Political conflict in the International Workers' Association, 1864-1877

A W Zurbrugg

INTRODUCTION 2
German Socialism 6
The International in France 10
Politics in Switzerland 13
Politics Elsewhere 14
The International in Switzerland 18
The Basel Congress 22
Unity, Debate and Expulsion 25
Accountability and Control 30
Delusions 37
A Non-sectarian International? 39
The Ongoing International 57
Conclusion 69
Appendix 1: The Basel Congress of the International, 1869. 77
[A] Summary and extracts of the report of the opening day's discussion, on the Congress agenda and on state politics. 77
Appendix 2: Resolutions of the Saint-Imier Congress of the International Workers' Association, 15-16 September 1872. 82
Appendix Three: Geneva, 1873 Congress. 87
[A] Strikes and Trades Organisation – Congress discussion (extracts) and resolution. 87
[B] Revised General Statutes of the International Workers' Association, 1866/1873. 88
Appendix Four – Bakunin's last letter to Élisée Reclus. 91

Appendix Five – Resolutions of the Congresses of Verviers and Ghent, 5 to 8 September, and 9 to 14 September, 1877. 93
The tendencies of modern production and property. 93
Politics and political parties.....94
On the organisation of trades' organisations 96

KEY SOURCES:.....97
Chronology (International events and events in particular countries.) 98

The Abbreviation 'IWA' is used for the International Workers' Association (AIT in French sources). Short details on many of the persons mentioned in this text are given in end-notes. These usually occur after the first reference to an individual. Square brackets identify matter introduced by author.

Introduction

Socialism it has been said, has two souls.[1] The content of this metaphor may be explored in the conflict in the International Workers' Association (First International) between Social-democratic 'authoritarians' and Anarchist 'anti-authoritarians'. This conflict is still an evocative moment in labour history and resonates today, continuing to strike cords – or discords – amongst socialists.

When one considers terms such as Communist, Party, Politics and Union not all is as it might seem – the meaning of these terms differed as they were defined in varied contexts. Ideas of class were shaped by particular factors with distinct resonances. Many workers were seen as servants, lacking human dignity whilst the family's bread-winner – often an independent (male) artisan, was of a higher status, above the manual unskilled worker or the women worker – whatever skill she might have. The International Worker's Association (IWA) would discuss if its membership should be confined to manual workers; intellectuals were sometimes viewed as outside and distinct from the working class. This

was an age of migration. French, German, Italian and other migrant communities would preserve distinct identities in new locations; they would organise and publish newspapers in their own languages, helping to shape new socialist traditions drawing on experience from older homelands. The experience of migrants varied: some found it easier to assimilate, other were not respected and were seen as social inferiors.

Conflicts over priorities among Social-democrats and revolutionary socialists (who would later call themselves anarchists) addressed relations between varied forms of organisation, with a variety of priorities, working in several contexts, with varied levels of development. For example: 'The International does not repel politics in general; it cannot avoid getting itself involved as long as it is constrained to struggle against the bourgeois class. It rejects only bourgeois politics and religion, because the one creates the exploitation and domination of the bourgeoisie whilst the other blesses and sanctifies it.'[2] In this perspective 'politics' focussed on the construction and development of solidarity across a range of class structures and movements. This was the politics of the 'Commune-republic';[3] viewing large nation states as a militaristic, nationalistic nemesis bent on the destruction of more accountable localised community structures. Others viewed electoral politics as an excellent avenue for propaganda; they saw the strength of the International best exemplified in the German Social-democratic Workers' Party. Parties were like armies, and as with armies a strong central leadership was crucial;[4] for them centralised states, despite the intentions of their rulers might serve to facilitate progressive change.

National antagonisms were commonplace and unhelpful. Marx and Engels were wont to disrespect other nationalities, most especially Slavs. They saw Russia as a centre of reaction,[5] and had called for a new Germany to come together in a war against Tsarist Russia. Bakunin asked: was there anything to choose between a pan-Germanic Empire and a Tsarist Empire? In his view both were brutal, but the German Empire was both brutal and 'savant' [scientific].[6] He saw Bismarck as the leader of reaction.[7] He cast empires as monsters.

> Their very principle is that civilized nations should conquer barbarians. It is the application of Darwin's law to international

> politics. As a consequence of this natural law, civilised nations, being ordinarily stronger, must either place barbarian peoples under the yoke of the exploiter, or exterminate them; or so they say, civilise them. Thus is permission given for North Americans to gradually exterminate Indians, for Britons to exploit oriental Indians, for the French to conquer Algeria and lastly for the Germans to civilise Slavs...[8]

Bakunin, provoked by repeated accusations that he was a spy for the Tsar, used abusive 'German Jewish' epithets against his accusers. A new industrial power emerged in the newly united Germany after the Franco-Prussian war. Italian unification was also advanced in this crisis. France had been an Empire and became a republic, but only after a period of civil war and the decimation of radical Paris. A short lived republic was set up in Spain. This was a time in which the form and content of states was changing. Years later, in 1914, James Guillaume[9] would motivate support for the defence of France in terms of resisting reactionary German imperialism.[10]

Social or socialist democracy, or social-democratic-republican might cover a multitude of sins. In the Swiss Jura region one Social-democratic-republican party broke up when some members sought to build an alliance with royalists[11] for a first-past-the-post election. Their leader, a Dr Pierre Coullery,[12] had been a pioneer of the IWA, and had edited and produced a journal *Le Voix de l'Avenir* that circulated for some time as the organ of the French-Swiss Romande IWA federation. In southern Germany Social-democracy emerged in symbiosis with democratic and populist bourgeois parties. Members of the International Workers' Association had varied priorities and often found themselves in disagreement with one another.

However conflict was not the whole story. There was also co-operation between those who would later become enemies. Those who later became known as 'Anarchists' would value Marx's *Capital.* Marx would send a letter of appreciation to Carlo Cafiero thanking him for his popular abridgement of *Capital.*[13] In its short life the Paris Commune involved partisans of various radical persuasions, and both Bakunin and Marx recognised its heroic features. In London Marx befriended Paul

Robin,[14] before and after his bitter critic. And in Geneva Johann Philipp Becker,[15] worked openly in close proximity with Bakunin for over a year in the Alliance for Socialist Democracy.[16] Both supported a strike of local building workers',[17] and sought to promote the labour movement both in the region and further afield. This Alliance – later denounced by Marx and Engels as a dread and secret conspiracy out to destroy the International – had Becker as its Vice-President. It was set up as an 'Enemy of every despotism, recognising no political forms other than the republican form, absolutely rejecting every reactionary alliance, and every political activity which did not have as its aim the immediate and direct triumph of the cause of labour against Capital.'[18] Despite the hard feeling created by the congress of the Hague in 1872, a range of 'anti-authoritarians' and 'authoritarians' came together at the IWA's Bern congress of 1876, and agreed to meet together for a Universal Socialist Congress. For a time the Socialist Party was conceived of as a diverse body encompassing diverse streams. So, despite disagreements, there were times when all sorts of socialists looked some common ground.

Bakunin has been labelled by historians as an Anarchist, but that was not the label that he used. Anarchism may have been evolving before 1875, but it was only later in the century that those who were to call themselves Anarchists began to adopt the Anarchist label; earlier they had more often described themselves as federalists, collectivists and revolutionary socialists, in opposition to the bourgeois socialists who worked with and became much like liberal bourgeois politicians. Bakunin and his collaborators believed that much 'politics' divided the movement; they had in mind the two sorts of 'politics' that they encountered: the politics of the bourgeoisie – a politics, which might be radical or liberal, but did not seek labour emancipation; and the politics of electoral socialists. The latter may have had labour emancipation in mind, but through their use of hierarchical and bourgeois state forms they placed workers in the service of the bourgeoisie, subordinating economic liberation to the winning of the battle for 'democracy'. Bakunin and his allies had another concept of politics – the politics of promoting responsible, accountable, federal structures where labour interests might predominate.

German Socialism

Marx and Engels had high hopes for the labour movement and the IWA before the Franco-Prussian war: 'when the next revolution comes, and that will perhaps be sooner than might appear, we (i.e. you and I) will have this mighty instrument in our hands.'[19] When war broke out in 1870 one French IWA paper commented: 'Is this war justified? Is it national? No. It is purely dynastic. In the name of democracy and humanity, of the true interests of France, we energetically support the protests of the International against the war.'[20] Shortly after the outbreak of war Marx and Engels exchanged letters observing:

> The French need a thrashing. If the Prussians win, the centralisation of the state power will be useful for the centralisation of the German working class. German predominance would also transfer the centre of gravity of the workers' movement in Western Europe from France to Germany, and *one has only to compare the movement in the two countries from 1866 till now to see that the German working class is superior to the French both theoretically and organisationally*. Their predominance over the French on the world stage would also mean the predominance of our theory over Proudhon's, etc.[21]

Such thoughts did not remain private.[22] They were shared with some of the leaders of the German Social-democratic movement, and the latter published extracts in their press. This is not to say that Marx and Engels were out and out nationalists. Like leading German Social-democrats they opposed the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine.[23] Social-democrat in parliament refused to vote for credits for the war against France[24] and suffered prosecution and imprisonment. Some Social-democrats were moved to oppose Prussian dominance in a Pan-German state. But Marx and Engels saw the unification of Germany through a lens that on more than one occasion confused national and party-political interests. Thus it was argued that: 'Bismarck, as in 1866, is at present doing a bit of *our* work for *us*, in his own way and without meaning to, but all the same he is doing it. He is clearing the ground for *us* better than before.'[25] Was Bismarck really aiding the labour movement?[26] The '*us*' referred to here was for the most part the German Social-democratic

Workers' Party. Marx had singled it out in the report of the General Council to the Basel Congress of the IWA in 1869:

> At the recent Eisenach Congress the delegates of 150,000, German workmen, from Germany proper, Austria, and Switzerland, have organised a new democratic social party, with a programme *literally embodying the leading principles of our Statutes*.[27]

That report also remarked on several bitter strikes – for example in Basel, Lyon and Rouen and noted the formation of trade unions in Germany, but did not note similar strike action there. Seven delegates resident in Germany attended the Basel congress: a teacher, a student, three media workers, a tanner and a weaver.[28] Of the 26 delegates resident in France who attended, just one worked in the media whilst the rest were workers. The size and depth of the French delegation, organising despite state repression, and drawing on a strong network of IWA sections and councils, contrasts with its German counterpart.

In France the membership of IWA was expanding rapidly; estimates range from tens of thousands and – with some exaggeration – go as high as a quarter of a million.[29] The IWA worked next to and influenced a wide range of workers' organisations and here and elsewhere the estimated size of the IWA's membership may vary if allied or nominally affiliated bodies are included in membership figures. However government repression obstructed cohesive organisation; certain sections was disrupted, key members were arrested and imprisoned, and the IWA was unable to hold national congresses. When opportunities came in the autumn of 1870 and the spring of 1871 many IWA members would participate in rebel movements, but there was no cohesive organisation fit to take a lead. One of the historic personalities of the movement – Henri Tolain – was censored by the Parisian IWA for his failure to support the Commune. Most local activists did support the revolt, although there was no clear consensus as to what priorities should be. Later exiles from the Commune remarked that their organisation in the International Workers' Association in France had gone some way to prepare the way for that insurrection.

The wider picture of the development of the IWA may not have been known to many members of the London General Council. For example the minutes of its meetings that followed on from the Basel congress – as published – would have provided little help to those seeking an understanding of what had happened there.[30] They inform of congress arrangements and regulations, about how congress delegates mixed, and tell of a pleasant evening spent en route in Paris. They say 'the most important vote was that on the land question' which passed with a bigger majority, but the ideological and political controversies that had been a feature of the congress, e.g. on electoral politics and inheritance, are not discussed. If the discussion of the congress was accurately reported in these minutes then members of the council who knew only this report and discussion could have had no real understanding of the issues that had been discussed in Basel.[31]

Although there were groups of German workers living in London the IWA General Council was unable to develop regular contacts in Germany. On 29 September 1871 Marx wrote to Gustav Kwasniewski: 'At the International Workers' Association [London] Conference, Germany was not represented either by delegates or by reports, and no financial contributions have been received since September 1869.' Marx was not unaware that German law prevented the affiliation of the Social-democratic Workers' Party, but he went on to remark that laws 'cannot prevent the organisation of the Social-democratic Workers' Party from carrying out the same tasks *in practice* as are performed in every other country, tasks such as enrolling individual members, paying dues, sending in reports, etc.' Marx and Engels were evidently frustrated by a relationship which they described as 'platonic'. In practice then, there was little or no support forthcoming for the IWA from the Eisenacher party which according to Marx embodied the leading principles of IWA Statutes.[32]

The key demands of the Eisenachers were:

> 1. Granting of universal, equal, direct, and secret suffrage to all men aged 20 and over for elections to the [North German] parliament, the parliaments [Landtage] of the German states, the provincial and municipal assemblies, and any other

> representational bodies. The elected parliamentary deputies are to be granted adequate per diem pay. 2. Introduction of direct legislation (i.e., the right to make and reject proposals) through the people. 3. Abolition of all privileges attached to class, property, birth, and religious faith. 4. Establishment of a people's militia in place of standing armies. 5. Separation of the church from the state and of schools from the church. 6. Obligatory classes in elementary schools and free instruction at all public educational institutes. 7. Independence of the courts; introduction of trial by jury and specific trades' courts; introduction of public and oral court proceedings, as well as the administration of justice at no cost. 8. Abolition of all laws aimed against the press, associations, and labour unions; introduction of the normal workday; restriction of female labour and a ban on child labour. 9. Abolition of all indirect taxes and introduction of one progressive income tax and inheritance tax. 10. State support of the co-operative system and state loans for free producers' co-operatives subject to democratic guarantees.

If such priorities were those of the IWA then what was suggested here was that the IWA was tasked mainly with promoting state-sponsored co-operatives and the civil rights of the worker – one presumes the male worker.

Here and elsewhere in the IWA there was little consideration of women workers and their interests. There were mass strikes of textile workers – mostly women – in 1868-9 in Lyons and in Basel, and these had some impact on the recruitment of members to the IWA. Some members of the IWA,[33] had argued for 'equal pay for equal work', whilst a less-enlightened section in Paris had once resolved: 'The place of women is in the home, not outside, nature has made here a nurse and homemaker, we do not divert her away from her path, away from such social functions; labour and the study of human problems is for men, childcare and building beauty for the home life of the (male) worker is for women.'[34] The Spanish IWA would later conclude: 'to restrict women to doing only domestic work, is to place her in a position of dependence on men, and in consequence to deprive her of freedom. What means are there to make women free? There is only work.'[35] In 1871 the London conference passed a resolution encouraging female participation.

As its full title suggested – the International Working Men's Association was not a body that always prioritised gender equality. Where men were expected to earn the family wage, women were expected to maintain the home. In Geneva there was a *section des dames* (ladies' section) in the local IWA but according to Bakunin his wife was not well received there, because these ladies saw her as a threat to their comfortable bourgeois order. Men were expected to express opinions and perhaps women were not. The strikes of women workers in Lyons and Basel, shortly before the Basel congress of 1869, did not have the consequence of creating female leaders or delegates. Bakunin held a mandate as delegate from Lyons, but appears to have had little to say about this strike of women workers. Similarly the Basel congress report mentions no women textile workers, although a (defeated) strike had recently involved many women workers in and around the city. In Italy however at least one woman – Luisa (Gigia) Minguzzi – had influence and later some entirely female groups and sections were organised there.[36]

The International in France

In France, in 1870, the defeat of the regime of Napoleon III in a war with German states became the occasion for a rebellion of working people. Marx wrote of 'France' saying that if she 'understands at last that in order to carry on a revolutionary war, revolutionary measures are wanted, she may still be saved.'[37] At about the same time workers were expressing their demands: 'We want solidarity in all times, in times of danger as in times of plenty. Finally we want land for the peasant who cultivates it, mines for miners who work there, and factories for workers who create prosperity.' (*Paris Libre*). In November 1870, a declaration was drawn up for socialist candidates for the national elections of 18 February 1871, which would be endorsed by the IWA and other workers' organisations:

> Revolutionary candidates demand: recognition of workers' political presence, the removal of an oligarchic government and of industrial feudalism [and] the organisation of a Republic which, like its counterpart of 1792 delivering land to peasants, will

deliver the tools of labour to workers, and, through social equality will achieve political freedom.

