



Alexander Berkman (1870–1936) addresses a rally of the Industrial Workers of the World in New York in 1914.

The revolutionary syndicalist IWW (nick-named the “Wobblies”), part of the broad anarchist tradition, started in the United States in 1905 and soon spread across the world, organising militant IWW trade unions as far afield as Australia, Siberia, South Africa, and Chile, and with its propaganda finding an audience in places such as Punjab, Fiji, Cuba, New Zealand, Mexico, and Hong Kong. The IWW stressed “dual unionism.”



Railway workers of the General Confederation of Labour of France on strike in 1910.

The French CGT played a critical role in the second wave of syndicalism from the 1890s onwards, and stressed the importance of “boring-from-within” the orthodox unions. The CGT’s 1906 *Charter of Amiens* was, alongside the IWW’s 1905 Preamble, the most influential syndicalist document of the era, inspiring the establishment of anarcho-syndicalist organisations across Europe and Latin America. *Picture courtesy of the Centre for International Research on Anarchism.*

Dual Unionism, Reforms, and Other Tactical Debates

In this chapter and the one that follows, we will shift our analysis toward an examination of anarchist tactics, asking, What were the different positions adopted in pursuit of long-term anarchist strategies?

This chapter will explore two main sets of tactical issues. The first deals with the tactical issues posed by the activities of the state machinery, and how the movement responded to questions of warfare, labour law, and state welfare systems. How can the military operations of the state be opposed? Should anarchists and syndicalists participate in statutory industrial relations systems? Should anarchists and syndicalists support state welfare systems?

The second set of tactical issues deals with how anarchists and syndicalists should relate to the union movement. The adoption of a syndicalist strategy, for instance, begs the question of what immediate steps are to be taken in order to realise the project of building a revolutionary labour movement. In particular, it raises tactical concerns about how to relate to existing, orthodox unions. Should such unions be captured (by “boring from within”), or should new syndicalist unions be formed outside the existing unions (“dual unionism”)? Or should anarchists and syndicalists work within existing unions in order to promote oppositional rank-and-file movements independent of the formal union structure?

The Antimilitarist Tradition and Popular Revolt

The broad anarchist tradition’s fervent opposition to state wars and imperialism was an important expression of its antistatism. Anarchist and syndicalist antimilitarism was not just about opposition to the use of force to uphold the state but also a rejection of the *class* character of the modern military. Anarchist and syndicalist opposition to war did not derive so much from pacifism—an opposition to violence in any form—but from a class analysis. The modern military served, on the one hand, as the weapon of last resort in the maintenance of the class system; on the other hand, wars by the state were waged only to benefit the interests of the ruling classes, and offered nothing to the popular classes but conscription, regimentation, injury, and death.

Arising from competition in the state system along with the drive for new markets as well as sources of labour and raw materials—at its most sophisticated, the broad anarchist tradition avoided the crude economic explanations of Marxism—these wars pitted sailors and soldiers, drawn overwhelmingly from the popular classes, against one another to serve ends not their own. The socialising role of the military, and the role of nationalism in fostering war and dividing the international popular classes, was duly noted by Kropotkin:

Childhood itself has not been spared; schoolboys are swept into the ranks, to be trained up in hatred of the Prussian, the English or the Slav; drilled in blind obedience to the government of the moment, whatever the colour of its flag, and when they come to the years of manhood to be laden like pack-horses with cartridges, provisions and the rest of it; to have a rifle thrust into their hands and be taught to charge at the bugle call and slaughter one another right and left like wild beasts, without asking themselves why or for what purpose.¹

It was, Maximoff argued, the “criminally mercenary interests” of rival ruling classes that impel them to “sow hatred and hostility between nations.”²

Antimilitarism was a central theme in the revolutionary popular counterculture promoted by the broad anarchist tradition. There was little debate among the anarchists and syndicalists in the glorious period about the necessity of antimilitarism; current anarchism is also strongly associated with opposition to the wars of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. The “military spirit is the most merciless, heartless and brutal in existence,” said Goldman, and militarism must be halted by “human brotherhood and solidarity,” which alone could “clear the horizon from the terrible red streak of war and destruction.”³

If wars “are only waged in the interest of the ruling classes,” observed Rocker, then “any means is justifiable that can prevent the organised murder of peoples.” These include strikes, boycotts of military production, the disruption of military facilities and transport, and the subversion of the armed forces themselves:

As outspoken opponents of all nationalist ambitions the revolutionary Syndicalists ... have always devoted a very considerable part of their activity to anti-militarist propaganda, seeking to hold the workers in soldiers’ coats loyal to their class and to prevent their turning their weapons against their brethren in time of a strike. This has cost them great sacrifices; but they have never ceased their efforts, because they know that they can regain their efforts only by incessant warfare against the dominant powers.⁴

Antimilitarism was a central activity for many anarchists and syndicalists. Nieuwenhuis was perhaps its greatest exponent in Europe and the key figure in the International Anti-Militarist Union formed in 1904. A popular young Lutheran minister, Nieuwenhuis left the church in 1879 and joined the Social Democratic Union, which had been formed in 1881 and was modeled on the German SDP.⁵ He was the first socialist senator in the Netherlands. When the Social Democratic Union split in 1893, with orthodox Marxists leading a breakaway Social Democratic Workers’ Party, Nieuwenhuis and the majority of members remained loyal to the existing organisation. Like many in the Social Democratic Union, he moved toward

anarchism by 1897. He published *De Vrije Socialist* ("The Free Socialist," which still exists as *De Vrije*, that is, "The Free") and wrote widely, dying in 1919.

The project of subversion was also linked to the view that it could lead to a split in the military when the revolution came; as the troops are "mostly workingmen and in sympathy with the general strike," they could be "induced to join the ranks of their striking fellow workers." Therefore, antimilitarist work should encourage "working class soldiers not to shoot their brothers and sisters ... but, if need be, to shoot their own officers and to desert the army when the crucial moment arrives."⁶ A masterpiece of this sort of appeal, stressing common class interests, is the "Don't Shoot" leaflet, also known as "An Open Letter to British Soldiers." Written by an anonymous British syndicalist, it got Tom Mann and several other syndicalists arrested for incitement to mutiny after it appeared in the British *Syndicalist* in the 1910s:

Men! Comrades! Brothers!...

You are Workingmen's Sons. When We go on Strike to fight to better Our lot, which is the lot also of your Fathers, Mothers, Brothers, and Sisters, YOU are called upon by your officers to MURDER US. Don't do it.... "Thou shalt not kill," says the Book. Don't forget that! It does not say, "unless you have a uniform on." No! MURDER IS MURDER, whether committed in the heat of anger on one who has wronged a loved one, or by clay-piped Tommies with a rifle.

Boys, Don't Do It! Act the Man! Act the Brother! Act the Human Being! Property can be replaced! Human life, Never! The Idle Rich Class, who own and order you about, own and order us about also. They and their friends own the land and means of life of Britain.

You don't! We don't! When We kick, they order You to murder Us. When You kick, You get court-martialled and cells. Your fight is Our fight. Instead of fighting Against each other, We should be fighting With each other.... You, like Us, are of the Slave Class. When We rise, You rise; when We fall, even by your bullets, Ye fall also.

Comrades, have we called in vain? Think things out and refuse any longer to Murder your Kindred. Help US to win back the Britain for the British, and the World for the Workers.⁷

The history of the broad anarchist tradition is also replete with numerous examples of large-scale and effective antimilitarist campaigns, particularly in the glorious period. Some of the most important of these campaigns developed into revolts by the Western popular classes against colonialism. During the Cuban war of independence (1895–1904), the Spanish anarchists campaigned against Spanish intervention among the working class, peasantry, and military. "All Spanish anarchists disapproved of the war and called on workers to disobey military authority and refuse to fight in Cuba," leading to several mutinies among draftees.⁸ The Spanish anarchists also opposed the intervention of the United States from 1898 onward. Michele Angiolillo, the insurrectionist anarchist who assassinated Spanish president Antonio Cánovas del Castillo in 1897, declared at his trial that the deed was in revenge for the repression of anarchists in Spain as well as for Spain's atrocities in its colonial wars in Cuba and the Philippines.⁹

The 1909 Tragic Week started as a popular revolt against conscription in the Spanish government's ongoing war in Morocco. It followed the decision by the Spanish government to call up army reservists, "most of whom were working-class family men, strongly anti-militarist ever since they, or their fathers, had returned starving, and ridden with malaria, from the colonial war with the United States in 1898."¹⁰ Starting with a general strike on Monday, July 26, 1909, by Solidaridad Obrera ("Workers' Solidarity," the CNT's predecessor), the revolt escalated rapidly. By Tuesday, the working class was in control of Barcelona—halting troop trains, overturning trams, cutting communications, and erecting barricades. By Thursday, fighting broke out with government forces and over 150 workers were killed. For Henry W. Nevinson, a contemporary, the "refusal of the Catalonian reservists to serve in the war against the Riff mountaineers of Morocco" was "one of the most significant" events of modern times.¹¹

The great significance of the Tragic Week was that "the proletariat in Europe rebelled and shed its blood against imperialism in Africa."¹² It was not an isolated incident. In 1911, the CNT marked its birth with a general strike in September, called in support of strikers in Bilbao and against the ongoing war in Morocco.¹³ Again, in 1922, following a disastrous battle against the forces of Abd el-Krim in Morocco in August—a battle in which at least ten thousand Spanish troops died—"the Spanish people were full of indignation and demanded not only an end to the war but also that those responsible for the massacre and the politicians who favoured the operation in Africa be brought to trial," expressing their anger in riots and strikes in the industrial regions.¹⁴

