Article

Resistant exit

Jennet Kirkpatrick
School of Politics and Global Studies, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287, USA.
jennetk@asu.edu

Abstract Several recent works in political theory argue that exit, rather than being a coward's choice, is a potent mode of resistance that is particularly well suited to the current political era. These works reclaim exit, seeing it as a method of political opposition. While innovative and illuminating, these accounts are limited because they tend to treat all exits as resistance, regardless of context or content, and they are inclined to over-saturate exit with oppositional political meaning. I argue that resistant exit should be more narrowly defined. By examining a range of empirical cases, I identify and explore three distinctive characteristics of this particular type of opposition. In addition to clarifying a recently developed idea in current scholarship, this article provides a systematic way for scholars to understand and interpret the intersection between resistance and exit.
Contemporary Political Theory (2019) **18,** 135–157. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41296-018-0252-1; published online 27 August 2018

Keywords: resistance; exit; exodus; immigration; political exiles

Leaving has experienced a noteworthy turnabout in political theory. Long equated with excessive self-regard and a dereliction of duty, walking away has been recuperated, even lauded, by Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, and by Paulo Virno. Though differing on points, these thinkers are united in a tendency to see exit in a positive light and to connect it with opposition, resistance, hope, and radical politics. On this view, those who walk away do not possess a character flaw, such as a lack of fortitude, bravery, or grit, and they are not giving up on the cause of political transformation. Instead, exodus has the potential to prompt radical democratic change, especially in the struggle against a new global form of sovereignty that is decentered and de-territorialized.

A striking contribution of this work is that it imagines a novel connection between exit and resistance. At the same time, this unorthodox idea of resistant exit is largely unexplored in general terms. Hardt, Negri, and Virno are focused on a particular case of exit, exodus by the multitude as opposition to Empire, and they tend to assume that leaving, *tout court*, is resistance. Yet, moving beyond the

particular case that Hardt, Negri, and Virno have in mind presents problems with the idea that exit, in and of itself, is resistance. This would mean, for instance, that the flight of a wealthy tax exile to protect private assets would be a resistant exit. This example is sharply opposed to what Hardt, Negri, and Virno envision, of course, because it increases wealth disparities and decreases equality. It is also at odds with what we generally think of as resistance. The distance between the tax exile, who acts to protect private wealth by leaving a polity, and the civil disobedient, who engages with the polity to change it, seems too large to ignore. If this intuition is correct and not all exits are resistance, then what makes an exit an act of resistance? What does a resistant exit look like?

This article takes up this question by outlining three political behaviors and beliefs sufficient to identify resistant exit. The three features are:

Making a Spectacle. Activists create a public exhibition of the exit itself that is intended to draw public attention.

Constructing Unorthodox Alternatives. Groups or individuals construct alternative political organizations or modes of being in exit or exile that emphasize the failures of the political structures that were left.

Maintaining Bonds with the Exited Group. Those who exit preserve solidarity with those who remain behind, and they make public-minded efforts to resist from the outside.

These three analytic characteristics tend to blend and overlap in practice, but any one of the three is a sufficient signal of a resistant exit. My goal is here not to catalogue every attribute of resistant exit, but rather to initiate systematic thinking about a new category of political analysis. To my knowledge, no one has analyzed whether a resistant exit is a real thing – that is, a delineated political action that has observable characteristic traits – or outlined its defining features. This is not to say that the action itself is new. As the excellent scholarship on political exiles shows, individuals and groups have long left polities with the aim of undermining the dominant regime (Afkhami, 1994; Forsdyke, 2005; Shain, 1991, 2005).

What is new is the analytic category of resistant exit, an overarching classificatory scheme that allows us to see that political exiles are an example of a larger political phenomenon. Like any worthy classificatory category, resistant exit should prompt us to perceive connections between actions that we did not apprehend before and allow us to see the parallels between, for instance, political exiles, principled resignations from political office, exits from political parties, and so on. It should also enrich an understanding of the political world.

Because my intent is to understand the broad, analytic contours of a political action, I look at a wide-range of individuals, groups, and events that illuminate resistant exit. These individuals or groups exited, meaning that they purposefully departed from a political group or public good and thereby revoked their membership in the group or the benefit of the good (Hirschman, 1970). Exits can be

  1470-8914 **Contemporary Political Theory** Vol. 18, 2, 135–157

physical, involving moving from a nation-state or a political community, and they can be associational (leaving a political party or civic association). The examined individuals and groups also engaged in resistance, by which I mean that they intended to disrupt dominant power arrangements, discourses, or identities or that they expected to expose an injustice of dominate power relations. Those undertaking a resistant exit sometimes act covertly, but their opposition is intentional and deliberate (Scott, 1985; Hollander and Einwohner, 2004). Resistant exits interrupt, intervene, or object to a prevailing mode of power and, through strong opposition and engagement, they reveal an alternative perspective, a different agenda, or a new course of action.

The first section of the article looks more closely at the origins of exit as an analytic category in the work of Albert Hirschman, and it examines how Virno, Hardt and Negri have radicalized exit by connecting it with resistance. The first section also draws attention to the broad understanding of resistant exit in these works. With this theoretical groundwork in place, the article turns to illuminating three indicators of resistant exit, each of which is explored in a section of the article. These three sections of the article examine a variety of empirical cases with the goal of identifying robust threads common to a wide range of resistant exits. The article examines, for instance, the resignation of a British politician from office (Robin Cook), the flight of conscientious objectors to the Vietnam War, political exiles, the founding of 19th century American utopian communities, and acts of public self-immolation.

Exit: The Radical Potential and a Problem

For Albert Hirschman, exit revealed dissatisfaction (Hirschman, 1970). In his path-breaking work, *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty*, Hirschman described consumers who are unhappy with a product or service and, rather than expressing their displeasure to the company or remaining silent out of loyalty, they exit, switching products or service providers. Hirschman, an economist, argued that this kind of behavior is applicable to politics as well as economics, and he urged political scientists to pay greater attention to exit. The political exits that Hirschman considered are varied, including emigration and migration, defection from political parties, resignation from political office, exits from public goods, boycotts, and even "dropping out" to alternative or utopian communities in the 1960s. But these diverse cases share a general feature for Hirschman: the exit itself is typically undertaken to pressure decision makers to be responsive. Exit is an instrument, in other words, to encourage leaders to alter their product, service, organization, or public good and thus to decrease dissatisfaction with it. A sizable portion of the political science research following Hirschman adopts his economic approach, analyzing the "modus operandi" of exit with an eye for costs and benefits, equilibria, and

strategic advantage (Hirschman, 1970, p. 33; Dowding and John, 2012; Gehlbach, 2006; Kato, 1998; Bednar, 2007; Albrecht and Ohl, 2016). A few others have gestured to exit and resistance, though they have not explored the connection between the two in detail (Krane, 1983, p. 35; Albrecht and Ohl, 2016; Golden, 1992).

Writing well before Hirschman made exit into a term of art, Karl Marx argued that physical departures played a disruptive role in colonization in America. In the final chapter of *Capital*, Marx confronted a puzzle: why had capitalists struggled in the colonies despite an economic environment that, given abundant resources and cheap land, seemed ideal for the accumulation of capital? The answer, Marx argued, lay with labor. Free immigrants to America tended to refuse the role of wage laborers and to leave the labor market in search of better opportunities. The "wage-worker of today is tomorrow an independent peasant, or artisan, working for himself. He vanishes from the labor-market … [becoming an] independent producer" who works for himself "instead of for capital" and enriches himself "instead of the capitalist gentry." Because of the abundance of land and resources in the American colonies, the free wage laborer could leave, shucking off an imposed economic role and the subservience that it implied all at once. As Horace Greeley famously put it a few years before the publication of *Capital*, in America it was possible to "Go West, young man, go West and grow up with the country." As a result of the wage-labor's penchant to leave and the possibilities to do so, the law of supply and demand was "torn asunder" according to Marx. Moreover, the situation created a chance for radical economic reversals, a possibility that delighted Marx in its perversity. The one-time wage laborer could become a rival of the capitalist. "The excellent capitalist," Marx noted, "has imported bodily from Europe, with his own good money, his own competitors!" (Marx, 1936, pp. 838–848).

