation suggests, in order to be effective, security culture must be adopted as a new common sense rather than perceived as an elitist and exclusionary practice. That is to say, activists are at pains to ensure that the implementation of security culture does not damage the practice of affinity.

> Security culture is a form of etiquette, a way to avoid needless misunderstandings and potentially disastrous conflicts: Security culture should not be another form of elitism; just because someone is not wearing the appropriate punk clothing does not mean that they are a cop (or vice versa). Security concerns should never be an excuse for making others feel left out or inferior, just as no one should feel they have a "right" to be in on anything others prefer to keep to themselves. When dealing with those who violate the security culture of their communities, keep in mind that they should not be rebuked too harshly the first time – this isn't a question of being cool enough to join the in-group, but of establishing group expectations and gently helping people understand their importance. Nevertheless, such people should always be told immediately how they're putting others at risk, and what the consequences will be should they continue to. Those who can't grasp this must be tactfully but effectively shut out of all sensitive situations. (Coldsnap Legal Collective 2008)

The above quotation also stresses the difficulty of growing a movement that is grappling with security concerns. New comers might feel left out and suspected, two emotions that make committing to a political cause and a community more

difficult to do. In his book “Policing Dissent: Social Control and the Anti-Globalization Movement”(2008), Luis Fernandez recounts an experience he had when he went to a spokes council at a major protest site. Fernandez and a couple of friends, all of whom were from out of state, showed up at a spokes council before a major convergence where police had already been harassing anarchist protesters. When they arrived they were questioned by anarchists in charge of meeting security about their identities, histories of activism, and intentions. They were then allowed into the meeting. The meeting began with an activist announcing that it was not a safe space and that no one should say anything that they didn’t want the cops to hear. They also felt like they are singled out for suspicion because one of Fernandez’s companions was a journalist. Eventually they left the meeting feeling discouraged and rejected. Although they had initially wanted to help out with the convergence, they felt that paranoia had driven them away and broken the potential affinity that could have been built in a more trusting environment. He concludes this anecdote with his opinion that security culture is antithetical to movement growth. In this sense, the paranoia instilled by police infiltration seems to be an even more effective method of social control than do the arrests and criminal cases brought through such tactics. In effect, activists are forced to make their movement more exclusive in order to maintain security, which has a negative impact on their ability to grow the movement and its capacity to foment social change.

However, despite these limitations, security culture does appear to be successful in some circumstances. In the case of the RNC Welcoming Committee, the vouching procedure barred three apparent activists who later turned out to be infiltrators from attending the second national consulta because they could not find appropriate people to vouch for them. On the other hand, yet another infiltrator who worked for the Ramsey County Sheriff's department who also failed his vouching simply walked straight into the meeting after announcing he was a member of the Welcoming Committee. In this case security culture worked, it was physical security that failed.

At RNC WC meetings, members were periodically reminded of good security culture practices and of the possibility that some group members might secretly be cops or informants. This did increase fear, but it also reinforced security culture norms. However, this also created something of an informal bi-level membership structure in which some members were more on the inside than others.

Some group members who did not fit traditional anarchist stereotypes of disgruntled and slightly dirty youth had a hard time moving from the periphery of the group to the center. In particular there was one 30ish year old white working class man who said he was an unemployed welder named Chris who was constantly excluded from a variety of WC functions. Additionally, a mid-40's clean-cut woman allegedly named Norma Jean was also received with mixed feelings by the group. In fact, there were several secret meetings about these

two figures and whether they could or should be excluded from the group based on their strange behavior and unconventionally normal backgrounds and appearances. In the end they were allowed to remain members of the group, however after the RNC they were both exposed as infiltrators in the affidavits used to justify the warrants for the arrest of the RNC 8. “Chris” and “Norma Jean” both worked for the Ramsey County Sheriff’s department. However, since both of these people failed to be vouched for they were excluded from sensitive meetings and relegated to supporting roles where they did relatively little harm (in fact, they helped to cook gleaned food for hundreds of people while they were excluded from meetings).