In February 1871 twenty vigilance committees demanded: 'by all means possible the suppression of the privileges of the bourgeoisie, its removal as a managing caste, and the political ascendency of the proletariat. In a word, social equality. No more bosses, no more proletariat, no more classes.' Work was to become the foundation of social constitution and the product of work would belong to workers

One part of France, epitomised by the Paris Commune, emerged in March 1871 and was welcomed by most left streams – radicals and revolutionaries – including many inspired by the ideas of Blanqui[38] and Proudhon.[39] Some eight months earlier Marx and Engels had written of France's labour movement being inferior to that of Germany. They now revised their theory of the state and wrote of the Paris Commune as a *model* for future working class transformation. Other parts of the left also saw the Paris Commune, brief and ephemeral as it was, as a path-breaking popular polity involving and empowering workers, men and perhaps women too, in initiatives to change society. André Léo[40] expressed criticisms in *La Sociale* in May 1871: she argued that a revolution could not be made without women. Women she noted were suffering most; food was too expensive, work scarce. It was time for something new a revolution in which there was no privilege for just one race or sex. A new society should serve all, and should recognise the contribution of women.[41] Clubs in Paris provided a set of debating chambers where matters were debated, facilitating the distillation of projects and priorities and involving the participation of working people. The Commune was seen as a comprehensive, popular, federal, social and productive body, rather than merely a political form. It may have been dressed up and partially shaped by past fashions, but it had a new content nonetheless. It was hailed as a partial prefiguration of a socialist future. It was preceded by communal insurrections in other French cities, and inspired later insurrections in Italy and Spain. Nothing like these erupted in Germany.

So, the view that the German working class was superior to the French both theoretically and organisationally does not square with what Marx and Engels observed. If anything, given the strength and the

militancy of the unions in France, and their weakness in Germany, the opposite was the true. Bismarck was at work – releasing soldiers from the French army to attack the Commune, and working against the labour movement in Germany. Bismarck's strength, and the repression that he facilitated impacted more strongly on the French labour movement. Yet in their correspondence, Marx and Engels talked of Bismarck serving *us*. Who then was this us? The 'us' in question was not the international labour movement if Bismarck was so obviously facilitating the repression of the Commune. Marx and Engels had another rationale in mind. Writing in 1865 Engels had characterised development in Germany as being behind that of England, in that feudalism still survived and the industrial revolution was only beginning: 'Here there are still numerous social elements which have survived from former feudal and post-feudal conditions…' Hence, in his view, what was needed was for workers to support the bourgeoisie in its struggles, as working class would benefit from reforms:

> Every victory by the bourgeoisie over reaction on the other hand is at the same time in one sense a victory for the workers, contributes to the final downfall of capitalist rule and brings the moment closer when the workers will defeat the bourgeoisie. […]
>
> the proletariat will thereby also acquire all the weapons it needs for its ultimate victory. With freedom of the press and the right of assembly and association it will win universal suffrage, and with universal, direct suffrage, in conjunction with the above tools of agitation, it will win everything else.[42]

Marx and Engels saw German national unification as a step forward – facilitating modernisation and industrial development, and national unity. Their ideas drew on the model of the unitary French Jacobin state: destroying local feudal structures and opening new opportunities; with labour benefiting from modern liberal reform. Engels' focus on progress through economic development failed to confront other realities: that political democracy could not be equated with economic and social democracy, and new capitalist states might be modern or 'progressive' but continue to supress working people.

Politics in Switzerland

Experience in Switzerland was instructive: feudalism had been destroyed by the impact of the French revolution and by further revolutions in 1830 and 1848, and new dynamics were at work. Bakunin, examining experience there, saw a labour aristocracy predominating, even in the IWA, and promoting factional and sectional interests.[43] Coalition politics might seem imperative if a majority was to be obtained in a first-past-the-post election, but coalitions were often futile. When socialists were placed on a list of the Radical party, their supporters might choose to scratch such candidates and vote conservative.[44] He observed labour 'representatives' being absorbed into bourgeois institutions.[45] A few members of the IWA were elected or co-opted into city and cantonal governments. Guillaume remarked that Dr Coullery and another 'pseudo-socialist', Elzingre, co-opted into the government of Neuchâtel: 'both took care never to utter a word about the International in that assembly'. Even when socialists were placed on a radical list, radical voters might choose to scratch such candidates and vote conservative; so coalition politics that seemed imperative if a majority was to be obtained in a first-past-the-post election, did not help socialists, and were judged to be futile.[46] Some years later the Jura federation would also take note of the killing of Italian workers by a Swiss militia – hence, the idea that universal conscription might be radical panacea,[47] was discredited.

The weapons that Engels sought in Germany, especially universal suffrage, had been available to Swiss workers for many years but had not proved so powerful. Some minor reforms were eventually obtained in the 1870s in Switzerland, legislating against child labour for example, and attempts were made to tame the most virulent forms of jungle-capitalist industrial relations, but a working day of ten to twelve hours was still quite normal. The Basel IWA congress had heard reports of sweating for miserable wages. Swiss 'democracy' might co-opt a few of the more prosperous workmen into the political system but left class power intact. The interests of the mass of the working class – women, the unskilled and migrants – were left out in the cold where the skilled sectors of the labour movement supported such politics

Politics Elsewhere

The German movement was distinguished in one respect – in the formation of two political parties – the smaller of the two German parties being the one singled out for praise by Marx and the one that he and Engels often referred to as 'our party'. Both parties sought to obtain some recognition from the IWA, believing that some link would help their cause.[48] Neither the one nor the other would play any organic role within the IWA. They were riven by internecine fighting. Wilhelm Liebknecht helped spread this vituperative spirit. At the Basel IWA congress in 1869 he was obliged to apologise for spreading the accusation that Bakunin was a Russian agent, a spy for the Tsar.[49] The German left faced government repression and one can understand that it should be cautious of agents-provocateur entering its ranks; but when such fears were used to motivate abuse of political opponents, the movement would itself become a victim of this vicious, hateful sectarianism. Such was the fate of much of the German left, where vicious in-fighting was commonplace.

The experience of the left in various parts of Europe was very diverse. Reliable dues-paying individual membership was lacking, and lack of funds undermined the capacity of the IWA to function. It also left open to interpretation who was a 'real' member. Insofar as some IWA organisation developed on the basis of linguistic affinity – rather than location – there was some confusion in its structures. Before 1868 there was a German language structure in the IWA largely directed in Geneva and articulated through the publication the *Vorbote* (Herald) newspaper that circulated in German-speaking circles both in Europe and in North America. There was also a widespread practice of sections having themselves represented at congress by persons from outside their own sections; a practice which made impeded accountability and transparency. Except in parts of Belgium, northern France and northern Britain, there were few large industrial conurbations in these times. In France or Germany only one person in three lived in a town. There were few large industrial workplaces where labour was organised and affiliated to the IWA. So the typical IWA member was more likely to be a skilled craft-worker or artisan, rather than a factory worker; and this picture obtained

in Britain and Germany as much as in France and Spain.[50] There were for example no miners or factory workers on the General Council of the IWA.

Labour organisation took on varied characteristics. In Britain, in the 1870s, trade unions had some strength, particularly amongst skilled workers, and membership was in excess of the half million mark, whilst party political bodies were extremely weak. In Germany the pattern was the other way around – parties were stronger and the free trade unions weaker: 'as late as 1872, with a mere 19,000 members'.[51] Membership grew in the next seven years, reaching 50-60,000 circa 1878; but this organisation was 'more or less completely destroyed' when Bismarck moved to attack the labour movement,[52] leaving the vote as an easier way to register dissent. Circumstances in southern Europe were different. An Italian delegate at the IWA's Basel congress said that so miserable was the condition of the poor in Naples that they could not contemplate even a one day stoppage of work. In Italy and Spain reactionary monarchical regimes were faced by revolts supported by a variety of anti-clericals, radicals, republicans and socialists. In Spain the IWA grew massively after 1870, and became the strongest section of the IWA with a membership in the tens of thousands. There and in many other parts of Europe electoral politics was impossible.

In England, despite the presence of the General Council in London, the IWA had very little weight in the labour movement. In a letter George Julian Harney, Marx noted: 'At London I regret to say, most of the workmen's representatives use their position in our council only as a means of furthering their own petty personal aims. To get into the House of Commons is their ultima thule' [ultimate desire].'[53] Some of the long serving trade union leaders who were members of the General Council would part ways with the IWA over its support for the Commune. Bakunin commented on one occasion that trade unions 'only sought to improve workers' situation in the existing order' and had no ambition to change that order.[54] Despite the location of the General Council in London the IWA had only a shallow presence in Britain.

Marx defined his concept of politics perhaps reflecting on conditions in England. In his letter to Friedrich Bolte of 23 November, 1871 he wrote:

> [T]he attempt in a particular factory or even a particular industry to force a shorter working day out of the capitalists by strikes, etc., is a purely economic movement. On the other hand the movement to force an eight-hour day, etc., law is a political movement. And in this way, out of the separate economic movements of the workers there grows up everywhere a political movement, that is to say a movement of the class, with the object of achieving its interests in a general form, in a form possessing a general social force of compulsion.

So here Marx defined the barrier between '*purely economic movements*' and *politics* – which he conflated with 'class' politics[55] – in terms of whether or not demands were made to a particular national state. IWA congresses had aired other ideas as to the potential of workers' organisations as potentially constructing a new polity. In an 1869 congress resolution on strike funds and workers' organisations the IWA had looked forward to another future – one in which 'wage-labour [is] to be replaced by a Federation of Free Producers'.[56] Marx had a particular definition of Jacobin politics, out of step with much of the IWA.

Notwithstanding some appreciative writing on the Paris Commune, in their strategic thinking Marx and Engels often looked not so much to the reconstruction of the state, but rather to a process of change through electoral politics. Marx did not just ignore other forms of politics – he denied that they existed, thereby obstructing discussion between alternate conceptions of politics. Bakunin conflated 'theoretical' Marxism with a reformist cross-class politics. Marx and Engels did not advocate permanent subordination of working people to the bourgeoisie.[57] But Engels evidently thought that various stages of development were needed, so for example he argued in articles later published with the title *The Bakuninists at work*:

> Spain is such a backward country industrially that there can be no question there of immediate complete emancipation of the

> working class. Spain will first have to pass through various preliminary *stages of development* and remove quite a number of obstacles from its path. The Republic offered a chance of going through *these stages* in the shortest possible time and quickly surmounting the obstacles.
>
> …a minority [elected by working people] would be elected to the Cortes large enough to decide the issue whenever it came to a vote between the two wings of the Republicans.[58]

Interestingly, after the inauguration in Spain a republic (1873), some 1,800 convicts were liberated from prison by rebels in Cartagena, amongst them many sailors and soldiers who had resisted conscription having no desire to fight in ongoing colonial wars in Cuba and elsewhere.[59] Engels called such people 'Spain's worst robbers and murderers'. Engels looked to collaboration between working people and radicals, working with a minority of labour parliamentarians to become a decisive bloc, yielding progressive results. He downplayed conflicts between working people and the radical bourgeoisie. His views contrast with those of the IWA in Spain who noted that the middle classes – yesterday's monarchists – still had influence and economic power in the new republic. In February 1873 one Barcelona IWA journal argued:

> [History] has shown us that the catchphrase and axiom that 'Workers emancipation can only be the work of the workers themselves' is a great truth. So, with this in mind we should not place any confidence in others looking out for us. We have to look out for ourselves. We can count on nothing more than our own forces.

In this perspective force should be in the hands of the people, not the military; there should be collective rather than private property, and the IWA should work not for a bourgeois republic run by the middle classes, but for social revolution, 'a republic in which there would be no bourgeoisie, priests, lawyers, magistrates, soldiers, or politicians – where there would only be workers.'[60] In September a Federal Commission letter advised: 'If you are not permitted to organise public meetings, organise

secret assemblies. Consider meeting in groups of ten, in [convenient] places such as bourgeois barber shops.'

Engels disparaged supporters of other intellectual traditions and made an amalgam of backwardness and Bakuninism. He was sympathetic to Irish nationalism, and along with Marx, he noted that sense of superiority that existed amongst parts of the British labour movement was sustaining imperialism and impeding socialism. But such sympathies did not extend to peoples in Southern Europe who would espouse forms of Anarchism. He was slow to recognise the disparagement that clouded Northern European thinking in relation to southern neighbours. He was also slow to recognise a growing accommodation of labour to capital. In these times in the working of electoral politics many Social-democrats would become engrossed with and would choose to promote cross-class alliances in order to win elections. When Bakunin and his co-thinkers accused 'Marxists' of subordinating the interests of working people to those of the bourgeoisie they were often describing the reality they experienced. Marx too recognised the infection of 'parliamentary cretinism',[61] but he was more wont to attribute it to stupidity and less able to recognise that it was rooted in particular social groups and their particular social interests. Marx and Engels adopted the bourgeois habit of counter-posing their one reasonable solution to a problem, against some stupid option; such debating tactics served to curtail and restrict discussion.

The International in Switzerland

Developments in Switzerland had some impact on the IWA. Switzerland provided a base for radical organisations. International congresses were held in Basel, Geneva and Lausanne. Naturally enough the local Swiss delegations were quite large, whereas those with the greatest distance to travel and limited funds were poorly represented.[62] Discrete groups could organise and correspond with countries where radical organisation and publications were banned and censored. The Ticino offered a refuge for Italians. Russians too gravitated to a place where they were usually safe from the attentions of the Tsarist secret

police. Through such refugees the IWA developed distinct linguistic networks with organisations both there and abroad. The location of Switzerland in the centre of Europe facilitated organisational work. German exiles there worked with German speakers in the various states of Germany and Austria; when anti-Socialist laws banned organisation in Germany, Switzerland provided an organisational base. French speakers could easily work with contacts nearby in Lyon, Savoy and Alsace. The regional federation that organised in Francophone Switzerland came to have affiliates in France. Language and affinity often went hand in hand: the francophone Swiss communicated more easily with counterparts to the west; German speakers looked to the north. IWA organisation in Switzerland was largely shaped along linguistic lines.

The IWA's organisation in Switzerland reflected this complex reality. In many towns and cities there were sections defined by location or by trade and others brought together by language; for example, in non-German-speaking areas there were separately organised German language IWA sections. Language based bodies found it natural to circulate their journals, and consider developments, across borders. Francophone IWA federations reflected awareness of French-speakers as a minority within the Swiss confederation, and at times IWA political opinion would divide along linguistic lines.

For the male of the species Switzerland was at the time the most democratic state in Europe. The electoral process was affected by the range of imperfections that were common to liberal democracy, but men could vote, voting determined the choice of representatives in the lower house of government, and the executive had to act in such a way as to not frustrate the majority too overtly. Here the liberal/radical wave of 1847-8 had won, whilst in the rest of Europe it had been defeated. Liberals and radicals ran several cantonal and state institutions.

Although Switzerland provided a safe haven for refugees it also harboured strong nationalist sentiments. The earliest labour organisations were given a patriotic name – *Grütli*. These bodies sought harmony between employers and employees, promoted a national (as opposed to cantonal or local) Swiss identity and had rules that set out that only Swiss citizens could become members. The nationalist ideology of the *Grütli*

disrespected many non-Swiss in the labour movement. Such thinking coloured much of the labour movement and contradicted the *inter*nationalism of the IWA. Bakunin worked to promote an internationalist labour politics that had no respect for frontiers, in contrast with politics that focussed on one particular state. The ill treatment of foreign labour was highlighted in July 1875. The Jurassians *Bulletin* reported on protests of Italian workers constructing the St Gotthard tunnel striking against poor pay and conditions. They were fired on by the local militia. Four men were killed and ten more wounded. The *Bulletin* also noted an incident in Berlin in March 1877: a riot broke out when 'cheap' Silesian and Polish workers were hired to work on building tramways. A riot ensued, the foreign workers were sacked and replaced by local workers.[63]

Most *Grütli* associations, like the bulk of the British trade union movement had nothing to do with the IWA. Even where the IWA did exist it might take on rather restrained forms, and might be viewed rather critically by outsiders. Two refugees from France – Benoît Malon[64] and Gustave Lefrançais[65] – encountering the local IWA in Geneva observed:

> Despite the liberty enjoyed by the Genevans, despite all the means at their disposal – free press, freedom of assembly and of association, the International in reality has no intellectual existence here: neither meetings nor conferences, nor discussions of principles. Most of the members are absolutely ignorant of the principles and goals of the International. Each contents himself with saying: 'I am a member of the International.' But again nothing serious; the intelligent, disgusted, draw away or are excluded by the committees that alone, govern and direct the sections, which meet at best once a month![66]

Malon attempted to prevent a split between the factions of the Geneva IWA, but after criticising Nicholas Utin,[67] and after supporting a new Propaganda Section in Geneva he along with several friends was expelled from the central Geneva IWA section, as Bakunin had been somewhat earlier. Bakunin analysed of divisions in the local IWA in his texts *Rapport sur l'Alliance* and *Protestation de l'Alliance*. The splits and expulsions that divided the IWA in Switzerland became precedents for the

sanctions applied by Marx, Engels and supporters of the General Council.[68] Political differences there would come to the fore elsewhere.

