ARTICLE

The Revue International Anarchiste's World Survey (1924–1925)

A Transnational Attempt at Reappraising, Revising, and Reinvigorating the Anarchist Movement

JASON GARNER

This article focuses on a key moment in anarchist history, a point of reflection following a period of intense action, of hope but ultimately defeat that began with the Russian Revolution and ended with the rise of fascism in Italy and authoritarian dictatorship in Spain. The First World War, with the rise of nationalism, government intervention in the economy, and the rise of democratic socialism had also raised important questions about anarchist tactics and their analysis of contemporary society and the nature of the masses. The "time of critical self-analysis has begun" as early as 1918.[1] However, the immediate consequences of the War, the evolution of the Russian Revolution, and the postwar wave of social and labor unrest across Europe and elsewhere, in which anarchists were actively involved, to a large extent postponed debate while further exposing limitations to anarchist tactics and provoking further divisions.

By the early 1920s the revolutionary wave was replaced by a conservative backlash and state repression in various countries, which led many

Journal for the Study of Radicalism, Vol. 17, No. 1, 2023, pp. 1–28. ISSN 1930-1189.

anarchists to seek refuge in exile. One focal point for anarchist exiles, and a center for transnational contacts, was France, particularly Paris, in the early 1920s. Anarchists fled north across the border from Italy and Spain escaping repression and dictatorial government. Other anarchists escaped repression from Eastern Europe and Russia, but such was the number of exiles from the two Mediterranean countries that anarchist groups in exile were established in France by Spanish and Italian exiles, while Italian and Spanish revolutionary syndicalist sections were established within French unions. Exiled anarchists joined together with their French counterparts to create the Ouevre Internationale des Editions Anarchistes (OIEA), to create "a permanent contact" between anarchists of all countries at both local and national level as a first step towards the creation of an Anarchist International.[2]

The OIEA undertook a number of projects, one of which was the publication of the *Revue International Anarchiste* (*RIA*), a monthly polyglot journal that was published in Paris from November 1924 to June 1925. The aim of the *RIA* was to "create and maintain regular moral and material links between the anarchists of the whole world" while at the same time "scrupulously respecting those tendencies particular to each nation."[3] The *RIA* was a forum for anarchism "in all of its multiple expressions and did not represent any particular tendency," i.e. communist, syndicalist or individualist.[4] The *RIA*, was a unique experiment in transnational anarchist relations with each edition being seventy-two pages; twenty-four in French (*RIAF* in the notes), twenty-four in Spanish (*RIAS*), and twenty-four in Italian (*RIAI*).[5] The initial pages usually focused on policy and tactics, the middle pages on culture (including poems and book reviews) and science, and the a final section consisting of "international reports" with general information on movements in other countries.

Following complaints from *RIA* readers who could only read one language that they were unable to understand two thirds of the publication, the editorial team decided to divide it into three separate magazines. Anarchist journals in France already existed in both French and Italian (*La Revue Anarchiste* and *Iconoclasta*), so an agreement was reached to work together and the *RIA*'s Spanish section created a new newspaper, *Acción*.[6] The limit of transnational communication, at least at a linguistic level, had been reached.

In its first issue, the *RIA* launched a "World Survey" on the immediate and future tasks of anarchism. Anarchists from around the world were invited to participate with responses coming from many prominent anarchists of time, most of them from the three national groups in charge of publications. This article is based predominantly on these responses, although other articles from the *RIA* are also used to provide greater detail to certain arguments. The survey provides first-hand insight into the views of contemporary anarchists on the future of the movement in light of recent events, and proposals on to how to overcome recent setbacks and failings. Although some responses were published in more than one section, in general, as with other articles, they were specific to each group, which provided a means to compare the views of French, Italian, and Spanish anarchists on how the movement should adapt and evolve.

The transnational "turn" has in recent years become the dominant discourse in anarchist history, demonstrating the interrelationship between national movements.[7] In this article the intention is not to focus on these links per se, but rather to use a clearly transnational project, the *RIA*, to provide an analysis of debates that, as with anarchism itself, operated along transnational, international, and national lines.[8] The aim is also to see how much the lines among the three are blurred, and whether and to what extent much national experience led to differences in interpretation of anarchism, specifically in relation to tactics.

Turcato has argued that anarchists saw their movements as "a single . . . transnational movement that crossed the territorial boundaries" but at the same time "preserved a national identity," creating a form of "'cross-nationalism' which crossed national boundaries and at the same time remained focused on the struggles of national scope." [9] Writing about the role of London as the "junction of anarchist networks" before the First World War, Turcato concludes that the close contact among anarchists showed "the steady and consistent evolution of competing, cross-national anarchists currents." He believed that the traditional historiography of the movement, which focuses on the division among competing tendencies—individualism, collectivism, communism and syndicalism—was misleading, because in reality these tendencies could find a way to coexist in what is by definition a diverse group. The main cause of friction was over the question of organization, whether creating formal national organizations benefitted

collective action or were the precursors to reformism and hierarchical control. This debate became more relevant in the postwar period when the failure of their actions to bring about revolutionary change forced anarchists to focus on the practical means of achieving it.[10]

The nature of any anarchist organization and anarchists' relationship with the labor movement in general would be one of the main points of many of the responses to the survey. The survey, like the *RIA* in general, was open to anarchists of all tendences as well as all countries and therefore provides a comprehensive view of the position of the movement at that time in relation to whether there was a need to revise policies and tactics. Anarchists did not know that this would mark the high-point in their revolutionary history, with the exception of the Spanish revolution of 1936–37, and looked to reappraise, revitalize, and perhaps revise or reaffirm tactics and ideas. The survey presented the forum to do so.

Position of the Anarchist Movements in France, Italy, and Spain.

Before this article addresses the World Survey's responses, a short summary and analysis of the position of anarchism in France, Italy and Spain is needed to provide a background to the debate. This is because the national and international context of 1924 was not simply completely different from the immediate prewar period, but also from the immediate postwar years of social unrest that came to an end in 1923. It is particularly relevant to see how a debate concerning whether or not there was a need for reviewing and revising anarchism in general and, in particular, its tactics, had evolved before conducting the survey, which, it was hoped, would provide a forum for clarification of where the movement was, where it wanted to go, and how it planned to get there.

France

Even before the First World War began in 1914, anarchism in France had for some time been in decline due to the negative impact of the terrorism associated with the propaganda tactics, the growth of reformist socialism, and the increasingly less revolutionary stance adopted by the revolutionary

syndicalist Confédération Générale du Travail (CGT). By 1914, the CGT appeared to favor evolutionary, rather than revolutionary, change and had become entwined in negotiation and subsequently collaboration with the state. The War showed that a large portion of the working class felt a lot closer to the national community than the anarchists wanted to believe, a point amply demonstrated by the CGT leadership's acceptance of the French government's call for a political truce (Union Sacrée).[11] Even some prominent anarchists supported an allied victory, which provoked a shocked response from others.