In a sense, although the effectivity of security culture as a practice is somewhat dubious, given the success of the state in continually infiltrating anarchist movements, the attempt to rebuild affinity along new lines is instructive of emerging forms of biopolitical struggle. In particular, the acknowledgement that the affective structures of anarchist organizing are vulnerable to infiltration has led to a reformulation of anarchist organizing praxis. Importantly, this has not meant the abandonment of affinity as a goal, nor direct action as a tactics. Rather, bioPolitical tactics, such as infiltration and the manipulation of anarchist desires, have been met with a renewed attempt by anarchist activists to develop emotional connections that can endure police pressure and evade the most obvious emotionally-based traps set by security personnel. However, this has not been attempted without cost. Security culture provides a form of affinity

under threat. It is a compromise. The reality of undercover agents' cultivation of emotional ties with activists as a tactic for entrapment has put significant pressure on anarchist communities. While security culture does allow affinity-based organizing to occur. It has nevertheless resulted in considerable paranoia and worry that makes affinity a more difficult goal to accomplish. Trusting someone requires a leap of faith, but in trusting the affective capacity of the group is augmented. Emotional bonds of affinity are absolutely central to anarchist organizing; a centrality that places these bonds at the center of biopolitical struggle.

Conclusion

The particular affective structures of the articulation between anarchist organizing and state strategies for social control are intensely biopolitical. It is at this intersection that Foucault's Biopolitics become insufficient because they have little place for thinking rebellion as a positive form of power. It is not merely the case that the state takes life as its object, rebellious forms of life also take the forms of their interconnection as a realm of struggle. In this regard Negri's bifurcation of the biopolitical into constituted and constituent elements makes clear the ways in which the emotional underpinnings of the capacity to act in a radical fashion emerge as a central site of revolutionary struggle. Finally, affinity operates as a form of love, whose drive for increased class power is complicated

by both the structure of biopolitical rebellion currently in vogue in anarchist circles and by the bio-Political techniques of infiltration and surveillance that characterize contemporary forms of Constitution.

Love binds together an affinity group as a collective of individuals, while class hatred pushes the group to confront inequality and oppression through direct action. In this sense, and similar to Negri's formulation in Alma Venus, Common Wealth, and elsewhere, the appropriation of a Spinozan understanding of love as a material force, cupiditas, that which drives matter to enter into combination and increase in strength, is grafted onto human politics. Love is both the impetus for, and the goal of radical political organizing based in affinity. Entering into collectivity with others increases capacity to act and amplifies oppositionality. The attempts to limit this connection are the bioPolitical operation of state power to contain and quash connection that is in excess of liberal forms. Love is mobilized in confronting limits to freedom, the state and capital, and it therefore becomes an object of biopolitical operation.

Affinity, then, is a form of emotional connection and affective strength that is based in love for comrades and hatred for oppression. As Negri writes:

> The materialist definition of love is a definition of community, that is, a definition of the construction of affective relationships that extend through a generosity that constructs social arrangements. Love cannot be something that is closed in a couple or in the family, but must be something that opens up to a wider community. It must be something that somehow constructs communities of knowledge and desire that becomes constructive of something else. Today love is posed in an absolutely fundamental way as the destruction of every attempt to

> close existence in something proper or private. I think that love is the fundamental key for transforming the proper or private into what is common (Negri 1998).

However, love as a militant predisposition can be dangerous, and it can make oppositional movements vulnerable to attack through bioPolitical modes of control. In the case of the anarchist movement, infiltration becomes a constant threat that inhibits the ability of the movement to grow in power. But the movement is also capable of autonomous recomposition, of shifting its particular emotional and affective structures to respond to external and internal threats. Sometimes this comes in the form of new techniques for building security and screening potential comrades, sometimes it comes as a wholesale attempt to reconstruct foundational mythologies – as in the case of adapting security culture to affinity-based organizing.

Conclusion, Reflections, and limitations

A wise man once told me that to posit an ontology is necessarily to make a wager[23]. Foundational claims cannot be proven or disproven, they are, in effect axiomatic. To gamble on the claim that resistance is primary is to take a stand for an unabashedly partisan science. This dissertation has been my attempt to lay out one possible way that such a partisan science of space, place, and struggle can be done. It has been my intent in so doing to build on the calls of scholars like Leitner, Peck, Maringanti, and Sziarto (2007), J.K. Gibson-Graham (2006), and Wendy Larner (Larner 2003; 2006) to decenter neoliberalism from examinations of contentious politics. I do this not because neoliberalism is unimportant, but rather because it cannot adequately be conceived aside from its myriad articulations with constituent struggle. Resistance is primary precisely because Constituted power cannot exist without its constitutive corollary, constituent power.

