

THE HISTORICAL BANKRUPTCY OF ANARCHISM



On several occasions, we have criticized political currents and ideologies more or less directly related to and/or antithetical to the history and interests of the revolutionary workers' movement. But we had not yet directly confronted the main one, both in its history, traditions, and persistence, and in its vacillations, confusions, and betrayals. This is the current known as "anti-authoritarian," "libertarian" -that is, anarchism as an ideology and social practice-. This current of thought and action has always maintained a profound and ambiguous relationship with the social and emancipatory project of the insurgent proletariat. In its main historical experiences, as well as in its indispensable formal political organizations, there have almost always been clashes between the centralizing and "authoritarian" tendencies produced by the very needs of the struggle and, on the other hand, the centrifugal and spontaneous forces, more attached to local and immediate realities than to the future of the struggles.

It is within this expectant and confusing context that democratism¹ and its retinue of diverse assemblies and endless rhetoric emerge, mostly justified by anti-authoritarian ideology as a formal opposition to capitalist dictatorship. The political manifestations of these organizational nascent then take shape through libertarian currents, with anarchism as their fundamental programmatic reference. This ideology of rejecting all authority is present not only in most social movements but also throughout the world, as the first, often immature, expression of the need for autonomy and independence from the old structures of capitalist control.

This rejection of rules and restrictions stems from the need for air and breathing that arises from every thwarted birth, before it must regulate itself and organize itself to survive. In this sense, anarchism, too, will have to organize and structure itself, even under the veil of anti-authoritarian and "anti-organizational" rhetoric. This is the fundamental and recurring contradiction between libertarian discourse and its practice of effective political collaboration within the capitalist mode of production. When anarchists like Malatesta, Berneri, or Bails maintain a firmly revolutionary stance against any collaboration with bourgeois structures, then, despite what they say, they cease to be anarchists in the strict sense, since they perceive, even if they don't dare to say it clearly, that social revolution is necessarily authoritarian, because the exploited class, by refusing to be exploited, imposes its own interests. The

¹For more information on the critique of democracy and democratism, see our text: « Contribution to the critique of democracy» in our journal Matériaux Critiques N°3, and on our website: <https://materiauxcritiques.wixsite.com/monsite/revue>

clearest example of this assertion is the 1937 call for a revolutionary junta by the "Friends of Durruti," led by Balias. Therefore, when cornered by the authorities, the most consistent anarchists in their revolutionary will must choose to wield power, even in its most extreme and dictatorial forms. It is this insurmountable contradiction that makes the label "anti-authoritarian" completely ridiculous and inappropriate for anarchists themselves.

There is nothing more authoritarian than a libertarian who peremptorily declares, "There are no bosses here," or who proclaims, like the anarchist Juan García Oliver before becoming "Minister of Justice," "the dictatorship of anarchy."² Furthermore, the libertarian movement is by no means monolithic and has known -and continues to know- numerous theoretical and practical variations: from individualist and Stirnerian anarchism to anarcho-syndicalism, from "platformist" anarcho-communism (a platform developed, among others, by P. Archinov³) to "libertarian municipalism" by way of "individual repression," "right-wing anarchism" (anti-modern and aristocratic), "government anarchism" (from Catalonia to Rojava⁴), or self-managed agrarian communities⁵...

Anarchism is historically characterized by its rejection of all authority and power -especially that emanating from a state, even a "revolutionary" one- in order to demand individual liberty, "direct" democracy, and self-management, that is, the management of society by its members. However, the central question remains the basis of the legitimacy of this authority⁶: either revolution or counter-revolution, that is, either an attack on the law of value with a view to its abolition, or its management. In general terms, and as an introduction, we could define the strength and constancy of anarchism, in its diverse and varied forms, as inversely proportional to the corruptions and disloyalties produced by the history of counter-revolution, particularly by social-democratic reformism and the counter-revolutionary perfidy of Stalinism and its many offshoots.