Amplifying Marx's idea, Virno argues that, along with civil disobedience, exit should be a preferred mode of resistance on the political left. Referencing Hirschman ("a beautiful book"), Virno notes that "the Left has not seen that the exit-option (abandoning a disadvantageous situation as soon as possible) was becoming prevalent over the voice-option (protesting actively against the situation)" (Virno, 2005, p. 20; also see Cassegard, 2008). While some on the left disparage flight as defection and an abdication of responsibility, Virno sees exodus as a beneficial and creative mode of action (Virno, 1996, pp. 30–31). Virno draws a parallel, for instance, between the exit by today's youth from wage labor to independent activity or temporary jobs and Marx's example of the mass exodus by nineteenth-century American wage laborers from the factory to the frontier (Virno, 1996, pp. 31–32).

A benefit of exit, Virno argues, is that it changes the conditions of the struggle and presents a new horizon of opportunities. Exit refuses the boundaries of conflict provided by the state; it "alters the rules of the game" and, for this reason, it is

  1470-8914 **Contemporary Political Theory** Vol. 18, 2, 135–157

destabilizing to the state (Virno, 2004, p. 70; Squire, 2015). Exit also affords a degree of self-determination otherwise denied in the contemporary context: the young worker who leaves a job in the corporate world, for instance, must invent a new existence, a new life, the contours of which he or she will in part determine. Because of its demands of imagination and invention, Virno sees exit as the opposite of the cry "there is nothing to lose but one's own chains." Instead exit depends on having much more than chains, even on possessing a "latent kind of wealth" and "an exuberance of possibilities" (Virno, 2004, pp. 70–71). For Virno, exit hinges on a surplus. The one who exits must possess an excess of imagination, responsibility, skills to even consider exit, let alone make it a success (also see Bargu, 2011, pp. 103–122; Westermann, 1945). According to Virno, exit impedes transferring this surplus back to the state because its essential character is to refuse the boundaries of the state. The excess, the "wealth," stays with those who exit.

For Hardt and Negri, exodus is fundamental to resistance and class struggle in an age of imperial and biopolitical power. As they put it, "A specter haunts the world and it is the specter of migration" (Hardt and Negri, 2000, p. 213). Hardt and Negri stress that the turn to desertion as resistance is a new development that is linked to a historical transition in power regimes. In the previous age of "disciplinary society," regulation occurred through institutions like prisons, schools, and asylums and the paradigmatic form of resistance was sabotage. In the age of Empire and biopolitical power, control extends beyond institutions to the bodies and intellects of workers and increasingly moves toward the interior, such that there is not a clear, discernable outside enemy (the capitalist, the prison, the state) with which to oppose, to struggle against. As Hardt and Negri see it, the ever present, interior quality of biopolitical, imperial power can be effectively subverted through exit, evacuation, and desertion. Leaving creates the possibility of creating a counter-empire, an alternative political and social space in which the multitude can construct an "absolute democracy." In addition to controlling their own banishment, the multitude "must also transform that resistance into a form of constituent power, creating the social relations and institutions of a new society" (Hardt and Negri, 2004, p. 348). Thus, for Hardt and Negri exit is bound up with a revolutionary destruction of the current biopolitical regime of power. But, exit is also connected to creation. Desertion generates the conditions necessary to build a new "absolute democracy."

Though important differences exist between Virno, and Hardt and Negri, there are some clear themes running through their writings on exit. First, these are redemptive accounts in which exit by the multitude is linked to opposition and radical change, not with cowardice, weakness, or a lack of alternatives. Indeed, the negative view of exit has been reversed in Virno, Hardt and Negri: exit is transformative, it enables self-determination, and it signifies a superfluity of possibilities. Second, the political work of exit does not occur primarily at the individual level, but rather on the social and collective level. Exit is described as

initiating broad political change that extends well beyond the individual. The extent of this change varies, with Hardt and Negri taking a more hopeful view of the transformative power of exit by the multitude than Virno (Mouffe, 2008; Lotringer, 2004, p. 16). Exit here is equated consistently with resistance and thought of as a collective process.

These accounts share a problem: a tendency to naturalize exit as an oppositional, progressive force. Neither account considers what makes an exit an act of resistance or how a resistant exit can be distinguished from non-resistant exit. Because these questions are not taken up and the concept of resistant exit itself is under-theorized, these works give the impression that there is a natural equivalence between exit and opposition.[1] Looking back on the historical example raised by Marx – the flight of nineteenth-century American factory workers to the western frontier – complicates this easy correspondence between exit and resistance. Individuals departed for the frontier for a wide range of reasons, some of which did not have obvious bearing on the working conditions in the American factory. For many of the mostly male "forty-niners," flight was prompted by the lure of boundless, easy riches, as well as the promise of a wilderness adventure that would test their manhood (Faragher, 1979; Johnson, 2000a, b; Limerick, 1987; Reid, 1997a, b; Rohrbough, 2000; Slotkin, 1974). For others, leaving was, in effect, a method of divorce, allowing men to separate from a spouse under the socially acceptable guise of providing for their families (Rohrbough, 1997, pp. 243–256). These nineteenth-century workers left for the frontier in search of many things – effortless wealth, manly exploits, de facto divorce. In Hirschman's terms, their exit did express displeasure with many aspects of their lives back east. Yet this displeasure touched on many aspects of life; it was not directed primarily at the factory or articulated predominantly in terms of working conditions.

Moreover, displeasure is not the same as resistance. Walking away out of displeasure typically entails a clean separation and an uncomplicated negation of the group or thing that is left. A forty-niner who was displeased with his life back home, for instance, packed his bags, withdrew, and, so doing, repudiated the community that was left. There is a critique in exiting from displeasure, but it is unspecific and negative. Exiting because of displeasure does not engage or create, and in this sense, it is quite different from a resistant exit, which remains involved with the group that was left and points the way to new possibilities for it. A problem with Virno, Hardt and Negri is that they have not clarified this difference.

Chantal Mouffe raises this problem in her critique of Virno, Hardt and Negri on the issue of withdrawal. Mouffe points out that they are too optimistic about the emancipatory potentialities of mere withdrawal. As Mouffe puts it, a "process of social critique characteristic of radical politics cannot consist any more in a withdrawal from the existing institutions." Instead, radical politics must entail "an engagement with" existing institutions "in order to disarticulate the existing discourses and practices through which the current hegemony is established and

  1470-8914 **Contemporary Political Theory** Vol. 18, 2, 135–157

reproduced, with the aim of constructing a different one" (Mouffe, 2008, p. 5). Mouffe's emphasis is on withdrawal and engagement. As she sees it, Virno, Hardt, and Negri idealize exit by endowing it with an essentialized emancipatory potential, and they are inclined to disregard the tenacity with which dominant power will reassert itself in the face of opposition. Indeed, simply walking away out of displeasure can create a vacuum in which dominant power can re-assert itself. Absent the interference of those who left, dominant power can re-articulate its view of the world – including the exit – unimpeded.