The objective of this research was to attempt an examination of contentious politics that placed the articulation between domination and resistance at the ontological center of knowledge production, and to ask how this might aid in decentering neoliberalism and gaining a more adequate understanding of the relations between social movements, state power, and

[23] Brue Braun made this comment during his graduate seminar "Aleatory Materialisms" at the University of Minnesota.

capital. In the first chapter I demonstrated that a struggle-based ontology is capable of beginning to bridge the divides in geography between Marxian political economy and Foucauldian post-structural approaches to neoliberalism and contestation. This was accomplished through the articulation of autonomous Marxism with the geographic traditions of regulation theory and Foucauldian governmentality theories. This articulation allowed me to incorporate the concepts of composition analysis, and the social factory into geography. Additionally, in the first chapter I introduced the concept of the composition of contestation as an aid in thinking the autonomy of modes of contestation from the forms of domination. This conceptualization aided in charting the path of the following chapters; in essence, chapters two, three, and four examine how certain contestations of neoliberalism have emerged through mass protest events, specifically protests targeting the 2008 Republican National Convention and its recent antecedents since Seattle 1999.

In the second chapter I explained Negri's concepts of Constituted and constituent forms of power, and built upon these ideas to produce my concept of constituent space as a geographical contribution to Autonomous theory. This concept also contributes to understandings of public space as a technology for the capture of constituent power. This distinction acts as a corrective for the so-called "end of public space" literature, which has posited public space largely as a kind of spatiality that is defended by social movements in the face of the operations of capital and the state to dismantle public space. Instead, my work

demonstrates that public space is sometimes a spatiality that social movements struggle against and the state struggles to impose. This insight followed from my focus on the articulation between domination and contestation, which allowed me to consider how the category of public space as the spatialization of a relation of subject to sovereign is produced.

In chapter three I examined how police and security agencies have responded to the anarchist rejection of public space in contemporary protest politics through the governmental technique of separating liberal from illiberal protesters in the spaces of the city, and how the Saint Paul Principles were developed as a form of counter-conduct that allowed liberal and radical protesters to contest the ability of the police to successfully role out their governmental operations. This chapter contributes to the governmentality literature in geography through demonstrating how governmentalities and counter-conducts articulate as sites of social struggle. This example may be helpful in counter-acting the tendency in geography for Foucauldian studies of governmentality to seriously neglect constituent practices in favor of logics of domination.

In chapter four I develop an argument that affect and emotion are central targets of both state strategies for suppressing radical contestations and social movement strategies for developing radically antagonistic forms of class power. This draws on Negri's distinction between two forms of politics, biopolitics and bioPolitics, in which the former is a constituent practice that pits life against

domination and the latter is a practice of Constitution in which Power is pit against life (Casarino 2008). This chapter contributes to contemporary debates in geography on the role of affect in politics by insisting that affect and emotion are strategic targets of radical social struggle.

Despite the promise that I think a struggle-centered approach to domination and contestation holds, there are some important limitations to this work. Politically speaking, research on emerging compositions of contestation runs the risk of outing new strategies to the state. In the case of my case study I was at constant pains to explain how struggle was unfolding in a manner that would not be useful to the police and security agencies in cracking down on, de-escalating, or repressing social movements. This need to be obtuse about what was going on has very likely made my dissertation much less useful to social movements than it would otherwise had been if I didn't have to worry about the police using my dissertation as evidence in the prosecution of RNC WC activists. Indeed, on at least two occasions representatives of the Ramsey County Sheriff's department have mentioned that they intended to read my dissertation upon its completion. This is a problem that I do not have any ready answers to. Perhaps the problem is academic publishing and distribution of materials developed through this type of research; if these chapters were never publically published but rather distributed underground by social movements perhaps I could have been more direct.

In a sense, it is precisely this pressure to avoid incriminating activists that has driven this dissertation in such a theoretical direction. I continually found that I simply could not ethically write about many of the most interesting aspects of the mobilization against the RNC because to do so would be a gross violation of security culture (see chapter 4), which would jeopardize the safety of my research subjects.