Anarchism likes to present itself not as a theory of chaos, but as a libertarian alternative that, as Élisée Reclus defined it, would be "the highest expression of order." **It remains to be seen what kind of "order" it is actually referring to: the order imposed by the needs of the**

²The personal trajectory of García Oliver is emblematic of that of many anarchist leaders in Spain—from terrorism to ministerialism! In October 1922, along with Buenaventura Durruti, Francisco Ascaso, and Ricardo Sanz, he founded the group "Los Solidarios" (The Solidarity Group), a direct-action group that took up arms against the murderers of the free trade union and their leaders. This group claimed responsibility for several assassinations, including that of Cardinal Juan Soldevilla y Romero and an attack against King Alfonso XIII. During the events of May 1937, the last revolutionary uprising, García Oliver intervened to disarm the insurgents and force a return to work. For this reason, many considered him a traitor to the proletarian cause. On this episode and many others, see the correspondence between Diego Camacho ("Abel Paz") and Juan García Oliver, presented by Agustín Guillamón in the journal "Balance," no. 38, and in French, published by Ni patrie, ni frontières, p. 55. To obtain these journals, write to Yves Coleman, 10, rue Jean-Dolent, 75014, Paris, France. Juan García Oliver also wrote an autobiography: "L'écho des pas," Editions Le Coquelicot, Toulouse, 2014.

³Biography on the website: <https://maitron.fr/archinov-piotr-piotr-marine-dit-dictionnaire-des-anarchistes/>

⁴In this Kurdish region of Syria, the new state "PKK" was born in 2013 based on a "democratic confederalism" that ideologically claims to be from the libertarian municipalism of Murray Bookchin.

⁵Regarding references, we primarily refer any further research to Daniel Guérin's Anthology of Anarchism: Neither God nor Master, La Découverte / Poche, Essays, 2 volumes, Paris, 1999. Furthermore, we have already published a critical text on self-management: "Critique du mythe auto-gestionnaire" (Critique of the Myth of Self-Management) in our journal Matériaux Critiques no. 7, as well as on our website: <https://materiauxcritiques.wixsite.com/monsite/revue>

⁶In political sociology, and according to Alain Renaut, in his work «La fin de l'autorité» (The End of Authority), Champ/Flammarion, Paris, 2004, authority exists «when a power enjoys a capital of trust and when the people over whom that power is exercised maintain their trust in it».

generalization of the class struggle toward the abolition of wages, or the order of maintaining wage slavery, even if it is "self-managed."

In major historical experiences, such as the Paris Commune, revolutionary Russia in 1905 and 1917, Spain in 1934 and 1936-37, etc., where anarchists constituted a significant political force, their clashes with the demands of the struggle and the need to assume revolutionary power compelled them either to abandon their "anti-authoritarian" principles or, for the most part, to openly join the ranks of the "anti-fascist" bourgeoisie and the left wing of capital. This dramatic regression is clearly reflected in the patriotic turn of August 1914 and in the active participation of most of the leading figures of anarchism in the first global capitalist carnage. This betrayal and dishonor will affect first and foremost the signatories of the "Manifesto of the Sixteen,"⁷ including its authors: Jean Grave and Pierre Kropotkin, who was described for the occasion as "the anarchist prince of the trenches."

It is this lamentable trajectory, which constitutes the majority of libertarian formations,⁸ that represents the first failure of anarchism. From the First International (the IWA, from 1864 to 1876), it was essentially the weaknesses, changes of course, and betrayals of the reformist "authoritarian" current that allowed, as a reaction, the persistence of the so-called "anti-authoritarian" current. The opposition between Marx and Bakunin would express these divergences, both "strategic" and "tactical," and even "personal."⁹ This polemic would crystallize, despite the common goal of a classless and stateless society, two one-sided and caricatured positions that would endure in history: one, "authoritarian," of "state communism," and the other of a "federalist collectivism" characteristic of the libertarian vision.

Regarding this latter social organization, James Guillaume, quoting his friend Bakunin, defined it thus: *"I am not a communist because communism concentrates and absorbs all the powers of society in the State, because it necessarily leads to the centralization of property in the hands of the State, whereas I want the abolition of the State, the radical eradication of this principle of State authority and guardianship, which, under the pretext of moralizing and civilizing men, has enslaved, oppressed, exploited, and depraved them to this day. I want the organization of society and of collective or social property from the bottom up, by way of free association, and not from the top down, by means of any authority. In wanting the abolition of the State, I want the abolition of inherited private property, which is nothing more than an institution of the State, a consequence of the very principle of the State. In this sense, I am a collectivist and not at all a communist."* » James

⁷The "Manifesto of the Sixteen" was drafted in 1916 by Pierre Kropotkin and Jean Grave and signed by sixteen prominent figures in the libertarian movement who, joining the ranks of nationalists, sided with the Allies and opposed "German aggression" during the First World War. This text was first published in the syndicalist newspaper "La Bataille" and was intended as a response to the "Manifesto of the Thirty-Five," which, conversely, defended the proletarian line: antimilitarist and internationalist. This anti-war manifesto of February 1915, titled "The Anarchist International and the War," was conceived and written by E. Malatesta and included the signatures of, among others, Emma Goldman, Alexandre Berkman, F. Domela Nieuwenhuis, and Luigi Bertoni.