Although Virno, Hardt and Negri gesture to the interesting idea that exit can have an oppositional, disruptive edge to it, these thinkers romanticize exit, seeing it as producing all good things. A problem with this idealistic view of exit is that it endows the action with too much capacity for political change. It sets expectations about the oppositional potential of exit far too high. Exit is bound to disappoint. The more serious difficulty is that this romanticized view of exit erases the cooperation and trust that are integral to most real-world acts of resistance. Gone is the agency, the effort, and the organizing that is necessary for most resistance. Gone too are the risks and hardships that serious opposition to dominant power can entail. In practice resistance is often a collective and coordinated action and, though it can be undertaken by a single individual acting alone, it more typically depends on many individuals collaborating together and relying on one another.

One way to move past this romanticized view is to identify a resistant exit as a distinct form of political action – that is, to see it as a form of resistance that has its own distinguishing features, just as other forms of resistance do (sabotage, civil disobedience, violent uprisings, whistle-blowing). This effort is missing in Virno, Hardt and Negri, and to my knowledge, no theoretical work has examined it as a specific kind of political opposition. Yet seeing the phenomenon as a distinct kind of political action is a first step in exploring it. This was, for instance, the first move by theorists who embarked on the path-breaking work of defining civil disobedience in the latter half of the twentieth century (Arendt, 1972; Ball, 1973; Bedau, 1969; McWilliams, 1969; Murphy, 1971; Coffin and Leibman, 1972; Rawls, 1969). Confronted by social critics who argued that civil disobedience was nothing more than ordinary law breaking, theorists constituted civil disobedience as a distinct category of resistance, and they defined the specific actions and beliefs that distinguished it from an ordinary violation of law (collective action, public goals, non-violence and so on). Theorists have disagreed on these specific attributes, but they agreed on the general idea that resistance takes different forms (Laudani, 2013; Sabl, 2001; Scheuerman, 2015; Celikates, 2016). They also share an understanding of how to study these different forms – that is, by paying attention both to the way the action is performed and to the ideas, beliefs, and goals of the actors who undertake it.

In what follows, I turn to the events themselves – acts of resistant exit – to address the conceptual limitations of exit in post-Marxist scholarship. While the

work of Virno, Hardt and Negri suggests examining the resistant exits of either the multitude or their close approximates, I look beyond this group to a wide range of events and figures, including politicians and elites who are the antithesis of "the Multitude." I begin the first section, "Making a Spectacle," with Robin Cook, a British politician known for his love of the public spotlight and for his dramatic exit from Prime Minister Tony Blair's Cabinet. Part of my reason for broadening the realm of cases is normative. I understand resistant exit to be a general kind of action that is not limited to one particular group or class of people. An expansive view is also dictated by this article's goal of describing resistant exit in comprehensive terms. If we want to see resistant exit as a general form of resistance that, like civil disobedience, has broad defining traits, then it is necessary to look for common traits across a number of examples in democratic and non-democratic contexts.

Making a Spectacle

In March 2003, Robin Cook resigned his positions as Lord President of the Council and Leader of the House of Commons in protest against Prime Minister Tony Blair's decision to invade Iraq. Commentators speculated about the motives behind Cook's resignation at the time, and members of the public questioned what Cook hoped to accomplish by resigning from his high-ranking position. Was Cook's resignation a strategic move intended to position him as the next prime minister? Or was Cook's resignation connected to Prime Minister Tony Blair's decision to invade Iraq?

Speculation about why Cook resigned points to a more general problem with exit. Walking away tends to be a quiet act, even a silent one (Warren, 2011, pp. 693, 696; Green, 1998, p. 184). Leaving may well be "voting with one's feet," but what is one voting for or against? Even the most commonplace and costless exits, like opting out of an email list, suffer from this problem: companies, eager to know why you left, prompt you with a survey (Too many emails? Irrelevant emails? Never signed up for this list?). In Cook's case, the stakes were much higher. And, for the Blair administration, silence could be much more useful. If Cook exited noiselessly, the Prime Minister could provide his own explanations, asserting that Cook resigned to "spend more time with his family" or to embark on "other pursuits," two clichéd explanations that conveniently hide political discord or moral disagreement.

Cook's solution was to fill the void; he was outspoken about why he resigned. Cook explained that he objected on moral principle to Blair's decision to go to war with Iraq and that he believed that it was an ill-advised move for Britain. Cook claimed, in other words, that his was a "principled resignation" (Alderman and Cross, 1967, pp. 112–119; Felice, 2009, p. 148; Weisband and Franck, 1975;

  1470-8914 **Contemporary Political Theory** Vol. 18, 2, 135–157

Rhodes, 2011, pp. 244–279; Hirschman, 1970, pp. 114–119).[2] In the literature on exit, actions like Cook's are referred to as "noisy exits," a term intended to capture the use of exit and voice (in Hirschman's terms) (Barry, 1974, pp. 95–99; Hirschman, 1970, p. 117; Laver, 1976, pp. 741–743; Pfaff and Kim, 2003, p. 403; Dowding *et al.*, 2000, p. 475; Dowding and John, 2012, pp. 10, 58; Montanaro, 2012, pp. 1102–1103).

As noisy exits go, Cook's was quite loud. An ambitious, even peacocking politician according to some, Cook used every means at his disposal to announce his exit as conspicuously as possible and to explain it in his own terms. Through his repeated, vociferous public justifications of his exit, he sought to maximize its significance for the British public and the political realm. He first wrote a letter of resignation explaining his opposition to Blair's decision in moral and pragmatic terms. Though ostensibly to Blair, the letter courted and found a much wider audience when it was broadcast across traditional media and the internet. Cook gave numerous interviews, and he wrote a book fittingly entitled *Point of Departure* that offered an even more detailed justification of his decision to resign his office (2003, 2005; Brown, 2005; Cook, 2003a, b; Dayell, 2005; Tempest, 2003). Cook, who died in 2005, even used the epitaph on his gravestone to explain his actions to future publics: "I may not have succeeded in halting the war, but I did secure the right of parliament to decide on war." Cook is perhaps best known, however, for his dramatic resignation speech in the House of Commons, which resulted in the first standing ovation in the House's history.

Cook's justifications were public, and it is important to unpack what is meant by that term. One answer has to do with audiences: a public justification attempts to engage various publics, to attract their attention (Walzer, 1988). Though Cook's resignation was addressed to Blair, it was certainly written for a much larger audience, specifically, the whole of the British government and the British citizenry. With his resistant exit, he declared to the majority that their values—which Cook claimed to represent—were sharply at odds with their elected political leadership. His departure pointed to a rift in democratic representation and implicitly called on various publics within Britain to consider and reconcile the competing claims (Cook, 2003a, p. 337). His exit posed a series of questions to the British publics: did Blair represent them or did Cook? Which policy prescription was preferable? Who was morally right?

Another element of a public justification – a public use of "voice" – is to appeal to publicly held values. The one who walks away can refer to collective political values in order to explain her decision to exit, as Cook did, for instance, when he justified his departure by referring to the British tradition of pluralism and heterogeneity (Cook, 2003a, pp. 57, 350). Rather than defending his exit through ideas that were alien to the general public, Cook explicated his actions in terms of broadly understood British ideals. At the very moment that he left the British

Cabinet—a move that some considered unpatriotic—he called on patriotic and publicly held ideals of the British political system.