Bakunin and his co-thinkers recognised the faults of this Swiss democracy and defined a politics that sought to transcend them. These revolutionary socialists received some support from Belgium, and from southern Europe where electoral-politics had little resonance, but less support from many other parts of northern Europe where electoral-political reform seemed to have better prospects. Britain and Switzerland had a modicum of civil liberty; but in much of the rest of Europe the IWA had to be, in part or in hard times, a clandestine organisation – organisation in Southern Europe had to take on very different features to counterparts in Northern Europe.

The conflicting conceptions of 'party' and 'politics' in the IWA in Switzerland reflected different appreciations of 'reality', different evaluations of prospects for progress, different levels of organisation, varied levels of state regulation and repression, the interests of particular sets of people (native Swiss and non-citizens) and geographical concerns (whether one looked to politics at home, or abroad – to France, Germany, Italy, Russia, Spain, etc.) A politics that appeared to Social-democrats as progressive in Germany might appear to revolutionary socialists (future anarchists) as at best unproductive in Switzerland,[69] at worst placing the labour movement in the service of bourgeois politicians. Revolutionary socialism, as it became anarchism, would articulate a critique of Social-democracy elaborated from its experience. In each case 'socialism' was defined in a context and in reaction to that context. If 'socialism' meant a course of action in Germany and a very different course of action in the Jura region of Switzerland, how then was it to be reconciled as an international movement? Socialists were faced with assimilating a variety of experiences, drawing out some commonalities from those experiences and setting out some universal socialist themes. But going beyond this, setting out priorities for Europe as a whole would be inappropriate. Disparities in economic and political conditions had their effects on the potential cohesiveness and weakness of the ongoing IWA.

The Basel Congress

Different experiences and perspectives had been manifested in the Basel Congress of the IWA in 1869. When the new General Council met after the congress, it heard a report that this congress was better attended than previous ones.[70] Four points had had been set out on its agenda, points that had been discussed by sections of the IWA prior to the congress. Some delegates from German Switzerland and Germany demanded that that a fifth point should be added – a discussion of democratic or parliamentary politics. Bruhin, an attorney-general in the Basel city government, and representing local IWA sections, argued that this was the most important question and that 'the state was not a bourgeois institution, but the people themselves, and if the people were the state, they can decide whatever they want and thereby achieve the goals of the International.' Liebknecht, for the new Eisenach party argued that the question 'had major importance in countries where reforms of this kind might be proposed and accomplished.' James Guillaume commented the latter appeared to us as a simple democrat, the like of IWA members Bruhin or Grosselin (a candidate for the Geneva government). Eugène Hins, a professor, and delegate for the Belgian federation argued that existing states should be left to rot, whilst the IWA built its own organisation, '…to the point where it is the stronger, then on the ruins [of the existing state] we will set up our own, ready-made and prepared, as it exists in every [IWA] section."[71] The matter was placed on the agenda, but only after the agenda circulated to and discussed by IWA sections before the congress. In fact for lack of time it was not discussed further. Evidently there were conflicting views at this congress as to whether it was opportune to give it any priority.[72]

The Basel congress brought together delegates with various priorities. Four or more currents were in evidence: firstly ambitious 'practical' politicians ready to form alliances with the bourgeoisie 'to get things done' and advocates of direct democracy – populists who looked back to Swiss democratic assembly politics, and supported referenda – such populists saw the state as being the vehicle through which democracy could prevail; a second set defended individual property rights; thirdly there were collectivists who supported the General Council; and fourthly collectivists who were friends and allies of Bakunin.

There was a large majority at the congress that favoured the proposition that landed property should belong to the community rather than to individual. Here all collectivists were in general agreement and voted together.

A resolution on creating funds for workplace resistance was also agreed with little overt controversy. It was noted that the IWA had organised already in local bodies. It was said that such bodies – future trades' councils, bourses du travail or camera del lavoro – had potential to develop a network that might serve as an alternative to the organs of the state. A resolution, proposed by Jean-Louis Pindy, a representative of carpenters in Paris, concluded that the creation of resistance funds should be promoted and workplace organisations should come together in national trades' federations, for common action, 'until such time as waged-work is replaced by the Federation of Free Producers.'[73] The motion focussed on the need for wider forms of industrial organisation, and spelt out their key tasks – which should include directing strikes and research. In Germany, where trade union organisation was in its early infancy, such thinking may have appeared unrealistic – here the labour movement was weaker both in terms of numbers, in terms of its ambitions and imagination. Friedrich Lessner, a tailor representing German workers in London and the General Council, defined unions as only a means to an end, 'they could never become the end of the present movement' – 'the abrogation of wage labour'.[74] Another representative of the General Council, Robert Applegarth, had earlier said that British trade unions would know how to use their political power in the reform movement, 'They were able to put the screw on to compel parliament to pass laws in their favour.'[75] Although the resolution itself encountered no formal opposition and was adopted unanimously,[76] there were delegates who emphasised that the congress should not concern itself with such ideas for the future, should prioritise more practical concerns and doubted that trades bodies 'would be the bodies that would be called on to regenerate the social order'.[77] There were warnings from a Geneva delegate that strikes should be well prepared and should not be initiated lightly.[78] Perhaps the perspectives of the proposer of this resolution – and his allies – had greater resonance where workplace labour struggles were sharper, and less resonance where the labour movement was more restrained.

Some of those speaking in this debate motivated work in terms of building labour structures that were an alternative to the state. Hins is reported to have said that the trade unions represented the future, and 'Whatever the English, the Swiss, the Germans, and the Americans might hope to accomplish by means of the present political State, the Belgians repudiated theirs.'[79] Such perspectives, insofar as they omitted any support for electoral politics, indicated that some Belgian, French, Spanish and Swiss delegates were seeing local and industrial labour organisation as the framework for change, and as the focus of their activity. Here then there were the building blocks of a syndicalist strategy, one distanced from electoral-political priorities. This train of thought anticipated forms of revolutionary syndicalism: it looked for a double structure – both local and industrial, it spoke of the present and the future, and it had a transformative end in view, rather than being limited to achieving reformist demands alone. However, since there was no resolution put that made explicit the differences that various speakers began to explore, these differences were not pressed or sharpened.

The two radical poles in the IWA manifested their differences over the issue of other forms of property, and its inheritance. Marx and Engels had advocated the abolition of inheritance when they wrote the *Communist Manifesto.* On the occasion of the application of the Alliance for Social Democracy to join the IWA, twenty years later, Marx, asked on behalf of the General Council that it should amend its statutes, replacing a reference in to the equalisation of classes to *abolition* of classes. But for the Basel Congress, Marx prepared arguments *opposing* abolition of inheritance. The General Council resolution argued:

> To proclaim the abolition of the *right of inheritance* as the *starting point* of the social revolution, would only tend to lead the working class away from the true point of attack against present society. It would be as absurd a thing as to abolish the laws of contract between buyer and seller, while continuing to present state of exchange of commodities. It would be a thing false in theory, and reactionary in practice.[80]

Instead the General Council called for transitional measures, including the taxation of inheritance, and the use of such funds for

purposes of social emancipation. Marx's views were comprehensively rejected by the congress. Those who opposed this view argued that it would be illogical if congress did not corroborate common ownership of land with the abolition of inheritance. There were 37 votes against this General Council proposal, and only 19 votes in favour; whilst six delegates abstained. This was an unprecedented defeat for the General Council.

Bakunin recognised that there was some truth in the argument that Marx had written, property and inheritance were effects and consequences. But that was not all:

> law in turn had become the cause of further developments, it itself becomes a real fact, very powerful, which has to be overturned if one seeks to come to an order of things that is different to that which now exists. In this way the right to inherit, having been a natural consequence of the violent appropriation of natural and social wealth, has become later a basis for the political state and the juridical family, which sanction and guarantee individual property.[81]

Bakunin highlighted that the state and capital defended each other and so both should be targeted, whereas in Marx's view it was better to press for reform through taxation. Bakunin's view point won an absolute majority amongst the ordinary delegates: 32 voted for the motion and 17 against, with 13 abstentions, but the motion had no overall absolute majority; the opposition of the six man deputation from the General Council was enough to frustrate the majority that existed amongst the ordinary delegates.

Unity, Debate and Expulsion

In the aftermath of the Basel Congress leading members of the General Council in London sought to assert the priority of electoral-party politics. Much of this work was carried out in private letters or in confidential communications. The General Council did not seek debate in the press of the IWA or through a regular sequence of well-prepared debate in annual congresses. Instead it asserted its authority and its right

to define IWA policy. Engels, correspondence with Carlo Cafiero is one example of this letter writing campaign.

> We know as well as he [Bakunin] does that inheritance is nonsensical, although we differ from him over the importance and appropriateness of presenting its abolition as the deliverance from all evil; and the 'abolition of the state' is an old German philosophical phrase, of which we made much use when we were tender youths. *But to put all these things into our programme would mean alienating an enormous number of our members, and dividing rather than uniting the European proletariat.*[82]

What then would *unite* the European proletariat? When Engels argued that the unity of the European proletariat would be enormously alienated by Bakunin's perspectives, he passed over the fact that in Basel the majority of the IWA in congress had in fact rejected the General Council's position on inheritance calling for its progressive taxation: he was ignoring reality and was refusing to acknowledge that there were conflicting perspectives. If Engels had said that many of the wealthy, as well as prosperous artisans and small traders, might have been alienated by a policy against inheritance he might have been nearer the mark. (Those who moved the resolution on inheritance had Capital with a capital C in mind, and made an exception for small or personal property). In electoral contests, such a policy might have antagonised some prosperous layers. Against this, such a policy had supporters and might appeal to unskilled workers with no property.

So, there was many levels of conflict: over questions of tactics and strategy, of process, (who should decide priorities), of the advantages or disadvantages of electoral alliances with the bourgeoisie, of the interests of particular layers among working people and professionals, and not least questions relating to the utility of tactics which, if they might be appropriate and fit for some circumstances and places might also be unfit – or for some – inappropriate in other circumstances, depending on which layers they suited or promoted. Engels presentation of Bakunin's thought ran as follows:

> Bakunin maintains that it is the state which has created capital, that the capitalist has his capital only by favour of the state. As, therefore, the state is the chief evil, it is above all the state which must be done away with and then capitalism will go to hell of itself. ... Hence therefore complete abstention from all politics.[83]

> Everywhere experience has shown that the best means of freeing the workers from this domination by the old parties is to found in each country a proletarian party with a political programme of its own…[84]

Bakunin had argued in the debate on inheritance in Basel that there was a feedback between state and capital, and between capital and state, each supported the other.[85] In a letter to comrades in the Jura Bakunin wrote: 'Abolition of the state, this then is the political goal of the International, its achievement is the precondition or necessary adjunct of the economic emancipation of the proletariat. But it will not be achieved at a stroke; in history, as with physical nature, nothing is done at a stroke.' […revolutions are long prepared...] 'For the international also, there is no question of destroying every state, from one day to the next.'[86] He advocated abstention primarily from *bourgeois* electoral politics, and rejected arguments that had been advanced by Marx in Engels, in the *Communist Manifesto*, that labour should support bourgeois parties such as the Radical party in Switzerland.[87] Such a view was shared by influential members of the General Council. Eccarius would argue later that in Switzerland, the UK and the USA advances could be made by working people allying themselves with advanced progressives and with the bourgeoisie.[88] In contrast Bakunin thought that socialist politics could not consist of the business of standing in elections. There were conditions that obstructed electoral tactics from facilitating progress towards socialism. Bakunin wrote:

> What must be excluded without pity is the politics of bourgeois democrats or bourgeois socialists who, when they declare 'political liberty is the *precondition* for economic liberation', can understand through these words only this: 'political reforms, or political revolution should *precede* economic reforms or economic revolution; in consequence workers should ally themselves with

> more or less radical bourgeois to achieve firstly the former, only later achieving the latter against them.' We vociferously protest against this dire theory, which can only result, for workers, of making them serve again as instruments against themselves, delivering them, once again, into bourgeois exploitation.[89]

So Bakunin had no respect for in Social-democratic politics. In such politics he saw working people's interests being subordinated to those of other classes. He saw greater potential in workplace and community organisations. No doubt Engels thought that Bakunin's ideas were quite inappropriate and troublesome, especially in view of their likely impact in Germany. The Basel IWA congress resolution that looked towards the abolition of private land ownership caused trouble for his allies in Germany and provoked the hostility of liberal democrats.[90] If the Basel resolution on inheritance had passed it would most likely have caused even worse trouble. As we shall see, Marx and Engels expected that the IWA would grow, and they were not so concerned if socialist parties adopted a moderate line, making alliances with bourgeois radicals. They expected that after a time working people would vote against bourgeois parties and left parties would become dominant. It would be 'our turn' to prevail.[91]

One of the first expulsions of members had occurred in the IWA in Switzerland. By 1871 Engels was seeking to *smash* the opposition to the General Council.[92] On 16 July 1871 he wrote again to Cafiero to say that the Bakuninists were a sect and 'It would be good for us to get rid of them altogether.' He went on to say about England:

> The trade union movement, among all the big, strong and rich trade unions, has become more an obstacle to the general movement than an instrument of its progress; and outside of the trade unions there are an immense mass of workers in London who have kept quite a distance away from the political movement for several years, and as a result are very ignorant. But on the other hand they are also free of the many traditional prejudices of the trade unions and the other old sects, and therefore form excellent material with which one can work.[93]

So Engels wanted material on which he could 'work', wanted rid of opponents and yet felt *he* had a right to invoke working class unity.

Bakunin had very different views on paths towards unity. He noted that in Geneva, Zurich and Germany IWA supporters were being used by ambitious people, as a platform to facilitate their electoral prospects, or as instruments of bourgeois radicalism.[94] He observed a labour aristocracy at work: exercising power through bureaucratic procedures, defending the interests of skilled local people above the interests of unskilled non-citizen workers; seeking to win elections with bourgeois radical allies.[95] Such experiences led him to emphasise building workplace solidarity,[96] it best advanced the cause of labour, rather than electoral politics. Bakunin criticised both workplace union organisations and central all-trades labour organisations that took on party-political agendas; in his view both had limitations and both needed each other to remedy each other's limitations. He also worked with other 'political' organisations. He had won support for his policies in mass assemblies of the Geneva labour movement where the large numbers of building workers supported him and had outvoted the smaller numbers of highly-skilled who worked in luxury jewellery and watch making trades – the Fabrique. He drew a distinction between the labour movement that functioned in committees and mass assemblies where committee members could be held to account and where their interests would be subsumed within the large mass. He also noted that in large assemblies often it was the same personalities who spoke whereas most IWA members were silent. It did not follow that mass assemblies were always useful for empowering new or inexperienced members.

The records of IWA congresses show that a good proportion of delegates were teachers or professors, editors or publicists and that there were a sprinkling of other professional types. Evidently those who had means could afford the costs of travel to congresses and had the confidence to speak at such events. Conversely distance, cost and inexperience probably deterred many more from seeking to attend. Later, when federalists denied the right of congress delegates to make decisions for the wider IWA membership they were reacting to a situation in which the stacking of votes reflected not so much the strength of organisations but rather the accidents of location or personal wealth that allowed some

delegates to attend and discouraged others. Instead they sought to have decisions made at a lower level where there was greater control by the membership.

The statutes of the IWA spoke of morality, justice, and truth. When disagreements broke out over the direction the IWA should take, and when Engels and Marx and their allies sought to resolve these disagreements by manipulating the terms of conflict, by denigrating opponents and by expulsions, most of the IWA's membership saw their values being trampled on, and so rejected the leadership of the 'Marxist' General Council. For them a delegation of power to such people worked only to create an upper caste of political leaders. There were few outright 'Bakuninists', but there were many more who recognised that if authoritarian tendencies were given free rein labour's emancipation would become less the work of workers themselves, and more the work of a distinct caste. In the USA conflict was also rife amongst IWA organisations. Marx's correspondent, Sorge antagonised several sections which set up their own general council, condemning authoritarian practices.[97] The majority on the General Council in London sided with Sorge, over protests from Eccarius and Hales.

