

implies, can tear down the wall of modernity that in time and space for a long time served to separate what is referred to as „tribes“ or „ethnic groups“ from societies and nations. While „anarchism has tended to be an ethical discourse about revolutionary practice“ (ibid. 6), old notions of revolution in the sense of uprising should be revisited. Instead of a single revolutionary moment in history that will transform society and the global constellation of nation-states, he indicates to reframe anarchy in terms of „rejection of foreign oppression, [...] constant passive resistance to state institutions“, and the „elaboration of autonomous, and relatively egalitarian modes of self-government“ (ibid. 33). Borrowing the concept of exodus from Italian marxist Paolo Virno, he refers to an „engaged withdrawal“ and therefore rather slipping away from authority's grasp than confronting it (ibid. 60, 61). Bypassing the nation state, therefore, is about small units on a local level avoiding it until (in an utopian final version) the nation state becomes redundant (ibid. 40).

Having put the presumptions about anarchy aside, the shift on the opportunities the concept has to offer for communities becomes possible. Graeber (2004: 35) at this point frames counter power as something that is rooted in the imagination and capable of innovating the social, political, and economic forms in a

„gradual creation of alternative forms of organization on a world scale, new forms of communication, new, less alienated ways of organizing life, which will, eventually, make currently existing forms of power seem stupid and beside the point. That in turn would mean that there are endless examples of viable anarchism: pretty much any form of organization would count as one, so long as it was not imposed by some higher authority, from a klezmer band to the international postal service“ (Graeber 2004: 40).

On an institutional level, he states that imaginative counter power takes forms of direct democracy, consensus and mediation (ibid. 35). The consensus system as opposed to a majoritarian democracy is widely used by groups that can be identified as anarchist, for it has several advantages when it comes to decision making. Majoritarian democracies rely on coercive force