Civil disobedients often perform a similar action: they invoke shared principles to legitimize their resistance. This is, in John Rawls's estimation, an indicator that distinguishes civil disobedience as a "political act." It is "guided and justified by political principles, that is, by the principles of justice which regulate the constitution and social institutions generally" (Rawls, 1971, p. 365). In democratic contexts, civil disobedients break the formal, democratic law, while appealing to the established values of the democratic majority. They are, in this sense, outsiders who break the law *and* insiders who know how to speak to the political values of the majority. With this example in mind, Cook's resistant exit might be considered public in two respects. He attempted attract the attention of all members of the political community by creating a calamitous spectacle of his departure from the Cabinet. Moreover, he made an effort to engage various British publics by speaking in a common, shared political language (Walzer, 1988).

The Cook example relies heavily on speech as a means of creating a public spectacle of the exit. Is it possible to engage in a spectacular resistant exit without using speech? This seems less common in democratic politics, which relies heavily on speech, but more so in contexts where speech and assembly are restricted. Consider Mohamed Bouazizi's self-immolation in a public street in front of the Governor's office in the center of town in Sidi Bouzid, Tunisia in 2010. It would overstate the case to say that voice was entirely absent. Bouazizi did complain to the Governor's office of his mistreatment, and by some accounts he shouted, "How do you expect me to make a living?" before dousing himself with gasoline. Still it was not Bouazizi's use of public voice that attracted the attention of concerned individuals in Tunisia and beyond. The spectacle – his violent, desperate speech act with its desolate aesthetics – is what garnered the attention of various publics and played a role in pro-democracy protests in Tunisia, Egypt, Yemen, Bahrain, Libya, and Syria (Bargu, 2014, 2016).

In contexts in which public speech is restricted, activists sometimes go to extraordinary ends to ensure that their resistant exit is public and that it will be seen by a number of public audiences. This dedication to acting in public is particularly clear in self-immolations in the Tibetan area of China. From 2009 to 2016, more than 140 self-immolations have occurred in this region (Najar, 2016). Though initially self-immolates were religious figures such as monks, lamas, and nuns, the phenomenon spread to include laypeople and secular individuals (farmers, teenagers, parents). Those undertaking self-immolations have connected their actions to demands for Tibetan autonomy or independence from China (Gouin, 2014; Law *et al.*, 2014; China, 2011; Whalen-Bridge, 2015). For this reason, the Chinese government has attempted to downplay the political significance of Tibetan self-immolations for domestic and international audiences and to claim instead that they are ordinary suicides or splinter terrorism (Whalen-Bridge, 2015; China, 2011; Huizi *et al.*, 2013). A central issue in Tibetan self-immolations has

  1470-8914 **Contemporary Political Theory** Vol. 18, 2, 135–157

become publicity. Chinese authorities, wanting to conceal self-immolations and other opposition as much as possible, have restricted foreign media and academics from the region (and as a result first-hand knowledge of the phenomenon outside of China is limited). However self-immolations are often undertaken in public and are often understood to address a range of public audiences, including accidental onlookers, fellow Tibetans, political exiles, and an international community (Whalen-Bridge 2015, pp. 59–60).[3] The most immediate public audience, the onlookers, has become key to evading Chinese censors and to reaching these other public audiences outside of Tibet. Onlookers have started a chain of technological transmission, not unlike the fire bucket brigades of old: pictures and videos have been passed on to political exiles, to the Tibetan government-in-exile, to international NGOs, and to the foreign media, alerting all of these public audiences of these acts of resistance (Bartholet, 2013).

It is important to note that resisting in public in China carries serious risks. Family, fellow activists and friends may be subject to political repression after the self-immolation. Moreover, acting in public creates the possibility of intervention by the police, who may be able to interupt the self-immolation before death occurs (Huizi *et al.*, 2013). To confound the police, some Tibetan self-immolators wrap themselves in barbed wire (Whalen-Bridge, 2015, p. 57; Bartholet, 2013). In pragmatic terms, these measures increase the likelihood of death even if the authorities are alerted quickly. In political and theoretical terms, these methods reveal just how essential public action is to this kind of spectacular resistant exit.

Tibetan self-immolations are extreme examples. They entail an exit from life itself, not just politics, and they involve violence to the self. Lacking freedom of speech and committed to Buddhist principles of non-violence to others, these activists have turned violence on themselves with the hope that their resistant exit might disrupt or dislodge Chinese rule. In their extremity these cases underscore the centrality of public action and public audiences for spectacular resistant exits. These are carefully constructed aesthetic acts that, far from being done on the spur of the moment, are designed and executed in a thoughtful way to address a wide set of public audiences. Tibetan self-immolations also reveal another important point about privilege and context. Resistant exits are not only the province of political elites like Cook, and they do not only occur in Western contexts where freedom of speech is protected. Even those who lack the freedom to speak and do not possess anything like the political and material resources of an elite like Cook can sacrifice the one thing that they do possess for a political purpose: life.

Constructing Unorthodox Alternatives

The first kind of a resistant exit appeals to the senses; it is a display, a show, a performance intended as an affront to dominant power and designed to draw the

eye or ear of the public. Done well, it is not subtle, complex, or the least bit confusing. The second kind of resistant exit is, in contrast, far more cerebral and layered. It is sometimes even hidden. It involves moving to a new place – a physical exit – in order to construct an alternative society or organization. This new, unorthodox society challenges those who govern or control by modeling or exemplifying a non-conformist alternative.

Consider the Occupy Wall Street protests in 2011. Critics and supporters alike understood this action to signify opposition, but commentators generally did not consider what kind of resistance they were observing. While this was an inclusive, non-hierarchical group that by its very nature encompassed a wide range of approaches and actions, its primary mode of opposition was not civil disobedience or violent unrest. Rather, it was in living. By this, I mean that the protesters in Zuccotti Park created an alternative mode of being in the world together, one that was based on non-conformist principles of self-government, and they briefly practiced this new way of living as a community. Their response to an American government that, as they saw it, was unduly under the sway of corporations and of the wealthiest 1% of the American population, was to construct an oppositional place, one that practiced consensus-based decision making in general assemblies. The group allied itself with a democratic tradition based on direct, widespread, and on-going public participation of an inclusive swath of citizens that is in many ways the opposite of the representative, institutionalized, and exclusive tradition dominant in American politics. In this sense, the Occupy group is an example of what has been called "prefigurative politics," "existential politics," or "nomoi" (Breines, 1989, p. 6; Epstein, 1991, p. 57; Disch, 1997, pp. 132–165; Cover, 1986). A group changes its own political existence by constructing novel political relationships, building new institutions, and designing innovative buildings and tools (Cassegård 2008, pp. 9–12). Feminists, anarchists, and socialist groups in the 1960s engaged in prefigurative politics, as did numerous utopian communities in nineteenth-century America (Bestor, 1950, p. 3; Francis, 2005; Gura, 2008, pp. 150–179).

The phrase "prefigurative politics" is something of a misnomer however because it obscures the necessity of an exit. Utopian communities, communes, and the Occupy group were all preceded by an exit – that is, protesters exited from their normal lives, their regular modes of living, their everyday jobs, and their orthodox ways of doing politics. They physically moved from their normal, private homes to inhabit a new place and this visible, collective transition signified their opposition. The exit demonstrated that they were no longer fully a part of the standard order or of the normal way of doing things. As one utopian community put it, "We voluntarily withdraw from the interference of the governments of this world. We can take no part in the politics, the administration, or the defence of those governments … We cannot render evil for evil, railing for railing, or wrath for wrath…" (Ballou, 1897, pp. 5–6). In this sense, the exit by a group not only

  1470-8914 **Contemporary Political Theory** Vol. 18, 2, 135–157

precedes the opposition, but also enables it. Without an exit, without the shared flight to the new space, these groups could not have constructed their unorthodox mode of being. For this reason, the exit appears integral to opposition; it gives these experiments in living greater political meaning as expressions of antipathy to orthodox politics and society.