Accountability and Control

Between federalists and centralisers and between anti-authoritarians and authoritarians there were tensions over issues of control and accountability. The politics of the Jura anti-authoritarians were set out in the conclusion of their *Mémoire*[98] to the federations of the IWA. They looked for a change that empowered workers' associations and communes as opposed to a centralised people's state as advocated by German Social-democracy. Their goals and organisational norms stressed participation as opposed to delegated power. Marx's comments on Bakunin's writings also help to define these disagreements. Marx criticised Bakunin when the latter asserted that the idea of a Volksstaat – a people's state – was a delusion and that it would be impossible for people to have any real control over a government in a large state of tens of millions of people.[99] When it came to governmental organisation Bakunin looked towards a

Federation of Communes where local autonomy preserved local accountability. Marx, and even more so Engels, were wont to see large states as progressive. Marx referred to the democracy of trade unions as a model of how working people might participate and run a national organisation or state. Marx and Engels were influenced by the great French revolution. The Jacobin state, with elements of dictatorship and democracy had served to destroy feudalism and to defend France against invasion by reactionary forces; however it did not follow that what suited the bourgeoisie in making its revolution would also suit proletarian revolution: Bakunin had seen in Geneva how ossified workplace structures might create petty dictatorships for more affluent committee-men. In stressing antagonism to a state, which he conceived of only as a bourgeois form, Bakunin looked to a new form of social structure, one where the locus of organisation was not in a rarefied remote geographically defined structure in which the bourgeoisie would naturally predominate, but rather in a network of economic and workplace bodies, where the influence of working people would predominate; partnered by a network of Communes.

Bakunin drew lessons from this experience – he stressed autonomy and accountability, worker's democracy and direct action; whereas the electoral strategy advanced by Marxists in these times empowered 'representatives' to act *for* or *instead* of working people, facilitating the power of more affluent layers and disempowering other marginal layers. 'Politics' was rejected by those who saw only *bourgeois* politics: they noticed that those few workers who were elected were absorbed by the bourgeoisie. For Marx and Engels authority was seen as a natural part of life,[100] and critics of centralisation were ridiculed as disruptive elements. Marx and Engels saw the movement going through stages of winning the battle of democracy. Bakunin and Guillaume saw stages of a developing bourgeois and privileged-worker layers exercising power over workers – what might in later years be seen as a professional-managerial caste or class. Where reforms were gradual such layers would draw more power to themselves and the initial goal of the IWA, that working people should accomplish their own liberation, would evaporate. Belgian internationalists once wrote:

> This is what is what centralisers and followers of Blanqui do not understand, or do not want to understand; failing to conceive of a society without hierarchies, they – above all the latter – have imagined the doctrine of the dictatorship of the initiators and they are agreed on procuring popular well-being despite the people.[101]

Marx and Engels despised English trade union leaders, but they were ready to collaborate with counterparts in the Geneva Fabrique. In Germany, party politics predominated and the interest of an anti-reactionary alliance of liberals, radicals and socialists tended to prevail. Such was the weakness of German trade unions that as yet they posed no threat that might disturb the solidarity of an anti-reactionary alliance led by artisans and small traders. The decision of the Basel congress not to prioritise discussion of electoral politics had angered the German allies of Marx and Engels. Wilhelm Liebknecht, had remarked that those minded to oppose discussion of his party's priorities were reactionaries. Bakunin had announced that he would leave Geneva and moved to the Ticino after the Basel congress of the IWA. When Engels was freed from his work helping to manage his family's business interests in Manchester he was able to join the IWA and with his considerable energy and his financial resources he was able to help push the IWA General Council in a new direction. Marx had previously devoted much of time to writing *Capital*, but now directed more time to IWA business. Together they set their sights on shaping the rest of the IWA to move towards the practice of the German Social-democratic Workers' Party through the General Council.

Incredibly, they accused Bakunin of trying to exercise a dictatorship over the IWA, when in fact the latter was far removed from daily contact with any IWA organisation. Today a journey from Geneva to Bakunin's new home near Lugano might be made in hours; back in 1870, before the construction of railways and tunnels under the Alps it was a journey that might take days, over mountain passes closed for much of the winter. Certainly Bakunin inspired a set of political supporters and corresponded with co-thinkers, but he had no 'control' over them or over IWA journals as some have alleged.[102] There was more truth in the opposite perspective – it was Marx and Engels who were seeking greater power for themselves and they felt threatened by Bakunin's ideas. They set out to destroy his influence and to redirect the IWA, and did so

without having this change of direction considered by the IWA as a whole. There was a three year gap between the Basel congress of 1869 and the congress of The Hague, in 1872. Circumstances would favour their influence. The French section was completely disorganised by war and repression. The composition of the General Council changed with new men coming, men who had not been elected by the IWA congress, and men who for the most part had never attended any past IWA congress.

The Basel congress's resolution to hold the next congress in Paris could not be implemented. Suggestions that Italy serve as a congress venue were ignored. Instead of Paris, Mainz was selected as a congress venue, and when this was perceived as inopportune, London was selected, not for an open congress, but rather for a private conference, which brought in only a very few, carefully selected representatives of the wider IWA.

The London conference of 1871 put through controversial policies decided on by the General Council without the prior discussion amongst all IWA sections that hitherto had been the norm within the IWA. Instead of facilitating an IWA wide pre-congress debate over strategy, the General Council sent out private and confidential circulars to allies whilst neglecting contact with others. When it had first met after the Basel congress the General Council had recognised that congress had been the best yet. It now chose to act as a partisan body, targeting enemies for expulsion from the IWA, working with its supporters and shunning opponents who had had greater support at the Basel congress. One key decision of the conference was a resolution setting out that the proletariat should set itself as a political party in order to achieve its overall goals – the abolition of classes. Given recent events in Germany and the remarks set out on behalf of the General Council in 1869 noting that German Socialists had adopted the IWA's precepts, this amounted to an endorsement of the Eisenacher party model. This was a step that reversed the entente encapsulated in one of the resolutions of Geneva congress of the IWA in 1866, which had observed that: 'It is the business of the International Working Men's Association to combine and generalise the spontaneous movements of the working classes, but not to dictate or impose any doctrinary system whatever.' The London conference also passed a motion to outlaw the adoption by sections of sectarian names –

positivist, mutualist, collectivist, communist, etc. – or to form 'separatist groups' under the name of 'propaganda sections'.[103]

Viewed in the light of developments in the 1890s and the subsequent growth of large labour parties these decisions may be seen as setting out the priority of the electoral politics that facilitated the later growth of the Second International. But such a view reflects subsequent political development. A contemporaneous perspective on the London Conference and its prioritisation of building electoral parties might have seen it as an endorsement of two very small German parties competing against each other and with compromised agendas: often allying themselves with bourgeois liberals, often making demands that were barely different from those of liberals, and operating in a political system in which the legislature merely provided fallacious democratic decoration for aristocratic and military rulers. The idea of a people's state – as advocated by Marx's German allies, was something that Marx would himself repudiate. The conference promoted the attitude of German labour, and sometimes defined as 'German Communism', disregarding attitudes in parts of Europe which adopted other directions. It served to change the nature of the IWA. Previously the IWA had served as a venue for a wide range of organisations and attitudes, now – for those who went along with the General Council – some interests were promoted and others condemned. Those who rejected the pretension of the General Council began to define a politics that was federalist and anti-authoritarian, and suppler, allowing for a variety of regional tactics to suit differences in regional contexts. In the longer term this might be viewed as a step towards the definition of a Social-democratic or Marxist politics and a federalist or anti-authoritarian politics. In the shorter term, as will be shown below, it facilitated the partial breakup of the IWA, as partisans of the General Council sought to establish their hegemony over, but failed, with the bulk of the IWA and its federations persisting with ongoing IWA activity repudiating the General Council and its supporters.

The London conference resolution outlawing the use of other ideological names for IWA sections implied more than just a question of names: at issue was the existence of a range of groupings that had come together wishing to discuss progressive ideas, and those that sought to act

as think-tanks and political catalysts. Targeted especially were propaganda sections in Geneva and elsewhere – such bodies were often formed by refugees from the Commune; they often allied themselves with the Jura revolutionary socialists – and commonly rejected the electoral-political strategy. A ban on names implied a ban on the functioning of such bodies and their politics. It went hand in hand with the endorsement of other electoral-party-politics more to the liking of the General Council. Taken together this ban and this endorsement implied that the General Council should have a partisan power: they could promote their own viewpoint whilst outlawing inimical politics.

Moves to centralise leadership around the General Council, and to create more hierarchical organisational control over the IWA also worked towards restricting or denying the right of groupings of IWA members to interact, discuss and formulate strategy at a grass-roots level. Such moves might be consistent with a policy of building a hierarchical electoral-political party, but ran towards the destruction of the IWA as it had existed hitherto. Before 1870 the IWA had been an association of diverse forms of labour organisation, with a sovereign congress in which all viewpoints were respected. Where there had been controversy – over property in land – there had been extensive debate. The perspective that land should be owned and run for the benefit of a collective or community was not imposed as an article of faith. The mutualists – persons who defended some form of individually owned property – defeated at the Brussels Congress of 1868 asked for, and were given another opportunity to debate the matter at the Basel Congress of 1869. So before the London Conference the IWA had been an organisation that facilitated international discussion. The resolutions of the London Conference disrespected and abruptly broke with that tradition and sought to promote a narrower agenda set by the General Council, without these being discussed by all sections and federations, and without a debate in congress. Critics would describe these changes as a take-over – the politics of Marxian German Communists were being imposed on the IWA through the increased powers of the General Council.

The decision to target Bakunin and Guillaume was in the same vein. For the ruling group in the General Council their guilt was manifest: Bakunin and Guillaume obstructed the General Council's domination

over the IWA, hence they were seeking to destroy the IWA.[104] This was the underlying and real crime for which they were to be expelled. Bakunin, Guillaume and co-thinkers did seek to provide a sense of direction and sought to elaborate a set of aims and principles. The regular weekly or fortnightly publications of the Jura and Spanish federations provided space for federalist politics. Guillaume was the key editor of the Jura *Bulletin* and his view point was not hidden in that publication. However, he did not replicate the sequence of personal attacks on other socialists, he viewed the Socialist Party as a set of multiple tendencies, and he carried reports on the activities of all sorts of socialists. Marx, Engels and their allies did not be do as much.

Subsequent events would also give the lie to 'Marxists' accusations that these 'anarchists' were seeking domination. Future 'anarchists' would certainly seek influence, but they worked hard for many years to collaborate with non-anarchists. The ongoing IWA meeting in congresses in Saint-Imier, Geneva, Brussels and Bern between 1872 and 1876 would assert the rights of federations to develop their own political priorities. Priorities and policies were developed independently of any strategy set out by an executive. Appendices two and three set out resolutions of the Saint-Imier (1872) and Geneva (1873) congresses on trades' organisation, and these can be contrasted with the discussion and resolution of the previous IWA congress held in Basel in 1869 in Appendix one. These resolutions show a continuity of policy rather than an abrupt change of direction. There was no anarchist take-over of the ongoing IWA.

In the years in which Marx and Engels ruled the IWA General Council the process of decision making was determined by their sway over its meetings and in the meetings of its sub-committees. Rather than functioning openly, promoting discussions of strategy in congresses and facilitating the publishing of a variety of viewpoints in the press of the International, the General Council functioned on the sly. It sent out confidential prejudicial accusations against Bakunin which he could neither read nor respond to.[105] It organised an un-representative conference, which made decisions to outlaw enemies and support friends. It worked to fashion a congress agenda that addressed not the differences in strategy that were dividing the IWA, but an invented crime (that

Bakunin and allies were out to destroy the IWA) that would be used as a pretext for expulsion. It went on to construct a congress majority for its priorities.

Political circumstances, the availability of funds and the location of a congress largely determined who was able to attend a congress. Conditions of political repression prevented international congresses being held in France, Italy and Spain. Distance and the cost of sending delegates was a factor. The crossing of frontiers also presented a danger to revolutionaries. The choices of London and The Hague as locations for IWA meetings in 1871 and 1872 went a very long way to ensure which majority prevail.[106]

Delusions

In 1872 Marx imagined that his partisans were winning further influence. He wrote to Paul Lafargue,[107] in March:

> We have made excellent progress since the London Conference.
>
> New federations have been established in Denmark, New Zealand and Portugal. Our organisation has greatly expanded in the United States, in France (where Malon & Co – as they themselves admit – do not have a single section), in Germany, in Hungary, and in Britain (since the formation of the British Federal Council). Irish sections were formed quite recently. In Italy the only important sections, those in Milan and Turin, belong to us; the others are led by lawyers, journalists and other doctrinaire bourgeois. (Incidentally, Bakunin has a personal grudge against me because he has lost all influence in Russia, where the revolutionary youth are on my side.)
>
> The resolutions of the London Conference have already been accepted in France, America, Britain, Ireland, Denmark, Holland, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Switzerland (except in the Jura), also by the genuinely working-class sections in Italy, and finally by the Russians and the Poles. Those who do not recognise this fact

> won't alter anything thereby, but they will be forced to cut themselves off from the vast majority of the International.

A few weeks later, in May 1872, Engels made a report to meeting of the IWA General Council stating the Jura federation counted just nine branches, 'most of them in a state of utter dissolution.' Such statements sought to portray enemies of Marx and Engels as tiny sectarian minorities obstructing the wider IWA, aiding the class enemy. Engels would write:

> The Alliance, in so far as it paralyses the action of the International against the enemies of the working class, serves admirably the middle class and the governments. For these reasons, the General Council will call upon the Congress of The Hague to expel from the International all and every member of the Alliance and to give the Council such powers as shall enable it effectually to prevent the recurrence of similar conspiracies.[108]

In good and bad times the membership of the Jura Federation fluctuated from around three to seven hundred, small numbers maybe, but not so small in the context of the Jura, an area without big cities.[109] At times the membership of the rival Geneva-based Romande Federation recognised by the General Council may have been larger; later strike defeats in Geneva greatly reduced the strength of organised labour there.[110] The General Council's decision to recognise the Geneva based federation, rather than the Jura federation as the organisation best representing the IWA in francophone Switzerland was based in the larger membership of the former. But at the IWA congress at The Hague, two years later, membership numbers did not tell.[111] The fifteen delegates from Germany – where there was no formal IWA structure and precious little engagement with the IWA – weighed rather more than the five person delegation from Spain representing organisations with a membership in the tens of thousands.[112] That autumn, after spending several days haggling over credentials, a majority at the IWA congress at The Hague voted to expel Bakunin and Guillaume. But these decisions commanded little respect. None of the persons named to form the new General Council were present at The Hague: two of them refused to sit and indicated their rejection of the line taken there. Critics noted that procedure had not been followed. The General Council had not circulated

the agenda two months in advance. The method of voting in congress (as applied in Basel) – the requirement that motions should not be deemed past if the number of abstentions and votes against was greater than the number of votes in favour – was not used consistently in The Hague. Further delegates were manufactured, blank mandates were available for those ready to follow the correct line .[113]

So, 'The authoritarian International committed suicide. In effect, Europe in its entirety would escape from the influence of the General Council.'[114] Shortly afterwards an extraordinary IWA congress was hosted by the Jura federation in Saint-Imier. Delegates rejected the authority and the resolutions of this rigged congress and set out alternatives.[115]

With the 'General Council' IWA now having adopted the priorities of Marx and Engels, and with their chief enemies expelled, one might have expected that 1873 would have been a year in which Marx and Engels would see their 'party' flourish. In fact the opposite was the case. Marx and Engels realised that the optimism was misplaced: their majority was ephemeral, supporters fled, their treasury was empty. They had over-estimated support for themselves and under-estimated their opponents. Already Serraillier had reported to Engels that in France the press of the continuity IWA – the *Jura Bulletin,* and the Belgian *La Liberté, L'Internationalle* and *Mirabeau* – was widely available in France, whilst he had not a line to hand to oppose this 'league of cretinism'.[116]

A Non-sectarian International?

Many writers consider that the meeting Saint-Imier marks the foundation of a new anarchist[117] or anti-authoritarian[118] international. This was not the view of the bulk of the IWA at the time. As we shall see, the pretension of the General Council to rule were widely rejected. The federations carried on their work. The General Council in New York was ignored.

