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If one believes that systemic ruptural strategies of emancipatory transformation are not plausible, at least under existing historical conditions, then the only real alternative is some sort of strategy that envisions transformation largely as a process of metamorphosis in which relatively small incremental transformations cumulatively generate a qualitative shift in the dynamics and logic of a social system. [perhaps cut the following and use this in the conclusion] This does not imply that transformation is a smooth, non-conflictual process that somehow transcends antagonistic interests. A democratic egalitarian project of social emancipation is a challenge to exploitation and domination, inequality and privilege, and thus emancipatory metamorphosis requires struggles over power and confrontations with dominant classes and elites. In practice, therefore, an emancipatory metamorphosis will require some of the strategic elements of the ruptural model: the history of the future – if it is to be a history of emancipatory social empowerment – will be a trajectory of victories and defeats, winners and losers, not simply of compromise and cooperation between differing interests and classes. The episodes of that trajectory will be marked by institutional innovations that will have to overcome opposition from those whose interests are threatened by democratic egalitarianism, and some of that opposition will be nasty, recalcitrant and destructive. So, to invoke metamorphosis is not to abjure struggle, but to see the strategic goals and effects of struggle in a particular way: as the incremental modifications of the underlying structures of a social system and its mechanisms of social reproduction that cumulatively transform the system, rather than as a sharp discontinuity in the centers of power of the system as a whole.¹

Understood in this way, there are two broad approaches to the problem of transformation as metamorphosis: interstitial transformation and symbiotic transformation. These differ primarily in terms of their relationship to the state. Both envision a trajectory of change that progressively enlarges the social spaces of social empowerment, but interstitial strategies largely by-pass the state in pursuing this objective while symbiotic strategies try to systematically use the state to advance the process of emancipatory social empowerment. These need not constitute antagonistic strategies – in many circumstances they complement each other, and indeed may even require each other. Nevertheless, historically many supporters of interstitial strategies of transformation have been very wary of the state, and many advocates of more statist symbiotic strategies have been dismissive of interstitial approaches.

In the next chapter we will explore symbiotic transformations. Here we will examine the logic of interstitial strategies. We will begin by distinguishing between interstitial strategies and what might be called interstitial processes. This will be followed by a discussion of different

¹ This understanding of metamorphosis suggests that the stark contrast between “rupture” and “metamorphosis” is in some ways misleading since emancipatory metamorphosis can itself be thought of as a trajectory of partial and limited social ruptures – institutional innovations – that cumulatively constitute a qualitative transformation. What is really at issue here is therefore the extent to which a large-scale comprehensive rupture with the fundamental structures of power in capitalism is possible.
types of interstitial strategies and a discussion of the underlying logic of the ways such strategies might contribute to broad emancipatory transformation. The chapter will conclude with a discussion of the limits of interstitial strategies.

**What is an interstitial strategy?**

The adjective “interstitial” is used in social theory to describe various kinds of processes that occur in the spaces and cracks within some dominant social structure of power. One can speak of the interstices of an organization, the interstices of a society, or even the interstices of global capitalism. The underlying assumption is that the social unit in question can be understood as a system within which there is some kind of dominant power structure or dominant logic which organizes the system, but that the system is not so coherent and integrated that those dominant power relations govern all of the activities that occur within it. Even in so-called “totalitarian” systems in which centralized power penetrates quite deeply into all spheres of social life there are still spaces within which individuals act in relatively autonomous ways, not following the dictates of the logic of the system. This need not imply that such interstitial practices are subversive or that they somehow corrode the dominant logic of the system, but simply that they are not directly governed or controlled by the dominant power relations and dominant principles of social organization.

Interstitial processes often play a central role in large-scale patterns of social change. For example, capitalism is often described as having developed in the interstices of feudal society. Feudal societies were characterized by a dominant structure of class and power relations consisting of nobles of various ranks who controlled the principle means of military violence and peasants with different kinds of rights who engaged in agricultural production and produced a surplus which was appropriated by the feudal dominant class through a variety of largely coercive mechanisms. Market relations developed in the cities, which were less fully integrated into feudal relations, and over time this created the context within which proto-capitalist relations and practices could emerge and eventually flourish. Whether one believes that the pivotal source of ultimate transformation of feudalism came from the dynamics of war-making and state-building, from contradictions in process of feudal surplus extraction, from the corrosive effects of markets, from the eventual challenge of emerging capitalists, or some combination of these processes, the interstitial development of capitalism within feudal societies is an important part of the story.