At a congress In November 1920, the Union Anarchiste Française (UAF) was created, replacing the Federation Communiste Revolutionnaire Anarchiste, which had been formed in 1913 but that had quickly disappeared during the War. The UAF was made up of regional federations that brought the local groups together. It was open to all the main contemporary anarchist tendencies—communist, syndicalist, and individualist—in an attempt to reconcile or synthesize their differences. The first of these, led by Sebastian Faure, seemed to be the most dominant. The splits apparent in Spain and Italy were not as virulent in France due, it would appear, to the relative weakness of the movement as a whole. According to a police report in early 1922, it had 400 members and its newspaper, *Libertaire,* sold 15,000 copies. A further report in February claims that the movement was in a "sort of depression" and this was evident to both Spanish and Italian exiles.[12] For the Italian anarchist Ugo Fedeli (who wrote under name of Hugo Trene), French anarchism was in a "profound and vast crisis," while Spanish exiles were even less impressed, claiming that French anarchism was little more than "an intellectual exercise" that shied away from reality and that the French anarchists, "except rare and honorable exceptions, were useless both collectively and individually" and "decadent."[13] All in all, the French anarchist movement was in "total disarray," a situation only made worse by divisions and confusion caused by the rise of Bolshevism, although from late 1920 the UAF was "blatantly and relentlessly hostile" to the Bolsheviks.[14]

Italy

Anarchists in Italy had played an active role in the factory occupations of September 1920 and in the factory committees during the strikes of 1919–20

but proved more successful at starting agitation than directing it towards any clear goal.[15] Aided by the growing unrest, the anarchist movement grew exponentially: the Unione Comunista Anarchica (UCA) was created in 1919 at a conference in Florence, changing its name to the Unione Anarchica Italiana (UAI) a year later. Open to all tendencies and including the anarchist affinity groups in Italy in 1920, the UAI had 20,000 members whereas membership of the revolutionary syndicalist Unione Sindacale Italiana (USI) was between 300,000 to 500,000 (up from approximately 100,000 before the War). However, their popularity still lagged far behind the Socialist Party (250,000) and the Confederazione Generale del Lavoro (CGL) with 2 million members.[16] The socialists were happy to negotiate and without their support the unrest subsided. By October 1920, with the factories now evacuated, the government moved on the Italian anarchists, arresting the leadership of both the UAI and the USI. Following the rise of fascism, anarchists found it impossible to operate as they were imprisoned, murdered, or forced into exile. Beginning in 1922, leading anarchists began to arrive in France and created a Refugee Committee in Paris.[17]

The main division in the Italian anarchist movement was between the organizationalists and the anti-organizationalists. According to Senta, before the First World War the latter group was probably the largest, although the pro-organizational sector subsequently grew in prominence.[18] However, it is also possible that the lines between the two became more blurred during the factory occupations and the social unrest of the period. In fact, these terms can be misleading because the anti-organizationalists were prepared to organize for specific situations and were often highly effective, as numerous journals and newspapers documented, although both groups were predominantly anarcho-communist.[19] Rather than the existence of the UAI itself, it was the way it was organized and operated (il Patto di Aleanza) that caused most friction.[20] According to Rento Souvarine, the UAI was a "permanent political organization" subordinating "the individual to a single governing center" and "compromised the great natural and free spontaneous energy" of the masses."[21] This appears to have been a more extreme position, however. According to Antonioli, the UAI was based on anti-organizational principles, reflected that "the distance between organizationalists and anti-organizationalists" had been clearly "reduced" following the War.[22] The need for some form of national organization was

"a common demand," among all the groups.[23] As with the French UAF, the UAI was a synthesis of the different groups. Individual and group freedoms were respected, but the question remained whether this would allow efficient and coordinated action. At its Bologna Congress in 1920, the UAI adopted a general program, most of which had been written by the perhaps the most prominent anarchist of the period, Errico Malatesta, twenty years earlier, but as if to stress this point, was vague on specific tactics.

Italian anarchists were split over the position regarding syndicalism: anti-organizationalist anarchists tended to argue that too many anarchists forgot their ideals when they became involved with the day-to-day struggles and negotiations of the labor movement, losing their anarchist identity.[24] They distrusted the revolutionary nature of syndicalism, being very aware of the "sad spectacle" of the French CGT.[25] There was also division among those who supported anarchist action in the unions. Armando Borghi, national secretary of the USI after the War, argued that all anarchists should join the USI to ensure it maintained its revolutionary ideals, but many preferred action within the much larger CGL as a means of creating a larger and more unified workers' organization in which anarchists could make their message heard but without taking official positions. The UAI position was neutral on the issue of specifying which union anarchists should join. Anarchists, therefore, could be found in both the CGL and the USI, often simply due to the nature or location of their work.[26]

With the rise of fascism from 1922 onwards these questions took second place to debates over the use of violence and the need to create alliances with other anti-fascist groups. This only increased the "disunion" evident in Italian anarchist ranks before 1925 when the Fascist regime had placed anarchists at the "margins of society."[27]

Spain

Since its inception, the close association between anarchism and revolutionary syndicalism in Spain had been perhaps the most significant aspect of Spanish anarchism—a source of strength but also of division and confusion. The lines between labor and the anarchist movements were therefore blurred, open to interpretation and hence confusion. In terms of organization, nearly all anarchists accepted the revolutionary syndicalist Confederation

National de Trabajo (CNT), founded in Barcelona in 1920, to be their national organization with separate anarchist organizations being run at regional and local levels. What was the need of a national anarchist organization, if prominent anarchists could meet and discuss issues at the regional and national congresses of the CNT? Resistance to the creation of a national organization was therefore not simply due to increasing state repression beginning in 1920, but also, as many anarchists argued, because they already considered the CNT in this way because it had adopted "libertarian communism" (although without defining exactly what the term meant) as its ultimate goal at the Madrid Congress in 1919. This goal and the domination of anarchists within the union itself gave the CNT a clear anarchist leaning, especially from 1916 onwards, and hence from this period it makes more sense to define it as anarcho-, rather than simply revolutionary, syndicalist.[28] The role of the labor movement in anarchism was therefore more evident and influential in Italy and France.