The Jura federation organised a representative IWA congress in Geneva in September 1873. The decisions taken at The Hague were repudiated by the six Federal Councils represented: Belgium, England,

Italy, the Jura, the Netherlands, and Spain. Greetings were received from Germany and the USA. The American Federation offered to share the costs of the congress. So too did representatives from sections in France where the IWA federation was banned, but given their circumstances their offer was politely refused. The success of the 1873 congress of the continuity IWA demonstrated that the bulk of the IWA repudiated the General Council, Engels and Marx. Marx and Engels had accused enemies of sectarianism:

> The first phase of the proletariat's struggle against the bourgeoisie is marked by a sectarian movement. That is logical at a time when the proletariat has not yet developed sufficiently to act as a class. Certain thinkers criticize social antagonisms and suggest fantastic solutions thereof, which the mass of workers is left to accept, preach, and put into practice. The sects formed by these initiators are abstentionist by their very nature –i.e., alien to all real action, politics, strikes, coalitions, or, in a word, to any united movement. The mass of the proletariat always remains indifferent or even hostile to their propaganda. The Paris and Lyon workers did not want the Saint-Simonists, the Fourierists, the Icarians, any more than the Chartists and the English trade unionists wanted the Owenites. These sects act as levers of the movement in the beginning, but become an obstruction as soon as the movement outgrows them; after which they became reactionary. Witness the sects in France and England, and lately the Lassalleans in Germany, who after having hindered the proletariat's organization for several years ended up becoming simple instruments of the police. To sum up, we have here the infancy of the proletarian movement, just as astrology and alchemy are the infancy of science. If the International were to be founded, it was necessary that the proletariat go through this phase.
>
> Contrary to the sectarian organization, with their vagaries and rivalries, the International is a genuine and militant organization of the proletarian class of all countries, united in their common struggle against the capitalists and the landowners, against their class power organized in the state. The rules of the International, therefore, speak of only simple 'workers' societies', all aiming for

> the same goal and accepting the same program, which presents a general outline of the proletarian movement, while having its theoretical elaboration to be guided by the needs of the practical struggle and the exchange of ideas in the sections, unrestrictedly admitting *all shades* of socialist convictions in their organs and Congresses.[119]

Such talk – invoking *all shades* of socialism – is jarring and out of place: the behaviour of Engels and Marx was viewed as 'authoritarian' and provoked the disgust of most internationalists. The continuity-IWA would gather support from federations who did not share the thinking of Bakunin or Guillaume, but nevertheless wanted to make manifest their disapproval of the pattern of calumnies and expulsions initiated by the General Council at the behest of Marx and Engels. Engels justified his stance in terms of preserving IWA unity and saving it from sectarians. In a letter to August Bebel[120] on 20 June 1873, he justified expulsions as follows:

> [T]here are circumstances in which one must have the courage to sacrifice momentary success for more important things. Especially a party like ours, whose ultimate success is so absolutely certain, and which has developed so enormously in our own lifetime and under our own eyes, momentary success is by no means always and absolutely necessary. Take the International, for instance. After the Commune it had its colossal success. The bourgeoisie, struck all of a heap, ascribed omnipotence to it. The great mass of the membership believed things would stay like that for all eternity. We knew very well that the bubble must burst. All the riff-raff attached themselves to it. The sectarians within it began to flourish, and misused the International in the hope that the most stupid and mean actions would be permitted them. We did not allow that. Well knowing that the bubble must burst some time all the same, our concern was not to delay the catastrophe but to take care that the International emerged from it pure and unadulterated.[121]

Engels was happy to throw away old party members with bad attitudes: 'The force of a single individual whom one has oneself reared

from the raw is worth more than ten Lassallean defectors, who always bring the germ of their false tendencies into the Party with them.' Such writings demonstrated his determination to press his agenda. Such priorities did not arise out of international collective discussion such as had been the norm established by IWA congresses. Rather Marx and Engels sought to achieve their ends through intimidation. A precedent was set that a partisan leadership should be empowered to decide policy and insult and expel political enemies. Marx was prepared to throw over the current membership of the International and move on:

> As I view European conditions it is quite useful to let the formal organisation of the International recede into the background for the time being, but, if possible not to relinquish control of the central point in New York...'[122]

The words 'recede into the background' covered over another reality, the deliberate expulsion of all active IWA federations by the New York based General Council – something Marx viewed as 'useful'. The manner in which Marx and Engels conducted themselves and interacted with the movement – leaving aside the rights or wrongs of their strategic thinking – had harmful effects on the labour movement – both then, and in the future. In their practice Marx and Engels defined 'our party' as a vituperative form of organisation, one that could insult and expel opponents, cause splits and promote particular sectarian priorities in the wider movement. Engels viewed the IWA a form of party, with a centralised leadership and looked to German socialist party organisation as the best model in these times.

Bakunin and his allies also sought to obtain influence in the IWA; they too organised in one or more party-like forms. On both sides there was a recognition that trade union organisation had a limited capacity [123] to transform society and that party organisation went some way towards remedying some limitations. Bakunin saw the Geneva Alliance as a form of political catalyst, facilitating public discussion of policy. He also worked in discrete fraternities and organisations shaped to reduce vulnerability to repressive regimes; bodies more able to withstand police attention than those where there was completely open organisation, where public discussion might be recorded and used to incriminate activists. Such

practices left him open to accusations of conspiratorial practice, a charge that any careful revolutionary facing repression would have found difficult to refute.[124] Conspiracy like beauty was something perceived in the eye of the beholder – crime or conversation – depending on one's view point. John Hales for one, on 6 November, 1872, indicted the London General Council for hypocrisy, in his view it had: 'attempted to organise a secret society within the International on the pretext of destroying another secret society, which it had invented to suit its aims.'[125] Herman Jung commented that it had been the practice of Marx to discuss the business of the General Council, before meetings, with him and other friends. This practice ceased when Engels moved to London.[126] He then felt that Marx had betrayed his former friends. Both those who were expelled from this 'conspiratorial' magic circle, and those who were never part of it may well have all experienced feelings of being excluded and disempowered.

Bakunin certainly had influence, but he did not have power over his supporters. Conversely, Engels set out to establish power in the IWA through the practice of appointing plenipotentiaries to act for and with the authority of the General Council. In November 1871 he had requested Lafargue to act as his emissary in Spain to set up firstly a base of operations – in effect a split – in the regional IWA and promising Lafargue that he would be given plenipotentiary power if the regional IWA failed to come into line.[127] The system was extended after the Congress of The Hague with agents and sub-agents appointed to have power over various regions.

Different evaluations prevailed as to the positive and negative value of party organisation, as to the role of mass organisations, and as to the relations between such bodies. Having been expelled from the Geneva-city-IWA-section,[128] a body that was more party than union in composition, Bakunin was sensitised to the potential failings of certain party organisations. What would happen to the IWA, Bakunin asked, if sections developed varied programmes? Would there be as many IWA's as there were parties? Solidarity, he argued, came through common activity. Programmes and party bodies had their place, but, more often, political consciousness grew where it was rooted in activity and experience. Often that experience developed as union members became involved in struggles. The criteria for building unity in a wider body like the IWA was

solidarity. Religious, philosophical and political questions should take a back seat. There was a place for other bodies that sought to do work that could not be done so easily in wider organisational forms. However Bakunin argued:

> The International Association can become an instrument for human liberation only after it has first liberated itself, and it will become this only when it ceases to be divided into two groups: a majority of blind instruments, a minority of knowledgeable engineers; only when it succeeds in spreading socialist politics, philosophy and science in the conscience and thinking of each of its members.[129]

Engels had referred to colossal success *after* the Commune, bringing in riff-raff. In fact the IWA had always been a very diverse body. Beyond testifying to his contempt for much of the IWA's membership, Engels' concept of success was peculiar. This concept of 'success' paid little heed to the problems being faced by the movement: the massacres of thousands in Paris, the banning and ongoing repression of the labour movement and IWA in France, Spain and elsewhere and international police co-operation designed to suppress revolutionaries. Some writers see the IWA reaching its peak around 1868-9, after its success in supporting a building workers' strike in Geneva. 'The most effective lever of the great forward movement made by the International in these years was the general wave of strikes which swept over all the more or less developed capitalist countries as a result of the economic crash in 1866.'[130] There was a different shape to the pattern of organisation in southern Europe. In Italy and Spain membership was numbered in tens of thousands in the early 1870s. Here the IWA was primarily organised in urban areas and in workplaces. It took in few rural people. There were ups and down in trade cycles, but war and repression made their impact, depleting and destroying IWA organisation. In northern Europe the composition of the organised labour movement changed. Weaker organisations with fewer resources – those of the unskilled and especially those where women and migrants were common – were undermined, whilst the organisations of artisans and skilled workers retained some strength. The General-Council-IWA was no longer involved in, or capable of supporting strikes;[131] much of energy and funds were dedicated the dissemination of partisan literature[132] bent on

keeping the party pure and unadulterated. In his letter to Bebel, Engels had remarked:

> Incidentally, old man Hegel said long ago: A party proves itself victorious by splitting and being able to stand the split. The movement of the proletariat necessarily passes through different stages of development; at every stage part of the people get stuck and do not participate in the further advance; and this in itself is sufficient to explain why the 'solidarity of the proletariat', in fact, *everywhere* takes the form of different party groupings, which carry on life-and-death feuds with one another…

The decisions to split taken at The Hague was unjustified even by Engels' dubious criteria. The party that Bebel and Liebknecht concentrated on developing was a *national* Social-democratic party, drawing strength from male artisans and skilled worker-citizens. The historian R.P. Morgan observed that *international* and national concerns might conflict, and in such circumstances it might suit the German party to promote national interests first.[133] If so, this split was not a step forwards, but rather a step backwards in terms of international labour solidarity. Furthermore German Social-democrats would seek unity with followers of Lassalle in a short while, and would adopt a programme that Marx found largely unpalatable. The current demands set out in Gotha were:

> (1) the fullest possible extension of political rights and freedom in the sense of the aforementioned demands; (2) a single progressive income tax, for the commune and state and local, instead of all the existing taxes, especially the indirect ones, burdening the people; (3) unlimited right of association; (4) a working day norm corresponding with the needs of society, and the prohibition of work on Sunday; (5) prohibition of child labour and all forms of labour dangerous to women's health or morality; (6) legislation to protect workers' life and health, control to ensure the healthy housing for workers, inspection of mines, factories, workshops, and domestic workplaces by officials chosen by the workers themselves, and an effective system of enforcement of the same,

> sensible insurance; (7) regulation of prison labour. (8) complete self-administration of all Workers' social benefits.

Marx commented that these demands contained nothing beyond the old democratic litany … a mere echo of the bourgeois People's party, of the League of Peace and Freedom. Engels noted that: 'less importance attaches to the official programme of a party than what it does.'[134] These demands indicate the key axes for the activity of the new party: the prioritisation of winning civil rights and influence through the electoral process for the more affluent male artisanate and highly-skilled labour. It is therefore difficult to see either practical progress, or any ideological progress being made, even in the German labour movement, in the aftermath of the break in the IWA that resulted from the decisions of the London Conference and the Congress in The Hague.

In Francophone Switzerland, where the first split in the IWA occurred, developments must have been yet more unpalatable to Marx and Engels. The policy differences[135] at issue in the split that occurred at La Chaux-de-Fonds, in April 1870, had been over the issue of the usefulness of electoral work – whether it was a *useful* means of propaganda. The resolutions of both sides in the dispute set out a rejection of a 'parliamentary road to socialism'. The resolution of the 'abstentionists' called for the renunciation of 'national political reforms' and declared: 'This Federation is the real representative of labour, its place is completely outside political governments'. The opposing resolution, which condemned abstentionism argued that 'all political agitation is subordinated to the socialist movement, and serves only as a means… representing labour.'[136] But almost the first act of the allies of Marx and Engels was to ally themselves with Coullery's party, led by a doctor who defended individual as against collective property, a species of Tory-radical who was allied with bourgeois conservatives. So the immediate consequence of the split in the IWA was that partisans of pro-electoral politics chose to work with bourgeois radicals, subordinating socialist politics to the needs of first-past-the-post electoral politics.[137] Those who advocated a greater priority for electoral politics were immediately influenced to seek allies to achieve some progress, and found allies who shared none of their socialist vision. The business of electoral-politics fed on such alliances. If such politics had 'worked' – to some extent – it might

have served some parts of the labour movement, but even so it would have left others out in the cold: women, the unskilled, and the migrant non-citizen. Engels attributed splits in the IWA to the activities of a sect – Bakunininists – out to impose themselves on the IWA. Such views made conflict appear inevitable – or even desirable insofar as 'Marxists' would not admit that their own perspective was sectarian, and deluded themselves with thinking that they (alone) defended the interests of the working class as a whole. In fact the allies supporting a 'Marxist' General Council had particular interests and represented mainly dispersed affluent, male fragments of the wider working class. In Geneva the pro-General Council IWA would dwindle; it was unable to support strikes and its journal would soon cease publication. It survived mainly as a lobby working for minority representation of affluent workers.

The criteria that Engels wrote about, for the timeliness of splits, overlooked the harmful effects which demoralised and repelled activists and worked on them to retire from further struggles. Faced with three days haggling at The Hague, over who would be allowed to vote, many people with limited resources might have concluded that the IWA was not a useful forum. Engels' focus on the *party,* coupling life-and-death feuding, everywhere, with proletarian solidarity is remarkable. If party life entailed such feuding as a normal activity it would of necessity repel a very large part of the proletariat.[138] Yet Engels sees this as *normal* – as the development of a Hegelian dialectic. For Engels and Marx the priority was that the General Council should direct IWA troops and elaborate their correct programme.

Conflicts in the IWA defined partisans and organisations in terms of opposing arguments. These conflicts changed the nature of the wider IWA, creating, even amongst those who resisted the change, distinct new forms with new memories and agendas. As early as 27 July 1869 Marx had written to Engels, warning that Bakunin wished to make himself a dictator in the IWA, and if he tried to he would be 'officially excommunicated'. (Engels replied disparaging him as a fat, ardently nationalist, Pan-Slavist, unfit to be a member of the IWA). Such accusations culminated in the expulsion of anti-electoralists on various pretexts. Feuding, insults and expulsion were a normal aspect of politics in the mind-set of Engels. Did libertarians act differently? Not entirely: the Spanish federation expelled

opponents who supported the General Council. But they suffered grievous provocation. The IWA was banned at the time. The Commune was being portrayed as a perpetrator of horrors and outrages and supporters in Spain were targeted for state repression. So when Paul Lafargue and supporters of the General Council published the names of political opponents in their newspaper this amounted to identifying persons for the police and facilitating their arrest and imprisonment.[139] A large meeting of IWA members meeting in Madrid in June 1872 found such behaviour intolerable. Nevertheless the General Council resolved to recognise this expelled group because it was working to 'thwart its [the Alliance of Socialist Democracy's] schemes'.[140]

Critics of the General Council attacked it as an institution and condemned the harmful dynamics of the relationships that it promoted – in their view its members had been corrupted and had turned into rulers. 'If there is one fact attested by experience a thousand times over, it is the corrupting effect that authority produces on those into whose hands it is consigned. It is absolutely impossible for a man who has power over his peers to remain a moral being.'[141] Such corruption was a commonplace in and around the labour movement; federalism was set out as a more accountable, decentralised and perhaps more secure form of international political organisation.

Attacks were made in the name of the General Council against Bakunin and he was cast as an intriguer and plotter. Certainly there were letters to and fro from Bakunin to his friends. Did this amount to a conspiracy? Were the letters between Marx and Engels so different? The discourse of the IWA being a 'mighty instrument in our hands' was carried on at a time when Engels was not a member of the IWA. What was at issue then was who should decide the strategic policy of the IWA. Clearly Marx and Engels discussed strategy, and did so as far as one can tell, from its minutes, much more between themselves than within the General Council as a whole.[142] Insofar as their practice was to discuss policy behind closed doors, away from the General Council, a covert Germanic leadership clique operated with little wider accountability. [143]

A poorly resourced international association had very restricted means of communication in these times. Letters and newspapers were the

means by which people kept in touch. Only a few attended annual IWA congresses and these provided rare occasions for meetings. It seems probable that amongst General Council members the understanding of controversial issues was very uneven; that those with a poorer ability to understand other languages were fed digested summaries by sub-committee members, and that it was through the medium of their correspondence that particular secretaries exercised the authority of the General Council. Correspondence may have been exchanged and documents signed which English speaking council members may not have read, or which they understood poorly or not at all. (On one occasion – as minutes of 5 March 1872 attest – Maltman Barry objected to having his name appended to an IWA document written in French which he did not understand.) After the defeat of the Commune it would be argued that the army of labour needed an effective leadership. The reality was that the General Council had a poor grasp of the problems faced by the wider IWA. It had few sources of information. If it relied on exiles for its views of developments, then it relied on only a small number of people poorly in touch with currents events. In London there was no regular periodical edited by the General Council or its local supporters, so the General Council had little capacity to get its views across to others. Various sections and federations of the IWA published a local and regional press, but frequent complaints testified to this press not being widely available in London. The general Council was also criticised for failing to maintain a regular pattern of communication with sections. Events would prove that the General Council could not command respect, but even if such respect had been forthcoming, the Council would have lacked the means and capacity to promote debate or exercise leadership. That capacity resided more in the hands of the editors of the IWA press managed by the various regional federations, and in the meetings of IWA regional and international congresses.