⁸However, we wish to highlight the recurring existence of splits within libertarian groups that, after undergoing programmatic ruptures and a process of theoretical reappropriation, have led them to the prospect of a truly revolutionary practice. This has historically been the case with a group like the "Friends of Durruti" (Jaime Balus, Vers une nouvelle révolution, Groupement des amis de Durruti, Le Coquelicot, Toulouse, 2019) or even some groups that, after 1968, joined the circles of the "ultra-left" and embraced certain political achievements of the "communist left." See: Rupture dans la théorie de la révolution textes de 1965-1975, presented by François Danel, Senonevero, Paris, 2003.

⁹On this debate, see the collection of texts: Marx/Bakounine, Socialisme autoritaire ou libertaire, 2 tomes, UGE, 10/18, Paris, 1975.

Guillaume, L'Internationale, Documents et souvenirs, Volume 1, (1864-1872), Éditions Grounauer, p.74-75. Geneva, 1980.

This quote fits well with anarchist doctrine, which Marxism opposes regarding the nature of the state in bourgeois society and its necessary abolition during the "transition period." As Engels, quoted by Lenin, often reminds us : "It is constantly forgotten that the abolition of the state is also the abolition of democracy, that the withering away of the state is the withering away of democracy." V. Lenin, L'État et la révolution, p. 122, Éditions sociales, Paris, 1972.

Furthermore, we must not confuse, as anarchists and many who call themselves Marxists do, the capitalist state with the semi-proletarian state of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The former must be destroyed at its root; the latter will wither away during the necessary period of transition from capitalism to communism, a period whose immediate objective is the abolition of wages and the internationalization of the revolution, which will eliminate borders in its advance.

"Being a class and not an order, the bourgeoisie is compelled to organize itself on a national scale, no longer local but national, and to give its average interests a general form. As a consequence of the emancipation of private property from the community, the state has acquired a particular existence alongside and outside of bourgeois society; in fact, it is merely the form of organization that the bourgeoisie necessarily adopts for themselves, both externally and internally, to mutually guarantee their property and interests. " K. Marx, The German Ideology, Works III, p. 1109, Gallimard, Paris, 1982.

"As the progress of modern industry developed, broadened, and intensified the class antagonism between capital and labor, state power increasingly took on the character of a public power organized for the purpose of social enslavement, an apparatus of class domination. After each revolution, which marks an advance in the class struggle, the purely repressive character of state power becomes ever more openly apparent. " K. Marx, The Civil War in France (1871).¹⁰

The characterization of "libertarian," like almost all others, is therefore approximate and inadequate, since it is based on a "formal" and relative aspect that, in reality, has never been a political and practical dividing line. In fact, all revolutionary action is, by its very nature (due to circumstances), authoritarian, violent, and dictatorial, since its objective is to impose, practically and by force, another relationship that radically disrupts and transforms the social hierarchy and its constitutive basis: the social relations of production. As Marx indicates in relation to the process of primitive accumulation:

" Some of these methods are based on the use of brute force, but all of them without exception exploit the power of the State, the concentrated and organized force of society, in order to violently precipitate the transition from the feudal economic order to the capitalist economic order and to shorten the transitional phases. And, in fact, violence is the midwife of every old society giving birth to a new one. It is itself an economic potentiality. " K. Marx, Capital, Volume 1, p. 548, Éditions Sociales, Paris, 1976.

It was Friedrich Engels who, in 1873, returned to this issue in his article "On Authority," to point out, after the Paris Commune, that there is nothing more authoritarian than a revolution.