However, to divide Spanish anarchists between syndicalists and communists, is misleading. Influenced by the work of Elorza in the 1970s, Spanish anarchist historiography tried to divide the CNT, and the anarchist movement in general, between syndicalists trying to focus more on economic gains and worker solidarity and radicals attempting to use the unions as a tool for immediate revolutionary policy—in reality there was a large middle ground between the two positions, which made anarchist action within unions essential but also accepted a difference between syndicalism and anarchism.[29] After all, the CNT had declared that its ultimate goal was the installation of a communist society. Nonetheless, the strike movements of 1916–19 and again in 1923, demonstrated for many that the labor and anarchist movements, although complementary, were not the same and some sort of clarity concerning their specific roles needed to be established. There had been numerous attempts to organize at the local and regional levels, yet these regional bodies often did not enjoy a long life in the years following the creation of the CNT, and again after 1917, but we can see that Spanish anarchists were not opposed to organization at these levels. But there was no national organization until the creation of the very loosely organized National Committee for Anarchist Relations in 1923.[30]

In Spain a cost-of-living crisis caused by the War had led to a growth in social unrest that was initiated by a general strike of 1916. The unrest reached

its zenith in 1919 with a general strike in Barcelona. During the period the CNT grew, rapidly overtaking the UGT, especially in the industrial regions of Cataluña where membership had grown from 16,000 in 1916 to 715,000 in 1919.[31] Thus, the CNT was more successful and indeed more anarchist than the Italian USI. Debate, therefore, was not so much about whether anarchists should act in the unions, but rather how they should act within the unions, bringing ideology or economic needs to the fore. The question of organization was directly related to this. Should anarchists be content with local and regional federations, or should they create a national one as well? And, if so, the problem was the same faced the French and Italian anarchists, which was over the nature of such an organization.

The early success of the strike movement was stifled by repression, and debate and divisions grew concerning the role of the CNT: whether it should immediately precipitate a revolution or whether it should, as a prelude to revolutionary action, act as a union making economic demands to benefit and educate the workers in the class struggle. As in Italy, and to a lesser extent in France, this debate was sidetracked by division and confusion caused by Bolshevism. The CNT had officially distanced itself from Moscow at the Zaragoza Conference in 1922 although anarchist condemnation had been growing since late 1919 over state and employer-sponsored repression in Russia.[32]

A French police report concerning exiled Spanish anarchists claimed that in 1922 militants were moving towards the creation of an autonomous federation but were also members of French groups and federations.[33] Many Spanish anarchists joined French syndicalist organizations, attended anarchist conferences, and formed affinity groups in the country. By 1924, there was a Spanish Anarchist Relations Committee in France that shared its headquarters with the OIEA.[34] By this time the CNT had "ceased to exist as an effective national organization" and the National Anarchist Committee had also been forced into exile in France.[35]

The World Survey on the Present and Future of Anarchism

By 1924 Paris was a transnational hub of anarchist activity gathering together anarchists escaping repression not just from Spain and Italy but

also countries such as Russia and Bulgaria who now, the dust having settled after years of social unrest associated with the Russian Revolution and its aftermath, in an atmosphere of relative tranquility although under constant police observation, sought to reassess and perhaps revise their ideas and tactics in light of these recent events. During this period, anarchists lacked "coordination, method, plan and structure," and were too "eclectic," and their ideals too confusing for the masses.[36] In revolutionary situations, Russia and Italy in particular, anarchists were clearly unprepared and "were not equal to the occasion."[37] After the collapse of the anarchists in Russia, the factory occupation in Italy and the strike movement in Spain, the division in their ranks caused by Bolshevism, and the state reaction, anarchism had "stagnated." Hence anarchists needed to undertake "a profound and serious revision of our theories if we want to be in harmony with the modern times."[38] It was time to put an end to the "chaotic separation of tactics and doctrine."[39] "A measured study" of the "fundamental problems" of anarchist doctrine was needed.[40]

The "World Survey" launched by the RIA was an attempt to gather these reappraisals, which were mainly from Europe with some coming from other parts of the world. A sharing of experiences and ideas would help fortify the movement, create a unity of direction and clarity, and perhaps be the basis for the creation of an Anarchist International to rival that of the Bolsheviks. Multiple transnational contacts had been made in Paris by anarchists in exile following repression in their own countries, but to spread their ideas beyond France and back to their own nations required a newspaper or bulletin, and the *RIA* could play that role.[41]

In November 1924, all three versions of the first edition of the *RIA* carried the "Great World Survey": a "terribly vast and complex" question concerning the immediate and future tasks of anarchism to which readers were asked to respond. [42] The question was, of course, "vast and complex" and indeed many of the answers were vague or abstract.[43] Responses came from anarchists from numerous countries, predominantly France and Italy but also Spain, Argentina, Mexico, Poland, and Russia. These responses came from some of the most prominent figures at the time—especially from France and Italy—such as Sebastian Faure, Luigi Fabbri, Enrique Flores Magón, and Arshinov. The Spanish version prompted the fewest responses, the majority of which were foreign. In fact, only one was Spanish, Abad de

Santillan who, although Spanish-born, lived in Argentina for most of his life. He was a member of the Federación Obrera Regional Argentina (FORA) and would have an influence on sections of the Spanish movement.[44] To try to compensate for the lack of Spanish survey responses, articles that touch on the issues raised in the survey responses by Spanish members of the *RIA* editorial team, Orobón Fernández, and Eusebio Carbo, both well-known militants of the CNT, were also included in researching this article.

The Need for Considering Economic Factors before a Revolution

Perhaps the most prevalent subject among those that responded was what anarchists needed to do in the prerevolutionary period. According to the Italian Ugo Fedeli (writing under the pseudonym "Hugo Trene") the Russian Revolution had caused "terrible confusion" and demonstrated "that many of our programmes . . . were full of dangerous simplicities," whereas during the factory occupations Italian anarchists had shown "a lack of deficient knowledge of economic factors" and therefore "the economic possibilities of their country." This was, he argued, due to the fact that in the past anarchists had concentrated predominantly on the means of destroying the existing form of society rather than on how to rebuild or replace it, when in reality a revolution "cannot succeed, if it does not have [a society] to replace the old one that is destroyed." The basis for this new society had to be built in the prerevolutionary period. When the revolution came it would have to be defended both economically and militarily and this would depend on the preparedness of the masses. Anarchists needed to start replacing the defeated society immediately and this would be organized by three groups: anarchist affinity groups, unions, and consumer and production cooperatives needed to be the "cells of the future society." The affinity groups needed to be linked federally with the other local, regional, national, and international organizations and focus on propaganda and education. A key point was that the supply and distribution of goods would have to be organized from the revolution's first moment and this would be carried out by unions and cooperatives.

In unions, therefore, anarchists had to educate workers "in the libertarian nature of their struggle" and not to limit demands to reforms or to blindly

follow its leadership. Cooperatives would be responsible for the distribution of goods as well as some elements of production and would also have an important educational function, showing workers how to administer businesses and also how to use profits to create libraries and free schools. The role of the cooperatives was as vital as that of the unions, and so "it will be necessary to infuse the cooperatives with the [anarchist] spirit and conscience that they currently lack."[45]

Ugo Fedeli's position was similar to that of the French anarchist, Sebastien Faure, whose response to the survey was the most detailed of those received and was published in all three sections. Faure argued for a "moral entente" among anarchist groups, unions, and cooperatives. There must also be clear light among the three movements: "Anarchism, syndicalism and cooperativism must maintain their respective physiognomy and complete independence." In this way anarchists would not only be able to turn workers away from political planners but also, by uniting the forces of production and consumption, this would have sufficient strength "to overthrow capitalism and the state and stand up to any attempt to restore authoritarian rule."[46]