Some IWA organisations had a more open practice than the London General Council. The Geneva Alliance had ambitions to catalyse the development of IWA politics. It involved expatriates from several countries. It took in disparate viewpoints in its membership. When it set out to discuss the strategic policy of the IWA – it did so in an open manner. It conducted open political meetings, in which those with other

allegiances, who were not Alliance members, could take part.[144] It took its policies to mass general assemblies of the local IWA and was able to sway the membership and obtain majorities against the Fabrique committee-men. Thus for a brief moment the Alliance forced the pace and constituted with allies – mainly building workers – a somewhat shaky non-electoral socialist party that shaped the policy of the local IWA.

Such practice was largely absent from the IWA in Britain. Many of the General Council members were expatriates or exiles, and if they discussed IWA policy they did so in particular small expatriate bodies; they developed no great following in the trade unions. For many years there was no British (or Irish) IWA structure at all, and a mass membership never developed there. There was no general assembly of IWA members in London through which IWA policies might be discussed. The General Council developed no regular press through which it could facilitate the exchange of views, evolve policy and develop accountability. Key figures were perhaps used to working in their own way and resented criticism. The General Council was poorly placed to facilitate a debate as to what strategy the IWA should adopt. Lacking such capacity it could only look with some jealousy at periodicals issued by other IWA bodies, and suffer reports from hostile press. Marx and Engels attempted to set out a political strategy, but without wide discussion such a strategy had little or no chance of being widely accepted. Critics of the General Council rejected the very idea of one orthodoxy. On 19 October 1872 a journal of the IWA in Barcelona, *La Federación* (No. 166) commented:

> The unity of the IWA, solidarity between the workers of the world neither can, nor should be a something imposed, nor the product of authoritarianism. It is, and it always should be the consequence of Necessity, Reason, Liberty and the sublime desire for social freedom among the entire proletariat. To consent within the IWA to any authoritarian power, would be the greatest of monstrosities. We could not consent to such things without forgoing that which no one should forgo: dignity, freedom and autonomy. The strength of the International, its revolutionary power is not at all based in the strength or power of some committee. It is born of workers' conscience, it is demonstrated by the activities of its sections, and it can never be anything other

> than the consequence of its convictions; the manifestation and result of its fertile, federal principles. To consider the International as an army, needing official directives, which should react with a single, obligatory, official programme for all Internationalists is to negate the power of the revolutionary principle, it means a constraint on progress, and it is a negation of the International itself.

The Jura *Bulletin* commented:

> The International, as we understand it, is unity on the terrain of economic solidarity, for the struggle of all the exploited – whatever their colour, beliefs or nationality – against the exploiters; so it would be contrary to those very principles by virtue of which the International exists, to constitute, in our association an official doctrine, an orthodoxy. Today, there can only be … one field on which workers can come together in immediate, practical understanding, that of unity against capital, the solidarity of all those who claim the integral product of their labour. […and any other unity would be an imposition…][145]

Engels had written earlier:

> The German workers have two important advantages over those of the rest of Europe. First, they belong to the most theoretical people of Europe, and have retained the sense of theory which the so-called 'educated' classes of Germany have almost completely lost. Without German philosophy, particularly that of Hegel, German scientific socialism – the only scientific socialism that has ever existed – would never have come into being. Without the workers' sense of theory this scientific socialism would never have entered their flesh and blood as much as is the case. What an incalculable advantage this is may be seen… the German workers stand for the moment in the vanguard of the proletarian struggle.[146]

Franz Mehring[147] denied this view, writing: 'the truth was that both fractions [Lassalleans and Eisenachers] were still a long way from scientific socialism as founded by Marx and Engels.'[148] German labour

parties often asked Marx and Engels for advice and quite often disregarded it. The pretension of Marx and Engels to make the IWA into an instrument in these times, to use the General Council to direct its strategy and priorities throughout Europe and the Americas was absurd, impractical and destructive, both in these times and subsequently.[149] When Engels and Marx thought of 'our party' they thought not so much of the European IWA with a range of forms, opinions and practices, but of themselves and of the feuding Eisenacher party. Like academics, they focussed scholastically on the definition of correct political texts and saw those texts and the records of the IWA as their property. Their 'party' became intent on presenting, prioritising and teaching one set of organisational and factional priorities for European labour organisation in general, excluding and insulting other theories and their supporters. Their policies, operated primarily within a German context; in other contexts this perspective – whatever strength it might have had – seldom related to local conditions.

Jules Guesde[150] wrote about the impact of political centralisation. It made it easier for police forces to decapitate the IWA. In a letter to the Jura Federation's *Bulletin*, published on 15 April 1873, he wrote that one of the delegates to The Hague congress, d'Entraygues (alias Swarm), a man appointed by the General Council as its agent in Toulouse, had been revealed as a police agent. Swarm had facilitated the arrests of forty IWA activists. Guesde concluded: 'What indeed permitted d'Entraygues to deliver IWA organisers in the South of France to the rural police was the leadership function in the IWA allocated by The Hague congress to a central authority.' Security would have been better of there had been autonomous organisation – confined to comrades well known to each other. Van Heddeghem (alias Walter), the delegate of the General Council in Paris, when brought before the judiciary declared that he had become a bitter adversary of the IWA.[151] The IWA journal *Federación* blamed Serraillier,[152] Calas and the London General Council for their bad judgment and misplaced confidence.[153] The aforementioned Jura *Bulletin* took issue with the system that gave 'powers' to such agents. It quoted the terms of d'Entraygues's mandate, signed by Sorge[154] on 30.12.1872. He was nominated to act in Paris where he was to organise the IWA, in conformity with its rules and resolutions; he was empowered to suspend

the membership of individuals and organisations, and was to report to the higher agent based in London. The *Bulletin* concluded: 'Happily besides these phantom organisations drafted by marxists and immediately sold to the police by their agents, there are in France real and serious sections which continue to promote the IWA's immortal principles.' A system of agents, as deployed by the General Council, amounted to a conspiratorial network. In later years it was argued that Social-democratic party – sometimes identified with Marxism – was a step above conspiratorial politics. At the time such a system did little to keep the General Council well-informed.

Seeking to maintain a hold on power within the IWA General Council, Marx and Engels had cast opponents as intriguers and manipulators:

> Bakunin & Co. will make every effort to beat us at the Congress, and as these gentlemen have no scruples about methods, we must take precautionary measures. They will send delegates from a hundred different societies not belonging to the International at all, and will try to obtain a seat and a vote for these persons as delegates of the International in order to place the General Council in the minority with the aid of a coalition of the most heterogeneous elements.[155]

Attendance at The Hague Congress in September 1872 was affected by many factors. The location in Holland was less accessible to delegates from the south – mostly critics of the General Council. However the Italian IWA broke solidarity with the General Council and decided not to send delegates to The Hague. A delegate from Spring Street, New York was rejected on the grounds that his organisation had been expelled by a rival body. Delegates from Germany were admitted although there was no public IWA organisation there.[156] The General Council in fact went a long way to ensure that its supporters were present. Its measures to secure the expulsion of Bakunin and Guillaume at The Hague had been anticipated in the split Switzerland.

As was noted above, the majority at the congress of the French-Swiss IWA federation at La Chaux-de-Fonds in April 1870 had been

sympathetic to Bakunin and Guillaume. The minority, with its strength centred in Geneva, withdrew and then sought to have its individual critics based in Geneva expelled. Bakunin and three friends were expelled from the Geneva Central IWA section in August 1870. (He remained a member of the Jura and Alliance sections). Marx and Engels also had Paul Robin expelled from membership of the General Council for defending the Alliance and for protesting against the policies adopted by the London Conference of 1871.

At The Hague in 1872 (as at La-Chaux-de-Fonds in 1870) party-builders were intent on obtaining a majority. Power struggles, rather than a discussion of political differences took up the vast part of the IWA congress's energy. Disputes over credentials went on for days; motions for expulsion of Bakunin and Guillaume were voted through at the end of the congress. Many 'Marxists' were viewed as intriguers, inspired by personal hatred, lacking the morality, justice, and truth that were incumbent on IWA members.[157] The IWA had been set up as an association in which congresses was sovereign. The attempt by Marx, Engels and their allies to impose, intimidate, excommunicate and expel persons and organisations produced risible results: the constituent federations of the IWA rejected the General Council. The latter found itself wholly isolated from the solidarity of the wider IWA and lacking the wherewithal – funds and journals – to organise and spread its word, and the 'General' – Engels found he had few foot-soldiers ready to do his bidding.

The IWA prior to the Congress in The Hague had been a mixed international labour forum, involving a variety of forms, serving a variety of purposes and working in different ways – through education, media, workplace-union, policy-formation, organisation, promoting co-ops. It existed in a variety of political contexts. So the priority assigned to building an electoral party structure was naturally less attractive to those motivated by other priorities. Bakunin was aware of the danger that different philosophical and political policies might work to split the International; and he called for unity drawing on the solidarity that emerged from struggles in the workplace and between unions.

Furthermore, party-builders were wont to fight among themselves, often for reasons of personal ambition. The majority that

dominated proceedings at the IWA congress in The Hague broke up and went separate ways. Communard refugees sympathetic to Blanqui left the IWA altogether when they failed to gain control over it. Two of the French delegates at The Hague later acted for the police, and other sections protested that their delegates had not voted as they wished. The General Council lost contact with the delegates from Denmark and Poland. Its collaborators in Geneva criticised the excessive power and the poor functioning the General Council. Two of Marx's long-term friends and collaborators on the General Council – Johann Eccarius[158] and Hermann Jung[159] – repudiated him. English speaking delegates at The Hague had complained that they were unable to understand proceedings because they could not understand what was being said: 'The difficulty, amounting almost to impossibility to know what is going on or even to be heard on any question, makes our delegation insignificant and our presence a joke.' John Hales and the British federation broke with the former members of the General Council in London.[160] Even German Social-democrats failed to express any solidarity. On 12 February, 1873 Engels wrote to Wilhelm Liebknecht threatening reprisals if the latter did not give him more explicit support:

> I must first know exactly what you mean by saying that 'the *Volksstaat* cannot become involved in International polemics at the present time'. If the *Volksstaat* proclaims itself neutral in the International's war against the secessionists, if it refuses to explain these events clearly to the German workers, if, in a word, the Lassallean revolt is to be concluded by your shaking hands over and beyond the International and by your sacrificing the International and York to the Hasselmanns, then our attitude to the *Volksstaat* will change fundamentally.[161]

The reaction of the regional federations to the congress of The Hague showed that Marx and Engels, so wont to accuse others of sectarianism, were largely isolated. They qualified antagonists as a set of 'heterogonous elements', but found little ongoing support from their own diverse and sometime allies; perhaps pride prevented them from recognising their own sectarianism. Engels in particular often equated 'our party' – the Eisenacher party – with labour in general, with the general interests of the world-wide labour movement. The possibility that other fragments of the

labour movement had distinct and/or conflicting interests, that in distinct regions, distinct interests existed – all this was subordinated to the vision of 'our party'. The pattern of insulting critics served this discourse: there was no need to consider other viewpoints, if their advocates were idiots. There was no need to consider that there might be so material underpinning to their views. The discourse of Engels on keeping 'our party' pure, and of being able to withstand a split was empty. Engels especially took refuge in an academic rhetoric of 'scientific socialism'. Bakunin noted the pride that accompanied a report that Marx's *Capital* was seen in a Paris bookshop. *Volksstaat*, the German Social-democrat party paper, equated the presence of a book in a shop window with the return of the International to Paris.[162]

The last congress of the General-Council-IWA was held in Geneva in 1873. Marx and Engels described it as a fiasco.[163] Becker, their long term collaborator in Geneva, confessed he had created delegates 'out of the air' to create a majority and to prevent other local critics relocating the General Council. Due to lack of support – and funds – no members of the New York General Council could afford to travel, so no proper account of its activities could be rendered. Little if anything of the congress proceedings was published.[164] Before the congress, (29 August 1873) Marx had written to Engels that given the circumstances no real congress was possible, and their factotum, Serraillier should develop a 'diplomatic' illness to excuse his not going to Geneva. Afterwards (27 September 1873) he wrote to Sorge: 'The fiasco of the Geneva Congress was unavoidable. From the moment it became known here that no delegates would be coming from America, it was clear that matters were going awry.' Engels also wrote to Sorge noting that the mandates expected for himself and Marx had not arrived. Their absence, and the absence of delegates from Germany, (one exception apart) 'stamped the Congress as a merely local assembly' (letter of 25 November 1873).[165] Despite declarations that progress was being made and support won, the General-Council-IWA was effectively defunct.

A death knell struck a year later when Friedrich Sorge resigned from the General Council in New York, following disputes between different local IWA bodies. Engels wrote: 'With your resignation the old International is entirely wound up and at an end anyhow.'[166] So, for Marx and Engels, the International was dead as soon as they lost their proxy

control over its key committee. Eccarius's view – set out two years earlier in *The Times* – that for all practical purposes the General Council in New York was fictitious, was now vindicated.[167]

The Ongoing International

Another larger continuity-IWA congress also met in Geneva in September 1873. The greater part of IWA, with the federal councils of Belgium, England, Italy, the Jura, the Netherlands and Spain sent delegates to repudiate the decisions taken at The Hague, and to insist on a pluralistic IWA: no single strategy was assigned priority, no place was allowed for an all-powerful General Council.

This congress recognised that the location of a congress facilitated a majority for richer and closer local sections if voting was by delegate, so congress resolved that where votes were taken, these would record the votes of each regional council. In article 6[168] of the revised statutes the role of the IWA was defined as a meeting place for discussion – through debate it should facilitate the harmonisation of views. The IWA would have a federal bureau, but it would have no right to lead the IWA; no longer would its members act as the General Council had done in Basel, London and The Hague, forming a decisive voting bloc in an IWA congress. The delegates of the various sections and federal councils reflected a range of views. Some defended electoralism, others did not.

The Geneva congress of the continuity-IWA in 1873 provided a non-sectarian forum open to all and it was attended by many shades of opinion.[169] Bakunin, tired of animosity, bade farewell to the Jura federation and retired from the fight.[170] He foresaw a period of reaction[171] and had few hopes for the progress of revolutionary socialism. Bakunin did not mince words in attacking Marx, but he was able to balance his criticism with a measure of respect.

Before the congress in The Hague Bakunin had carried out extensive correspondence with co-thinkers in Italy and Spain. His writing defending the Paris Commune and attacking Mazzini had won him an

extensive following in Italy. 'This success was achieved by Bakunin not as a result of his "intrigues", but as a result of the eloquent words …'[172] He was ready to endorse some collaboration with followers of Mazzini if this helped preserve IWA organisation, however, in a letter to Celso Ceretti of February 1872, he warned:

> Many, and doubtless the liveliest, sincerest and the youngest of them will want to work and join you. You will doubtless receive them with fraternal feelings, but, in good grace, but you will not let yourselves be carried away by them, and you will not allow them to introduce their authoritarian, deceitful, ambitious political passions into your compact camp. Open the door wide to them: *but accept them only on the condition that they frankly accept the entire programme of the International.*[173]

Bakunin warned that there was an abyss between bourgeois and socialist politics and such people should not be permitted to adulterate the politics of the IWA: 'never let such people penetrate your organisation'. He noted that among some urban workers there were many – especially in Britain and Germany – who were attached to the bourgeoisie and under their influence merely sought slight changes and electoral rights. He advised building the IWA among rural workers and peasants, and not just in cities. He worried that in this period after the Commune that revolutionary socialists would most likely to be banned by the state. He warned against the likely dissolution of public organisations and counselled the creation of a secret organisation.

> I would say further, even if it is the case that through sensible and energetic struggles you are able to secure the existence of your public sections, I believe that sooner or later you will agree on the necessity of creating among them *nuclei* of the members – those who are most reliable, dependable, intelligent and energetic – in a word those who are most intimate. These nuclei intimately linked with each other and with others which have or will organise in other regions of Italy or abroad, will have a twofold mission: firstly they will form the lively, inspirational soul of that immense body named in Italy as elsewhere the IWA; and secondly they will work on matters that cannot be discussed in public. They will

> form a bridge between theoretical socialist propaganda and revolutionary practice.

What then would be the relationship between these nuclei – might one not call this a party of sorts – and the mass of workers and IWA members?