¹⁰Website: <https://www.marxists.org/francais/ait/1871/05/km18710530c.htm>

“A revolution is undoubtedly the most authoritarian thing there is; it is the act by which one faction of the population imposes its will on the other by means of rifles, bayonets, and cannons-authoritarian means if ever there were any. And the victorious party, if it does not want to have fought in vain, must continue to rule by the terror that its weapons inspire in the reactionaries. Could the Paris Commune have lasted a single day if it had not made use of the authority of a people in arms against the bourgeoisie? Shouldn't it, on the contrary, be criticized for having made insufficient use of its authority? Therefore, it is one of two things: either the anti-authoritarians don't know what they are saying, and in that case, they are only sowing confusion, or they do know, and in that case, they are betraying the cause of the proletariat. In either case, they are serving reaction.” F. Engels, *De L'autorité*, in Marx-Engels, *Le parti de classe*, tome III, p.48-52, Maspero, Paris, 1973.¹¹

Therefore, it is its revolutionary and social nature, bearing an alternative societal project, that gives the insubordinate proletariat its strength, authority, and legitimacy. These elements, clearly expressed and developed, are proclaimed in what constitutes the "communist program." This program is necessarily based on the fundamental theoretical contributions of Marx and Engels, on an implacable critique of all false socialisms and so-called "socialist" countries, and on a strategic assessment of the main tactics whose inadequacy and failure the workers' movement has tragically experienced: parliamentarism, electoralism, trade unionism, gradualism, support for national liberations, frontism, and so on.

The anti-authoritarian tradition: a bad answer to a bad question

The "anti-authoritarian" tradition endures, in fact, thanks to a rupture and a false polarization that ideologically obscures the debate on the revolutionary strategy that should be applied. The rejection of bourgeois politics (today we would say "politics") becomes, among "anti-authoritarians," a rejection of politics in general, considered inherently corrupt and corruptible. Therefore, for them, it is a terrain to be strictly avoided in order to avoid both becoming and being compromised. Immediate attempts to subscribe, despite everything, to this contradictory, illusory, and dangerous tactic have provoked a series of political catastrophes in which many "revolutionaries" have become entangled and lost their way.

Even using the electoral arena for purely propagandistic purposes ultimately leads to validating peaceful and legal beliefs in the existence of a "subliminal" alternative to democratic dictatorship and its sacrosanct "social peace." However, this is precisely to ignore what constitutes the essence of democracy's strength: presenting itself as an open and free field for ideological confrontation between classes, when in reality it is nothing more than the exclusive domain of capital, which by definition imposes its rules and its capitalist essence. The graveyard of electoralism is filled with ghosts who believed they could survive, through "consciousness and will," the tsunami of materialism of this more than century-old mode of production, whose strength lies in its historical capacity to adapt and corrupt in order to endure.

“The very nature of debates in Parliament and other democratic bodies precludes any possibility of resorting to criticizing the policies of opposing parties, to propaganda against the very principle of parliamentarism, or to any action that transcends the limits of parliamentary procedure. (...) All

¹¹This fundamental text can be consulted on the website: <https://www.marxists.org/francais/marx/works/00/parti/kmpc075.htm>

efforts by communist parties to give a completely different character to the practice of parliamentarism can only lead to the failure of the energies expended in this Sisyphean task. The cause of the communist revolution urgently demands that, on the contrary, these energies be expended on the ground of direct attack on the capitalist system of exploitation." A. Bordiga, « Theses on parliamentarism », IIème congrès de l'IC, Moscow, 1920, in: Précis d'anti-électorisme élémentaire, 120 motifs de ne pas aller voter, choix de textes présentés par Raoul Vilette, p.76-77, Les nuits rouges, Paris, 2007.

"The unions are making fun of you." ¹²

The same applies to the "trade union question," where, after observing the limited nature of trade union struggle and its increasingly strong and evident incorporation into the apparatus of the bourgeois state, anarchism proposes not a critique of trade unionism and its historically counter-revolutionary character ¹³, but a "renewed" version of "revolutionary" trade unionism: "anarcho-syndicalism." In contrast to this libertarian reformism, some minority anarchists nevertheless maintained an anti-trade unionist class position.

"Trade unionism, despite all the declarations of its most fervent supporters, contains within itself, by the very nature of its functions, all the elements of degeneration that have corrupted workers' movements in the past. Indeed, as a movement that proposes to defend the current interests of workers, it must necessarily adapt to existing conditions and take into account the prevailing interests in society as it exists today." Errico Malatesta, *Anarchisme et syndicalisme*, 1907, in *Articles politiques*, p.156, 10/18, Paris, 1979.