Theorizing new approaches for geographers to study contentious politics, however, seemed a relatively safe way to reflect on my fieldwork without endangering anyone. This is, perhaps, one of the primary reasons that study of contentious politics in geography has tended toward an analytic of domination. In studying and exposing the operation of dominating power scholars produce political knowledge that is unlikely to be recuperated by the state or capital. However, they also often fail to help stories of effective struggle to circulate and aid in the composition of effective contestation.

The wager made by this research, that an analytic based in struggle could be fruitfully drawn from Autonomous Marxism into geography, has, I think, paid off. Much work remains to fully articulate and lay out the agreements, disjunctures, contributions, and silences that radical geography and Autonomous Marxism have in regard to each other. However I think that the utility of certain concepts has begun to be demonstrated in this dissertation. Some serious tensions did arise as I pursued this line of inquiry; and not all of them have been satisfactorily resolved here.

First, there is the rather serious concern that a theoretically driven dissertation such as this runs the risk of only telling stories that are amenable to the theoretical narrative. I take this critique seriously and acknowledge it as a problem. When theory is imposed from the beginning it is, in a sense, external to the case. The theoretical level of abstraction that is typical of Autonomous theory, along with my concerns for the safety of my research subjects did lead me to choose certain aspects of the mobilization against the 2008 RNC to analyze above others. I chose to analyze instances of rebellion over in-depth analysis of, for example, the city's campaign to attract the convention, police perceptions of Black Bloc rioters, or media representations of protesters. I would never claim that these are unimportant, only that they were peripheral to my intention here, which was to highlight the role of contestation in its articulation with domination. In many ways, it was never my intent to fully explain the contentious politics of the 2008 RNC, nor to fully historicize these struggles. Additionally, I do not think that my approach is any more susceptible to the critique that my facts follow my theory than are other Marxian approaches, or bourgeois approaches for that matter. The point is, all approaches assume theoretical underpinnings; mine might only be more apparent because they are relatively unfamiliar.

Second, in attempting to operationalize a particular vein of theoretical understanding within a geographic concept I more often than not ended up importing concepts into geography rather than articulating them carefully with

geographic understandings. In a sense, the theory of the capitalist socius, or of the primacy of resistance both operate as given assumptions rather than as theoretical propositions that could be challenged and tested. I am uneasy with this. I do think that a more critical appraisal of Autonomous theory is necessary as I revise the study presented here for publication. In a sense, I think that what I have accomplished in this dissertation has been to identify some places where geographical theory and Autonomous theory are articulable and I have begun to chart out some of the results of such an articulation. What I have not yet done is to "suture" these theories together in the manner suggested by Gidwani (2008). Such suturing is the task of the next several years.

In the end, I am somewhat theoretically ambivalent with the ontological claim of the primacy of resistance. On the one hand, I think that such a commitment is a needed corrective to the real tendency in geography to downplay the effectivity of contestation. The assumption of the primacy of resistance could counteract this phenomenon. On the other hand, I do not want to fall into false triumphalism. Just because contestation is pervasive, it does not follow that we are winning. Only that it is possible that we could win. So this is what it all comes down to. I choose to adopt the maxim that constituent power is basic because I think that the left is badly in need of hope for a revolutionary future. The failure of 1968 does not imply the failure of revolutionary struggle – the pessimism of much post-1968 theory aside. I think that Autonomous concepts are useful in fostering hope precisely because they can be articulated

with critical traditions in geography that seem to hold out less optimistic assessments of the future. In a sense, it is time to get over the failures of the 20th century and turn our attention toward the promise of the 21st. It is this movement toward the future that I hope this scholarship can aid.

Bibliographic References

ACLU. (2003). "Freedom Under Fire: Dissent in Post-9/11 American." ACLU Reports Retrieved 12/5/07, from http://www.aclu.org/national-security/freedom-under-fire-dissent-post-911-america.

ACLU. (2004). "Freedom Under Fire: Dissent in Post-9/11 American." ACLU Reports Retrieved 12/5/07.

ACME Collective. (1999). "Black Bloc Communique: A communique from one section of the black bloc of N30 in Seattle." from http://www.insurgentdesire.org.uk/blackbloc.htm.