> You have no need to recruit soldiers to form little secret armies, capable of undertaking small sudden actions … you want only a popular revolution, and in consequence you do not have to recruit an army, as your army is the people. What you should form is a staff [état-majors], a well organised and inspired network of leaders of popular movements. And for this it is not at all necessary to have a large number of individuals initiated into secret organisations.[174]

Would such a body become some form of dictatorship? Bakunin had written in June 1871:

> … in a social revolution, one that is diametrically opposed in this matter and in everything else to a political revolution, the action of individuals is almost nothing and the spontaneous of the masses should be all. All that individuals can do is to elaborate and propagate ideas that correspond with popular instincts, and moreover to contribute, through their incessant effort to the revolutionary organisation of the masses natural power, but nothing more than that, and everything else can be done only by the people themselves. Otherwise one will end up with a political dictatorship – that is to say with the reconstitution of the State with privilege, inequality, and every state oppression and one will end up through a diverted but logical path with a new creation of economic, social and political slavery for the popular masses.[175]

Clearly Bakunin was thinking that activists might take on certain delicate matters that could not be discussed publicly. But he had rejected rule by decree, the use of terror or the guillotine to force through change. Revolution would war against social privilege but not against persons.

What then would be the relationship between active revolutionaries (or some sort of party) and the mass of working people? In these times there was little experience – other than perhaps in the Paris Commune – that might point to some approximate insight into this problem. Experience did suggest that in some periods of downturn where activists were likely to be targeted for state repression some form of secret and tight organisation was sensible. In relation to the IWA Bakunin envisaged a situation in which various political opinions might confront each other – he uses the image of a tower of Babel. But this need not be a disaster – and 'economic' interests – solidarity in workplace and social struggles – might be worked on and serve to build a community in struggle; and some wider understanding might evolve.[176] Such thinking might suggest that where forms of mass democracy were to develop, and with them theoretical and political organisations, that however indispensable the latter might be in countering the action of strong states, they should not come first in the longer term project of building mass social democracy.

The work of continuing the IWA, of building relationships, preparing for the Geneva anti-authoritarian congress, publishing and sustaining the sequence of congresses that followed was much more the work of James Guillaume and his comrades in the Jura federation, rather than of Bakunin.[177] In the continuity IWA the Jura federation played a key role. Although the federation had a local base it was never a massive one, it had only a small, or very small influence in Switzerland as a whole. It spread geographically and had affiliates in many Swiss cities. It acquired Italian and German speaking groups, and for a time published a German language newsletter. Some exiles from France and Russia living in Switzerland joined. So too did a few sections from across the border in France. For some years after the defeat of the Commune the IWA in France was banned and thoroughly disorganised. Being unable to hold regular, open local and national meetings it was unable to contribute much to the ongoing IWA. The Jura federation continued to look towards France and hoped that new winds of change would spring up to the west, and bring change to their own region.

In Switzerland itself the Jura federation was opposed by other currents of the labour movement: by a range of cultural nationalists,

Social-democrats, and advocates of direct democracy. None of these trends achieved a mass following in these times. The itinerant and semi-permanent foreign labour force and the mass of women and men in textile industries were not won to any organisation. For the most part the labour movement in Switzerland remained confined within the orbit of workplace organising and electoral politics. Such politics was open to a minority but closed to the majority.

Other key components of the ongoing IWA were constituted by the Italian federation, which developed towards anarchist communism, and the Spanish federation which had syndicalist and anarchist features. The ongoing IWA was not a mass organisation in the sense that it had hundreds of thousands of members were consistently organised. In hard times – under conditions of repression formal membership no doubt ebbed away. In better times the membership in Italy and Spain was in the tens of thousands.[178] In the Jura, numbers were in the hundreds, but this was amongst a much smaller population. So, although this influence is not always recognised,[179] the ongoing IWA at times retained some weight within the labour movement.

Different evaluations of the state continued to be aired in IWA. On the one side of the spectrum were certain elements in the Belgian federation. It had lost some of its earlier supporters, but gained strength in Flemish speaking areas where many supporters embraced the concept of a people's state [Volksstaat]. César de Paepe[180] thought the state might become a means of providing social services. In 1874, at the IWA congress in Brussels he had remarked that despite their rejection of the authoritarianism manifested at the congress in The Hague, there were differing views about the state – some (he mentioned the Italians, the Jurassians and the Spanish) wanted an-archy; others (in Britain and Germany) wanted a Workers' state. Belgium, he said, was in the middle. He thought it would be best – instead of throwing themselves towards something unknown or chaotic – to seek to take over the state and transform it into a workers' socialist state. At the Bern IWA Congress of 1876, after specifying that the state might be shorn of its class elements; he concluded a thoughtful and nuanced argument:

> [I]n our view the State is an element that is socially necessary, but eminently changeable [modifiable] as it might be determined by different social organisations; for a particular or given society there will be a particular or given state…[181]

Errico Malatesta[182] of the Italian IWA responded that for him the state was still an ogre or *bête noire*. He asked: Was the state really the producer of useful public services, or rather, was it not something that exploited and monopolised them? To him it seemed that De Paepe and co-thinkers confused State with society; and 'this is why where there is no state they see only confusion, disorder and barbarism.'[183] Society would sustain such services because they were widely wanted. The exact form of a new society could not be foreseen however. De Paepe's arguments testified to the changing politics of much of the Belgian federation. Especially in Flemish speaking areas it had moved towards German Social-democracy.

The Bern congress of 1876 heard a report from the Italian Federation. Malatesta said a written report had been destroyed, to prevent it falling into the hands of the police. He reported that there had been a broad protest movement because wages were lowered whilst there was a rise in the price of food and goods. Some shops had been pillaged. The Italian federation believed it had no choice but to work in this movement, which also involved followers of Garibaldi and Mazzini.[184] The government had treated the IWA as the source of these troubles and the federation had been obliged to organise clandestinely. Police forces had attempted to impede the recent federation congress held on the outskirts of Florence, and had arrested and imprisoned Andrea Costa[185] and members of the federation's coordinating committee. Similar problems existed in Spain. The report of the Spanish federation noted that the republic had fallen apart when its government preferred to surrender itself to a new monarchy rather than arming the people. Provincial congresses were able to meet and these had discussed the agenda for this Bern congress. Membership and organisation had had its ups and down. Some strikes were won – including a striking of stone masons in Barcelona for a seven hour working day. Co-operative workshops were often failing and this experience had led some federations to advise against supporting producer co-ops. The federation was unable to fully satisfy the needs of prisoners, deportees and their families. Workers from San Fernando, some

66 persons, had been 'disappeared' – thrown into the sea. Congress was also reminded that both the Austrian and the Swiss governments had shot and killed striking workers.

Tensions existed within the continuity-IWA as it changed and evolved between 1872 and 1877. It lost contacts in Britain and the Netherlands. In France, Italy and Spain militant labour was repressed. The weight of member federations changed as they grew or were disrupted. New labour organisations formed some of them ephemeral, others having greater continuity. New contacts were made with groups in Greece, Egypt and Russia and new federations joined in 1877– from Montevideo (Uruguay) and France, the latter organising twelve local sections. In September 1877, shortly before elections due to be held in October, the following manifesto was published:

> What good would it do you, workers, to kill off a government of priests and dukes in order to set up in its place a government of bourgeois and lawyers? Consider, amongst those who you might set up in power are men who your fathers set up in February 1848; and these men shot your fathers. Do not forget that among the men you might install in government, there are those that your brothers sent there in 1870; and these men either had, or allowed your brothers to be massacred in 1871; and as for those of your friends who escaped or who shiver away in New Caledonia or elsewhere up to now it has been impossible to have them amnestied. Lastly remember that it was given to all of them to look after various republics and these republics met their deaths at their hands. Are you going to confide a new one to them? No. …in France the unitary, parliamentary, reactionary, bourgeois republic is dead. Long live the Federal republic of Communes.
>
> **For the French IWA federation the corresponding secretary L. Pindy.**

Before 1870 the IWA had been a centre of gravity pulling in diverse labour organisations. After 1872 the continuity-IWA had less weight and did not draw in so many labour bodies. In Belgium, Germany and Switzerland party-political organisations made progress and in these countries and in Britain co-ops, workplace unions and local networks were

not attracted to join. But by and large what growth there was, was patchy, shaped by an attraction of particular networks to the ideas and thinking of the ongoing IWA, rather than being the outcome of a comprehensive process of labour movement growth and the affiliation of all sorts of labour movement organisations.

The location of the co-ordinating bureau of the International and of its International congresses – in Belgium and Switzerland – suggests that organisation in these two regions sustained the international organisation. There may have been greater numbers of IWA supporters in France, Italy and Spain, but open organisation there was difficult or impossible, given the repressive attitude of the state. Changes within the Belgian federation, and its growing rapprochement with German Social-democracy contributed to the weakening of the structure of the IWA. Another source of tension was a difference of opinion as to prospects for insurrection. Some IWA activists may have wanted to distance themselves from the tactics of 'propaganda by the deed' as advocated by the Italian IWA.

In April 1877 thirty activists, including Cafiero and Malatesta, made an attempt to spark an insurrection in and around Letino (Benevento), a mountain area of Campania. A brigand tradition of peasant revolt survived in the region. In the south especially, the new Italian state was week and poorly entrenched. So there was some potential for revolt. But this was not well understood in northern Europe. The Leipzig paper of the German socialists, *Vorwärts* would later define Italian IWA insurgents as thieving rabble (Raubgesindel),[186] *Tagwacht*, for Swiss Social-democrats, defined them as agents provocateurs.[187] Unwittingly perhaps these Social-democratic papers reproduced the arguments of the Italian state that sought to portray such rebels as common criminals. The Jurassians' *Bulletin* continued to report on developments in Italy and showed practical solidarity raising funds to support prisoners.

The Italian and Spanish federations had little sympathy for a project for a Universal Socialist congress – an idea first mooted in Bern in 1876.[188] They had little reason to seek a rapprochement with a Social-democracy that would portray them as brigands. De Paepe had argued in Bern that trade union organisations from Britain and from Paris were not

homogenous organisations so should not vote in a Universal congress – and the IWA itself was not homogenous either. Perhaps he was already thinking that a more homogenous body was needed. He spoke of the creation of two internationals in Northern and Southern Europe – springing from different tactical priorities – and argued that there was no need for them to be hostile to each other, insofar as both would have the same aims and principles.[189] Doubts about this were also expressed. Joukovsky[190] thought that a Universal Congress would set up a new International. But he doubted that it would be socialist. The statutes of the 1866 congress had spoken of workers taking in hand their own liberation. 'Any idea of supreme leadership or government was something far from their minds.' It had looked for autonomous activity respecting local conditions. He wanted neither a return of a dictatorial General Council, nor voting by section, an arrangement that might facilitate the creation of a fictional or gerrymandered majority. Greulich,[191] present as an observer said he would welcome the presence of trade unions from Paris or from Britain at a Universal Socialist Congress. The reactionary tendencies of British trade unions was fertile ground for further discussion. It was noted that if voting at a Universal Socialist Congress was by persons present then it was likely that legal and electoral themes would predominate. The Bern congress delegates were therefore in agreement that current articles of the IWA, preserving regional autonomy should be defended.

In the spring and summer of 1877 some tension emerged between the majority of the Belgian federation, which was organising the Universal Socialist Congress and the rest of the IWA. At the request of the Belgian IWA the International's federal bureau had invited Social-democrats to the Bern IWA Congress of 1876. These invitations presaged the calling of a Socialist Congress open to all. What the outcome of that Universal Socialist Congress might be was unclear. Was it to invite Social-democrats into a wider IWA in which a variety of political strategies might be pursued? What were the best models for future action?

In May the Jurassians published a letter from an influential Belgian socialist Louis Bertrand[192] noting that a Paul Janson had been elected in Brussels beating the candidate of the reactionaries by 3,000 votes – they were not impressed and noted that he had been elected as a

liberal with the support of bourgeois voters.[193] A series of labour congresses held in Belgium in the first half of 1877 revealed profound disagreements there as to how, where and for what ends the labour movement should organise.

Two socialist congresses met in May 1877: one a congress of the Belgian IWA federation in Jemappes, and a second at Mechelen, near Antwerp, on 20th and 21st, a congress that founded a Social-democratic party modelled on its German counterpart. At a subsequent congress, held in Brussels in June, Philip Coenen, the Antwerp-based secretary of the Belgian IWA federation declared that Flemish socialists: 'have resolved to constitute a political party. As the [French-speaking] Walloons are partisans of an economic party, the formation of two separate federations is preferable, each of which will hold their congresses.'[194] So, a Flemish Social-democratic party was formed. There was a dispute as to whether a francophone Labour Union should continue and whether it should involve itself in positive (Social-democratic) politics or negative (abstentionist) politics. Some francophones went on to constitute a Brabant francophone Social-democratic party. De Paepe declared: 'we wish to make use of all the rights and liberties accorded us by the constitution, as Belgian citizens, conquering with these rights and constitutional liberties all social, economic, political and civil rights.'

The call for the Ghent congress had invoked socialist co-operation and unity. The Jurassians did not have great hopes for it, but they spoke of it clearing away misunderstandings, and of leading to a break with the sequence of insults that featured in German-language press.[195] They had noted that Liebknecht had earlier declared that it was important that the Bakuninist party should not dominate the upcoming congress in Ghent, and had said that if they did: 'that congress would be harmful for the general labour movement'.[196]

The formation of Flemish and Francophone Social-democratic parties in Belgium was indicative of future trends, it showed that energies were being re-directed into these new bodies whilst inclusive bodies, and the IWA were being side-lined. In Switzerland too there had been attempts to set up a Swiss Social-democratic party in May 1877, in a congress in Neuchâtel, bringing together members of socialist, workplace

and *Grütli* associations.[197] That congress agreed that persons in constituent bodies who were also members of other bodies, the IWA for example, should not be allowed to retain membership of the new party, if they were members of bodies which disagreed with the tactics of the new party.[198] Of eighty delegates only one was a French speaking Swiss. When meetings were opened to the public, speeches were translated from French to German, but not back from German to French, indicating that this new party might have been a largely a Germanic body.[199]

Whilst this was going on the IWA international federal bureau called for the annual IWA congress for 1877 to meet in Verviers. It proposed that it should be timed immediately before the Universal Socialist Congress in Ghent, so that delegates could decide in Verviers what policies they should promote later in Ghent. The Verviers local federation had a libertarian outlook and had resisted the project of forming a Social-democratic party in Belgium. Coenen received this notice for the Verviers congress but did not pass on this call to other IWA sections. Neither he, nor De Paepe, nor any other representative of the Belgian regional IWA attended it. Subsequently the Jurassians' report on the Ghent congress noted De Paepe viewed the Universal congress as a *substitute* for the Verviers IWA's congress, and thus – in his view – the IWA 'had in advance abdicated into the hands of the Universal congress from which something – as yet unknown – was to arise, something that could not be foreseen.'[200] This was not the perspective shared by other delegates to the Bern or Verviers IWA congresses.

So, much of the Belgian labour movement had taken sides, opting for a German Social-democratic model abandoning links with other IWA regions. Some were declaring that the anarchists were seeking to impose their politics on other socialists.[201] The Verviers congress adopted unrelenting anarchist positions,[202] and presented these to the Ghent congress shortly afterwards. Although the congress in Ghent had first been posed as a step towards greater unity there was little reason to expect it to fill that role.

The Verviers Congress of 6-8 September 1877 resolved that the local IWA section should serve as the seat of the IWA's international federal bureau, subject to the approval of the absent Belgian regional IWA

federation.[203] The Jura federation had been responsible for the running of that bureau since 1874, and perhaps did not wish that responsibility to remain with them. A location in Verviers for the bureau would have placed it within a federation with libertarian sympathies. However this was not to be. Some three months later the Belgian IWA federation, meeting in congress over Christmas decided that the IWA's international federal bureau should be relocated to Brussels, placing it amongst persons who had not attended the Verviers IWA congress and who, in Ghent, had voted against the policies agreed there. Little was ever heard of it again.[204] The men in Brussels: 'paralysed the very heart of the international…'[205]

The Ghent congress did set out some common ground: it was agreed that working people had nothing to hope for from bourgeois parties and that [trade] unions should be promoted. It was also plain that socialists with different politics could not work together. Differences should be explored but socialists of different persuasions agreed that they should not vilify each other.[206] Bertrand, Brismée,[207] Coenen and De Paepe voted with Greulich, Hales and Liebknecht against the policies approved by the Verviers congress.[208] The Ghent congress marked a realignment of socialist forces. IWA supporters were firmly marked as anarchists competing with and critical of a growing Social-democratic party-political movement.