However, anarcho-syndicalism would take root and be defined as follows: *"Anarcho-syndicalism can be considered the most mature expression of the entire anarchist movement. (...) The anarcho-syndicalist theory of frontal assault is based on a conception of the irreducible contradictions that undermine the capitalist system, on optimistic confidence in the unlimited capacities of the masses, and on the conviction that the overthrow of the existing order, as well as of political and economic privileges, will return man to his natural condition, a prerequisite for the social harmony that must be created, in which each person will give according to their ability and receive according to their needs."* Domenico Tarizzo, *L'Anarchie, Histoire des mouvements libertaires dans le monde*, pp. 81–82, Seghers, 1978.

More specifically: *"Revolutionary syndicalism is situated on the terrain of direct action and supports all struggles that do not contradict its objectives: the abolition of economic monopolies and state domination. The means of struggle are strikes, boycotts, sabotage, etc. Direct action finds its deepest expression in the general strike, which must be, at the same time, for revolutionary syndicalists, the prelude to social revolution."* L. Mercier-Vega & V. Griffuelhes, *Anarcho-syndicalisme et syndicalisme révolutionnaire*, Spartacus, p.41, Paris, 1978.

In fact, this amounts to replacing the role and function of the party with that of the trade union, considered less corrupt and less corruptible because, paradoxically, it is solely determined by the economic sphere (?). Faced with the integration of the "workers' parties," the trade union and its "grassroots" wing appear, to some, less susceptible to bourgeois corruption, **when, in reality, it was best positioned to practically negotiate the day-to-day integration of the working class into capital.** Politics would thus be excluded, even though,

¹²Song by the rock group « Trust »: « Bosser huit heures », on the album « Préfabriqués » from 1979.

¹³See in this regard the work of Benjamin Péret and G. Munis: "Les syndicats contre la révolution" (The unions against the revolution), Eric Losfeld, *Le terrain vague*, Paris, 1968, and our text: " Quelques considérations sur la question syndicale" in our magazine *Matériaux Critiques* N°4, and on our website: <https://materiauxcritiques.wixsite.com/monsite/revue>

from its very origins, the various tendencies within the labor movement have infiltrated it. This is the classic tactic of entryism, which has always proven ineffective.¹⁴

As Lenin would say: "*Anarchism has often been a kind of punishment for the opportunistic deviations of the workers' movement. These two aberrations complemented each other.*" V. Lénine, *La maladie infantile du communisme, le « gauchisme »*, p. 18 editions of Moscow, 1969.

Anarcho-syndicalism is defined as "*a current of trade unionism based on the principles of anarchism, that is, self-management, anti-authoritarianism, free federalism, direct democracy, with representatives elected temporarily and revocable.*"¹⁵

But, once again, this is an organizational divergence that opposes the political form of organization of the proletariat as a class to the "economic" form, while the reality of the class is defined as a consubstantial totality. Anarcho-syndicalism prolongs this separation between the "economic" and the "political" by proposing the expropriatory and "managerialist" general strike instead of the destruction of the state through the revolutionary seizure of power.

This action is limited to the economic sphere, and if it extends to the political sphere, it must be undertaken and supervised by other specialists: the parties and representative politicians dedicated to this purpose.¹⁶ The anarchist union is structured federatively, granting, in its own words, greater autonomy to its grassroots bodies and sections. These are usually organized by trade, which conveniently perpetuates their inherent corporatism and in no way constitutes an obstacle to the bureaucratization process present in all unions, both anarchist and "reformist."

"The trade union bureaucracy constituted the intermediaries of labor power, to sell it as a commodity at its fair price, to those very same people who were recruited from the struggles of industrial workers and extracted from them." Guy Debord, *The Society of the Spectacle*, p. 96, Champ Libre Editions, Paris, 1972.

The union sections, including those of anarcho-syndicalism, are fully integrated into the production apparatus and the wage system. They constitute an indispensable organic link. In France, it was in 1968, after the defeat brought about by the Grenelle Agreements that ended the general strike, that the company union section (SSE) was legalized. This official recognition clearly materializes the necessary reintegration of attempts at independent organizing of struggles within the yoke of the unions and the control that the latter are strictly responsible for enforcing.