It was by no means an isolated event, but rather one in an ongoing series of similar battles under anarchist and syndicalist influence. In Italy in the 1880s and 1890s, "anarchists and former anarchists" "were some of the most outspoken opponents of Italian military adventures in Eritrea and Abyssinia."¹⁵ This opposition to colonialism was linked, via antimilitarism, to opposition to the use of the state's armed forces against the Italian popular classes; this related imperialism to the concrete conditions of the Italian working class, suggesting that it had no interest in such a policy. The Italian invasion of Libya on September 19, 1911, was another rallying point. The majority of PSI deputies voted for annexation.¹⁶ Anarchists and syndicalists, on the other hand, organised demonstrations against the war and a partial general strike, and "tried to prevent troop trains leaving the Marches and Liguria for their embarkation points."¹⁷

Augusto Masetti, an anarchist soldier, shot and wounded a colonel addressing troops departing for Libya at a parade ground in Bologna, shouting, "Down with the War! Long Live Anarchy!" He became a popular symbol, and the anarchist journal *L'Agitatore* ("The Agitator") issued a special commemorative edition, claiming that "anarchist revolt shines through the violence of war."¹⁸ This led to the arrest of anarchists and syndicalists; Borghi, one of the paper's editors, had a previous conviction for antimilitarist activity in 1902 and so he fled to Paris.¹⁹ The war "stirred all the latent but deep anti-militarism of the peasant and working classes, imperfectly if at all integrated into the patriotism and nationalism which were universal among the middle and lower-middle classes," and it was the USI and the anarchists who captured the popular mood.²⁰ By 1914, an anarchist-led antimilitarist front, with

twenty thousand adherents, was sufficiently powerful that top politicians feared it could lay the basis for a revolutionary "Red bloc."²¹

On June 7, 1914, the anarchist-led antimilitarists organised a national demonstration on Constitution Day against militarism, against special punishment battalions in the army, and for the release of Masetti.²² With the spectre of the Red bloc in mind, the government ordered troops to prevent the protests.²³ Clashes with troops in the anarchist stronghold of Ancona following a rally addressed by Malatesta left three workers dead and sparked off the revolutionary crisis of the "Red Week" of June 1914, a mass uprising ushered in by a general strike.²⁴ Called by the PSI, the general strike was soon led by anarchists and the USI.²⁵

Approximately a million workers participated in what became a working-class movement of unprecedented power.²⁶ Ancona was held by rebels for ten days, barricades went up in all the big cities, small towns in the Marche declared themselves self-governing communes, and everywhere the revolt took place "red flags were raised, churches attacked, railways torn up, villas sacked, taxes abolished and prices reduced."²⁷ The movement collapsed after the CGL called off the strike, but it took ten thousand troops to regain control of Ancona.²⁸

Antimilitarism was widely adhered to elsewhere, always linked to a criticism of capitalism and the state. In France, anarchists like Michel called on conscripts to strike, forcing the ruling class "to go off to war by themselves."²⁹ The pre-First World War CGT had a long-standing tradition of antimilitarism. In 1900, the CGT and the Bourses du Travail decided to campaign among the military, with particular attention to young recruits, producing a seditious *Manuel du Soldat* ("Soldiers' Manual") for distribution among the soldiers and the public; the manual included a call for desertion. By 1906, two hundred thousand copies of the manual had been sold. By the early 1910s, antimilitarism constituted the "bulk of syndicalist activity."³⁰ In 1911, the CGT held an antiwar demonstration in Paris that attracted twenty thousand people, and a twenty-four-hour strike by eighty thousand workers in support of peace in 1913, and the state responded with massive raids, with syndicalists receiving a total of 167 months in jail. For the U.S. IWW, "the approved international policy of modern capitalism" was "but ruthless coercion in the pursuit of raw supplies and to secure export markets for capital and goods, all for the benefit of our economic overlords":

The IWW favours a league of the world's workers against the world's ravishers. It favours the organisation of labour on the lines of world industry, to strike on such lines against war and the outrages against humanity arising from capitalism.... With corporations in existence having world-wide branches, with inventions like the steamship, wireless, aeroplane, eliminating distance, time and national barriers, the industrial organisation of labour on a world basis is not only possible but necessary.³¹

In South Africa, anarchists and syndicalists opposed the introduction of compulsory military service by the Defence Bill (passed in 1912), arguing that the legislation aimed to create an all-white army to crush African workers. A "native rising" would be a "wholly justified" response to "the cruel exploitation of South African natives by farmers, mining magnates and factory owners," and should receive the "sympathy and support of every white wage-slave."³² For Shifu in China, "Our

principles are communism, anti-militarism, syndicalism, anti-religion, anti-family, vegetarianism, an international language and universal harmony.”³³

In Japan, Kōtoku opposed the Russo-Japanese war from 1903 to 1905, and Ōsugi was jailed in 1907 for an antimilitarist article addressed to conscripts.³⁴ The Zenkoku Jiren, at its founding, declared that “we are opposed to imperialist aggression and we advocate the international solidarity of the working class.”³⁵ Along with the Black Youth League (Kokushoku Seinen Renmai, better known as the Kokuren) anarchist group, the Zenkoku Jiren opposed Japan’s 1927 intervention in Manchuria, and the Zenkoku Jiren responded to the 1931 invasion of Manchuria with a call for struggle against war and military production, a refusal to enlist, and general disobedience to officers.³⁶ When the Japanese army entered Mongolia in 1933, the anarchists called for mass struggle, strikes in munition plants, and mutinies.³⁷

In 1907 and 1908, war threatened to break out between Brazil and Bolivia over the disputed territory of Acre, and a nine-year draft (seven in reserve forces) was instituted for male citizens aged twenty-one to forty-four. In response, the syndicalist Labour Federation of Rio de Janeiro established a Brazilian Anti-Militarist League, with chapters in coastal cities from Recife in the north to Porto Alegre in the south, and published *Não Matarás* (“Don’t Kill”).³⁸ In Rio Doce, women League activists destroyed a draft office and then telegraphed the minister of war to inform him of their actions—a pattern repeated in many other towns. The movement culminated in 1908 with a COB antiwar demonstration by five thousand people in Rio, backed by similar marches in other Brazilian cities as well as in Argentina and Uruguay, and a declaration that the revolutionary strike was the appropriate response to capitalist war. The Brazilians were represented at the 1913 International Syndicalist Congress held in London (a precursor of the IWA), where an opposition to war was reiterated.³⁹

The outbreak of the First World War in August 1914 nonetheless saw a number of prominent anarchists—among them Cherkezov, Cornelissen, Grave, Guillaume, and Kropotkin—come out openly in support of the Allies, maintaining that a German victory must be avoided at all costs. The French CGT did likewise, joining with political socialists, the state, and the employers in a Sacred Union for the duration of the war. The great majority of sections of the Labour and Socialist International—with the notable exception of the Bolshevik wing of the RSDRP and a few minor affiliates like the Bulgarians—also rallied to the flag, throwing overboard their formal opposition to war and destroying the International. Lenin made great play of the capitulation of the “anarcho-trenchists,” and suggested that anarchism had failed the test of war as badly as the Marxists.⁴⁰ Other writers speak in sweeping terms of the general crisis of the Left and the collapse of socialism in 1914, as “socialist leaders were either cowed or carried away by the wave of jingoism.”⁴¹

In fact, the vast majority of anarchists and syndicalists rejected the war, and adopted the view that the war should be met with revolutionary struggle—a perspective that goes back to Bakunin.⁴² Malatesta rebuked Kropotkin, called for resistance to the war, and called for a new socialist international.⁴³ He argued that the war was waged in the interests of the ruling classes, and declared,

The war ought to have been prevented by bringing about the Revolution, or at least by threatening to do so. Either the strength or the skill neces-

sary for this has been lacking. Peace ought to be imposed by bringing about the Revolution, or at least by threatening to do so. To the present time, the strength or the skill has been wanting. Well! there is only one remedy: to do better in future. More than ever we must avoid compromise.... Long live the peoples, all the peoples!⁴⁴

Notwithstanding the great prestige of Kropotkin, his prowar position was extremely unpopular. The “immediate reaction” of the “vast majority” of British anarchists was “to reject the war and immediate steps were taken to propagandise against it.”⁴⁵ No British syndicalist militant “actively supported the war,” and Mann (who privately hoped for a German defeat) “never wavered” in his “fundamental opposition to the war.”⁴⁶ Kropotkin was marginalised, as was Cornelissen, whose “very considerable” influence quickly “dwindled away to nothing.”⁴⁷ In France, an antiwar faction quickly emerged in the CGT, coalescing into a Committee for Syndicalist Defence in 1916.⁴⁸

A militarist group arose within the Italian USI and other sections of the Italian anarchist movement, but was soon defeated.⁴⁹ The anarchists and syndicalists generally maintained a consistently antiwar position, continuing into 1920, when they launched a mass campaign against the Italian invasion of Albania and the counterrevolutionary Western intervention against the Russian Revolution.⁵⁰ A militarist minority in Spain was also overwhelmingly defeated. In Germany, where the SDP had come out in support of the war effort and provided the crucial votes in parliament for war credits, the FVdG was “the only German workers’ organisation to have adopted an internationalist rather than a patriotic response to the war.”⁵¹ The U.S. IWW declared itself among the “determined opponents of all nationalistic sectionalism or patriotism, and the militarism preached and supported by our one enemy, the Capitalist Class,” and aimed at, “in time of war, the general strike in all industries.”⁵²