Agamben, G. (2009). What is an Apparatus. Stanford, Stanford University Press.

Anarchist FAQ Editorial Collective (2009). An Anarchist FAQ version 13.1. T. A. Library, The Anarchist Library.

Anonymous (2008). Wrecking You Again for the Very First Time.

Armond, P. d. (2001). Netwar in the Emerald City: WTO Protest Strategy and Tactics. Networks and Netwars: The Future of Terror, Crime, and Militancy. J. Arquilla and D. Ronfeldt. Santa Monica, CA, Rand Corporation.

Barnet, C. (2008). "Political Affects in Public Space: Normative Blind-spots in Non-Representational Ontologies." Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers **33**: 186-200.

Boghosian, H. (2004). The Assault on Free Speech, Public Assembly, and Dissent: A National Lawyers Guild Report on Government Violations of First Amendment Rights in the United States. Great Barrington, MA, The North River Press.

Boghosian, H. (2007). Punishing Protest: Government Tactics that Supress Free Speech, The National Lawyers Guild.

Bookchin, M. (1991). The Spanish Anarchists: The Heroic Years 1868-1936. Oakland, CA, AK Press.

Borum, R. a. C. T. (2005). "Anarchist Direct Actions: A Challenge for Law Enforcement." Studies in Conflict and Terrorism **28**(3): 201-223.

Bovard, J. (2003). "Free-Speech Zone" The administration quaratines dissent. The American Conservative**:** 1-6.

Boykoff, J. (2006). "Framing Dissent: Mass-Media Coverage of the Global Justice Movement." New Political Science **28**(2): 201-228.

Boykoff, J. (2007). Beyond Bullets: the Supression of Dissent in the United States. Oakland, CA, AK Press.

Boykoff, J. (2007). "Limiting Dissent: The Mechanisms of State Repression in the USA." Social Movement Studies **6**(3): 281-310.

Brenner, N., Jamie Peck, and Nik Theodore (2005). "Neoliberal Urbanism: Cities and the Rule of Markets." Draft.

Brenner, N. a. T. N. (2002). Spaces of Neoliberalism: Urban Restructuring in North America and Western Europe. Malden, Massachusetts, Blackwell Publishing.

Brown, W. (2008). Porous Sovereignty, Walled Democracy. Katz Distinguished Lecturees in the Humanities Series. The University of Washington.

Casarino, C. a. A. N. (2008). In Praise of the Common: A Conversation on Philosophy and Politics. Minneapolis, The University of Minnesota Press.
Chappell, B. (2006). "Rehearsals of The Sovereign: States of Exception and Threat Governmentality." Cultural Dynamics **18**: 313-334.
Churchill, W. a. J. V. W. (1990). The COINTELPRO Papers: Documents from the FBI's Secret wars Against Domestic Dissent. Boston, South End Press.
City of Saint Paul (2009). Saint Paul City Charter, Section 366A. C. Council. Saint Paul, Minnesota, City of Saint Paul.
Cleaver, K. a. G. K. (2001). LIberation, Imagination, and the Black Panther Party. New York, Routledge.
Clough, N. a. R. V. (2006). "Managing Politics and Consumption in Business Improvement Districts: The Geographies of Political Activism on Burlington, Vermont's Church Street Marketplace." Urban Studies **43**(12): 2261-2284.
Cohen, L. (1996). "From Town Center to Shopping Center: The Reconfiguration of Community Marketplaces in Postwar America." The American Historical Review **101**(4): 1050-1081.
Coldsnap Legal Collective (2008). Need to Know Basis. C. L. Collective. Minneapolis, self published.
Coleman, R. (2004). "Images from a Neoliberal City: The State, Surveillance and Social Control." Critical Criminology **12**: 21-42.
CrimethINC (2005). Demonstrating Resistance: Mass Action and Autonomous Action in an Election Year, An analysis of successes and failures of recent militant demonstrations. CrimethINC. New York, CrimethINC Ex-Workers' Collective.
CrimethINC (2005). Direct Action. An Anarchist Cookbook: Recipes for Disaster. CrimethINC. New York, CrimethINC ex-workers collective.
CrimethINC (2008). "What to Expect From the Conventions: An Analysis of the Strategic Opportunities and Challenges Presented by the 2008 Democratic and Republican National Conventions." The Journal of Aesthetics and Protest **In the MIddle of a Whirlwind: 2008 Convention Protests, Movement and Movements**.
D'arcus, B. (2005). Boundaries of Dissent: Protest and State Power in the Media Age. New York, Routledge.
Dalla Costa, M. a. S. J. (1975). The Power of Women and the Subversion of Community. London, Falling Wall Press.
Day, R. J. F. (2004). "From Hegemony to Affinity: The Political Logic of the Newest Social Movements." Cultural Studies **18**(5): 716-748.
Deleuze, G. a. F. G. (1983). Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia. Minneapolis, The University of Minnesota Press.
Della Porta, D. a. H. R., Ed. (1998). Policing Protest: The Control of Mass Protest in Western Democracies. Social Movements, Protest and Contention. Minneapolis, The University of Minnesota Press.
Della Porta, D. a. M. D. (1999). Social Movements: An Introduction. Malden, MA, Blackwell.