The examples considered thus far take place in less restricted political contexts, and, in the case of nineteenth-century utopian communities, they tend to rely on access to wealth and resources. Given this, it makes sense to ask whether this kind of resistant exit is possible for individuals operating in more restricted political contexts and with fewer material resources. James C. Scott's recent investigations into the self-governing hill people in "Zomia," a remote region of Southeast Asia consisting of overlapping parts of ten countries, provides an example of those who have exited from the state in less than ideal circumstances. The people of Zomia fled the state for two millennia, running from the slavery, conscription, corvée labor, disease, and bloodshed of the valley, in some cases to construct less hierarchical and more egalitarian societies (Scott, 2009, p. ix). Another historical example is found on the American continent: during the colonial period slaves fled to form maroon communities in the Caribbean, Central and South America, and North America (Price, 1996; Lockley, 2009, Heuman, 1986). Understood as resistance, maroon communities were attacked by colonial militias and government troops, and captured individuals were punished in a range of ways, including amputation of a leg (to prevent further escapes), castration, or a slow death by fire (Price, 1996; Patterson, 1970; Camp, 2004). Many "maroon" or rebel slave socities were constructed in direct opposition to the fundamental tenants of slave society, and they provided former slaves an experience systematically denied to them by slavery – that is, political freedom and its founding in institutions (Roberts, 2015; see also Hesse, 2014). These examples suggest that this kind of resistance is not solely the province of resource-rich actors or those living in less restrictive polities. Indeed, to the extent that oppositional communities can be hidden in the hills, woods, and swamps, this kind of resistance may be a particularly appealing to actors with few material resources or operating within repressive regimes.

Maintaining Bonds with the Exited Group

The first two sections of this article described types of resistant exits, spectacular exits and constructive exits, which have their own particular shapes and features. Much the same way a cake baked in a Bundt pan looks different from one baked in a round pan, these two kinds of resistant action tend to look distinct. The focus of this third section is somewhat different because it is a more general attribute or characteristic of resistant exits – political attachment – that is present in many of the examples already discussed.[4] In this sense, political attachment might be

thought of as an ingredient of resistant exit, one that is common (though not universal) in the two described forms.

Political attachment implies that the person who departs continues to be connected politically to those left behind and assists or leads in resistance from outside the exited polity or group. Consider conscientious objectors to the Vietnam War who fled from the United States, usually to Canada or Sweden. For some of those who exited, the break with the United States was complete and, like countless immigrants before them, they assimilated. Others however remained politically attached to the United States, while geographically and juridically outside of it (Baskir and Strauss, 1978; Dickerson, 1999; Hagan, 2001; Hunt, 1999). They actively encouraged other Americans to resist by writing the *Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada*, a 90-page how-to guide that became a best seller in the United States (Satin and Programme, 1968). While in Canada they protested against the American war by burning draft cards and induction notices at the American Consulate. Some stole back into the United States to participate in the various moratorium gatherings in 1969 and to protest against the Cambodian invasion in 1970. In other words, they used their exile status to their political advantage. As one activist put it, "I've been in enough jails in the South in the civil rights days" to know "[y]ou can't do fuck-all in jail unless you're into being a martyr, and I'm not into martyrdom…You can do something in Canada—a lot do" (Williams, 1971, p. 334).

Political attachment is an affective bond, and in this sense it is related to the general longing that immigrants often experience when they yearn for the customs, weather, scenery, cooking, or smells of their homeland (Shain, 1989, pp. 18–26; Shklar, 1993). The general immigrant experience of attachment, however, tends to be wistful, nostalgic, and can sometimes vindicate *status quo* political arrangements in the native land. Political exiles, in contrast, seek changes in the power dynamics in their former homeland, and they tend to shun misty-eyed or artless appraisals of its politics. Rather than relying on a fond remembrance for the way things were, political exiles are on a restless quest for up-to-date information about politics in their country of origin and are quite attentive to the shifting landscape of power.

This kind of political attachment is also distinct because it is an internally conflicted affective bond. On the one hand, the political attachment of the resistant exile shows loyalty to the group that was left, to its struggles, or to its ideals (Michnik, 1987). Maintaining the will, the desire, to be attached can be challenging; tracking political developments at a distance and even participating in them requires time, effort, skills and stamina. It is often far easier for a political exile to let go and move on with life, even in the absence of an explicitly assimilationist agenda in the host country. The problem with maintaining an attachment, as one Iranian political exile eloquently put it, is that it is difficult "to feel the texture of society," even a very familiar society, from abroad (Afkhami,

  1470-8914 **Contemporary Political Theory** Vol. 18, 2, 135–157

1994, p. 99). Political exiles wage a daily struggle against the forces of proximity, using their affection for the people they left to counter the irrepressible pull of all that is physically close, immediately tangible, and readily available.

On the other hand, this political attachment also contains antipathy. Alongside loyalty and devotion to those who remain in the country of origin, there is often a deep and abiding enmity for the regime or those who are in control. Those in power may have prompted the political exile to leave in the first place and, in his or her eyes, there is no doubt about the need for political change in their homeland. As acrimony, antipathy, and a desire for vengeance curl up with affection, solidarity, and the inclination to protect, it can be difficult to discern which emotion is the strongest. Kanan Makiya, an Iraqi exile who made his antipathy for Saddam Hussein clear in his *Republic of Fear*, a prescient denunciation of Hussein's violent Ba'athist regime, was equally outspoken about his affection for those who remained in Iraq (Makiya, 1989). Recalling the period of Hussein's invasion of Kuwait, Makiya emphasized not only his opposition, but also his endearment for Iraqis: "…with every fiber of my being I longed to be there with them. Only, in this instance, I couldn't be. It was an incredibly painful time" (Weschler, 1998, p. 48).

It is a crucial element that this political attachment be oriented to the public good of the place that was left. American conscientious objectors aimed at improving the lives of many Americans by ending the war in Vietnam, not just their own situation. Their view of the public good was subjective (others disagreed that ending the war would benefit the country), but they directed their actions toward benefitting a wide-swath of American citizens. This is a general feature of attachment in a resistant exit: it is a connection to the public and shared concerns beyond self-interest and egoistic motives. A contrasting case, one in which the balance tips toward self-interest, is Gérard Depardieu's renunciation of his French citizenship in 2012 in order to reduce his tax burden. Depardieu, who received his new Russian passport from Vladimir Putin, attempted to shut down public interest in his actions, stating: "I do not need to justify my choice … My reasons are plentiful and personal" (Mabry, 2012). Depardieu's motivations were personal and limited: he wanted to improve his own situation, not those of most French citizens. Indeed, as one critic pointed out, Depardieu appeared to value his own money "over motherland" and "ahead of even democracy itself" (Nikitin, 2013).

If Depardieu organized opposition to France's tax rate from abroad (something he has not done), would his departure be a resistant exit because he maintained a political attachment to his homeland? Two reasons suggest no. First, there is the problem of partiality. Tax breaks for the wealthy benefit the few in France, not the many, and for this reason are not in the interest of the common good. The vast majority of French citizens benefit from the public services and goods provided by taxes and a significant reduction of tax revenue would harm them, not help them. To put this somewhat differently, the attachment of the tax-exile-cum-tax-advocate is to a particular group, the wealthy, while the attachment in a resistant exit is to

policies or actions that will benefit the whole. A second problem is that this quasi-hypothetical case is not resistance. A Depardieu-like tax exile would not challenge or object to dominant power relations in France, but in fact would do the exact opposite. This tax exile would reinforce a dominant power relation by bolstering the power of the affluent in French politics.