A number of anarchists and syndicalists, including FVdG representatives, attended the antiwar Zimmerwald congress organised by Lenin in September 1916, but this was not the start of anarchist participation in an international antiwar organisation. Five months earlier the Spanish anarchists organised the first antiwar international labour congress, at which 8 countries and 170 organisations were represented.⁵³ Held in El Ferrol, it was followed by a FORA mass rally in Buenos Aires in May. In Brazil, where antimilitarist activities revived with the outbreak of the First World War and the crushing of a peasant revolt in Paraná, the COB condemned all sides in the war between the great powers.⁵⁴ In 1915, it issued an antiwar manifesto in conjunction with other unions, held numerous antiwar rallies, published the antiwar *Guerra Sociale* (“Social War”), and held an International Peace Congress in Rio de Janeiro. This was organised through the anarchist People’s Anti-War Agitational Commission—attended by delegates from Brazil, Argentina, Spain, and Portugal—which issued a manifesto calling for “permanent revolt.”⁵⁵ Meanwhile, Goldman, Berkman, Malatesta, and other major figures issued an “International Anarchist Manifesto against War.”⁵⁶

Anarchists and syndicalists were subject to repression for their positions. While *Freedom* in London had printed Kropotkin’s prowar position, it came out strongly against the war; its offices were raided, its press was seized, and its editor,

Tom Keell, was jailed.⁵⁷ Rocker, then resident in Britain, was interned as an “enemy alien.” When the South African Labour Party and the orthodox unions came out in support of the British Empire, anarchists and syndicalists helped form a War-on-War League, held numerous antiwar meetings, and suffered ongoing arrests. In Cape Town, the anarchist Wilfred Harrison—a former soldier, carpenter, pioneer of interracial unionism, key figure in the local Social Democratic Federation, member of the War-on-War League, and later a founding member of the CPSA—was sentenced to six months for antimilitarist propaganda.⁵⁸ Slandered as “Imperial Wilhelm’s Warriors”—as supporters of the German kaiser—the U.S. IWW faced “criminal syndicalism” laws in thirty-five states after 1914.⁵⁹ The repression increased dramatically after the United States entered the war in 1917, and was followed by the mass arrests and deportations of the Left during the subsequent Red Scare.

In Australia, where the IWW demanded, “Let those who own Australia do the fighting,” twelve Wobblies were tried for an alleged plot to burn down Sydney, and another eleven for “seditious conspiracy.”⁶⁰ With the passage of the December 1916 Unlawful Associations Act—which provided jail sentences of six months for anyone who advocated antimilitarism, direct action, or a change to the social order—more than one hundred Wobblies were subsequently imprisoned; others were deported, and the IWW press was suppressed. In Canada, the IWW was suppressed with the aid of the British North America Act of 1915, and a 1918 federal order-in-council made membership in either the Chicago or Detroit IWWs subject to a mandatory five-year prison term.⁶¹ In Germany, syndicalist publications were suppressed and activists were arrested.⁶² Undeterred, the new IWA included antimilitarism in its core principles, and founded an International Anti-Militarist Commission in 1926 to promote disarmament and gather information on war production.

If we have focused our account of anarchist and antimilitarism on developments in the glorious period, this is only because this era provides some of the most dramatic expressions of this tradition. The same commitment to antimilitarism can be found, however, throughout anarchist and syndicalist history, including opposition to the Anglo-Boer War (1899–1902), the annexation of Korea (1910), the invasion of Manchuria (1931), the Second World War (1939–1945), the Algerian War (1954–1962), the Vietnam War (1959–1975), the Gulf War (1990), the Russian war against Chechnya (starting in 1991), the invasion of Afghanistan (beginning in 2001), the occupation of Iraq (starting in 2003), and innumerable other conflicts.

Reforms, Laws, and Compromises

If the question of opposing war was fairly easily faced by the broad anarchist tradition, the daily struggle for immediate gains posed more complicated tactical issues. Mass anarchists assume that reforms are desirable, and recognise that the need for reforms is only removed with a revolution. Even a syndicalist union, based on a democratic structure, mobilised through direct action, and infused with radical ideas, must make numerous compromises with the ruling class in a prerevolutionary period, and engage in “negotiations, compromises, adjustments and contacts with the authorities and the employers.”⁶³ (We leave aside here the insurrectionist view that reforms were worthless, and the claim that a programme of winning im-

mediate gains was by definition “reformist” and therefore unacceptable.)⁶⁴ Unlike mass anarchism, insurrectionist anarchism refuses to deal with reforms, laws, and compromises.

However, the question for syndicalism is not whether to negotiate or make compromises with the class enemy but *how* to do so in a manner consonant with the syndicalist project. Most immediately and self-evidently, it follows from our discussion so far that, in situations falling short of revolution, negotiations and compromises must arise as the outcome of a struggle based on direct action, which forces the authorities and the employers to the negotiating table. It is in and around negotiations that complications arise, and specifically there are questions of *what* types of negotiations are acceptable, what compromises are possible, and which outcomes are compatible with the means and ends of a syndicalist union.

On one level, there is the issue of whether binding contracts could be entered into with employers. Syndicalists, given their stress on direct action and working-class autonomy, should evidently reject no-strike clause agreements as surrendering the vital weapon of direct action, and the politics of class struggle, in pursuit of an illusory class peace. But what of contracts—binding deals between labour and capital—as such?⁶⁵ The U.S. IWW reflected one view: “No contracts, no agreements, no compacts,” said Haywood. “These are unholy alliances and must be damned as treason when entered into with the capitalist class.”⁶⁶ Rather, victories should be enforced by the strength of the union.⁶⁷ For the IWW in New Zealand, “any understanding between workers and employers is only an armistice, to be broken, when convenient, by either side.” The “Employing Class, as a whole, has always recognised and acted up to this,” so it was “foolish” for workers to “keep to their side of contracts.”⁶⁸ It was feared that formal agreements with employers would sap the fighting spirit of the union and prevent it from taking industrial action at will.

The difficulty, however, was that weaker syndicalist unions were often unable to enforce agreements, and hostile employers were able to grind away at concessions; moderate unions like the AFL, as some Wobblies admitted, were able to attract members as a result of recognition agreements with employers as well as binding contracts. Other syndicalists, bearing this in mind, were willing to accept formal contracts with employers as an outcome of strikes, so long as the contracts did not bind the union to particular courses of action for a set period.⁶⁹

The ongoing development of official, statutory industrial relations systems, backed by law and including labour law courts, posed other issues. While such systems were absent or rudimentary in many places in the late nineteenth century, these systems evolved rapidly in the twentieth century, partly from the concern of elites for social order and partly under the impulse of social democratic movements. In 1904, for instance, the world’s first Labour government was formed by the Australian Labour Party, which implemented suffrage and welfare reforms as well as immigration controls and a system of compulsory arbitration in labour disputes.⁷⁰ Similar models were adopted in New Zealand and elsewhere. In South Africa, major labour law reforms beginning in 1924, partly sponsored by the local Labour Party, created a whole system of negotiating forums at the level of industry; while generally avoiding compulsory arbitration, the new system (besides excluding large sectors of the working class) made legal strike action possible only after a lengthy set of

negotiations and procedures had failed. Other reforms enabled unions to apply for statutory wage determinations, again a cumbersome process.

From the 1920s onward, many import-substitution industrialisation regimes and fascist states also created state-corporatist systems, in which unions were directly controlled by the state. From the 1940s onward, Keynesian welfare states established national-level, voluntary corporatist forums to negotiate policy, prices, and wages, and create binding social pacts between the classes, along with workplace forums to forge a consensus between unions and employers. Rather than decline with neoliberalism, voluntary corporatism and workplace forums have survived in the West as well as proliferated elsewhere.

Statutory industrial relations systems, of whatever type, pose a whole set of challenges. A consistent syndicalist might presumably reject direct participation in state-corporatist structures out of hand. Yet this still leaves the issue of whether it is possible to work at the grass roots of the state-controlled unions or employer-sponsored unions with the aim of fostering a syndicalist current of some sort. With the CNT surviving as a clandestine body following the establishment of the Miguel Primo de Rivera dictatorship in Spain in 1923, many activists entered the “free unions” promoted by employers (and tolerated by the new regime) to form “underground antidictatorial syndicalist nuclei.”⁷¹

What of involvement in mechanisms that include compulsory arbitration? Historically, almost all syndicalists rejected these structures as both biased against labour and limiting the scope for direct action. The FORU in Uruguay, for example, rejected state arbitration in “the settlement of quarrels between capital and labour” as well as “draft legislation” to make such intervention mandatory.⁷² The Mexican CGT refused to participate in the statutory Juntas de Conciliación y Arbitraje (conciliation and arbitration councils), established in 1924 and designed to promote state-sponsored unions, and was thus declared an outlaw organisation.⁷³ Likewise, many French syndicalists refused to become entangled in collective bargaining machinery.⁷⁴

Disillusionment with such systems played a key role in the life of the British syndicalist Mann. The son of a clerk at a colliery, Mann worked from a young age, became an engineer, converted to socialism in the 1880s, helped found the Independent Labour Party, and became a prominent trade unionist.⁷⁵ After immigrating to Australia in 1901, however, he was profoundly disillusioned with the system of compulsory arbitration and the Labour government; in conjunction with a rejection of craft unionism, this played a direct role in his shift to syndicalism. A pivotal event was the Broken Hill miners’ strike, which was won after twenty-one weeks. The role of the Australian Labour Party, the labour laws, and state repression—and the failure of railway workers to prevent the police being transported in—convinced Mann of the need for revolutionary industrial unionism and the futility of “reliance on parliamentary action.”⁷⁶ When he returned to Britain (visiting France and South Africa as well), he formed the Industrial Syndicalist Education League (ISEL) in 1910, led mass strikes in 1911, and published the *Industrial Syndicalist*. He later helped found the CPGB, heading its National Minority Movement union faction, and died in 1941.

For the IWW in New Zealand, the “evil effects of Arbitration on the workers generally” included “encouraging dependence on something outside themselves, taking the spine out of unionism, creating parasites in the shape of judges, lawyers, clerks, etc., opening the way to trickery on the part of union secretaries and others, in manipulating legal phraseology which the average worker has no time to unravel.”⁷⁷ Arbitration could not protect workers from changes in capitalism, which continually undermined settlements, and it also legitimised exploitation under the cover of fairness.