Dickens, P. (2010). "Class War and the Agents of the State." Property is Theft! Retrieved 2/20/10, 2010, from http://propertyistheft.wordpress.com/2010/01/10/class-war-and-the-agents-of-the-state/.
Dwyer, J. (2007). City Police Spied Broadly Before G.O.P. Convention. The New York Times. New York. **March 25, 2007:** 11.
Dykes, A. (2009) "FBI infromant who stung RNC 2008 anarchists connected to 'firebomb plot' on Brave New Books and "suicided" Palestinian activist Riad Hamad." Prisonplanet.com.
Feldman, L. (2009). "Review of "The People's Property? Power, Politics, and the Public" by Lynn Staeheli adn Don Mitchell." City and Community **vol. 8**(1): 87-88.
Fernandez, L. (2008). Policing Dissent: Social Control and the Anti-Globalization Movement. New Brunswick, New Jersey, Rutgers University Press.
Flusty, S. (2001). "The Banality of Interdiction: Surveillance, Control and the Displacement of Diversity." International Journal of Urban and Regional Research **25**(3): 658-664.
Foucault, M. (1977). Discipline and Punish. London, Penguin.
Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. The Foucault Effect:. G. Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press**:** 87-104.
Foucault, M. (2007). Security,Territory, Population: Lectures at the College De France, 1977-78. New York, Palgrave Macmillan.
Fraser, N. (1992). Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy. Habermas and the Public Sphere. C. Calhoun. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press**:** 109-142.
Gelderloos, P. (2007). How Nonviolence Protects the State. New York, South End Press.
Gibson-Graham, J. K. (2006). A PostCapitalist Politics. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.
Gidwani, V. (2008). Capital, Interupted: Agrarian Development and the Politics of Work in India. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.
GOP.com. (2007). "RNC Site Selection Committee To Recommend Minneapolis – St. Paul For 2008 Republican National Convention." Retrieved 10/7, 2008, from http://www.gop.com/News/Read.aspx?ID=6600.
Gordon, C. (1991). Governmental Rationality: an introduction. The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality. G. Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press**:** 1-51.
Graeber, D. (2004). Fragments of an Anarchist Anthropology. Chicago, Prickely Paradigm Press.
Grindon, G. (2007). The Breath of the Possible. Constituent Imagination: Militant Investigations Collective Theorization. S. Schukaitis, David Graeber, and Erika Biddle. Oakland, CA, AK Press**:** 94-107.
Habermas, J. (1991). The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry in to a Category of Bourgeois Society. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
haloka (2009) "Brandon Darby's Politics of Moral Certitube." Twin Cities Indymedia.