A further French survey response from Georges Bastien, a prominent member of the minority revolutionary syndicalist tendency in France, supported Faure and Fedeli's basic point that "a society cannot be improvised" and also agreed about the importance of unions and cooperatives. In both unions and cooperatives anarchists needed to adopt "a line of behaviour, both for the present and the future."[47] While writing in the French section, the Polish anarchist Isaak Gurfinkiel (writing under the pseudonym "Jean Walecki"), resident in France since April 1923, and secretary of the International Anarchist Committee, mirrored this general point: cooperatives were "essentially libertarian and anti-state" and would be "the base of the future organization . . . of social consumption" with unions and factory committees taking control of production.[48]

The survey responses from the Spanish participants were noticeable for the lack of reference to cooperation, specifically consumer cooperation. Indeed, there were fewer responses to the survey in the Spanish edition than the other two countries and most came from non-Spanish nationals, the most detailed from Faure, Fedeli, and Santillan. In-depth treatment of prerevolutionary economic policy was almost completely lacking from the Spanish texts. Indeed, the potential role and importance of cooperatives,

so prevalent in Italian and French responses, was completely absent in the Spanish responses. In fact, the only reference to cooperation in the Spanish section (with the exception of the survey response from Faure and Fedeli) being a rather general article by José Joseph, of whom little is known. This is surprising given that it was to be one of the key aspects of Joan Peiró, the prominent anarchist and former (and future) CNT national secretary, in his 1925 book, *Trayectoria de la CNT*.[49] The book by Peiró focused on the development of the role of cooperatives in both the prerevolutionary and immediate revolutionary periods as well as the need for anarchists to act within the cooperatives. Despite Peiró's arguments only a small section of the CNT showed any interest in cooperatives until the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War in 1936. [50]

Labor relations

Unions and cooperatives were, therefore, placed at the center of anarchist policies, at least for the French and Italians. Spanish responses focused on the relationship between anarchists and the unions and, for them at least, the concomitant concept of organization. In Spain, the depth of confusion caused by this relationship was reflected in the first two survey responses published in the Spanish edition of the *RIA*. The first, from the French anarchist, Pierre Beauchet (writing under the name "Pierre Mauldés") who was on the editorial board of *Le Libertaire*, argued that to put faith in the revolutionary potential of the unions was "a proposal to suffer the greatest delusions." The creation of an independent anarchist organization was the "only hope."[51] Whereas in the second response Abad de Santillan, from the Federación Obrera Regional Argentina (FORA), argued in favor of what he called the Anarchist Workers Organization (Movimiento Obrero anarquista [MOA]) which went beyond revolutionary or anarcho-syndicalism, where goals, tactics, and day-to-day policies should be on a clear anarchist basis, i.e., that unions would be run by anarchists along purely anarchist lines.[52]

The MOA would have a significant impact in Spain, although more due to its proponents' critique of syndicalism than its potential to be adopted by the CNT. This is evidenced by the often vitriolic and divisive attacks from Santillan and Lopez Arango, the other Forista proponent of the MOA among

prominent members of the CNT, including Eusebio Carbo and Valeriano Orobón Fernandez, both members of the *RIA* editorial team.[53] Carbo, a prominent figure in the CNT, argued that although this, in his opinion, should "always revolve in an orbit of our ideas," it did not mean that the CNT was, or should, "become anarchist." Anarchists should seek to influence the workers' movement, but not confuse this economic organization with a political one. He rejected outright "the material hegemony of anarchist groups in the economic organizations [unions]."[54] The anarchist movement had to be based on affinity groups and not on unions.

As Garner has shown, the majority of anarchists who were suspicious of reformist tendencies or revolutionary syndicalism also rejected the MOA.[55] The position put forward by Noja Ruiz, a prominent Spanish *RIA* correspondent, aptly summed up this position: "we agree [on the importance] of the labour organizations but confess that they do not seduce us . . . We can achieve a lot, however, in these organizations but only as long as we organize ourselves first," in order to have "a coordinated action in the labour organizations."[56] Wary of the potential dangers of becoming too dependent on the unions, but aware of the potential role these would play in any revolutionary action, anarchists needed to organize themselves outside the unions in order to have consistent and coordinated action within the unions. This position was not that different from the one put forward by the majority of anarchists who responded to the survey published in the French and Italian *RIA*s.

The Italian position on the relationship with the unions was also divided, although in the survey responses at least, there was a far clearer line drawn between anarchism and syndicalism. Luigi Fabbri, perhaps the most internationally known Italian anarchist of the time after Errico Malatesta (with whom he shared the same general outlook), argued that anarchists should join unions in their capacity as workers and propagate their ideas through words and actions "but without pretending to impose their ideas and methods on those who do not accept them, and without subordinating to the trade union's needs their specific task of anarchists." Fabbri's position was close to that of Malatesta, by far the best-known of Italian anarchists at that time. Fabbri argued that it was important not to confuse the function of anarchist organization with that of the syndicalist.[57] For Ugo Fedeli, the unions' role was not at the head of the revolution but rather that they served as a means to reach the workers and undertake an educational role.[58]

Camillo Bernari, an active member of the UAI, complained that during the recent social unrest too many anarchists had stayed out of the unions but he also complained that many of those who had joined had been forced to "subordinate their revolutionary initiative."[59] The arguments about the nature and importance of anarchists' role in unions were echoed by Carbo as well as those concerning the difference between anarchism and syndicalism.

However, there was also Italian opposition to an active syndicalist role in any revolutionary process whereas there was none in the Spanish responses. Tintino Persio Rasi (who wrote under the pseudonyms of Auro D'Arcola and Gold O' Bay), argued that "syndicalism is based on the principle of the class struggle, anarchism is founded on the opposite, the principle of the struggle against classes." Syndicalism was hierarchical and authoritarian and would lead to "the political and economic dictatorship of a class." "Anarchism has nothing in common with syndicalism, not its method, its system, its mentality and its aims. Together, they can only exist to the detriment of each other."[60] This position is similar to that of Mauldés, cited above.

It is important to note, however, that this position did not reflect the majority position in the survey responses published in the French and Italian *RIA*s. In the French *RIA*, Bastien also stressed the importance of acting within the unions to improve workers lives in present society as a means to gain workers' support and to show them a path towards revolution based on "practical achievements . . . the continuous struggle against the abuses of political or economic are an excellent authority are an excellent means of training for the revolution [gymnastique révolutionnaire]."[61] The importance of anarchists propagating their ideas within unions, but not confusing anarchism with syndicalism, was also made by Faure. Piotr Arshinov, a Ukrainian, whose writing was published in the French *RIA*, argued that for any revolution to be successful, workers' organizations' central role was in taking the factories from the bourgeoisie. Perhaps due to the relative weakness of the anarchist influence in the CGT, syndicalism did not play such a prominent role in French survey responses. According to André Respaut, "Syndicalism in France does not seem to be playing a major role at the moment, in the social movement," due to its divisions mainly among socialist, communist, and anarchist.[62] Anarchists were by far the weaker group, which perhaps explains the relative lack of focus on syndicalism in the

French survey. The main focus in French survey responses was on education as well as organization, the latter being the means of advancing the former.