The situation is more complicated with statutory negotiating forums and mechanisms for wage determinations that allow independent rather than state-run unions, and do not impose compulsory arbitration. Such systems certainly tend to push unions into official channels, foster a bureaucratic layer to work in these channels, and limit strike action, but they also provide unions with a degree of legal protection as well as determinations and regulations that can be used against employers and the state.

Compared with the alternative of crude repression, such systems have their attractions. Yet can they be effectively used in the mass anarchist project, and if so, which mechanisms can be engaged, and in which circumstances and with which qualifications? In Spain, where mixed labour commissions (representing unions and employers) and “parity committees” (which also included government representatives) emerged in 1919, the CNT briefly entered the former only to subsequently repudiate all such structures as corrupting, and the issue contributed to the subsequent split that saw a moderate faction, the *treintistas*, break away, form rival unions, and launch an electoral Syndicalist Party.⁷⁸ The moderate UGT, by contrast, became deeply immersed in such structures—a fact that accounts in part for its relatively high level of bureaucratisation.

These unresolved debates have been revived in Western Europe and elsewhere in the last quarter of the twentieth century, particularly around the statutory workplace forums established in many plants. Typically these allow workers to elect candidates, provide a mechanism for negotiating changes and disputes at work, and in some cases, supply the mechanism through which protected legal strikes may be authorised. Where the elections are individualised—that is, every worker, unionised or not, can elect candidates who stand on an individual basis—even orthodox unions have feared the possibility that the forums will duplicate union functions and render the union irrelevant by making free collective bargaining impossible. As a result of these concerns along with union pressures, workplace forums have therefore often been structured to allow unions to run candidates.

It is in such cases that the question of whether syndicalist unions should participate in workplace forums has been sharply posed, particularly in the late twentieth century. In Spain, the collapse of the Franco dictatorship in 1975 saw the CNT, suppressed for decades, rapidly reconstituted; its membership grew to three hundred thousand by 1978.⁷⁹ In 1979, the Spanish CNT began to split: there were a range of issues at stake, but one was certainly the question of participation in the post-Franco workplace forums.

The view of the official CNT was that such participation was incompatible with the syndicalist project, and that the forums should thus be boycotted. This po-

sition remains in force and is considered official IWA policy. It is clearly expressed by the Solidarity Federation, the IWA's current British affiliate, which argues that workplace forums would "control and pacify people at work," create an illusion of class partnership that leads workers and unions to take responsibility for the fortunes of the firm, undermines free collective bargaining, turns workers into a passive electorate, and detracts attention from the need to form strong union branches capable of direct action.⁸⁰ Where participation in forums is accompanied by the provision of subsidies, the problems are exacerbated by a growing union dependence on outside funding.⁸¹

An alternative position was represented by the main breakaway from the Spanish CNT, the Spanish CGT (it dropped the name CNT in 1989 after a lengthy and acrimonious dispute about which grouping constituted the "real" CNT), which argued for a critical and limited participation in the workplace forums. Currently, besides a formal membership of around sixty thousand, this union represents two million workers in terms of the workplace forums and other industrial relations structures, making it the third-largest union federation in the country and considerably larger than the official CNT.⁸² The CGT has been accused of reformism by the IWA, which amended its statutes in 1996 to ban participation in workplace forums. The CGT's response has been that it remains loyal to syndicalism but has adapted its tactics to the new situation, and has done so to great effect. A similar split has played out in France in the 1990s, where the National Confederation of Labour (CNT), a syndicalist successor to the old CGT, split into two groups, a majority and a minority, based respectively in Paris and Bordeaux. The pro-participation CNT-Paris is substantially larger than the IWA section.

State welfare systems, which developed rapidly from the 1930s onward, also pose difficulties. Syndicalism stresses the importance of winning reforms, and much of the expansion of welfare is attributable, at least in part, to working-class struggles. Syndicalism also sees improvements in the material conditions of the working class in positive terms, and there is no doubt that state welfare systems have been critical, especially in the West, in improving the quality of popular life. Yet such welfare also serves to promote particular family structures (as, for example, when the state makes child support grants available to married women through their husbands) and foster a profound loyalty to the state as the benevolent representative of the public.

A case in point of some of the difficulties is presented by the Swedish SAC's situation; it was one of the only IWA affiliates still functioning as a union after 1945, in large part because Sweden had been relatively unaffected by the rise of dictatorships, fascism, and war elsewhere (although key members were interned during the war along with other "subversive elements"). By this time, the Swedish state was developing into a model of social democracy, introducing an extensive and expansive welfare system as well as a complicated system of collective bargaining. One aspect of this system (partly a concession to the Labour Organisation union federation, or LO, that was allied with the ruling Social Democratic Labour Party) was that the unions played a role in the administration of welfare, including the distribution of unemployment benefits.

Grappling with this issue, the SAC revised its programme in 1954 and decided to start distributing state unemployment funds to its members.⁸³ This was condemned by the IWA, and the SAC left in 1956, with many feeling that the union could not compete with the dominant Labour Organisation unless it also participated in the distribution of unemployment monies.⁸⁴ At the same time, while the SAC grew quickly, it also grew markedly moderate. Key SAC and SUF figures, notably the veteran activist Helmut Rüdiger (1903–1966), headed a “new orientation” current that articulated a programme that was not very different from that of mainstream social democracy; it included proposals for participation in municipal elections, stressed that the main struggle was against totalitarian systems, whether of the Left or Right, and is best considered in this period as a form of libertarian reformism, not anarchism or syndicalism.

From the 1970s onward, the SAC again swung to the Left and syndicalism—yet maintains participation in the unemployment benefits system to this day. The existence of state welfare was something that even large syndicalist unions, however purist, could not and cannot ignore. A whole range of issues arise here. Could a genuinely syndicalist union participate in a state welfare system? Could it even intervene in policy debates in order to change that system? Or were such forms of participation altogether incompatible with syndicalism? Finally, should state welfare be supported in the first place?

In the 1910s, many U.S. and British syndicalists distrusted state welfare schemes, arguing that these inculcated loyalty to the state machinery, sapped the fighting spirit of workers, and were reforms provided from above, rather than won from below.⁸⁵ The FORA even organised strikes against the introduction of such systems in the 1920s. On the other hand, even at that time some syndicalists approved of social reform laws like minimum wages and bans on child labour.⁸⁶ Where such social reform was introduced from below, the issues were not so complicated—they could be seen, like higher wages, as a consequence of syndicalist militancy and as compatible with the role of the syndicalist union—but in many cases, like in Argentina and Germany, the reforms were initiated and driven *from above*. Were they then acceptable? The contradictory character of state welfare is at the heart of these difficulties:

But partly as a result of the effects of the proletariat’s struggle, the State has taken on other roles apart from that of policeman and these roles, known by the general term “welfare state,” have some very complex facets. On the one hand they have allowed the bosses to offload onto taxpayers (and thus mostly the workers themselves) part of the costs deriving from the greater security and well-being of those less well-off; a burden created through pressure from the workers has been offloaded onto the collectivity, which otherwise would form part of the cost of labour. On the other hand, though, these functions have enabled a minimum redistribution of wealth in favour of the workers; as the result of decades of struggles they have allowed the conflict to be regulated for the protection of the weakest, they have produced social institutions, such as education, healthcare and social insurance, with a high element of solidarity.⁸⁷

The rise of neoliberalism, associated with a retreat of the welfare state, recasts the questions. The fear of an all-embracing state, incorporating the popular classes

through its generosity, is being increasingly replaced by the fear of a lean capitalist state that enforces austerity, and the concern for many is, reasonably enough, less about defending the autonomy of the working class than it is about a larger defence of the popular classes against the neoliberal agenda. What the lean state of neoliberalism would like to get rid of, social reform, “is the very thing that the proletariat have an interest in maintaining.”⁸⁸ The global rollback of welfare has given rise to significant popular resistance, playing a crucial role in the rise of the antiglobalisation movement, in which anarchists are often prominent, and there are many cases of syndicalists joining in struggles for the defence of welfare.⁸⁹ The complication here, however, is ensuring that the defence of welfare remains separated from calls for the return of Keynesianism, central planning, and import-substitution industrialisation regimes.

In summary, unlike principles and strategies, the development of appropriate tactics is not an easy matter. Depending on the context—for example, the rise of state welfare or its retreat—the tactics will be different. Principles and strategies provide a guide for the development of tactics, and set the boundaries on which ones are acceptable, but the continual emergence of new situations means that tactics must evolve continuously, are shaped by the context, and that there is no universal set of tactics applicable to every situation. Ultimately, while a clear analysis of particular historical conjunctures, knowledge of historical experiences, and understanding of the implications of principles and strategies can aid the development of tactics, it is practice that offers an effective adjudicator between different tactical approaches.

At present, the jury is still out. There is no consensus among syndicalists over issues of contracts in collective bargaining, participation in the statutory industrial relations machinery, and the issue of state welfare. One result has been a split in syndicalist ranks, leaving most syndicalists outside the IWA—including all of the largest syndicalist unions (with the exception of the Revolutionary Confederation of Anarcho-Syndicalists, RKAS, in Russia). One consequence has been the formation of the European Federation of Alternative Syndicalism (FESAL). Another has been the emergence of a new international formation also outside the IWA: established in Madrid in 2001, the International Libertarian Solidarity network includes dissident syndicalist unions like the Spanish CGT, the CNT-Paris, and the SAC as well as a number of other anarchist groups like the FdCA and the WSM along with the Italian formation, the Confederation of the Base. The latter is a revolutionary syndicalist body that emerged from the largely apolitical rank-and-file COBAS (“base committee”) movement of the 1980s. Such initiatives have, perhaps understandably, not been welcomed by the IWA.