Hardt, M. (1996). Introduction: Laboratory Italy. Radical Thought in Italy: A Potential Politics. M. a. P. V. Hardt. Minneapolis, The University of Minnesota Press**:** 1-10.
Hardt, M. a. A. N. (2000). Empire. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.
Hardt, M. a. P. V. (1996). Radical Thought in Italy: A Potential Politics. Minneapolis, The University of Minnesota Press.
Harvey, D. (1989). "From Managerialism to Entrepreneurialism: Urban Governance in Late Capitalism." Geographiska Annaler **17**(1).
Iveson, K. (2007). Publics and the City. Malden, MA, Blackwell.
Keith, M., and Stephen Pile (1997). Geographies of Resistance. London, Rutledge.
Klepto, K. (2004). "Making war with love: The Clandestine Insurgent Rebel Clown Army." City **8**(3): 403-411.
Kutcher, C. (2008). Plans to Target Transportation Infrastructure Surrounding Republican National Convention. D. o. H. S. Highway Watch. Washington, D.C., Transportation Security Operations Center, Department of Homeland Security.
Laclau, E. a. C. M. (1985). Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics. New York, Verso.
Lakey, G. (2000). "Mass Action Since Seattle: 7 ways to make our protests more powerful." Training for Change Retrieved 10/12/09, 2009, from http://www.trainingforchange.org/mass_action_since_seattle.
Larner, W. (2003). "Guest Editorial: Neoliberalism." Environment and Planning D: Society and Space **21**: 509-512.
Leitner, H., E. Sheppard, and K. Sziarto (2008). "The Spatialities of Contentious Politics." Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers **33**: 157-172.
Leitner, H., E. Sheppard, K. Sziarto, A. Maringanti (2007). Contesting urban futures: Decentering neoliberalism. Contesting Neoliberalism: Urban Frontiers.
Louwagie, P., Emily Kaiser, and Heron Marquez Estrada (2008). RNC: So, how'd we do? Depends on who you ask. The Star-Tribune. Minneapolis, MN.
Low, S. a. N., Smith, Ed. (2006). The Politics of Public Space. New York, Routledge.
MacLeod, G. (2002). "From Urban Entrepreneurialism to a "Revanchist City"? On the Spatial Injustices of Glasgow's Renaissance." Antipode: 602-624.
Marston, S. (1990). "Who are "The People": Gender, Citizenship, and the Making of the American Nation." Environment and Planning D: Society and Space **8**: 449-458.
Marx, G. (1988). Undercover: Police Surveillance in America. Berkeley, The Univesity of California Press.
Marx, K. (1990). Capital: A Critique of Political Economy. New York, Penguin.
Mayron, A. a. D. H. (2000). Police Arrest 81 in Genetic Engineering Protest Clash. Pioneer Press. St. Paul, Star Tribune Company.
Minneapolis Saint Paul 2008 Host Committee (2008). "Minnesota's Conventional Wisdom Pays Off. Minneapolis**:** 11.
Mitchell, D. (1995). "The End of Public Space? People's Park, Definitions of the Public and Democracy." Annals of the Association of American Geographers **85**(1): 108-133.
Mitchell, D. (2003). The Right to the City: Social Justice and the Fight for Public Space. New York, The Guilford Press.

Mitchell, D. (2005). "The S.U.V. model of citizenship: floating bubbles, buffer zones, and the rise of the "purely atomic" individual." Political Geography **24**(1): 1-38.
Mitchell, D. a. L. S. (2005). "Permitting Protest: Parsing the Fine Geography of Dissent in America." International Journal of Urban and Regional Research **29**(4): 796-813.
Negri, A. (1991). Marx Beyond Marx: Lessons on the Grundrisse. New York, Autonomedia.
Negri, A. (1991). The Savage Anomaly. Minneapolis, The University of Minnesota Press.
Negri, A. (1998). "Back to the Future." Retrieved 4/1/10, from http://www.generation-online.org/p/fpnegri19.htm.
Negri, A. (1999). Insurgencies: Constituent Power and the Modern State. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.
Negri, A. (2008). The Porcelain Workshop: For a New Grammar of Politics. New York, Semiotext(e).
O'Nimmity, A. (2008). The Battle of the River: A Fiction. Minneapolis.
Office of the Inspector General, D. o. H. S. (2008). Effectiveness of the Federal Trucking Industry Security Grant Program. H. Security. Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Homeland Security.
Panzieri, R. (1961). "The Capitalist Use of Machinery: Marx Versus the Objectivists." Quadernni Rossi.
Pile, S. (2010). "Emotions and Affect in Recent Human Geography." Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers **35**: 5-20.
Proudhon, P. J. (1970). What is Property? An Inquiry into the Principle of Right and Government. New York, Dover.
RNC Welcoming Commitee (2008). Crash the Convention: RNC 2008. Minneapolis, MN.
RNC Welcoming Commitee (2008). RNC Welcome Guide. Minneapolis, RNC Welcoming Committee.
Rose, L. (2009). The Political Prosecution of the RNC 8: Part 2 Informants and Undercover Agents: The Governments Strategy To Disrupt, Set Up and Attack Opposition To The Republican National Convention. Revolution. Chicago, IL, The Revolutionary Communist Party, USA. **March 8**.
Rose, N. (1996). Governing "advanced" liberal democracies. Foucault and Political Reason:Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism, and Rationalities of Government. A. Barry, Thomas Osborne, and Nikolas Rose. Chicago, University of Chicago Press**:** 37-64.
Ruddick, S. (1996). "Constructing Difference in Public Spaces: Race, Class, and Gender as Interlocking Systems." Urban Geography **17**(2): 132-151.
Schaller, S. a. G. M. (2005). "Contesting Public Space and Citizenship: Implications for Neighborhood Business Improvement Districts." Journal of Planning Education and Research **24**: 394-407.
Schukaitis, S. (forthcoming). "Dance, Dance, Recomposition: Recuperation and its Discontents." submitted to ACME.