The "SSE" can be created "*in any company by unions that have at least two affiliated employees in the company or establishment (judgment of the social chamber of July 8, 2009).*"

¹⁴Generations of activists thus attempted to infiltrate, openly or secretly, trade union structures to influence them or even assume their leadership as a "conduit" for a political party (typically the CGT in France, first under anarchist influence (F. Pelloutier, E. Pouget, B. Broutchoux...), and then, from the 1920s to the present, globally subjected to Stalinism and its vicissitudes). Of course, we should also mention the Spanish CNT, which maintained the majority libertarian ideology until the catastrophe of its participation in government and its collapse after the war. We should also cite the FORA in Argentina or the USI in Italy. Conversely, we do not include the IWW, which has been the subject of a specific study by us: "The Submission of the Labor Process to the Valorization Process through the Example of the American Labor Movement (1887-1920)," in our journal *Matériaux Critiques* no. 12. as on our website: <https://materiauxcritiques.wixsite.com/monsite/revue>

¹⁵ Web page : <https://www.toupie.org/Dictionnaire/Anarcho-syndicalisme.htm>

¹⁶It is interesting to note that a "new movement," such as the "yellow vests," which arises spontaneously, without codes and against all the "old elites," must also quickly structure itself appropriately, with "representative spokespeople," appointed or self-proclaimed, in order to integrate itself in one way or another (violently and thanks to social media) into the realm of legitimate political spectacle.

Its function is to supervise, based on *"republican values", the proper functioning of the company in all its different individual and collective aspects (health, security, legislative, training, accounting, etc.).*

Unions are therefore an indispensable structure for industrial logic and the best allies of employers within the company, helping them to produce increasingly better and more profitable goods. Their "opposition" is contractual and aims to obtain the most effective negotiated compromise, without confrontations that could escalate. They are the best agents of social peace, even in the event of conflict. This function can also be assumed by structures that are not yet institutionalized and that arise from attempts at self-organization in labor struggles, such as committees which, influenced by trade union ideology, can even create "unionism without unions."

This is clearly the case with anarcho-syndicalism, which, in practice, is no different from other trade union structures (common front), except perhaps for a more "radical" and "autonomous" discourse. It was this trajectory that saw the transformation/recovery of the strike movements and "inter-company workers' committees" in Poland in 1980-1981, first through the demand for the right to create "free trade unions," then with the official recognition of "Solidarnosc (the opposition trade union in Poland)," and finally, thanks to Walesa, its rise to the head of state. This example shows us how a patriotic trade union, with the help of the Catholic Church, became the last lifeline to rescue capitalism in crisis and avoid a situation that could have led to a workers' insurrection against the decline of the old Stalinist regimes. This can be seen as a general allegory for trade unions (including anarchist ones¹⁷) which, from top to bottom in the social structure, are incorporated into capitalist logic until they merge, thanks to structures of conciliation, social dialogue, and co-management with the bourgeois state itself.

This integration has become the privilege of state modernity, since trade unions, for example in Belgium, still lack legal personality (they are simply de facto associations) and, therefore, can never be sued in court or convicted for their actions. It is always the individuals -union members or others- who are considered responsible and must answer individually for their actions. Therefore, trade unions are legally unaccountable, even though they participate, with legal representation, in all aspects of social dialogue and play an important role in the management of unemployment and benefits. Finally, they are also an important structure of social promotion and meritocracy that allows their most active militants to leave the field of the company to rejoin another profession, corresponding to them to a clear social ascent.

"For former ¹⁸workers, becoming a union leader represents an improvement in their material situation. And, although it is not easy, this new professional activity provides them with 'a position of influence, a fairly wide autonomy, a feeling of usefulness and importance (as well as) a status in the community that few union members can expect from their usual profession.'" Jean Faniel.