While interstitial *processes* and *activities* clearly play a significant role in social change, it is less obvious that there are compelling interstitial *strategies* for social transformation. The urban artisans and merchants in feudal society whose interstitial activities fostered new kinds of relations did not have a project of destroying feudal class relations and forging a new kind of society. They were simply engaged in profit-seeking activities, adapting to the opportunities and possibilities of the society in which they lived. The broader ramifications for long-term social

---

2 One of the fundamental issues in social theory is the extent to which society can be viewed as a “system” and, if so, what kind of system. At one extreme is the view of society as a system in much the same way as an organism is a system with well articulated parts that fulfill interconnected functions. But societies can also be viewed as a system more like an ecology in nature: there are systematically interconnected causal relations among the component parts, and some of these may have the character of functional connections and feedback processes, but they are not governed by a coherent logic and there is no necessary functional relations that smoothly integrate the whole. Here I will be treating the systemness of social phenomena in this way as a loosely coupled system.
change were basically unintended by-products of their interstitial activities, not a strategy as such. An interstitial strategy, in contrast, involves the deliberate development of interstitial activities for the purpose of fundamental transformation of the system as a whole.

There are certainly many interstitial activities in contemporary capitalist societies which are candidates for elements of an interstitial strategy of social emancipation: producer and consumer coops, battered women’s shelters, workers factory councils, intentional communities and communes, community-based social economy services, civic environmental councils, community-controlled land trusts, cross-border equal-exchange trade organizations, and many other things. All of these are consciously constructed forms of social organization that differ from the dominant structures of power and inequality. Some are part of grand visions for the reconstruction of society as a whole; others have more modest objectives of transforming specific domains of social life. Some are linked to systematic theories of social transformation; others are pragmatic responses to the exigencies of social problem-solving. What they have in common is the idea of building alternative institutions and deliberately fostering new forms of social relations that embody emancipatory ideals and that are created primarily through direct action of one sort or another rather than through the state.

This vision of interstitial transformation has a long and venerable place in anticapitalist thinking, going back to the anarchist tradition in the 19th century and continuing in various anarchist and “autonomist” currents to the present. While there is no inherent reason why strategies of interstitial transformation should be restricted to the specific anarchist vision of emancipatory alternatives, there is an obvious affinity between the anarchist vision of an ultimate destination without a coercive state and the idea of interstitial strategies that largely ignore the state. The preamble of the Constitution of the Industrial Workers of the World, the influential anarcho-syndicalist movement in early 20th century United States, proclaimed, “By organizing industrially we are forming the structure of the new society within the shell of the old.”

Half a century later, Colin Ward, the prominent British anarchist writer, described the

---

3 I will use the term “anarchism” describe the theoretical foundations of interstitial strategies because anarchist writers have placed the greatest emphasis on such strategies. As is the case for many political labels, terms like “anarchism” become infused with different meaning depending upon the historical context in which the label becomes linked to concrete political movements. The classical anarchist vision of social emancipation revolves around the idea of a stateless society in which social cooperation is organized through voluntary activity within relatively small communities linked through some kind of voluntary federation. At times, however, anarchism became identified with particularly violent attacks on centers of authority and with visions of chaos rather than noncoercive community. The term “autonomist” became popular in some European political contexts in the second half of the twentieth century to identify movements that were part of the anarchist tradition, but which emphasized voluntary, autonomous formation of egalitarian cooperation.

