

## Abstract

The thesis analyses a dispute of two anarchist movements promoting Anarcho-Capitalism and an automated non-monetary economy. It asks the question whether the dispute can be explained in terms of paradigm conflict and not exclusively in political terms. The goal is to search for signs of scientific paradigm in an apparently ideological dispute. The thesis also examines the reasons why did the debate deteriorate into a personal and moral conflict of the representatives. The method of analysis is Grounded Theory, with reference to authors who interpret Kuhn's paradigm conflict as the consequence of an unconscious language barrier. Paradigm was operationally defined as a hierarchy of concepts with physical reference, theoretical network of the concepts and the scientific field objectives. The field objectives are the only reliable reference points between paradigms. The thesis sums up the debate between Anarcho-Capitalists and proponents of Resource-Based Economy and recovers the scientific answers and field objectives which were demanded yet missing in the debate. The thesis concludes that the debate can legitimately continue and that the ideological differences were mostly caused by a different scope of technical instruments and their describing paradigms, regardless of historical origin and ideological leaning. The operationalized paradigm is recommended as a method of choice when analyzing other fringe movements in general to assess their scientific potential.