Political attachment to the common good of those left behind seems to be a persistent element of resistant exits, appearing in a wide range of cases. Indeed, there may be a relationship between political attachment and the immediate efficacy of the resistant exit. In a few cases examined in this article, political attachment is low or lacking: some maroon communities needed to remain hidden from their oppressors in order to survive and some utopian communities purposefully cut off contact with the local community to preserve their distinctive way of life. These examples also tend to be the least likely to have an immediate effect by interrupting, intervening, or objecting to a prevailing mode of power.

Political attachment seems noteworthy, too, at a conceptual level because it works against the natural predilection of exit. Exit tends to pull people apart by expanding geographic and psychic space. It creates gaps and erects boundaries. This may be why some theorists have associated exit with individual autonomy or with the capacity of individuals to be in control of their lives (Okin, 2002; Ben-Porath, 2010; Green, 1998; Galston, 1995; Eisenberg and Spinner-Halev, 2005; Shachar, 2001; Kukathas, 2012). On this view, individuals separate themselves, *qua* individuals, through exit and they break with the goals, values, or principles of the community or group that was left. While this kind of separation is a part of resistant exits, there is a countervailing tendency as well. Political attachment works in the opposite direction, preserving and creating contacts, connections, and solidarity. In much the same way as exit seems naturally to pull apart, political attachment binds. It draws people and places together, it transgresses partitions, especially juridical and geographic borders, and it conjoins the very same things that exit tends to dismantle or destroy.

Exit Versus Resistant Exit

People walk away all the time, for all sorts of reasons. They want new opportunities. They become disenchanted with a group or place that once filled them with passion; they grow apathetic, cynical, or weary. Or, they leave to seek protection offered by a new political place or association. We know, too, that people do many different things after they have departed. Some choose to embrace the new situation fully, and they assimilate. Having set themselves on a fresh and unknown path, they experience it without reservation. Others do not integrate, and they remain apart. All this variation suggests that exit is a pluralistic enterprise in which there are disparate reasons to exit and multiple ways to do so.

  1470-8914 **Contemporary Political Theory** Vol. 18, 2, 135–157

A problem with post-Marxist conceptions of exit is that they tend to elide the multiplicity of this phenomenon. Rather than being many things, exit is reduced in a procrustean way to one thing: an oppositional political act. On this view, all exits are acts of radical opposition with the potential to destabilize the state and a biopolitical regime of power. Exit also has the capacity to usher in what Hardt and Negri call "absolute democracy." The withdrawal from a place or group, so this argument goes, not only reveals a general dissatisfaction, but also strikes a defiant blow against existing political and economic institutions and prevalent ways of being. Put in the strongest terms, these works suggest that leaving is always, already oppositional and it is always, already political. Moreover, it is effective. In these accounts, exit is a particularly formidable kind of opposition, one with the potential to initiate global upheavals.

If we begin with the plurality of exit and accept that there are multiple kinds of exit, not just one, things look a bit different on several dimensions. Foremost, we can see that resistant exit is a specific kind of exit (and specific kind of resistance) that has distinguishing characteristics and appears a certain way. Actors engaging in resistant exits do more than just walk away; they use the exit to express opposition or to further the cause of disrupting dominant powers. They do special things through the exit itself – create spectacles, construct alternatives, remain attached in a public-minded way to the group that was left – that advance the goal of resistance. Those engaged in resistant exit have a distinctive outlook and disposition as well. They do not let go, forget, or wholly repudiate. Indeed, despite their exit, they often embrace political engagement and public connection with the place or association that was left. They may use their own departure as a moment of creation, rather than just negation. A narrower view of resistant exit also suggests a more limited understanding of efficacy and results. These are not effortlessly efficacious acts that yield radical democratic change. Rather, resistant exits often require considerable determination, effort, and organizing, and they sometimes entail great personal sacrifice.

Looking more closely at resistant exit as a particular phenomenon also illuminates its political character. Beginning with Hirschman, exit has been associated with economics and functionalism: exit was seen as an efficient tool to convey dissatisfaction with a brand or good to the leadership of the company or organization. One just walked away from the offending brand or good, no strings attached, and the message of dissatisfaction was expressed silently without the need for further communication. For Hirschman, exit was a flexible tool that could be applied to economic or political contexts with equal facility because the action itself – the exit – was devoid of content. This view rendered exit as a means to an end. Such a functionalist view of exit places a great deal of emphasis on how effective or efficient the tool (exit) is at attaining the goal. The tool itself is less significant than the goal that it is intended to further.

Resistant exits challenge an economic view of exit on several key dimensions. Unlike Hirschman's silent exits, for instance, resistant exit often involves quite a bit of communication because political actors feel the need to firmly tie the exit itself to a larger agenda of political opposition. Concerned that audiences might misconstrue the exit or those with power might distort its meaning, political actors take care to identify their exit as opposition and to use a shared, public language to justify it. In some cases of self-immolation, resistant exits lack verbal or written speech. Still these are expressive speech acts that fashion the leave-taking itself into a public spectacle. These performative exits are intended to draw the public gaze, to speak to a concrete political context or crisis, and to address a specific and common problem. They are deliberate, thoughtful acts in which the action is itself delivers the message. Among resistant exits, in other words, there is a natural alliance between exit and communication that is at odds with Hirschman's silent exits. Self-interest is another area of difference. The economic view tends to understand exit as an egoistic act in which the individual exits from a good or service because his or her needs are no longer being meet. But, as discussed in the case of the tax exile, resistant exit often involves concern for shared and general matters that cannot be reduced to self-interest alone. While self-interest can play a role in resistant exits, there is typically something more, a concern for the general wellbeing of those left behind. In some resistant exits, like self-immolations, the concern for the common good of those left behind is paramount, and if self-interest exists at all, it is not a decisive factor.

A final contrast with an economic view concerns the idea that exit is a tool that, because it is devoid of content itself, can serve economic or political ends equally well. While resistant exits certainly demonstrate means-to-end rationality, they also exceed an economic, functionalist view because they are politically expressive acts. The acts themselves, separate from the ends that they serve, make defiance manifest; they expose a struggle against power. Resistant exits can be expressive in another way. In the group or individual that leaves, the resistant exit co-joins action and moral conviction, and it makes this cohesion public. Both of these expressive qualities suggest that even if a resistant exit fails to accomplish or further the more expansive political goals (freeing a people; ending war), it will be politically significant nonetheless. A failed resistant exit – one that accomplishes nothing in terms of the larger political goals – still bears witness. It reveals the existence of political opposition and discloses the moral convictions that inspired the defiance.

Though they write from completely different perspectives, Hirschman and the post-Marxist theorists examined here show a similar tendency to miss the particularity of resistant exit. This is a mistake. There is good reason to pay attention to resistant exit as a specific phenomenon. Resistant exits can illuminate substantial political rifts, signal upheavals, or mark the beginnings of a transition. As we have seen, leaving can be expressive of deep opposition and antipathy. It shows a breach so severe that an individual or group can no longer be a member of

  1470-8914 **Contemporary Political Theory** Vol. 18, 2, 135–157

the spurned organization and refuses to give even the appearance of tacit consent to it. Not only do exits signal discontent and problems, but they also create opportunities to build novel political structures and to imagine new political arrangements. An exit from one organization can turn into an entrance, an opening. These possibilities may exist on an institutional level as well, and the departure of a polity from a federation may point to collective forms of resistant exit, ranging from separatist movements to the United Kingdom's "Brexit" from the European Union. But to see the rifts and changes that they may portend, we have to identify resistant exits correctly and to see them in their particularity. Stretching the concept too thin leads to missing it altogether.