4 The literature of the I.W.W. continually refers to new forms of worker organization as “embryonic” forms of the future society, suggesting again the idea that the future is built within the interstices of the present. For example, in a 1913 pamphlet titled “The Trial of a New Society” by Justus Ebert (I.W.W., Chicago, 1913) the metaphor of embryonic development is used to characterize the process of transformation. The solidaristic organization of workers in the Lawrence, Massachusetts textile strike of 1912, the pamphlet proclaims, was “The crude embryo -- the rough outline of the future state, where industry and government shall be, by, for, and of the workers direct.” In the conclusion to the pamphlet the author asks: “The fact that a new economic power has arisen and is achieving new political and social triumphs within the old social order cannot be denied. But the question arises, can it endure? Will the embryo thus conceived develop until it overgrows and dominates all institutions in the interests of a new era?” In answering in the affirmative, the author draws on the history of the rise of the bourgeoisie which “developed their own institutions, their crafts, their trade, their guilds, their communes and confederations outside of
central idea of an anarchist strategy thus: “...far from being a speculative vision of a future society...[anarchy] is a description of a mode of human organization, rooted in the experience of everyday life, which operates side by side with, and in spite of, the dominant authoritarian trends of our society....the anarchist alternatives are already there, in the interstices of the dominant power structure. If you want to build a free society, the parts are all at hand.”5 At the beginning of the 21st century when activists at the World Social Forum proclaim, “Another world is possible,” much of what they have in mind are anarchist-inflected grass roots initiatives to create producer and consumer co-operatives, fair trade networks, cross-border labor standards campaigns, and other institutions that directly embody the alternative world they desire.

Many socialists, especially those enmeshed in the Marxist tradition, are quite skeptical of such projects. The argument goes something like this: While many of these efforts at building alternative institutions may embody desirable values and perhaps even prefigure emancipatory forms of social relations, they pose no serious challenge to existing relations of power and domination. Precisely because these are “interstitial” they can only occupy spaces that are “allowed” by capitalism. They may even strengthen capitalism by siphoning off discontent and creating the illusion that if people are unhappy with the dominant institutions they should just go off and live their lives in alternative settings. Ultimately, therefore, interstitial projects constitute retreats from political struggle for social transformation, not a viable strategy for achieving radical social transformation. At best they may make life a little better for some people in the world as it is; at worst they deflect energies from real political challenge to change the world to something better.

There are certainly instances in which this negative diagnosis seems plausible. The hippy communes of the 1960s may have been inspired by utopian longings and a belief that they were part of the “dawning of the Age of Aquarius,” but in practice they functioned more as escapes from the realities of capitalist society than as nodes of radical transformation. Other examples, like organic grocery cooperatives, while not escapes from capitalist society, nevertheless seem constrained to occupy small niches often catering to relatively affluent people who can afford to “indulge” their preferences for a particular kind of “life style”. Organic grocery cooperatives may embody some progressive ideals, but they do not pose a threat to the system.

As a general indictment of interstitial strategies of transformation, these negative judgments are too harsh. They assume both that there is an alternative strategy which does pose a serious “threat to the system” and also that this alternative strategy is undermined by the existence of interstitial efforts at social transformation. The fact is that in present historical conditions no strategy credibly poses a threat to the system in the sense that there are good grounds for believing that adopting the strategy today will generate effects in the near future that would really threaten capitalism. This is what it means to live in a hegemonic capitalist system: capitalism is sufficiently secure and flexible in its basic structures that there is no strategy possible that immediately threatens it. The strategic problem is to imagine things we can do now which have reasonable chances of opening up possibilities under contingent conditions in the

future. Interstitial strategies, of course, may ultimately be dead-ends and be permanently contained within narrow limits, but it is also possible that under certain circumstances they can play a positive role in a long-term trajectory of emancipatory social transformation.

The question, then, is this: what is the underlying model of social transformation in which interstitial activities can be viewed as part of an overall strategy for emancipatory social empowerment? What is the implicit theory of the ways in which such activities can cumulatively transform the society as a whole? Writers in the anarchist tradition devote remarkably little attention to this problem. While there is extensive anarchist writing that criticizes existing structures of capitalist and statist power and defends a vision of a federated cooperative alternative without the coercive domination of the state, there is very little systematic elaboration of how to actually “build the new society within the shell of the old” and how this can lead to a systemic transformation.