Organizations and Organization

As has been seen, following the War, French and Italian anarchists had already created their own national organizations whereas it was only in 1923 that Spanish anarchists formed a national committee, although regional and local federations or groups did exist. For Luigi Fabbri, it was vital that anarchists in each country create their own organization with a clear program based on an anarcho-socialism.[63] For both Fabbri and Luigi Bertoni, organization and anarchy went hand in hand, the former was "eminently anarchist" and the latter was an "idea that was specifically based on organization," i.e., the creation of an anarchist organization was an integral part of their ideological activity, although this should be based on "the voluntary and free association of men" with no central committee or delegates.[64] Bernari argued that Italian anarchists needed to make the UAI "a combat organization capable of acting in a coordinated and synchronised manner," because too much energy was wasted in uncoordinated and sporadic action.[65] Again, the problem remained: how to create this coordinated body with the organization still retaining its loose voluntary nature?

This point was raised by Antonio Scottu (writing under the pseudonym, "Meteor"), a frequent contributor to the *RIAI*, who argued that no one had yet "succeeded in showing us an organic system of organization, based on representative principles that does not contradict anarchist doctrine." He felt that "the obsession with creating a programme and organization will follow the path to authoritarian socialism."[66] Any anarchist organization, he concluded, should remain at group level, and be based on the anarchist principles of voluntary membership and freedom of ideas: "Only in this way the selection, coordination and the tactical ability of our movement is only possible this way."[67]

Italian anarchists had recently experienced a potentially revolutionary situation and therefore related the relevance and need of an organization to their recent experience and cited the benefits of an organization that could help coordinate if events such as the factory occupations were to recur.

The need to create a specific anarchist organization in nonrevolutionary environments was more closely related to propaganda tasks and education. Giuseppe Bifolchi (writing under the pseudonym "Viola"), leader of the Italian section of the French UAF, argued that an anarchist "party" (the word "party," instead of "organization" was used by Malatesta, Fabbri, and other prominent members of the UAI) would help precisely in these areas.[68]

The focus on the relationship between the need to create a national organization, education, and action was a main theme in the French responses.[69] Pierre Beauchat (Mualdés) agreed that education and action depended on having an organization. A national federation (any national anarchist organization would have to be federally based) would provide a "moral and material liaison" for anarchist groups and would have greater financial resources, thus helping to organize effective propaganda.[70] Georges Bastien concurred: a powerful movement based on common action would be indispensable in preparing efficiently for the revolution.[71]

In his response, Faure said that he accepted that there had been those violently opposed to organization within anarchist ranks due to fears that centralization would lead to the dictatorship of some over others. However, he also accepted that few anarchists felt this to be completely true because recent events had led most anarchists to see the need for a certain level of organization. Federalism, he argued, would permit members of an organization to conserve their individuality whether it be at local, regional, or national level. The main task ahead for anarchists was to educate both themselves and the masses and it should be anarchist groups at different levels that would be responsible for a "most profound study of anarchism" and hence create "complete anarchists." For Faure, the greater the impulse given to education, the more vigorous and truly anarchist the action would be; the more developed the organization, the more coordinated the organization, the more coordinated and fruitful this action would be."[72] Georges Vidal, author and member of *Le Libertaire* editorial team, argued that at that moment anarchists did not have a clear idea of where they were going. Vidal was an intellectual so it should not be surprising that he emphasized the lack of education among anarchists: anarchists, as informed, thinking beings needed to have a better and deeper understanding of social and moral problems.[73]

In short, French anarchists seemed to be suggesting the weakness of the movement was due to a lack of understanding of anarchism and

contemporary society. The main focus of anarchist activity at the time, therefore, was to remedy this through education. This should start with the anarchists themselves and then with the workers via "educated" anarchists acting within unions and cooperatives). And for this to be effective, it needed to be organized within a clear structural framework.

Meanwhile, for André Colomer, an anarcho-syndicalist who was about to leave the anarchist movement for the French Communist Party, the creation of a strong organization was a prerequisite to help anarchists penetrate the working masses.[74] The French anarchist André Respaut (who also worked with the Catalan CNT) added a further dimension: an organization was even more important in France because at the time the syndicalist movement could not play an important role due to its divisions and the influence of politicians; hence, an organization was even more important.[75]

Yet there remained the problematic dichotomy of creating an effective organization able to coordinate activity that was also voluntary and decentralized. Although the majority of anarchists could now see the need for some form of organization, there was still division over the exact remit this should have. A number of French anarchists called for a clear program of action to avoid the pitfalls that had befallen anarchists in Russia and to avoid being simply a movement of opposition. For example, Claude Content, cofounder of the moderate libertarian newspaper *Le Semeur de Normandie,* believed that the anarchist failure in Russia was due to a lack of an organization and a clear program of action—in short, if anarchists wanted to progress from being simply an opposition movement they needed to organize and have a clear program. Bastien believed that workers would only follow a concrete program and if anarchists failed to provide one, they risked losing members to revolutionary syndicalism as had occurred in Argentina and Spain.[76]

The need for clarity did not simply relate to a program, but also related to anarchist education and propaganda, which, for Ugo Fedeli, needed to be revised. He felt that this was because the recent upheavals had shown that anarchist literature was often "utopian and overly exaggerated optimism" and had avoided tackling "practical questions" and hence had resulted in the movement being "restricted to a small circle of idealists."[77] Anarchists were talking to anarchists and not reaching out sufficiently to the masses. As the UAI program attested, it was easy to see what anarchists were against and wanted to destroy, but what was not clear was what they were going to replace

this with and how they were going to do it.[78] In short, anarchists needed to have a clear and achievable view of how revolution could be achieved that workers could relate to.[79]

The French *RIA* included a response from the Ukrainian anarchist, Peter Arshinov, who had taken part in the Makhnovshchina revolution and escaped from Russia following repression there, eventually relocating to France.[80] The Italian *RIA* published Arshinov's article on "The Problem of the first day of the Revolution," which expanded the ideas set out in his response to the Survey and that would subsequently be incorporated in the *Platform*, a program for anarchist action developed by the Dielo Truda group (formed by Russian anarchists living in exile), which first appeared in 1925. Arshinov wrote that during the Russian Revolution anarchist projects had been "abstract and contradictory." The masses were attracted to solid ideas and anarchists were in "perpetual disorganization." In his revision of tactics following the Russian Revolution, he stressed the need for a "precise programme for the day after the revolution." This program should be broken down into four areas: the organization of industry, agriculture, and consumption and the defense of the revolution. The revolution had to "nourish, clothe and house" all the hungry, ragged and homeless." The most important task for anarchists was to help workers "to expropriate factories from the bourgeoisie, to make it function immediately.[81] All this required organization and a clear, developed program.