Boring from Within and Dual Unionism

The same *complexities* can be seen in relation to the question of how syndicalists would approach existing, established unions. Most immediately, there is the question of whether activists should aim to reform existing unions, “boring from within” to transform them into syndicalist unions, or take a “dual unionist approach,” aiming at the creation of new and revolutionary unions outside the established bodies. The unions and groups linked to the IWA are strongly identified

with dual unionism, as are all the main syndicalist unions that exist outside the IWA, such as the IWW, the SAC, the Spanish CGT, and the CNT-Paris. Such is the contemporary identity between syndicalism and dual unionism, that some current anarchist writing on syndicalism evidently assumes that syndicalism is necessarily dual unionist in character.⁹⁰

Dual unionism is by no means a necessary feature of syndicalism, however. The question of whether it was an appropriate tactic was fiercely debated in the glorious period, for example, and many of the major syndicalist unions of the past were formed by boring from within. Both the Chicago IWW and the Detroit IWW adopted a strictly dual unionist perspective, but not all syndicalists held this view. The IWW was explicitly formed as an alternative to the conservative AFL, a body whose most powerful affiliates restricted their membership to skilled workers and whose activities were sectional in the extreme. In many cases, AFL unions explicitly excluded women, workers of colour, and immigrants from membership.

It was believed by the IWW founders that the AFL was incapable of reform and that the IWW would soon overtake the older body. Despite early successes, however, the IWW did not grow as quickly as was hoped, and it also lost key affiliates, like the Western Federation of Miners. At least some members thought that the policy of dual unionism was to blame—foremost among those was Foster. Foster had spent six months in France, studying under CGT militants like Monatte, before visiting Germany and Hungary.⁹¹ He attended the 1911 IWW convention and recruited several activists to his position, including Ford, who came from Seattle. Foster's views were ridiculed by Vincent St. John, Trautmann, and other major figures, but he had enough support to be elected editor of the IWW's *Industrial Worker*. Foster used the *Industrial Worker* to promote the boring from within approach. The debate was also carried into the IWW's other paper, *Solidarity*, before being closed down, following which Foster pursued his case in the *Agitator*, through a tour of IWW locals, and then via the new SLNA.

Foster was profoundly impressed by the fact that the French syndicalists had captured the French unions by boring from within and came to view the IWW's dual unionism as a deviation from syndicalism itself, as well as an ineffective policy. He was also inspired by the example of the British syndicalists around Mann. Like Foster, Mann promoted boring from within existing unions. Foster, following this approach, made important criticisms of the IWW, which apply to the policy of dual unionism more generally.

Firstly, Ford and Foster considered the IWW's policy of dual unionism to be "a freak" with "no justification" and doomed to failure.⁹² Even established moderate unions *could* evolve in a syndicalist direction. Implicit here was the view that even the most reactionary unions could not simply and repeatedly betray the working class; to survive, they must at least partially represent class interests.

The notion that the established unions could not evolve, and that the IWW alone was a real union and would inevitably replace the other ones, was for Foster an "IWW patriotism" with no basis in fact.⁹³ It was a caricature of other unions and ignored the fact that established unions retained the loyalties of existing members, who were not prepared to throw in their lot with an entirely new union: such obstacles to replacing existing unions were simply ignored by the IWW. Workers

generally preferred to join established and proven unions, and the fact that the existing ones were often compelled to open their ranks to new categories of workers and reform their policies showed both their ability to change as well as their lasting appeal. Indeed, many ordinary workers rejected the IWW not so much because they disagreed with its ultimate aims but because they saw it as a threat to their existing unions.

In the second place, there were a number of negative features associated with dual unionism. One was a tendency to have a dogmatic and sectarian view of rival unions. As an example, Foster mentioned how the Western Federation of Miners had been unreservedly praised when affiliated to the IWW and then, following its withdrawal, was suddenly characterised as a fake union that should be “wiped out of existence”—even though the union had not really changed in any real way.⁹⁴ Another problem was that dual unionism divided the working class and hence undermined the very project of One Big Union. It is worth returning to Malatesta at this point, for he made a similar assertion. Malatesta noted that for a union to function, “it is necessary to bring together all workers, or at least all those who aim at improving their conditions,” and it cannot therefore only recruit to its ranks those who embrace an anarchist programme. It is in this sense that he declared, “I do not ask for anarchist syndicates, which would immediately give legitimacy to social-democratic, republican, royalist and all other kinds of syndicates, and which would divide the working class more than ever against itself.”⁹⁵

Perhaps even more seriously, a policy of dual unionism effectively withdrew the radicals from the existing unions, isolating them in small rival dual unions that had (for all the reasons mentioned above) little chance of success. The IWW approach had led the best militants to withdraw from the existing unions into “sterile isolation.” This was, Ford and Foster argued, a “calamity,” a “desertion and disarming of their militants”; its result was that these unions were left in the “undisputed control of conservatives and fakers of all kinds to exploit as they see fit.” Even the Western Federation of Miners, stripped of its best element, like Haywood, was degenerating into a “typical Socialist [Party] labour union-voting machine.”⁹⁶

On the other hand, even where dual unions did manage to grow, they failed to resolve the basic problem that bedeviled the existing unions: the lack of a radical political outlook and a cadre of revolutionary militants. Unable to challenge the existing unions effectively, the IWW turned to recruiting the unorganised workers ignored by the AFL. These workers, though, often joined the IWW because nothing else was available, not because they embraced its syndicalist vision; if the AFL had been on the scene and willing to open its doors, many would have joined it. Membership in the IWW did not imply agreement with the goals of the IWW; it would be a mistake to assume that twenty-five thousand IWW recruits were necessarily equivalent to twenty-five thousand syndicalists.

As Malatesta pointed out, the effect of such a recruiting strategy could be that the “original programme becomes an empty slogan which no one bothers about” and “tactics are readjusted to contingent needs”; the door was then opened for the union, formed on a radical platform, to evolve into an ordinary bread-and-butter union, whose leadership either adapts or “must make way for the ‘practical’ men.”⁹⁷ The very success of the union could lead, in other words, directly to the destruction

of its revolutionary aims as an ever-increasing number of members failed to share its original goals.

The third key contention in favour of boring from within was that it worked. Good examples, said Ford and Foster, were Britain, where Mann had been in the forefront of massive dock and railway strikes, the French CGT, and "Spain, Italy, Portugal."⁹⁸ There is certainly a great deal of evidence for this view. The Spanish CNT, for instance, had originally been formed as Solidaridad Obrera in 1907 by a coalition of anarchists and political socialists, but was captured by anarchists soon afterward.⁹⁹ Anarchists and syndicalists had likewise also taken hold of the Portuguese UON, while the roots of the Italian USI also lay in work within the CGL.

There are other examples, not cited by Ford and Foster, that indicate that boring from within was a common syndicalist tactic could bear real results. The CGOM in Mexico and the Federative Union of Metal Workers of America in the United States seem to have been taken over by boring from within. The Argentine Workers' Federation (FOA), founded in 1901 by a range of forces, was captured by anarchists by 1904 and renamed FORA, which then adopted an explicitly anarchist platform at the fifth congress in 1905. The situation in Brazil, Cuba, and Peru appears to have been similar.

In twentieth-century Greece, anarcho-syndicalists like Konstantinos Speras (1893–1943) focused their attention on trying to win over orthodox unions.¹⁰⁰ Born on the island of Serifos, Speras came into contact with anarchists in Egypt and then became active in Greece, where he was repeatedly arrested. In 1916, he set up the Union of Workingmen and Miners of Serifos, and was subsequently part of the anarcho-syndicalist minority in the Greek General Confederation of Labour, where he was elected to the supervising committee. He was involved in the Socialist Worker Party of Greece, which developed into the Communist Party of Greece (CPG), and in 1920 was prominent at the Greek General Confederation of Labour conference, where anarcho-syndicalists represented one-third of the delegates. In 1926, he was expelled from the union body at the behest of the CPG. By this time Greece was under a dictatorship, but Speras remained active. In 1943, he was murdered by CPG agents.

What was necessary, according to Ford and Foster, was the formation of an organised syndicalist "militant minority" in the existing unions. This would help conquer the unions "from within" and give a militant lead to the workers.¹⁰¹ The IWW was faced with the problem of combining its union functions with its ideological one: it sought to grow by recruiting any worker available, and then had the problem of trying to educate raw recruits about its preestablished syndicalist programme. The militant minority had no such problem, Ford and Foster argued: based among *already* organised workers and strong union structures, it could concentrate on winning existing union members over to syndicalism.

From this perspective, while the ISEL in Britain had so far failed to conquer the existing unions, it had succeeded far better than the IWW (or its contemporary British section, which never really succeeded in forming unions) in influencing vast numbers of workers with syndicalism. Ford and Foster's view was then that the IWW should reorganise itself as a militant minority, join the AFL, and then conquer it. As for the unorganised workers, the reorganised IWW could set up special

unions to cater to them; these would not face competition from the AFL, and as the IWW permeation of that body proceeded, the new unions could be amalgamated with it.¹⁰²

The retort of the dominant IWW faction to such claims was predictable: the AFL could not be reformed, it was a waste of time and energy to bore from within its structures, controlled as they were by the labour fakers, and in any case, the IWW was obliged to recruit the unskilled, women, blacks, Mexicans, and immigrants excluded from the AFL.¹⁰³ As Haywood put it, "I do not give a snap of my finger whether or not the skilled workman joins this industrial movement at the present time. When we get the unskilled and labourer into this organisation the skilled worker will of necessity come here for his own protection."¹⁰⁴

Many IWW stalwarts felt that it was simplistic to blame the IWW's continued minority status relative to the AFL on its dual unionist approach, as there were many millions of unorganised workers entirely ignored by the AFL. The obstacles to recruiting these workers were many: unskilled and migratory workers were always hard to organise, as were immigrants and oppressed nationalities like blacks; employers, the state, and vigilantes routinely attacked the IWW; the ruling class had far more resources than the syndicalist union and immigrants were often denied U.S. citizenship if they joined the IWW; IWW propaganda against patriotism and religion alienated many workers; and the SPA was often hostile as well.¹⁰⁵ For many, the prospect of dissolving the IWW into the AFL threatened to undermine its achievements in these trying circumstances.