¹⁷A group like, for example, the Libertarian Communist Organization, like the entire classical "leftist" current, asserts that: "Union leadership will not change; it is outside of it that genuine emancipatory movements must be found. However, we are not anti-union and we differentiate between rank-and-file members and their leadership. Companies where there is no union representation are often the worst, proof that grassroots unions remain, despite all their limitations, 'one of the few spaces that allows for the organization of the working classes.'" On their website : <https://oclibertaire.lautre.net/spip.php?article4316>

¹⁸Jean Faniel, Trade Unions: actors subjected to structural tensions : <https://www.revuepolitique.be/syndicats-des-acteurs-structurellement-sous-tensions/>

Thus, it is clear that anyone can make a career in a union, just as in any political party whose objective is to direct/manage the capitalist economy based on the exploitation of those they are supposed to defend. It is evident that, in this way, many left-wing and anarchist activists will end up at the head of the structures they initially wanted to transform or even destroy. After numerous vicissitudes and factional struggles, they are the ones who ultimately constitute, in most unions, the structural backbone, becoming the permanent fixtures they once so vehemently criticized.

Union infiltration is, in fact, the best training ground for bureaucrats and new cadres for the capitalist left. Anarchists are by no means immune to this sinister regression, which, despite their rhetoric, returns them to the worst vices of the old reformism that, for a long time, has only aspired to the efficient management of capitalist affairs through the exploitation of its wage slaves. Thus, in all their social practices, both present and those of their "illustrious" past, they constitute nothing more than the liberal tendency of leftism, seemingly more "sympathetic" to all those focused on immediate gains than the old reformists, but all the more effective in their permanent opposition to the class independence of the proletariat. They thus constitute one of the last ideological lifelines of capital and its reform: "Anarchists, one more effort to be revolutionaries!"

November 2025 : Fj, Eu, Ms & Mm.

Translated by IsaCR.

Literature

Works:

- F. Danel, Rupture dans la théorie de la révolution, textes de 1965-1975, Senonevero, Paris, 2003.
- G. Debord, La société du spectacle, éditions Champ Libre, Paris, 1972.
- D. Guérin, Neither Dieu, nor Maître, Anthologie de l'anarchisme, La Découverte/Poche, Paris, 1999.
- J. Guillaume, L'Internationale, Documents et souvenirs, Volume 1, (1864-1872), Éditions Grounauer, Genève, 1980.
- V. Lénine, L'État et la révolution, social éditions, Paris, 1972.
- V. Lénine, La maladie infantile du communisme, le « gauchisme », Moscow éditions, 1969.
- J. Maitron, Le mouvement anarchiste en France, 2 volumes, Maspero/Fondations, Paris, 1982.
- AND. Malatesta, Articles politiques, 10/18, Paris, 1979.
- K. Marx-F. Engels, Le parti de classe, tome III, De L'Autorité, Maspero, Paris, 1973.
- K. Marx / M. Bakounine, Socialisme autoritaire ou libertaire, 2 volumes, UGE, Paris, 1975.
- K. Marx, L'Idéologie Allemande, Œuvres III, Éditions Gallimard, Paris, 1982.
- K. Marx, La guerre civile en France, 1871, Éditions Sociales, Paris, 1972.
- L. Mercier-Vega & V. Griffuelhes, Anarcho-syndicalisme et syndicalisme révolutionnaire, Spartacus, Paris, 1978.
- J. Garcia Oliver, L'écho des pas, éditions Le Coquelicot, Toulouse, 2014.
- B. Péret and G. Munis : « Les syndicats contre la révolution, Eric Losfeld, Le terrain vague, Paris, 1968.
- A. Renaut, La fin de l'autorité, Champ /Flammarion, Paris, 2004.
- D. Tarizzo, L'Anarchie, Histoire des mouvements libertaires dans le monde, Seghers, 1978.
- R. Vilette, Précis d'anti-électorisme élémentaire, Les nuits rouges, Paris, 2007.

Articles and magazines :

- J. Faniel, Syndicats : des acteurs structurellement sous tensions, in Politique 104, 2018 : <https://www.revuepolitique.be/syndicats-des-acteurs-structurellement-sous-tensions/>

Websites:

- Le Maitron, dictionnaire biographique, Archinov Piotr : <https://maitron.fr/archinov-piotr-piotr-marxine-dit-dictionnaire-des-anarchistes/>
- Marxists.org : <https://www.marxists.org/francais/marx/index.htm>
- Matériaux Critiques : <https://materiauxcritiques.wixsite.com/monsite/revue>
- Organisation communiste libertaire – OCL: <https://oclibertaire.lautre.net/spip.php?article4316>

Illustration musicale: Sex Pistols, Anarchy in the UK, <https://youtu.be/8qChlOevQSs?si=zhtoazf9GAqDkKb>