Conclusion

The OIEA, perhaps the strongest example of an anarchist transnational project in the postwar period, and definitely so within Europe, had an overarching international focus that was amply demonstrated in the *RIA*. The *RIA*'s aim to create links between all anarchists of the world was only partially achieved, it was predominantly a European affair (despite reports on movements elsewhere and a few articles by non-European anarchists). It did, however, provide a forum for the exchange of ideas between leading anarchists of all the main tendencies in a period of confusion and reappraisal following the revolutionary wave of the postwar period and the subsequent repression. The survey therefore gave each national group the possibility to

explain what, from their experience, needed to be improved or changed and in so doing also presented in a general way, ideas that could be beneficial to the anarchist movement both internationally and for other national groups.

The responses show the influence of "cross-national" thinking. There are evident differences in focus between French, Spanish, and Italian anarchists and their sections in the *RIA*, but at the same time there was a clear convergence of basic ideas on the organizational and tactical necessities that crossed these national lines.

The Spanish section showed a relative obsession with union politics, even when agreeing for the need to create a specific anarchist organization, and the focus was always on the CNT. The Labor movement, and its central role in a revolutionary policy was a fundamental aspect of the Spanish section of the *RIA*, to the detriment of aspects mentioned in the other sections, in particular the potential role of cooperatives. Although many Italian survey responders saw the importance of the labor movement, they did not make it a central issue and some were dismissive of its role, warning against its bureaucratic and reformist tendencies. Some French survey responders doubted whether the unions needed to be central to policy and tactics, especially in relation to the relative weakness of the anarchists in the labor movement at the time. In general, the French response accepted the need to organize but focused their attention on the role of education.

Nonetheless, there was general agreement by anarchists from all three countries in relation to the areas covered in the survey. The need to prepare for any revolutionary situation and creating a national organization, organized federally, for the purpose of education and clarifying for the masses anarchist ideas and positions, especially within unions and cooperatives. In unions and cooperatives anarchists should also educate themselves on the operation of the economy and thus learn the knowledge necessary to understand production and distribution of vital goods and be able to maintain them during a revolutionary transition.

However, looking beyond the generalizations, differences and divisions were also evident, not so much along national lines but across them. In particular, this was in relation to the question of creating a national organization, how it could achieve its goals, and particularly the dichotomy between individual or group freedom and the need for a coherent and coordinated action. This mistrust of organizations and their potential to lead to hierarchical

and even authoritarian decision-making procedures was also reflected in the position towards syndicalism. Any revolution needed the active support of the labor movement, but this entailed the danger of centralization and bureaucracy mentioned above. How to overcome these differences was not really explained, the hope being that by acting along the lines outlined, anarchists would be better prepared when a new revolutionary process presented itself, and that any remaining disagreements would be solved by the logic and necessity of the period. As has been seen, the *RIA* survey brought together and presented the ideas of prominent anarchists, predominantly from three countries, to a transnational audience, which represented an important step in the necessary reappraisal of tactics, both on national and international grounds, showing a broadly similar outlook. However, it also exposed the cross-nationality of the differences and difficulties facing the movement and its future. The survey represents an attempt to reappraise tactics in the light of the failures during the revolutionary unrest following the First World War in order to be better prepared next time. However, with the exception of Spain, where revolution was the by-product of the Civil War and where these differences continued to divide the movement, this next time would never come.

Notes

1. Constance Bantmann, *The French Anarchists in London, 1880–1914. Exile and Transnationalism in the First Globalisation* (Liverpool, UK: Liverpool University Press, 2012), 187. See also Jason Garner and José Benclowicz, "A Failure of Praxis? European Revolutionary Anarchism in Revolutionary Situations, 1917–1923," *Left History* 1, no.1 (2021): 10–44.
2. Sebastian Faure, "Nuestra encuesta . . . ," *RIAS*, 15 April 1925; and L'Oeuvre Internationale des ëditions Anarchistes fonde "*La Revue Internationale Anarchiste*," *La Revue Internationale Anarchiste*, 15 November 1924. See also Antonia Senta, *Momenti di storia dell'anarchismo. Tre percorse tra Otoo e Novevento* (Bologna, Italy: BraDypUS, 2016), 41; and Jason Garner, *Goals and Means*: *Anarchism, Syndicalism and Internationalism in the Origins of the Federación Amarquista Ibérica* (Oakland, CA: AK Press, 2016). A large amount of the funds were donated by the Spanish anarchist group Los Solidarios;

see Abel Paz, *Durruti en la Revolución Española*, (Madrid, Spain: Fundación Anselmo Lorenzo, 1996), 119–20.

3. "La Revista Internacional Anarquista a sus Lectores," *RIA*S, 15 November 1924.
4. "Le Redazione, Per entrare in discurso," *RIAI,* April 1925.
5. Many previous journals in Spain, United States, France, Switzerland, etc., had previously published pages or sections in a second language, but the RIA was the first to be published in three languages in sections of equal length.
6. "La Revue International Anarchiste se transfome," *RIAF*, June, 1925.
7. Constance Bantmann and Bert Altena, eds., *Reassessing the Transnational Turn: Scales of Analysis in Anarchist and Syndicalist Studies* (Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2017).
8. See Florencia Peyrou and Darina Martykánová, "Presentación," *Ayer* 2, no. 94 (2014): 13–22; and José Moya, "Anarchism" in *The Palgrave Dictionary of Transnational History: From the Mid-19th century to the Present Day*, ed. Akira Iriye and Pierre-Yves Saunier (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 39–41.
9. Davide Turcato, "The Other Nation: The Places of the Italian Anarchist Press in the USA," in *Historical Geographies of Anarchism: Early Critical Geographers and Present-Day Scientific Challenges*, ed. Federico Ferretti, Gerónimo Barrera de la Torre, Anthony Ince and Francisco Toro (London: Routledge, 2018), 40–64. On a similar line, Levy, in referring to the Italian anarchist Errico Malatesta, talks of the "binomial," the "interlacing of homeland and exile" of "local patriotism and cosmopolitanism." Carl Levy, "The Rooted Cosmopolitan: Errico Malatesta, Syndicalism, Transnationalism and the International Labour Movement," in *New Perspectives on Anarchism, Labour and Syndicalism*, ed. David Berry and Constance Bantmann (Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars, 2010), 61–79.
10. Davide Turcato, "European Anarchism in the 1890s: Why Labor Matters in Categorizing Anarchism," *WorkingUSA* 12, no. 3 (2009): 451–66.
11. Michel Dreyfus, *Histoire de la C.G.T. Cent ans du syndicalisme en France* (Brussels, Belgium: Editions Complexe, 1995), 109–42; and Nicholas Papayanis, *Alphonse Merrheim: The Emergence of Reformism in Revolutionary Syndicalism, 1871–1925* (Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff, 1985), 33–112.
12. Archives Nationales de France (ANF), Files F/7/12948 (Notices sur le movement et associations), January 1922 and F/7/15955 (Faure), 28 February 1922.
13. Hugo Trene, "Sulla crisi del movimento anarchico francese," *La Tempra*, 20 September, 1925; Sebastián Clara, "El movimiento obrero en Francia," *Solidaridad Obrera*, 19 March 1931; Ricardo Sanz, *El sindicalismo español antes de la Guerra Civil (Los Hijos del Trabajo)* (Barcelona, Spain: Petronio, 1976), 186. Juan García Oliver talks of the