**How Interstitial Strategies can contribute to emancipatory social transformation**

Many of the specific examples in chapter 7 used to illustrate social empowerment and the economy were substantially the result of interstitial strategies. Wikipedia is the result of people building an alternative noncapitalist form of knowledge production within the extraordinary site of interstitial activity called the internet. Many projects within the social economy are the result of interstitial strategies, even if as in Quebec some of them receive some subsidies from the state. Worker-owned cooperatives are the quintessential form of interstitial organization at the center of classical anarchist strategies of interstitial transformation. To this list many other empirical examples could be added: a wide variety of internet-based strategies that subvert capitalist intellectual property rights (e.g., Napster, the music-sharing site); open-source software and technology projects; fair trade networks designed to link producer cooperatives in poor countries to consumers in rich countries; efforts to create global labor and environmental standards through various kinds of monitoring and certification projects. Within each of these interstitial activities, many of the actors involved see what they are doing as part of a strategy for broad social change, not simply as self-limiting activities motivated by life-style preferences or the desire to “do good works”. The question then is how these kinds of interstitial activities could have broad transformative, emancipatory effects for the society as a whole? What is the underlying logic through which they might cumulatively contribute to making another world possible?

There are two principle ways that interstitial strategies within capitalism potentially point the way beyond capitalism: first, by altering the conditions for eventual rupture, and second, by gradually expanding their effective scope and depth of operation so that capitalist constraints cease to impose binding limits. I will refer to these as the ***revolutionary anarchist*** and ***evolutionary anarchist*** strategic visions, not because only anarchists hold these views, but because the broad idea of not using the state as an instrument of social emancipation is so closely linked to the anarchist tradition.

**Paving the route to rupture**
Many 19th century anarchists shared with Marxist-inspired revolutionary socialists the belief that ultimately a revolutionary rupture with capitalism would be necessary. Where they differed sharply was in the belief of what sorts of transformations were needed within capitalism in order for a revolutionary rupture to plausibly usher in a genuinely emancipatory alternative. For Marx, and later for Lenin, the central task of struggles within capitalism is to forge the collective capacity of a politically unified working class needed to successfully seize state power as the necessary condition to overthrow capitalism. The task of deep social reconstruction to create the environment for a new way of life with new principles, new forms of social interaction and reciprocity, would largely have to wait until “after the revolution.”

For revolutionary anarchists, on the other hand, significant progress in such reconstruction is not only possible within capitalism, but is a necessary condition for a sustainable emancipatory rupture with capitalism. In discussing Proudhon’s views on revolution, Martin Buber writes, “[Proudhon] divined the tragedy of revolutions and came to feel it more and more deeply in the course of disappointing experiences. Their tragedy is that as regards their positive goal they will always result in the exact opposite of what the most honest and passionate revolutionaries strive for, unless and until this [deep social reform] has so far taken shape before the revolution that the revolutionary act has only to wrest the space for it in which it can develop unimpeded.” If we want a revolution to result in a deeply egalitarian, democratic, and participatory way of life, Buber writes, “the all-important fact is that, in the social as opposed to the political sphere, revolution is not so much a creative as a delivering force whose function is to set free and authenticate – i.e. that it can only perfect, set free, and lend the stamp of authority to something that has already been foreshadowed in the womb of the pre-revolutionary society; that, as regards social evolution, the hour of revolution is not an hour of begetting but an hour of birth – provided there was a begetting beforehand.” A rupture with capitalism is thus necessary in this strategic vision, but it requires a deep process of interstitial transformation beforehand if it is to succeed.

There are, I think, four different arguments implicitly in play in this vision of pre-revolutionary (i.e. pre-ruptural) interstitial social transformation within capitalism. These arguments are represented in Figure 10.1, a modified version of the transition trough diagrams from the previous chapter.

First, supporters of the necessity of interstitial transformation within capitalism claim that such transformations can bring into capitalism some of the virtues of a society beyond capitalism. Thus the quality of life of ordinary people in capitalism is improved by such transformation. In phase I of Figure 10.1 interstitial transformations in capitalism are initiated

--- Figure 10.1 about here ---

6 Buber argues that while Marx eventually came to acknowledge some virtues in the creation of cooperatives, he remained critical of views that saw this as a centerpiece of struggles within capitalism, feeling that it was an illusion that cooperatives could contribute much to remaking society so long as the bourgeoisie remained in power.

7 Buber, *Paths in Utopia*, p. 44.

8 Buber, *Paths in Utopia*, p. 44-5. The metaphor of birth combines the idea of incremental metamorphosis with rupture: the moment of birth is a rupture with the past. There is a “before” and “after”, a discontinuity in the life course. But birth can only happen after a successful, incremental gestation in which future potentials are brought to the brink of full actualization.
and these generate an improvement of the quality of life for the average person relative to a
capitalism without such transformations.\(^9\)

Second, the revolutionary anarchist strategy affirms that at some point such interstitial
social transformations within capitalism hit limits which impose binding constraints (phase II in
the figure). Capitalism ultimately blocks the full realization of the potential of socially
empowering interstitial transformations. A rupture with capitalism (phase III) becomes necessary
to break through those limits if that potential is to advance further.