About the Author

Jennet Kirkpatrick is Associate Professor in the School of Politics and Global Studies at Arizona State University. She is the author of *The Virtues of Exit: On Resistance and Quitting Politics* (University of North Carolina Press, 2017) and *Uncivil Disobedience: Studies in Violence and Democratic Politics* (Princeton University Press, 2008).

Notes

1. In his introduction to Virno's *A Grammar of the Multitude*, Sylvère Lotringer argues that "[c]apitalism itself is revolutionary because it keeps fomenting inequality and provoking unrest." Capital provokes "resistance to its own rule" (Lotringer, 2004, p. 18).
2. While less common in the United States, "principled resignation" is an accepted practice in British politics, perhaps because resignation means moving to the backbenches of British Parliament. In the American system, in contrast, resignation typically entails a more substantial loss of power (Hirschman, 1970, p. 114–119).
3. In this respect, Tibetan self-immolations are different from *sati*, the Hindu funeral custom in which a widow demonstrates her private grief by immolating herself on her husband's funeral pyre.
4. The three categories of resistant exit can and often do overlap in practice. The presence of one alone, however, constitutes a resistant exit.

References

(2003) More Friendly Fire from Robin Cook. *Daily Mail*, March 31, 12.

(2005) Obituary: Robin Cook. *Economist*, August 13, 71.

(2016) *Rethinking Civil Disobedience as a Practice of Contestation-Beyond the Liberal Paradigm*. 1.

Afkhami, M. (1994) *Women in Exile*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.

Albrecht, H. and Ohl, D. (2016) Exit, resistance, loyalty: Military behavior during unrest in authoritarian regimes. *Perspectives on Politics* 14(01): 38–52.

Alderman, R.K. and Cross, J.A. (1967) *The tactics of resignation: a study in British Cabinet government*. New York: Humanities Press.
Arendt, H. (1972) On violence. In: *Crises of the Republic*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
Ball, T. (1973) *Civil Disobedience and Civil Deviance*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publicactions.
Ballou, A. (1897) *History of the Hopedale Community, from its Inception to its Virtual Submission in the Hopedale Parish*. Lowell: Thompson & Hill.
Bargu, B. (2011) Max Stirner, Postanarchy *avant la lettre*. In: J.C. Klausen and J.R. Martel (eds.) *How not to be Governed: Readings and Interpretations from a Critical Anarchist Left*. Lanham: Lexington Books, pp. 103–122.
Bargu, B. (2014) *Starve and Immolate: The Politics of Human Weapons*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Bargu, B. (2016) Why did Bouazizi burn himself? The politics of fate and fatal politics. *Constellations* 23(1): 27–36.
Barry, B. (1974) Review article: 'Exit, voice, and loyalty'. *British Journal of Political Science* 4(1): 79–107.
Bartholet, J. (2013) Aflame. *The New Yorker*.
Baskir, L.M. and Strauss, W. (1978) *Chance and Circumstance: The Draft, the War, and the Vietnam Generation*. New York: Vintage Books.
Bedau, H.A., ed. (1969) *Civil Disobedience: Theory and Practice*. New York: Pegasus.
Bednar, J. (2007) Valuing exit options. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism* 37(2): 190–208.
Ben-Porath, S. (2010). Exit rights and entrance paths: Accommodating cultural diversity in a liberal democracy. *Perspectives on Politics* 8(04): 1021–1033.
Bestor, A.E. (1950) *Backwoods Utopias: the Sectarian and Owenite Phases of Communitarian Socialism in America, 1663-1829*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Breines, W. (1989) *Community and Organization in the New Left, 1962-1968: the Great Refusal*. New edn. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
Brown, G. (2005) Robin Cook, In All Honesty. *London Times*, August 8.
Camp, S.M.H. (2004) *Closer to Freedom: Enslaved Women and Everyday Resistance in the Plantation South*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
Cassegard, C. (2008) From withdrawal to resistance: The rhetoric of exit from Yoshimoto Takaaki to Karatani Kojin. *Asia-Pacific Journal* 6(3).
Celikates, R. (2016) Rethinking Civil Disobedience as a Practice of Contestation — Beyond the Liberal Paradigm. *Constellations* 23(1): 37–45.
China, United States Congressional-Executive Commission on. (2011) In: Commissions and Temporary Committees (ed.) *Special Report Tibetan Monastic Self-Immolations Appear To Correlate with Increasing Repression of Freedom of Religion*. Washington, DC.
Coffin, W.S. and Leibman, M.I. (1972). *Civil Disobedience: Aid or Hindrance to Justice*? Washington: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.
Cook, R. (2003a) *Point of Departure*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
Cook, R. (2003b) Resignation Speech, March 17, 2003. In: *Point of Departure*. New York: Simon & Schuster, pp. 361–365.
Cover, R. (1986) Violence and the Word. *Yale Law Journal* 95.
Dayell, T. (2005). Robin Cook. *Independent*, August 8, 32–33.
Dickerson, J. (1999) *North to Canada: Men and Women Against the Vietnam War*. Westport: Praeger.
Disch, L. (1997). 'Please Sit Down, but Don't Make Yourself at Home': Arendtian 'visiting' and the prefigurative politics of consciousness-raising. In: C.J. Calhoun and J. McGowan (eds.) *Hannah Arendt and the Meaning of Politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 132–165.
Dowding, K., John, P., Mergoupis, T. and Vugt, M. (2000) Exit, voice and loyalty: Analytic and empirical developments. *European Journal of Political Research* 37(4):469–495.