"decadent French pure anarchists" *in El eco de los pasos* (Barcelona, Spain: Ruedo Ibérico, 1978), 83–84. See also "Desde Francia," *Alba Social*, 1 April 1923. This position is reflected in much of the modern historiography; see, for example, Alexander Varias, *Paris and the Anarchists: Aesthetes and Subversives during the* Fin de Siécle (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996), and Richard Sonn, *Anarchism and Cultural Politics in* Fin de Siécle *France* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989). For a more detailed focus on the French anarchist movement, see David Berry, *A History of the French Anarchist movement, 1917 to 1945*, (Oakland, CA: AK Press, 2009), and Constance Bantmann and David Berry, "The French Anarchist Movement and the First World War," in *Anarchism, 1914–18: Internationalism, Anti-Militarism and War*, ed. Matthew S. Adams and Ruth Kinna (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2017).

14. Berry, *History of the French Anarchist Movement,* 30; and Alexandre Skirda, *Facing the Enemy: A History of Anarchist Organization from Proudhon to May 1968* (Edinburgh, UK: AK Press 2002), 117.
15. Garner and Benclowicz, "A Failure of Praxis?"
16. Figures come from Carl Levy, *Gramsci and the Anarchists* (Oxford: Berg, 1999), 119. The UAI newspaper, *Umanita Nova*, which at its height (in 1920) had a readership of 50,000 but soon fell victim to censorship and repression, being published irregularly and having to move its offices from city to city before being published by exiles abroad in the United States starting in 1924. Franco Schirone, *Cronache Anarchiche. Il giornale Umanità Nova nell'Italia del Novecento (1920–45)* (Milan, Italy: Zero in Condatta, 2010).
17. Marco Masulli, "El sindicalismo de acción directa italiano en perspectiva transnacional: redes militantes y conexiones políticas y organizativas entre Francia y España," *Pasado y Memoria. Revista de Historia Contemporánea* 20 (2020): 67–91.
18. Antonio Senta, *Luigi Galleani e l'anarchismo antiorganizzatore*. Paper presented at the European Social Science History Conference, Glasgow, Scotland, 11–14 April 2012, https://ar1lib.org/book/12252081/2d88d4.
19. This point was made by the USI president Armando Borghi, quoted in Paul Avrich, *Voces Anarquistas. Historia oral del anarquismo en Estados Unidos* (Madrid, Spain: Fundación de Estudios Libertarios Anselmo Lorenzo, 2004), 230.
20. Fabrizo Giulietti, *Gli anarchici italiani dalla grande guerra al fascismo* (Milan, Italy: FrancoAngeli SRL, 2015), 104–13.
21. Renato Souvarine, "Polemica pro anarchism," *L'Avvenire Anarchico*, 28 April 1922; Renato Souvarine, "Non Possimos . . . ," *L'Avvenire Anarchico*, 17 November 1922; and Renato Souvarine, "Basi, struttura e funzioni "gerarchiche" dell'Unione Anarchica Italiana

and La responsabilita dell' U.A.I. nella rivoluzione mancata del '19–20," *L'Avvenire Anarchico*, 13 and 27 October 1922.

22. Maurizio Antonioli, "La nascita dell'UAI e gli anarchici individualisti e antiorganizzatori," in *L'Unione Anarchica italiana: Tra rivoluzione europea e reazione fascista (1919–1926)* (Milan, Italy: Zero in condotta, 2006), 97–110. Individualist anarchism still existed although there was general agreement that the anarcho-individualist tendency was weakened by the postwar experience. Fausto Buttà, *Living Like Nomads: The Milanese Anarchist Movement before Fascism* (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars, 2015), 195.
23. Luigi di Lembo, "La tradizione dell'anarchismo federato," in *L'Unione Anarchica italiana. Tra rivoluzione europea e reazione fascista (1919–1926)* (Milan, Italy: Zero in condotta, 2006), 13–27.
24. Carlos Molashi, "L'attivita degli anarchici nei Sindacati," *Pensiero e Volonta*, 1 April, 1925.
25. Hugo Trene [Ugo Fedeli], "Il nostre movimiento in Francia," *Il Risveglio*, 19 January, 1924.
26. Spartaco Stagnetti, "Sull'unita sindacle," *Fede*, 5 April 1925.
27. Italo [Garinei?], "Appunti critici sul movimiento anarchico in Italia," *RIAI*, 15 April 1925. Auro D'Arcola [Tintino Persio Rasi], "La Chiave di volta," *RIAI*, 15 May 1925.
28. See Garner, *Goals and Means*; Josep Termes, *História del movement anarquista a Espanya* (Barcelona, Spain: L'Avenc, 2011); and Julián Vadillo Muñoz, *Historia de la CNT: Utopía, pragmatismo y revolución* (Madrid, Spain: Catarata, 2019).
29. Antonio Elorza, "La génesis de la Federación Anarquista Ibérica," *Revista de Trabajo,* nos. 39, 40, and 44–45 (1972): 123–218. Against this, see, for example, Garner, *Goals and Means*, and Julián Vadillo Muñoz, *Historia de la FAI: El anarquismo organizado* (Madrid, Spain: Catarata, 2021).
30. For an examination of the constant attempts at creating regional organizations, and the creation of the National Committee, as well as the subsequent creation in late 1926 and early 1927 of the National Federation of Anarchist Groups, which would be the embryo for the Spanish section of the FAI created in 1927 by Spanish and Portuguese anarchists, see Garner, *Goals and Means*, 69–75 and 137–49.
31. The figures are taken from Termes, *Història del moviment anarquista a Espanya*, 304–5.
32. Jason Garner, "Separated by an 'Ideological Chasm': The Spanish National Labour Confederation and Bolshevik Internationalism, 1917–1922," *Contemporary European History* 15, No. 3 (2006): 293–326.
33. French National Archives, file F/7/13442 (Espagne), 16 March 1922.