There was, finally, an additional complication, touched on briefly in the IWW press: it was not always possible for even the most ardent advocate of the boring from within approach to make progress in the established unions without being "kicked out."¹⁰⁶ The Italian case, cited by Ford and Foster as an example of boring from within, in point of fact bears this out: the syndicalists in the CGL and PSI were eventually driven to establish the USI as a dual union by precisely the relentless campaign of expulsions and pressure by the political socialists. Mann's U.S. 1913 tour, which also stressed boring from within, left Haywood and others unmoved, and Foster and his faction left the IWW, while the SLNA worked within the AFL unions with some success.

Tactics in Context and Organisational Dualism

Several points in this debate bear some further exploration. First, both Malatesta and Foster emphasised organisational dualism in their discussions of syndicalism: the need for a strictly anarchist organisation or syndicalist militant minority besides the (syndicalist) union. Malatesta envisaged such a group working within the unions to promote the anarchist project and shift the unions toward a revolutionary goal; Foster doubted that a dual union could combine its ordinary union work and its syndicalist ideals, while his policy of boring from within required the constitution of a militant minority in the existing unions.

Both warned against the formation of dual unions on a radical platform, suggesting that such bodies were caught between a rock and a hard place: either they enforced a strict adherence to their revolutionary programme, in which case they

must form small isolated bodies that masqueraded as unions while actually being close to a strictly anarchist or syndicalist political organisation, or they must open their doors to all, with the danger of evolving into an orthodox union as a result of the influx of workers who did not share their original aspirations. The rationale for a militant minority and the manner in which such a grouping should operate are contentious issues, to which we will return in a subsequent chapter.

Most immediately, however, it should be noted that bodies like the IWW tended to have their *own* informal militant minorities.¹⁰⁷ Even where a syndicalist union, formed by boring from within, emerges as a powerful force, it must confront the same problems as a dual union in raising the consciousness of the raw recruits. Where a syndicalist union is a major force, it will inevitably recruit many workers by virtue of its strength and record, rather than its politics. Education becomes crucial for any syndicalist union in order to prevent the dilution of union policies by the addition of new members.

The Mexican CGT faced precisely this problem: growing rapidly in the late 1920s, it was overwhelmed by an influx of members who did not share its anarcho-syndicalist position; by 1928–1929, the syndicalists were on the retreat, and the union split into rival federations along political lines.¹⁰⁸ Yet massive recruitment need not result in the collapse of the union's syndicalist commitment. By contrast, the Spanish CNT managed to win the battle of ideas by promoting a radical popular counterculture that infused the union with radicalism, which spread far beyond the union structures. That the CNT was successful in this is shown by the fact that its anarcho-syndicalist position was never seriously challenged at its congresses, despite a radically democratic practice, a minimal bureaucratic layer, and massive ongoing growth.

This success must be attributed in large part to its success in fostering a radical and popular counterculture as well as the role of the FAI, an anarchist political organisation formed in 1927, of which we will say more in the next chapter. This ability to combine union and ideological work shows some of the problems with the criticisms of syndicalism that “a union that accepts members irrespective of their politics is, by definition, not revolutionary,” and “to have a mass base and therefore be effective in day to day struggles,” a syndicalist union must have an open membership policy.”¹⁰⁹ Rather, the question is what is to be done to educate the new members—an issue to which we will return.

The contemporary predominance of dual unionism in syndicalism should, in other words, be historicised and not projected back into the past as an inherent feature of syndicalism (or flaw, if the policy was rejected). The movement had and has an alternative tactical option in the form of boring from within. There are also many cases of syndicalist movements alternating between the two. While the French CGT was first made syndicalist through boring from within, the loss of syndicalist control in the 1910s saw two main responses: some French syndicalists broke away to form the CGT Revolutionary Syndicalist in 1921 as a minority union (this later evolved into the contemporary French CNTs); others, like Monatte, continued to bore from within the CGT, where they exerted some influence.

While boring from within could be effective, it is also necessary not to pose the choice between this approach and dual unionism on an abstract level. Circum-

stances matter greatly, as the cases of the USI and French CGT show. It is notable that many successful instances of boring from within took place in relatively young union bodies, which may suggest that the possibilities of conquering long-established unions with a well-entrenched bureaucracy could be far more limited. This observation may seem especially apposite where existing unions have long been entangled in statutory industrial relations machinery, particularly when participation in national-level social corporatist structures tends to generate a layer of union bureaucrats that operates outside the direct control of union members. Many unions are also controlled by political parties that do not tolerate rival factions operating in their ranks. The obstacles to capturing such unions are substantial.

Moreover, in most countries there are several union centres and a number of independent unions within different sectors, not to mention the fact that there are often different unions catering to different grades of workers: to which established unions, then, should anarchists or syndicalists convinced of boring from within direct their activities? If it is true that the Argentine FORA and Spanish CNT were both formed by boring from within, it is also the case that both unions were only a section of the larger labour movement. While the UGT in Argentina evolved into the syndicalist CORA, which eventually merged into the FORA, the CNT always faced a serious rival in the form of the UGT linked to by the Spanish Socialist Party. Even at its height in the 1930s, the CNT only organised half the working class; the UGT organised the other.

In a sense, then, the syndicalists in both these countries actually used both boring from within and dual unionism, showing that the picture is more complicated than a simple choice between two tactical approaches. Even the IWW was unable to maintain a strict dual unionism as it spread from the U.S. In Britain, the De Leonists operated a separate Industrial Workers of Great Britain, and distinct IWW unions were formed in Canada, Chile, Ecuador, and Mexico. In Australia and New Zealand, the IWW existed primarily as a vocal and influential current that overlapped with the established unions, rather than serving as a rival union centre. In South Africa, where the ideas of the IWW had a great influence, there was a separate IWW union from 1910 to 1912. There were also syndicalist attempts to penetrate the main unions through the formation in 1917 of a Solidarity Committee within the South African Industrial Federation, followed by the promotion of an independent shop stewards' movement from 1918 and involvement in the Cape Federation of Labour, alongside the formation of separate unions like the Industrial Workers of Africa, which organised workers of colour who were specifically excluded from both centres.

With the formation of the Comintern, Lenin harshly attacked dual unionism and the U.S. IWW, and made a principle of boring from within.¹¹⁰ Context clearly matters; tactical issues cannot be made into abstract principles to be applied regardless of the situation. Thus, the USI in Italy was forced into a dual unionist position and the prospect of boring from within the CGL seemed unpromising. Furthermore, the USI developed into a powerful body that had at its height in 1920 about eight hundred thousand members, roughly half the size of the CGL.¹¹¹ To simply dissolve the USI back into the CGL posed serious problems: besides a disruption of the work achieved so far, there was the danger that a merger could easily mean sur-

render to the very officials who had made the formation of a dual union necessary. Given the considerations so far outlined, however, it is not surprising that practically no functioning syndicalist union accepted Lenin's advice and dissolved into the established nonsyndicalist unions.

Syndicalism and Rank-and-file Movements

A third syndicalist approach, which offers an alternative to both boring from within and dual unionism, is worth mentioning: the formation of independent rank-and-file movements within the established unions. This type of syndicalism can be anarcho-syndicalist, as was the case with the Union of Anarcho-syndicalist Propaganda and the Confederation of Russian Anarcho-syndicalists, or revolutionary syndicalist, as was the case with the Shop Stewards and Workers' Committee Movement in Britain, all active in the 1910s.

This approach does not seek to capture the union apparatus as such. This is where it differs from the boring from within of groups like the ISEL and the SLNA. It is an independent movement, it may overlap with the orthodox unions and participate in them, but it does not seek to capture them; instead, it aims at forming a movement of the union rank and file as well as the unorganised, based on regular mass meetings and delegate structures and infused with a radical programme that can operate independently of the unions where needed. The classic statement of its approach is as follows: "We will support the officials just so long as they rightly represent the workers, but we will act independently immediately they misrepresent them."¹¹²

A key example of this approach is the Shop Stewards and Workers' Committee Movement in Britain in the mid-1910s; we will examine the Russian case in the next chapter. An independent rank-and-file movement emerged spontaneously as a result of a range of factors, notably increasing wartime controls over industry, the dilution of skilled work, and the quiescence of the union bureaucracy.¹¹³ Revolutionary syndicalists soon dominated it politically. In Scotland, the stronghold of the SLP in Britain, De Leonists like Gallacher found themselves playing a leading role in the first major initiative: the important Clyde Workers Committee.¹¹⁴ Shifting away from their traditional dual unionism, they began to see a rank-and-file workers' movement, independent of the union leadership, yet overlapping with the unions, as the road to One Big Union. In England, IWW supporters won a number of workers' committees to the 1908 IWW *Preamble* from 1917 onward, and the centre of the movement shifted increasingly to Sheffield.¹¹⁵

By 1919, the emerging movement was evolving into a formal countrywide structure, with a national administrative committee headed by J. T. Murphy, and published *Solidarity* and *The Worker*.¹¹⁶ The former had been established by syndicalists like Mann, and the latter was printed on the SLP press.¹¹⁷ The movement held national conferences in 1919 and 1920 (taking care not to develop into a new dual union), and linked up with the syndicalist South Wales Unofficial Reform Committee, which worked within the miners' union.¹¹⁸ It also formed close links with the Chicago IWW, including an arrangement for the interchange of membership cards.¹¹⁹