Schukaitis, S., David Graeber, and Erika Biddle (2007). Constituent Imagination: Militant Investigations Collective Theorization. Oakland, CA, AK Press.
Select Committee To Study Governmental Operations (1976). Supplementary Detailed Staff Reprots On Intelligence Activities And The Rigths Of Americans. I. A. United States Senate. Washington.
Sennett, R. (1976). The Fall of Public Man: On the Social Psychology of Capitalism. New York, Vintage Books.
Sheppard, B. a. R. H. (2002). From ACT UP to the WTO: Urban Protest and Community Building in the Era of Globalization. London, Verso.
Siebel, W. and J. Wehrheim (2006). "Security and the Urban Public Sphere." German Policy Studies **3**(1): 19-46.
Smith, N. (1996). The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City. London, Routledge.
Solnit, D. and R. Solnit (2009). The Battle of the Story of the Battle of Seattle. Berkeley, AK Press.
Spinoza, B. (1951). A Theologico-Political Treatise. New York, Dover.
Spinoza, B. (2008). Ethics. Charleston, S.C., Bibliolife.
Staeheli, L. and D. Mitchell (2008). The People's Property?: Power, Politics, and the Public. New York, Routledge.
Terranova, T. (2004). Network Culture. London, Pluto Press.
Thoburne, N. (2003). Deleuze, Marx, and Politics. New York, Routledge.
Tronti, M. (1964). "Lenin in England." Classe Operaia **1**(1).
Tronti, M. (1966). The Strategy of Refusal. Operai e Capitale. Turin, Einaudi**:** 234-252.
Tronti, M. (1966). "Struggle Against Labor."
Tronti, M. (updated pamphlet). "Social Capital."
Union, A. C. L. (2004). "Freedom Under Fire: Dissent in Post-9/11 American." ACLU Reports Retrieved 12/5/07.
Virno, P. (2004). A Grammar of the Multitude: For an Analysis of Contemporary Forms of Life. New York, Semio text (e).
Wainwright, J. (2007). Spaces of resistance in Seattle and Cancun. Contesting Neoliberalism: Urban Frontiers. H. Leitner, J. Peck, and E. Sheppard.
Wainwright, J. a. R. O. (2006). "The Battles in Miami: the fall of the FTAA/ALCA and the promise of transnational movements." Environment and Planning D: Society and Space **24**: 349-366.
Ward, K. (2006). "'Policies in Motion', Urban Management and State Restructuring: The Trans-Local Expansion of Business Improvement Districts." International Journal of Urban and Regional Research **30**(1): 54-75.
Warner, M. (2002). Publics and Counterpublics. New York, Zone Books.
Wilde, L. (2007). "The Concept of Solidarity: Emerging from the Theoretical Shadows." The British Journal of Politics and International Relations **9**: 171-181.
Wright, S. (2002). Storming Heaven: Class Composition and Struggle in Italian Autonomous Marxism. London, Pluto Press.
Zerowork (1975). "An introduction to Zerowork." Zerowork **1**(1): 1-4.

Zick, T. (2005). Speech and Spatial Tactics. Legal Studies Research Paper Series. Queens, NY, St. Johns University School of Law. **Paper #05-010:** 580-651.