34. Archives de la Prefecture de la Police (Paris), Police Reports 15 November 1924 and 13 August 1924. There were definitely two "national Committees": one for exiles in France and one representing the national movement in Spain. Disagreements led to the National Committee returning to Spain in 1924. The clandestine nature of the Committee means there is little information available on it.
35. Garner, *Goals and Means*, 172.
36. E. C. Carbo, "Pasado y presente de España: Experiencias dolorosas," *RIAS*, December 1924; Hugo Trene [Ugo Fedeli], "Una consultazione mundiale," *RIAI,* January 1925.
37. Trene, "Una consultazione mundiale."
38. H. Noja Ruiz, "Mosaico," *RIAS*, November 1924; Camillo Berneri, "Una consultazione mundiale," *RIAI*, January 1925; Eusebio C. Carbo, "Revisionismo," *RIAS*, January 1925.
39. V. Oróbon Fernandez, "La Filosofia Anarquista y el momento actual," *RIAS*, December 1924.
40. V. Orobón Fernandez, "La anarquia subjetivista de Paul Gille," *RIAS*, January 1925.
41. Hugo Trene [Ugo Fedeli], "L'anarchismo ed i suoi mezzi internazionali d'azione e lotta," *RIAI*, 15 February 1925.
42. "Gran Encuesta mundial," "Une Consultation Mondiale," and "Una Consultazion Mondiale," *RIAS, RIAF, RIAI*, 15 November 1924.
43. Hugo Trene [Ugo Fedeli], "I compiti immediate e future dell'anarchismo durante la rivoluzione," *RIAI*, 15 June 1925.
44. María Migueláñez Martínez, "Más allá de las fronteras: El anarquismo argentino en el periodo de entreguerras," PhD, Universidad Autónoma Madrid, 2018, 86–93.
45. Hugo Trene [Ugo Fedeli], "Una parola sulla stampa anarchica de lingua Italiana," *RIAI*, 15 November 1924; Trene, "I compiti immediati e futuri dell'anarchismo durante la rivoluzione"; Hugo Trene [Ugo Fedeli], "Nuestra encuesta . . . . . ," *RIAS*, 15 June 1925; Hugo Trene [Ugo Fedeli], "Anarchismo e Cooperativismo," *RIAI*, 15 May 1925; Trene, "Una consultazione mundiale."
46. Faure, "Nuestra encuesta. . . . . ."
47. Georges Bastien, "Une Consultation Mondiale," *RIAF*, 15 December, 1924.
48. Isaak Gurfinkiel [Jean Walecki], "Une Consultation Mondiale," *RIAF*, 15 February, 1925.
49. Juan Peiró, *Trayectoria de la CNT, Barcelona* (Barcelona, Spain: Ediciones Jucar 1979). Two of the eleven chapters are dedicated to the role of cooperativism as part of a constructive element of the CNT's future.
50. Jason Garner and José Benclowicz, "Entre la reproducción del capitalismo y la preparación de la revolución: el anarcosindicalismo catalán ante el cooperativismo (1900–1939),"

Archivos de Historia del Movimiento Obrero Y La Izquierda 10, no. 19 (2021): 157–77, https://doi.org/10.46688/ahmoi.n19.325.

51. Pierre Mualdés, "La Labor inmediata del anarquismo," *RIAS*, 15 December 1924.
52. Emilio López Arango and Diego Abad de Santillán, *El anarquismo en el movimiento obrero*, (Barcelona, Spain: Cosmos, 1925).
53. E. C. C. [Eusebio Carbo], "El eclipse de la cordialidad," *RIAS*, 15 April 1925; Orobón Fernández, "Para el diario 'La Protesta': Una precisa calificación a sus insolventes redactores," *El Libertario* (Buenos Aires), October 31, 1925; Orobón Fernández, "Contumaces en la Calumnia," *Tiempos Nuevos*, September 10, 1925.
54. Eusebio Carbo, "Variaciones sobre lo mismo," *RIAS*, 15 February 1925.
55. Garner, *Goals and Means*, 169–86.
56. Noja Ruiz, "Sobre una encuesta," *RIAS*, 15 January 1925.
57. Luigi Fabbri, "Risposta al questionario," *RIAI*, 15 March, 1925.
58. Trene, "I compiti immediati e futuri dell'anarchismo durante la rivoluzione."
59. Camillo Berneri, "Una consultazione mundiale," *RIAI*, 15 January 1925.
60. Auro D'Arcola [Tintino Persio Rasi],"Sindacalismo, partitismo e individualismo nell'anarchismo," *RIAI*, 15 February 1925; Gold O' Bay [Tintino Persio Rasi], "Una Consultazione Mondiale," *RIAI*, 15 December 1924.
61. Bastien, "Une Consultation Mondiale."
62. Anfre Respaut, "Une Consultation Mondiale," *RIAF*, 15 March 1925.
63. Luigi Fabbri, "Risposta al questionario," *RIAI*, 15 March 1925.
64. Luigi Fabbri, "¿La anarquia es un partido?," *RIAS*, 15 March 1925; L. Bertoni, "Une Consultation Mondiale," *RIAF*, 15 March 1925.
65. Camillo Berneri, "Una consultazione mundiale," *RIAI*, 25 January 1925.
66. Meteor [Antonio Scottu], "L'irrealismo dei realizzatori," *RIAI*, 15 May 1925.
67. Meteor [Antonio Scottu], "Per una nuova e piú sana formazione dei gruppi anarchici," *RIAI*, 15 June 1925.
68. Viola [Giuseppe Bifolchi], "Une Consultation Mondiale," *RIAF*, 15 April 1925.
69. Albert Soubervielle, "Une Consultation Mondiale," *RIAF*, 15 January 1925.
70. Pierre Mualdés, "Une Consultation Mondiale," *RIAF*, 15 December 1924. The article was also published. although with sections censured, in *Solidaridad Proletaria*, 10 January 1925.
71. Bastien, "Une Consultation Mondiale."
72. Faure, "Nuestra encuesta mundial . . ."
73. Georges Vidal, "Une Consultation Mondiale," *RIAF*, 15 March 1925.
74. André Colomer, "Une Consultation Mondiale," *RIAF*, 15 April 1925.

75. André Respaut, "Une Consultation Mondiale," *RIAF,* 15 March 1925.
76. G. B. [Georges Bastien], " Setta o Partito," *RIAI*, 15 May 1925; Content, "Une Consultation Mondiale," *RIAF*, 15 January 1925; J. Chazoff, "Une Consultation Mondiale," *RIAF*, 15 January 1925; Georges Vidal, "Une Consultation Mondiale," *RIAF*, 15 March, 1925.
77. Hugo Trene [Ugo Fedeli], "Bibliografia," *RIAI*, 15 January 1925.
78. The program is reproduced in Vernon Richards, ed., *Errico Malatesta: His Life & Ideas*, (London: Freedom Press, 1993), 182–98.
79. Gurfinkiel, "Une Consultation Mondiale."
80. For information on the Makhnovschina, see Alexandr Shubin, "The Maknhovist Movement and the National Question in the Ukraine, 1917–1921," in *Anarchism and Syndicalism in the Colonial and Postcolonial World, 1870–1940,* ed. Steven Hirsch and Lucien van der Walt (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2010), 147–91, as well as the classic work of Peter Arshinov, *History of the Makhnovist Movement, 1918–1921* (London: Freedom Press, 1987).
81. P. Archinoff [Piotr Arshinov], "Une Consultation Mondiale," *RIAF*, no.7, 15 May 1925; P. Archinoff [Piotr Arshinov], "Il problema del primo giorno della rivoluzione," *RIAI*, 15 March 15 April and 15 May 1925. The articles had previously been published in the French anarchist press (but not in the *RIAF*).