For the syndicalists involved in the Shop Stewards and Workers' Committee Movement, the movement ought to become "one powerful organisation that will place the workers in complete control of the industry."¹²⁰ When organised as a formal national body, it adopted as "its objective control of the workshop, control of the industry, the overthrow of the present capitalist system of society and the establishment of Industrial Democracy."¹²¹ Yet, for all that, it did not aim to capture the existing unions or destroy them.¹²² J. T. Murphy (1888–1966)—the leading figure in the Sheffield Workers' Committee, a prominent De Leonist, and later a CPGB founder—was widely regarded as the theorist of the Shop Stewards and Workers' Committee Movement. He advocated replacing the "territorially constructed State" with a "real democracy" based on industrial unionism and saw the committees an important step on the road to a "Workers' Republic."¹²³

The Shop Stewards and Workers' Committee Movement was open to other currents as well; it should not be confused with a syndicalist militant minority like the SLNA or ISEL. Thus, it included numerous activists from the Independent Labour Party, a political socialist group, as well as the British Socialist Party, a Marxist party that emerged from the old Social Democratic Federation in opposition to that group's prowar position. MacLean, the Scottish Marxist, was another notable member. Still, the "chief sources of the ideology of the shop stewards' movement were the French and American doctrines of revolutionary syndicalism and Industrial Unionism."¹²⁴

The rank-and-file syndicalist approach transcends, in key ways, both dual unionism and boring from within. On the one hand, it accepts the argument that dual unionism is likely to simply isolate militants in small separate unions and accepts the boring from within notion that even the conservative unions are basically working-class organisations. On the other hand, it also accepts the dual unionist claim that an established union bureaucracy is exceedingly difficult to overturn. The task, then, is not to capture the union as a whole but to build an independent workers' movement that *overlaps* with the unions and can itself undertake the role of the One Big Union.

Rank-and-file syndicalism converges in some respects with the workplace strategy of some contemporary anarchists.¹²⁵ The WSM argues that unions are nonetheless fundamentally working-class organisations and a necessary response to the class system: "No amount of conservatism, bureaucracy or backwardness within the unions can obliterate this essential fact."¹²⁶ It also objects to dual unionism (which it identifies as the hallmark of syndicalism), and sees work within the existing unions as making a major contribution to revolution. The unions are seen as internally contested, and shaped by ongoing struggles between the bureaucracy and the membership as well as competing ideas. What is needed is a rank-and-file opposition within the unions that is willing to defend the union while challenging the bureaucracy, and that is able to develop its own campaigns as well as support progressive union initiatives. The aim is neither to take over the union as a whole nor to withdraw from it; it is to promote a style of unionism that is "essentially the same" as syndicalism and can lay the basis for workers' councils:

Trade unions will not become revolutionary organisations, they were never set up to be that. However from within trade union struggle will

arise the embryo of the workers' councils of the future. The early beginnings of this are seen wherever workers create their own rank & file organisation (without mediation or "all-knowing" leaders) to pursue their class interests.¹²⁷

Anarchists can be elected to unpaid and accountable union posts, like shop steward positions, but should not get embroiled in the union bureaucracy.¹²⁸ The promotion of direct action, self-activity, and revolutionary ideas is central to the revolutionary project, and anarchists should thus also oppose engagement with corporatist structures and other types of centralised bargaining that remove initiative from the shop floor.¹²⁹ The rank-and-file movement should not be the property of any single political current, yet it should be broad enough to attract workers who are militant but would not see themselves as having a particular political outlook; while "we fight for our politics" in the rank-and-file movement, "the movement should be independent of any one political organisation," and its role is really "to provide a focus for workers moving to the left and wanting to fight."¹³⁰

In Conclusion: Reform and Revolution

In this chapter, we have asserted that a historical approach to the broad anarchist tradition sheds a great deal of light on tactics. Simply adopting, for example, a mass anarchist strategy is only half the challenge facing an activist: the success of the strategy depends fundamentally on *tactical* choices. These should ideally be elaborated on the basis of a careful analysis of the situation in which the strategy is being applied, a careful consideration of the merits of different tactics in their own right, and the compatibility of a given tactic with the principles and strategy that it is meant to promote. Moreover, as circumstances change, tactics should also change.

Syndicalist boring from within, for instance, is a tactic with many arguments in its favour, but is not necessarily always applicable. The formation of a powerful union bureaucracy, entangled in the statutory industrial relations machinery or controlled by a hostile political party, can pose major obstacles to the success of this tactic. Indeed, it may certainly be doubted whether it would be successful in such circumstances, and whether an alternative approach may not be more effective.

A tactic cannot be made into a principle; different conditions merit different tactics. Issues of participation in statutory industrial relations machinery or dual unionism, or participation in welfare systems, are informed on one level by questions of principle; on another level, however, it is important to distinguish between principles, which are indispensable, and tactics, which are transitory, and not to make principles of particular tactics. The broad anarchist tradition suggests definite principles that must inform strategy and tactics, but no set of tactics is universally applicable. There is much that may be learned from the history of anarchism and syndicalism about the tactics that have been tried in the past, but the real challenge is always to develop tactics for the present.

Notes

1. Kropotkin, *War!*
2. Maximoff, *The Programme of Anarcho-syndicalism*, 45–46.

3. E. Goldman, "What I Believe," in *Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings and Speeches*, ed. A. K. Shulman (1908; repr., New York: Vintage Books, 1972), 38, 41.
4. Rocker, *Anarcho-Syndicalism*, chapter 5.
5. See R. de Jong, "Ferdinand Domela Nieuwenhuis," in *Woordenboek van Belgische en Nederlandse Vrijdenkers* (Brussels: Vrije Universiteit, 1979); G. Harmsen, "Nieuwenhuis, Ferdinand," in *Biografisch Woordenboek van het Socialisme en de Arbeidersbeweging in Nederland* (Amsterdam: International Institute of Social History, 1995); Nettlau, *A Short History of Anarchism*, 232–35.
6. Foster, *Syndicalism* pp. 9–13, 29–30.
7. Quoted in T. Mann, *Tom Mann's Memoirs* (1923; repr., London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1967), 236–38.
8. Casanovas, "Labour and Colonialism in Cuba in the Second Half of the Nineteenth-Century," 436.
9. *Ibid.*, 436.
10. Kedward, *The Anarchists*, 67; see also Joll, *The Anarchists*, 236.
11. Quoted in P. Trehwela, "George Padmore, a Critique: Pan-Africanism or Communism," *Searchlight-South Africa* 1, no. 1 (1988): 50.
12. *Ibid.*, 50.
13. Bookchin, *The Spanish Anarchists*, 163.
14. Paz, *Durruti*, 39.
15. Levy, "Italian Anarchism," 56.
16. Williams, *A Proletarian Order*, 36–37.
17. Levy, "Italian Anarchism," 56; Williams, *A Proletarian Order*, 37.
18. Colombo, "Armando Borghi."
19. *Ibid.*
20. Williams, *A Proletarian Order*, 35–36.
21. Levy, "Italian Anarchism," 56; Bertrand, "Revolutionary Syndicalism in Italy," 145. See also G. Proccacci, "Popular Protest and Labour Conflict in Italy, 1915–1918," *Social History*, no. 14 (1989).
22. Williams, *A Proletarian Order*, 56–57.
23. Bertrand, "Revolutionary Syndicalism in Italy," 145.
24. Levy, "Italian Anarchism," 56–57.
25. Williams, *A Proletarian Order*, 56; Woodcock, *Anarchism*, 333.
26. Bertrand, "Revolutionary Syndicalism in Italy," 145.
27. Levy, "Italian Anarchism," 56–57; Williams, *A Proletarian Order*, 51–52. The quote is from Williams.
28. Williams, *A Proletarian Order*, 36.
29. L. Michel, *The Red Virgin: Memoirs of Louise Michel*, ed. B. Lowry and E. E. Gunter (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1981), 129.
30. B. Mitchell, "French Syndicalism: An Experiment in Practical Anarchism," in *Revolutionary Syndicalism: An International Perspective*, ed. M. van der Linden and W. Thorpe (Otterup, Denmark: Scholar, 1990), 34–37; see also F. Feeley, "French School Teachers against Militarism, 1903–18," *Historian* 57, no. 2 (1994).
31. Industrial Workers of the World, *The IWW in Theory and Practice*.
32. Our Special Representative/Proletarian, "Sundry Jottings from the Cape: A Rebel's Review," *Voice of Labour*; December 1, 1911; see also P. R. Roux, "The Truth about the Defence Act: Straight Talk to Workers," *Voice of Labour*, October 11, 1912.
33. Quoted in Marshall, *Demanding the Impossible*, 521.
34. J. Crump, "Anarchist Opposition to Japanese Militarism, 1926–1937," *Bulletin of Anarchist Research*, no. 24 (1991): 34.