Third, if capitalism has already been significantly internally transformed through socially
empowering interstitial transformations, the transition trough will be tolerably shallow and of
relatively short duration (phase IV). Successful interstitial transformations within capitalism
mean that economic life becomes less dependent upon capitalist firms and capitalist markets.
Workers co-operatives and consumer cooperatives have developed widely and play a significant
role in the economy; the social economy provides significant basic needs; collective associations
engage in a wide variety of socially empowered forms of regulation; and perhaps power relations
within capitalist firms have been significantly transformed as well. Taken together, these changes
mean that the economic disruption of the break with capitalism will be less damaging than in the
absence of such interstitial transformations. Furthermore, the pre-ruptural transformations are
palpable demonstrations to workers and other potential beneficiaries of socialism that
alternatives to capitalism in which the quality of life is better are viable. This contributes to
forming the political will for a rupture once the untransgressable limits within capitalism are
encountered.\(^10\) The transition trough in figure 10.1 is thus much shallower than it would
otherwise be.

And finally, egalitarian, democratic social empowerment will be sustainable after a rupture
only if significant socially empowering interstitial transformations had occurred before the
rupture. In the absence of such prior social empowerment, the rupture with capitalism will
unleash strong centralizing and authoritarian tendencies that are likely to lead to a consolidation
of an oppressive form of statism. Even well-intentioned socialists will be forced by the
contradictions they confront to build a different kind of society than they wanted. The result will
be a decline in the quality of life for most people below the trajectory it would have had even
under capitalism itself.

\(^9\) I am using the general expression “quality of life” here to indicate the all-things-considered wellbeing of people,
without giving any particular weights to things like income, working conditions, quality of leisure, the nature of
community, etc.

\(^10\) An alternative way of expressing these arguments is to use the language of Antonio Gramsci. Gramsci argued that
in the West, with its strong civil society, socialist revolution required a prolonged “war of position” before a
successful “war of maneuver” was possible. This means that the period before a rupture is a period of building an
effective counter-hegemony. Gramsci’s emphasis was on building political and ideological counter-hegemony.
While he did not directly discuss the issue of interstitial transformations in the economy and civil society, they could
be viewed as transforming key aspects of the “material bases of consent” necessary for such a counter-hegemonic
movement to be credible and sustainable. For a discussion of Gramsci’s ambiguous views on the possibilities of
transforming civil society within capitalism in ways that would enhance social empowerment, see Cohen and Arato
(--section on Gramsci).
**Eroding the binding limits of capitalism**

The strategic scenario in figure 10.1 assumes that capitalism ultimately imposes untransgressable limits on the possibilities of democratic egalitarian emancipatory transformations. The evolutionary anarchist scenario for social emancipation through interstitial transformation drops this assumption. The basic idea, as illustrated in a stylized way in Figure 10.2, is this: Capitalist structures and relations do impose limits on emancipatory social transformation through interstitial strategies, but those limits can themselves be eroded over time by appropriate interstitial strategies. The trajectory of change through interstitial strategy, therefore, will be marked by periods in which limits of possibility are encountered and transformation is severely impeded. In such periods new interstitial strategies must be devised which erode those limits. In different historical periods, therefore, different kinds of interstitial strategies may play the critical role in advancing the process of social empowerment. Strategies for building workers cooperatives may be the most important in some periods, the extension of the social economy or the invention of new associational devices for controlling investments (eg. union controlled venture capital funds) in others. The important idea is that what appear to be “limits” are simply the effect of the power of specific institutional arrangements, and interstitial strategies have the capacity to create alternative institutions that weaken those limits. Whereas the revolutionary anarchist strategic scenario argues that eventually hard limits are encountered that cannot themselves be transformed from within the system, in this more evolutionary model the existing constraints can be softened to the point that a more accelerated process of interstitial transformation can take place until it too encounters new limits. There will thus be a kind of cycle of extension of social empowerment and stagnation as successive limits are encountered and eroded. Eventually, if this process can be sustained, capitalism itself would be sufficiently modified and capitalist power sufficiently undermined that it no longer imposed distinctively capitalist limits on the deepening of social empowerment. In effect the system-hybridization process generated by interstitial strategies would have reached a tipping point in which the logic of the system as a whole had changed in ways that open-up the possibilities for continued social empowerment.