Dowding, K.M. and John, P. (2012) *Exits, Voices and Social Investment: Citizens' Reaction to Public Services*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Eisenberg, A.I. and Spinner-Halev, J., eds. (2005). *Minorities Within Minorities: Equality, Rights, and Diversity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Epstein, B.L. (1991) *Political Protest and Cultural Revolution: Nonviolent Direct Action in the 1970s and 1980s*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Faragher, J.M. (1979) *Women and Men on the Overland Trail*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Felice, W.F. (2009) *How do I Save My Honor? War, Moral Integrity, and Principled Resignation*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
Forsdyke, S. (2005) *Exile, Ostracism, and Democracy: The Politics of Expulsion in Ancient Greece*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Francis, R. (2005) Brook farm without vision. *The Review of Politics* 67(2): 361–363.
Galston, W.A. (1995) Two concepts of liberalism. *Ethics* 105(3): 516–534.
Gehlbach, S. (2006). A formal model of exit and voice. *Rationality and Society*.
Golden, M.M. (1992) Exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect: Bureaucratic responses to presidential control during the Reagan administration. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 2(1): 29.
Gouin, M. (2014) Self-immolation and martyrdom in Tibet. *Mortality* 19(2): 176–183.
Green, L. (1998) Rights of Exit. *Legal Theory* 4(02): 165.
Gura, P.F. (2008) *American Transcendentalism: A History*. New York: Hill and Wang.
Hagan, J. (2001). *Northern Passage: American Vietnam War Resisters in Canada*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Hardt, M. and Negri, A. (2000) *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Hardt, M. and Negri, A. (2004) *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. New York: Penguin Press.
Hesse, B. (2014) Escaping liberty: Western hegemony, black fugitivity. *Political Theory* 42(3): 288–313.
Heuman, G.J. (1986) *Out of the House of Bondage: Runaways, Resistance and Maroonage in Africa and the New World*. London: Frank Cass.
Hirschman, A.O. (1970) *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Hollander, J.A. and Einwohner, R.L. (2004) Conceptualizing resistance. *Sociological Forum* 19(4): 533–554.
Huizi, L., Weichao, J. and Chunxiao, Z. (2013) Chinese commentary decries Tibetan self-immolations. *BBC Monitoring Asia Pacific (New China News Agency)*, February 3.
Hunt, A.E. (1999) *The Turning: A History of Vietnam Veterans Against the War*. New York: New York University Press.
Johnson, S.L. (2000a) My own private life: Toward a history of desire in gold rush California. In: K. Starr and R.J. Orsi (eds.) *Rooted in Barbarous Soil: People, Culture, and Community in Gold Rush California*. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 316–346.
Johnson, S.L. (2000b) *Roaring Camp: The Social World of the California Gold Rush*. New York: W.W. Norton.
Kato, J. (1998) When the party breaks up: Exit and voice among Japanese legislators. *The American Political Science Review* 92(4): 857–870.
Krane, D. (1983) Opposition strategy and survival in praetorian Brazil, 1964–79. *The Journal of Politics* 45(01):28–63.
Kukathas, C. (2012) Exit, freedom and gender. In: D. Borchers and A. Vitikainen (eds.) *On Exit: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on the Right of Exit in Liberal Multicultural Societies*, Boston: De Gruyter. 193 p.
Laudani, R., ed. (2013) *Disobedience in Western Political Thought: A Genealogy*. First English edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Laver, M. (1976) Exit, voice, and loyalty revisited: Strategic production and consumption of public and private goods. *British Journal of Political Science* 6(Oct):463–482.
Law, V.S., Weise and Wang, L. (2014) *Voices from Tibet*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
Limerick, P.N. (1987) *The Legacy of Conquest: The Unbroken Past of the American West*. 1st ed. New York: Norton.
Lockley, T.J. (2009) *Maroon Communities in South Carolina: A Documentary Record*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
Lotringer, S. (2004) We, the multitude. In: *A Grammar of the Multitude: For an Analysis of Contemporary Forms Of Life*. Cambridge: Semiotext(e).
Mabry, M. (2012) Depardieu's Cri de Coeur, Translated into English. *New York Times*, December 17.
Makiya, K. (1989) *Republic of Fear: The Inside Story of Saddam's Iraq*. New York: Pantheon Books.
Marx, K. (1936) The modern theory of colonization. In: *Capital, a Critique of Political Economy*. New York: The Modern Library. 2 p. l., 3–869 p.
McWilliams, W.C. (1969) Civil disobedience and contemporary constitutionalism: The American case. *Comparative Politics* 1(2): 211–227.
Michnik, A. (1987). Why you are not emigrating… In: *Letters from Prison and Other Essays*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Montanaro, L. (2012). The democratic legitimacy of self-appointed representatives. *The Journal of Politics* 74(04): 1094–1107.
Mouffe, C. (2008). Critique as counter-hegemonic intervention. *European Institute for Progressive Cultural Policies*. Accessed February 20, 2014.
Murphy, J.G., ed. (1971) *Civil Disobedience and Violence*. Belmont: Wadsworth.
Najar, N. (2016). *Tibetan in India Dies Days After Setting Himself on Fire to Protest China*. *New York Times*, March 4.
Nikitin, V. (2013) Depardieu and the new capitalism. *New York Times*, January 8.
Okin, S.M. (2002) 'Mistresses of Their Own Destiny': Group rights, gender, and realistic rights of exit. *Ethics* 112(2): 205–230.
Patterson, O. (1970) Slavery and slave revolts: A socio-historical analysis of the first maroon war Jamaica, 1655–1740. *Social and Economic Studies* 19(3): 289–325.
Pfaff, S. and Kim, H. (2003) Exit-voice dynamics in collective action: An analysis of emigration and protest in the East German revolution. *American Journal of Sociology* 109(2): 401–444.
Price, R. (1996) *Maroon Societies: Rebel Slave Communities in the Americas*. 3rd edn. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
Rawls, J. (1969) The justification of civil disobedience. In: H.A. Bedau (ed.) *Civil Disobedience: Theory and Practice*. New York: Pegasus, pp. 240–255.
Rawls, J. (1971) *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Reid, J.P. (1997a) *Law for the Elephant: Property and Social Behavior on the Overland Trail*. San Marino: Huntington Library.
Reid, J.P. (1997b). *Policing the Elephant: Crime, Punishment, and Social Behavior on the Overland Trail*. San Marino: Huntington Library.
Rhodes, R.A.W. (2011) *Everyday Life in British Government*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Roberts, N. (2015) *Freedom as Marronage*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
Rohrbough, M. (2000) No boy's play: Migration and settlement in early gold rush California. In: K. Starr and R.J. Orsi (eds.) *Rooted in Barbarous Soil: People, Culture, and Community in Gold Rush California*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 25–43.
Rohrbough, M.J. (1997) *Days of Gold: the California Gold Rush and the American Nation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Sabl, A. (2001) Looking forward to justice: Rawlsian civil disobedience and its non-rawlsian lessons. *Journal of Political Philosophy* 9(3): 307–330.

Satin, M.I. and Toronto Anti-draft Programme. (1968) *Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada*. Toronto: House of Anansi.

Scheuerman, W.E. (2015) Recent theories of civil disobedience: An anti-legal turn? *Journal of Political Philosophy* 23(4): 427–449.

Scott, J.C. (1985) *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Scott, J.C. (2009) *The Art of not Being Governed: An Anarchist History of Upland Southeast Asia*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Shachar, A. (2001) *Multicultural Jurisdictions: Cultural Differences and Women's Rights*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shain, Y. (1989). *The Frontier of Loyalty: Political Exiles in the Age of the Nation-State*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press.

Shain, Y. (1991). *Governments-In-Exile in Contemporary World Politics*. New York: Routledge.

Shain, Y. (2005) *The Frontier of Loyalty: Political Exiles in the Age of the Nation-State*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Shklar, J.N. (1993) Obligation, loyalty, exile. *Political Theory* 21(2): 181–197.

Slotkin, R. (1974) *Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press.

Squire, V. (2015). Acts of desertion: Abandonment and renouncement at the Sonoran borderzone. *Antipode* 47(2): 500–516.

Tempest, M. (2003) Cook resigns from cabinet over Iraq. *Guardian*, March 17.

Virno, P. (1996) The ambivalence of disnchantment. In: P. Virno and M. Hardt (eds.) *Radical Thought in Italy: A Potential Politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Virno, P. (2004) *A Grammar of the Multitude: For an Analysis of Contemporary Forms of Life*. Translated by Isabella Bertoletti, James Cascaito and Andrea Casson. Cambridge: Semiotext(e).

Virno, P. (2005) About exodus. *Grey Room* 21: 17–20.

Walzer, M. (1988) *The Company of Critics: Social Criticism and Political Commitment in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Basic Books.

Warren, M.E. (2011) Voting with your feet: exit-based empowerment in democratic theory. *American Political Science Review* 105(4): 683–701.

Weisband, E. and T.M. Franck. (1975) *Resignation in Protest: Political and Ethical Choices Between Loyalty to Team and Loyalty to Conscience in American Public Life*. New York: Grossman Publishers.

Weschler, L. (1998) *Calamities of Exile: Three Nonfiction Novellas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Westermann, W.L. (1945) Between slavery and freedom. *The American Historical Review* 50(2): 213–227.

Whalen-Bridge, J. (2015) *Tibet on Fire: Buddhism, Protest, and the Rhetoric of Self-Immolation*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Williams, R.N. (1971) *The New Exiles: American War Resisters in Canada*. New York: Liveright Publishers.