35. Quoted in *ibid.*, 35.
36. Crump, *Hatta Shuzo and Pure Anarchism in Interwar Japan*, 95. The full statement is reproduced in Crump, "Anarchist Opposition to Japanese Militarism"; Zenkoku Jiren, "What to Do about War?" in *Anarchism: A Documentary History of Libertarian Ideas, Volume 1: From Anarchy to Anarchism, 300 CE to 1939*, ed. R. Graham (November 1931; repr., Montréal: Black Rose, 2005).
37. Crump, "Anarchist Opposition to Japanese Militarism," 36.
38. Gordon, "Anarchism in Brazil," 100–109.
39. Thorpe, "Keeping the Faith," 196. See also W. Thorpe, "The Provisional Agenda of the International Syndicalist Conference, London 1913," *International Review of Social History*, no. 36 (1981); W. Thorpe, "Towards a Syndicalist International: The 1913 London Congress," *International Review of Social History*, no. 23 (1978).
40. Lenin, "The State and Revolution," 309–10.
41. A. L. Morton and G. Tate, *The British Labour Movement, 1770–1920*, rev. ed. (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1979), 255. See also N. Mackenzie, *Socialism: A Short History*, 2nd ed. (London: Hutchinson University Library, 1966), 130; C. Tsuzuki, *Tom Mann, 1856–1941: The Challenges of Labour* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 177.
42. Notably Bakunin, "Letters to a Frenchman on the Current Crisis."
43. C. Levy, "Anarchism, Internationalism, and Nationalism in Europe, 1860–1939," *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 50, no. 3 (2004): 343.
44. E. Malatesta, "Anarchists Have Forgotten Their Principles," in *Errico Malatesta: His Life and Ideas*, ed. V. Richards (November 1914; repr., London: Freedom Press, 1965); E. Malatesta, "Pro-Government Anarchists," in *Errico Malatesta: His Life and Ideas*, ed. V. Richards (April 1916; repr., London: Freedom Press, 1965), 250–51.
45. Quail, *The Slow Burning Fuse*, 287.
46. Holton, *British Syndicalism*, 200; Tsuzuki, *Tom Mann*, 178.
47. Woodcock, *Anarchism*, 203, 413.
48. Mitchell, "French Syndicalism," 37.
49. Levy, "Anarchism, Internationalism, and Nationalism in Europe," 342.
50. See, *inter alia*, Levy, "Italian Anarchism," 64, 71.
51. Thorpe, "Keeping the Faith," 195.
52. Quoted in "The Deadly Parallel," *International Socialist Review* 17 (April 1917): 618.
53. W. Thorpe, "El Ferrol, Zimmerwald, and Beyond: Syndicalist Internationalism, 1914 to 1918" (paper presented at the European Social Science History conference, Amsterdam, March 22–25, 2006), 5–6.
54. Gordon, "Anarchism in Brazil," 108–12.
55. Reproduced in *ibid.*, 311–13.
56. E. Goldman A. Berkman, E. Malatesta et al., "International Anarchist Manifesto against War," in *Anarchism: A Documentary History of Libertarian Ideas, Volume 1: From Anarchy to Anarchism, 300 CE to 1939*, ed. R. Graham (1915; repr., Montréal: Black Rose, 2005).
57. Quail, *The Slow Burning Fuse*, 291–93.
58. On these developments, see van der Walt, "Anarchism and Syndicalism in South Africa," chapters 3–5.
59. M. Dubofsky, "The Rise and Fall of Revolutionary Syndicalism in the United States," in *Revolutionary Syndicalism: An International Perspective*, ed. M. van der Linden and W. Thorpe (Otterup, Denmark: Scolar, 1990), 215.
60. See Burgmann, *Revolutionary Industrial Unionism*, chapters 1–14.
61. "The Class Struggle Declared Criminal," *The International*, January 4, 1918.
62. Thorpe, "Keeping the Faith."

63. Malatesta in Richards, *Errico Malatesta*, 126–27.
64. For an example of the latter view, see Crump, *Hatta Shuzo and Pure Anarchism in Interwar Japan*, 163.
65. F. Hanlon, “Industrial Unionism: The History of the Industrial Workers of the World in Aotearoa,” in *Industrial Unionism: The History of the Industrial Workers of the World in Aotearoa: Aim, Form, and Tactics of a Workers’ Union on IWW Lines* (1913; repr., Wellington, UK: Rebel Press, 2006), 22–23.
66. Quoted in Foner, *The Industrial Workers of the World*, 137.
67. *Ibid.*, 137–38, 168–69, 470–72.
68. Hanlon, “Industrial Unionism,” 23.
69. Hinton, *The First Shop Stewards Movement*, 312.
70. Mackenzie, *Socialism*, 132.
71. Bookchin, *The Spanish Anarchists*, 207.
72. Uruguayan Regional Workers’ Federation, “Declarations from the Third Congress,” 332.
73. Hart, *Anarchism and the Mexican Working Class*, 170–72.
74. Lambert, “Political Unionism in South Africa,” 44.
75. See, inter alia, Tsuzuki, *Tom Mann*; Mann, *Tom Mann’s Memoirs*.
76. T. Mann, “The Way to Win: An Open Letter to Trades Unionists on Methods of Industrial Organisation, by Tom Mann, Broken Hill, May 1909,” *Voice of Labour*, December 31, 1909; Mann, *Tom Mann’s Memoirs*, 193.
77. Hanlon, “Industrial Unionism,” 21.
78. Bookchin, *The Spanish Anarchists*, 180, 183, 195, 201, 203, 206, 217, 231, 235; Peirats, *Anarchists in the Spanish Revolution*, 59–84. The moderates issued a manifesto in August 1931, signed by thirty people, hence the name *treintistas*.
79. L. Golden, “The Libertarian Movement in Contemporary Spanish Politics,” *Antipode: A Radical Journal of Geography* 10–11, nos. 3 and 1 (1979): 116n3.
80. Solidarity Federation, *Out of the Frying Pan: A Critical Look at Works Councils* (Manchester, UK: Solidarity Federation, 1998), 2, 4, 8, 11–13.
81. *Ibid.*, 12–13.
82. See *Alternative Libertaire*, “Spain.”
83. M. Gardell, “A Conference in Spain,” *SAC-Kontakt* (December 1992) (English translation; source unknown).
84. Golden, “The Libertarian Movement in Contemporary Spanish Politics,” 18–19.
85. See Holton, “Syndicalist Theories of the State”; Haywood and Bohm, *Industrial Socialism*.
86. Holton, “Syndicalist Theories of the State,” 8.
87. Craparo, *Anarchist Communists*, 76–77.
88. *Ibid.*, 77.
89. Epstein, “Anarchism and the Anti-Globalisation Movement.”
90. See, for example, Workers Solidarity Movement, *Position Paper*.
91. See Foner, *The Industrial Workers of the World*, chapter 18; Zipser, *Working Class Giant*, 27–87.
92. Ford and Foster, *Syndicalism*, 43.
93. Foner, *The Industrial Workers of the World*, 423–24.
94. *Ibid.*, 424.
95. Malatesta in Richards, *Errico Malatesta*, 123–24; Malatesta, “Syndicalism,” 220–21.
96. Ford and Foster, *Syndicalism*, 45–46.
97. Malatesta in Richards, *Errico Malatesta*, 123–24.
98. Ford and Foster, *Syndicalism*, 43.

99. Bar, "The CNT," 121.
100. L. Kottis, *Konstantinos Speras: The Life and Activities of a Greek Anarcho-syndicalist* (London: Kate Sharpley Library, 2000).
101. See Ford and Foster, *Syndicalism*, 43–47; Foner, *The Industrial Workers of the World*, 422–34.
102. Foner, *The Industrial Workers of the World*, 425–26.
103. *Ibid.*, 418–22.
104. Quoted in *ibid.*, 37.
105. *Ibid.*, 462–71.
106. *Ibid.*, 421–22.
107. *Ibid.*, 147, asterisked footnote.
108. Hart, *Anarchism and the Mexican Working Class*, 156; Hart, "Revolutionary Syndicalism in Mexico," 200–1.
109. Made by the Anarchist Workers Group, "Anarchism in the Thatcher Years," *Socialism from Below*, no. 1 (August 1989). Available online at http://flag.blackened.net/revolt/awg/awg_thatcher1.html (accessed December 1, 2006).
110. V. I. Lenin, "Left-wing Communism: An Infantile Disorder," in *Selected Works in Three Volumes*, ed. V. I. Lenin (1920; repr., Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1975), volume 3.
111. Williams, *A Proletarian Order*, 194–95.
112. J. T. Murphy, quoted in Hinton, *The First Shop Stewards Movement*, 119.
113. See *ibid.*
114. See *ibid.*, 122–23.
115. A. E. Titley, "The IWW in England," *Workers' Dreadnought*, October 2, 1920.
116. S. Pankhurst, "Zinoviev to the Comintern: A 'Left' Wing View," *Workers' Dreadnought*, August 13, 1921.
117. Hinton, *The First Shop Stewards Movement*, 285n1; "Questions of the Day," *Workers' Dreadnought*, July 20, 1918.
118. Hinton, *The First Shop Stewards Movement*, 287; "Rank and File Convention," *Workers' Dreadnought*, February 14, 1920. For a statement of the committee's views, see Unofficial Reform Committee, *The Miner's Next Step: Being a Suggested Scheme for the Reorganisation of the Federation* (1912; repr., London: Germinal and Phoenix Press, 1991).
119. Thompson with Murfin, *The IWW*, 135.
120. Quoted in Hinton, *The First Shop Stewards Movement*, 129.
121. "The Workers' Committee," *Workers' Dreadnought*, March 9, 1918.
122. Hinton, *The First Shop Stewards Movement*, 290–93.
123. "Marxist Industrial Unionism," *Workers' Dreadnought*, October 19, 1918; J. T. Murphy, "The Embargo," *Workers' Dreadnought*, August 31, 1918.
124. Hinton, *The First Shop Stewards Movement*, 277; see also 290–93.
125. The FdCA has a similar position; see FdCA, *Towards a Programme of Conflictual, Class-Struggle Syndicalism*, 2005, available at http://www.fdca.it/fdcaen/labour/towards_a_platform.htm (accessed November 1, 2005).
126. Workers Solidarity Movement, *Position Paper*, section 2.1.
127. *Ibid.*, section 11.1.
128. *Ibid.*, section 7.4.
129. *Ibid.*, section 7.6.
130. *Ibid.*, sections 8.4. and 8.5.