--- Figure 10.2 about here ---

Of course the trajectory in figure 10.2 is highly simplified. Even optimistic visions of interstitial strategies understand that there can be reversals and the periods of thwarted advance of social empowerment could be quite extended. And there may be contingent historical circumstances in which interstitial strategies may no longer be possible – for example, in conditions of authoritarian statism where the political space for such strategies has been closed off. In such circumstances, ruptural strategies may be necessary, not so much to directly transform capitalism as to unbottle the interstitial processes blocked by authoritarian statism. The key idea, however, is that there is nothing inherent in the structures of capitalism as such which

---

11 Other kinds of structural limits might still exist – limits imposed by gender or global political divisions or some other kind of social relations – and this means that the cycle of encountering limits and devising new limit-eroding strategies would continue. But the specific limits to social empowerment imposed by capitalism would no longer impose binding constraints.
prevents interstitial strategies from having these transformative effects, and thus an interstitial trajectory towards social emancipation is possible within a world dominated by capitalism.\textsuperscript{12}

**Interstitial Strategies and the State**

It is possible to acknowledge that interstitial strategies of transformation can expand the scope of social empowerment and improve the quality of life of people without embracing these broad strategic visions. Interstitial strategies may create enlarged spaces for non-commodified, non-capitalist economic relations, but it seems unlikely that this could sufficiently insulate most people from dependency on the capitalist economy and sufficiently weaken the power of the capitalist class and the dependency of economic activity on capital accumulation to render the transition trough in the revolutionary scenario short and shallow. And while interstitial strategies may expand the scope of social empowerment, it is difficult to see how they could ever by themselves sufficiently erode the basic structural power of capital to dissolve the capitalist limits on emancipatory social change.

The basic limitation of both scenarios concerns their stance towards the state. The anarchist tradition of social emancipation understands that both civil society and the economy are only loosely integrated systems which allow considerable scope for direct action to forge new kinds of relations and practices. In contrast, anarchists tend to view the state as a monolithic, integrated institution, without significant cracks and only marginal potentials for emancipatory transformation. For revolutionary anarchists, in fact, the state is precisely the institution which makes an ultimate rupture necessary: the coercive power of the state enforces the untransgressable limits on social empowerment. Without the state, the erosion of capitalist power through interstitial transformation could proceed in the manner described by evolutionary anarchists.

This is not a satisfactory understanding of the state in general or the state in capitalist societies in particular. The state is no more a unitary, fully integrated structure of power than is the economy or civil society. And while the state may indeed be a “capitalist state” which plays a substantial role in reproducing capitalist relations, it is not merely a capitalist state embodying a pure functional logic for sustaining capitalism. The state contains a heterogeneous set of apparatuses, unevenly integrated into a loosely coupled ensemble, in which a variety of interests and ideologies interact. It is an arena of struggle in which contending forces in civil society meet. It is a site for class compromise as well as class domination. In short, the state must be understood not simply in terms of its relationship to social reproduction, but also in terms of the limits, gaps and contradictions of social reproduction.

What this means is that emancipatory transformations should not simply ignore the state as envisioned by evolutionary interstitial strategies, nor can it realistically smash the state, as envisioned by ruptural strategies. Social emancipation must involve, in one way or another,

\textsuperscript{12} This claim – the capitalism as such does not generate untransgressable limits of possibility – is sometimes couched in a language of “anti-essentialism.” See, for example, Julie Gibson and Katherine Graham, in *The end of Capitalism (as we knew it): a feminist critique of political economy* (by J.K. Gibson-Graham, Oxford: Blackwell, 1996) who argue that economic systems are always hybrids and that the capitalist dimension or component of the hybrid has no deep, unalterable “essence” which imposes rigid limits of possibility on the character of the hybrid as a whole.
engaging the state, using it to further the process of emancipatory social empowerment. This is the central idea of symbiotic transformation.
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