The *Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne* articulated a critique of German Social-democracy both before and after the Ghent congress. The *Bulletin* published a letter on the Gotha congress of May 1877 noting that German socialists' focussed their hopes and activities on one unique goal: electoral agitation.[209] It expressed only guarded pleasure when a socialist was elected to represent Berlin's 6th constituency, because many of his 6,246 votes came from non-socialists.[210] Guillaume confronted Liebknecht in Ghent and caused an incident when he noted that in a recent election Germany socialist had 'attenuated' their politics to make them more appealing to the electorate. He quoted the *Berliner Freie Press* report of a Reichstag deputy, Johann Most,[211] saying that socialist colours were not to be found in their programme. After the Ghent congress the *Bulletin* criticised the congress reports carried in *Vorwärts*. It noted that a resolution that had called for collective property had been subtly changed in translation. The French text had carried an amendment calling for

property to be run in the future either by some State or through Communes – referring to the system of Communes as seen briefly in France in 1871. The German translation rendered communes as sub-divisions of the state, and not as a different political form.[212] The *Bulletin* also objected to reports implying that the *delegates of socialist organisations* had agreed various policies in Ghent; it noted that the voting there engaged only particular persons and organisations – the delegates of *some* socialist organisations – it was not the case that all socialists were in agreement.[213]

The *Bulletin* also criticised the Russophobia of the German Social-democratic journal *Vorwärts*. In March 1877 the *Bulletin* carried a letter from Russian socialists criticising the editors of *Vorwärts*, arguing that *Vorwärts* should have refrained from insulting fellow-socialists who had protested at the Kazan church in St. Petersburg in December 1876. *Vorwärts* had accused them of shockingly immature conduct. Where was revolutionary solidarity they asked?[214] In the midst of the war between Russia and Turkey, in 1877-8, the *Bulletin* noted that *Vorwärts* took a one-sided line: instead of looking for the liberation of all working people under the yoke of the Russian and Turkish empires it praised the Turks for being more civilised than their antagonists.[215]

As battle lines were drawn up there was little space left for the International Workers' Association as a comprehensive all-encompassing body. The IWA changed shape in this conflict. Out of it there emerged Anarchism and Social-democracy as political forms, as well as other forms and structures.

Conclusion

The IWA's decline and disorganisation may be attributed to a variety of factors. IWA congresses had facilitated debate and had helped to bring the labour movement together. The IWA had brought together a range of formations before the 1869 congress – various types, with various expectations. It encompassed a range of regional organisations and did not promote one model as being more advanced worthy that others should emulate. Events thereafter tended to impede the development of the IWA as a comprehensive internationalist conference

of anti-systemic workplace activist organisations, whilst permitting the survival of particular nationally-organised labour forms. Workplace organisations came to be partnered by a variety of ideologically based bodies with compromising, reformist or revolutionary colours. The IWA had been able to survive up to 1877, allowing each regional federation to adopt for itself a policy that suited national circumstances. The stark divisions that emerged within the Belgian federation perhaps upset that modus vivendi: Social-democratic and Anarchist parties now confronted each other within national labour movements. The progress of political Social-democracy was encouraged by the rising vote of the German party. Parts of the continuity-IWA were re-cast as Anarchists, whilst former IWA supporters – including Paul Brousse, Andrea Costa, César De Paepe, Jules Guesde, and Benoît Malon – embraced a Social-democratic model. Although the international IWA organisation disintegrated after 1877, not all its structures did so, sections and federations continued to organise and evolve.

Repression played a large part in the disorganisation of the IWA and labour movement in the times. The IWA was never able to meet, publish, assemble, fundraise and organise freely: many matters were influenced, if not determined through the impact on the labour movement of social and state power and through its censorship of the press. Writers and editors were often sanctioned; protestors and strikers were imprisoned and on occasion killed. The visible and organised labour movement had a diverse character reflecting varied opportunities, perspectives and desires. The direction that labour should take, its velocity and the nature of its independence and autonomy were all profoundly controversial matters. Precisely what was in the best interest of labour solidarity was the stuff of controversy. Accusations that certain parties were compromised by public alliances, infiltration or secret compacts with class enemies begged questions as to how labour solidarity was to be constituted, and who should have a voice in the development of a labour polity. Elements that were visible and legal predominated over elements that were driven underground; Social-democratic parties attempting to work within the law would more easily build structures and raise funds, and these would facilitate their influence, and with it the influence of more prosperous and settled elements of the labour movement. Anarchists,

insofar as their priorities did not focus on winning votes in state elections, had less reason to prioritise the interests of the male, settled and prosperous layers who were allowed to vote. Various options were open (or closed) providing some opportunities for particular fragments of working people.

As time passed there was increasing doubt as to the socialism of Social-democrats. At the level of leadership many organisations – both Social-democratic parties and syndicalist unions too – had their own dynamics, and often they were more concerned to defend their own structural survival first and foremost. Franz Mehring recognised conservative tendencies even as he advocated orthodox Marxist perspectives: 'it is not necessary to disavow parliamentary political action in order to recognise that with all its quite acceptable reforms it can lead the working-class movement to a point where it loses all its revolutionary energies.'[216] Conflicting ideas may have helped colour thinking in these times – and would do so in the future – but other forces were also at work. The development of the economy and of legal regulation in particular states also helped shape various forms of trade union, radical syndicalist and electoral-political-party politics.[217] The setbacks suffered by revolutionary socialists/anarchists, and the limited opportunities opened to within-the-law labour were two sides of the same coin: grudging acceptance of sectors of organised labour as minor stake-holders subordinate to the interests of more powerful others within the economy and state.

The development of Social-democracy changed the nature, dynamics and opportunities open to socialist organisations. The congress in Ghent made plain that two conflicting trends had developed – Anarchism and Social-democracy. A new balance of forces emerged, one that harboured fewer hopes and restricted opportunities for radicals and revolutionaries. Social and economic developments also made some impact: in Switzerland they weakened the forces sustaining the Jura federation. The *Bulletin de la Federation jurassienne* ceased publication in March 1878 with editors recommending to readers other papers instead. But the Geneva paper *Le Travailleur* was to fold in April 1878. Similar problems struck other parts of the International. The French IWA's *L'Avant-Garde* expired in December 1878 and Verviers's *Le Mirabeau*

would cease publication in May 1880. French, Italian and Spanish internationalists were unready or unable to create one or more stable newspapers and bases to continue the international organisational work of the IWA. Social-democrats too found it difficult to organise. The Second International only came together in July 1899, twelve years after the Ghent congress.

Jean-Christophe Angaut writes: 'If in fact all dialogue between Bakunin and Marx was impossible, it was not only because of the personal antipathy between the two, but also because they were not talking from the same position, nor about the same thing.'[218] There is some truth in this. The thinking of each side changed and evolved. Fears of what critics might do ran beyond what the other side actually was doing – the sceptre of 'German communism' confronted the sceptre of 'Russian anarchism'. Neither Bakunin nor Marx had access to more than a few texts of the other, and what they wrote was neither written in similar conditions nor designed with identical purposes in mind.

But both sides did consider some aspects of the same reality. Some of their reflections were similar, other thinking was antagonistic. Bakunin noted that the Commune did not have time to develop as a socialist entity, and many of its members were not socialist.[219] Neither Marx nor Bakunin reproached it for its diverse leadership. However, some years later[220] Marx also wrote that with a modicum of good sense the Commune might have reached a compromise with the republic. If this thinking was Marx's real or considered opinion[221] then it contradicted his earlier appreciation for the Commune. At the time of the Ghent congress of 1877 Social-democrats had little liking for insurrectionary movements. In 1878 two attempts were made to assassinate the German Kaiser, and Bismarck took this opportunity to launch a range of anti-Socialist measures that destroyed the fledgling trade union movement and weakened Socialist electoral work. Social-democrats asserted their willingness to work within the law and blamed anarchists for their troubles.

Bakunin as opposed to Marx and Engels were both writing about the 'same thing' in writing on Germany: both criticised aspects of the German party politics. Their political strategies relied on different

perceptions of 'progress' – for Engels and Marx, there was progress in the development of a modern industrial national state, and in the development of a step by step socialist electoral-party politics to 'win everything else'.[222] Engels expected that progress would come as successive bourgeois regimes were unable to deliver reform – a quick succession of such regimes would be the speediest way forward and then there would be the advent of socialism.

Was dialogue possible between libertarian and Marxist socialists? Engels relationship with Cafiero is interesting. One episode might suggest that the gap between 'Marxism' and 'Anarchism' was not that wide. After Mazzini attacked the Commune Engels received a polemic defending it, sent to him by Cafiero. Engels assumed that it was Cafiero who had written it, and congratulated him; but in fact he should have congratulated its actual author – none other than Bakunin![223] Lines of communication between each side in this conflict had generally been cut, but where they were open for a time – as between Cafiero and Engels – Engels was able to appreciate that this attack on Mazzini was useful. But hatred of all things anarchistic blinded Engels. Later, when exceptional circumstances produced revolts in republican Spain in 1873, almost everything that went badly was attributed by Engels to the predominance of anti-authoritarianism in Spain.[224] Engels had counselled co-operation between the IWA and one set of republicans. Bakunin did not reproach the IWA for supporting revolts alongside another set of intransigent republicans, although he did advocate that they should maintain their own distinct organisations.

Cafiero when he read the *Communist Manifesto*, recognised that Engels was still demanding a strong national state, and this helped shape his rejection of 'Marxism'. He and others found hugely offensive the strong government personified through the partisan and sectarian activity of Marx and Engels – 'insinuations, slander and the whole series of personal intrigues'.[225] In Spain, as in Italy, there were strong regional forces, and demands for a strong state ran over regional sentiment and hugely diverse conditions. Cafiero recognised insulting patterns in the thinking of Marx and Engels. Regions that fostered opposition to their line were characterised as backwards, persons who opposed them were

idiots. A discourse that set up some social patterns as more advanced seemed to suggest that certain patterns were to be followed and others not. This discourse might help promote the interests of one national 'our party' to the detriment of another. A sense of national superiority might work to justify complicity between labour and the state; labour might fight labour, as one movement defended its own 'advanced' or 'more civilised' culture against one less civilised or 'barbaric'.

As was noted above, Engels wrote of the German labour movement as being the vanguard of the European labour movement. Bakunin, whilst he praised labour leaders who took an internationalist position in wartime, condemned the German labour for its placidity, for its lack of opposition to its authoritarian state, and for its embracing of the idea of a popular state. For Bakunin modernity did not equate with progress; small steps facilitated the empowerment of privileged layers and allowed the movement to rust, to be corrupted. He viewed Swiss 'socialist' electoral-parties becoming little more than letter boxes used by the bourgeoisie, he observed countervailing forces assembling around such parties working to weaken socialist communities and their solidarity. So there were different evaluations of 'progress' and different perspectives on the potential of electoral-political work.

In the 1870s there was already some misunderstanding in the judgements that conflicting partisans made of the other side. There was also guilt by association – judgment of the other side might be influenced by the real or alleged crimes of allies. There was also some accurate recognition that when it came to priorities and perspectives there was a real and substantial conflict. These differences would be reiterated after Bakunin's death at the Ghent Universal Socialist Congress in September 1877.

In Ghent there was common agreement that there should be collective ownership, but delegates divided as to what form collective ownership should take. 'Marxists' advocated state ownership, 'Anarchists' rejected it – saying that if the state became a universal employer, this would not change the position of workers. A different perspective on the

content of Communes – as a non-bourgeois political form – was developing amongst libertarians:

> For us Commune is no longer a territorial agglomeration; it is rather a generic name, a synonym for the grouping of equals, knowing neither frontiers nor barriers. The social Commune will cease very quickly to be a clearly defined whole. Each group of the Commune will be necessarily drawn to other similar groups in other communes; it will be grouped, federated with them, by links at least as solid as those which attach it to its fellow citizens, it will constitute a Commune of interests whose members are spread out in a thousand cities and villages. Any individual will only find satisfaction for his needs by grouping himself with other individuals having the same tastes and living in a hundred other Communes.[226]

Progressive organisational unity might develop through the goodwill and solidarity that came as strikes were won – this was the case around 1869 as the IWA organisations spread. Circumstances were very different by 1878: in much of 'Latin' Europe workplace unions had been banned for years. In 'democratic' Switzerland Italian navvies had been recently shot in a labour dispute. A demonstration in Bern in favour of the Commune had resulted in the arrest of many Jura activists. Workers were compelled to assemble for militia duties in the following year, in an attempt to place them under military law and to obstruct further troubles. The weak German trade-union movement was forced underground and disorganised in 1878.

Divisions came often in periods of downturn and defeat, especially as exiles reflected on the past. The defeat of the Commune, the reaction that arose in Spain and Italy after 1873, and setbacks amongst workplace organisations in other parts of Europe weakened all parts of the labour movement. If electoral-political-party organisations survived and even prospered, this was not so much a symptom of overall progress, but rather of setbacks and defeat suffered by radical social movements. The IWA – albeit for brief moments only – had some potential to develop as an active mass radical forum. Radicals and revolutionaries would look back to the IWA to situate the changes that had occurred in the theory

and practice of the labour movement. Features varied from place to place: some radical workplace organisations had taken shape linked to the IWA; elsewhere this tradition was wholly absent; in other places workplace organisation would come to serve privileged sectors of the labour movement. The IWA co-existed with other forms of labour organisation, forms that sought not radical change, but only marginal sectional improvements for themselves; it never managed to supersede them. The germs of participatory Anarchism and Revolutionary Syndicalism might be traced back to the IWA; so too might the germs of Reformist Socialism and business-trade unionism which adapted to conservative influences.[227]

If the conflicts that resounded within the First International between 1864 and 1877 helped shape thinking about what would subsequently be seen as Anarchism and Social-democracy this is not to say that either of these two theoretical poles, or other currents attracted anything more than a small following in the labour movement. There was some distance between practice, everyday priorities and ideology in various types of organisation – clandestine and open – and diverse forms – co-operative, educational, electoral, ideological, language-based, workplace. There was no homogenous mass organisation following particular persons such as Bakunin, Bebel, Blanqui, Engels, Greulich, Guillaume, Liebknecht, Marx, de Paepe or Proudhon in these repressive times. What emerged after 1877, when the Ghent Universal Socialist Congress made plain that unity was impossible, was not so much cohesive ideological 'parties' – Bakuninist or Marxist, but rather two poles of political practice and thinking – Anarchist and Social-democratic. Liebknecht argued at the Ghent Congress that Social-democracy was only using electoral-politics as a means, and that such electoral-politics was not the goal. Anarchists then and subsequently looked not so much to statements of intent, but rather to the practice of Social-democrats subordinating longer term interests to achieve short term 'practical' measures; they doubted the credentials of Social-democrats and believed that the latter were no longer revolutionary socialists. Much of this critique was accurate but not very helpful for everyday organising. Fragmented memories and lessons from past conflicts did not endow anarchists and revolutionary socialists with the capacity to resolve current

problems in the hard times that they encountered in the years after the Ghent congress.

Appendix 1: The Basel Congress of the International, 1869.

[A] Summary and extracts of the report of the opening day's discussion, on the Congress agenda and on state politics.

The fourth congress of the International took place over eight days from 5-12 September 1869, meeting in the 'Café National'. After an address from the leader of the local IWA the first session considered mandates and set up a bureau with Hermann Jung[228] as its president; two vice-presidents Bruhin[229] and Brismée[230], and nine secretaries: three for the French language, three for German, two for Spanish and one for English. The second session ratified procedures: no one could speak more than twice on a subject – ten minutes at first, and five minutes in reply; sessions would run from 9 to 12 noon and from 2 to 6pm. The composition of commissions considering the points on the congress agenda was then agreed; there were nineteen names on the commission considering societies of resistance [unions], eighteen for education commission, fourteen members of the commission on property in land; eleven to consider rights of inheritance; and eight for the question of mutual credit. The Congress agreed a seventh point: that it would concern itself in the first instance with the above five points that had been set for the agenda by the General Council; and an eighth point: that following consideration of the first five points congress should consider popular direct legislation (This agenda, as proposed by Robert[231] and Goegg[232] was agreed after a discussion quoted below).

The first lively controversy concerned the introduction of a sixth point on the agenda. Goegg, proposed that a question suggested by Bürkli[233] of Zurich – and supported by many Swiss and German sections, should be added to the agenda: popular direct legislation by the people (la législation dirècte du peuple et par le peuple) – a question that he considered highly important.

Robin: replied first, saying he had no prior knowledge of it, and, without discussing how opportune it might be, believed congress should consider the five questions placed on the agenda by the General Council; and should time permit, should then discuss the Bürkli's point as a personal, rather than as a general matter.

Schwitzguébel: commented that he was opposed to such ideas, but if there was a demand to consider the matter, such a demand should not be refused.

Bruhin: although papers in England and France had published five points only, in German and Swiss journals this sixth point had added:

> We Swiss and Germans, do not consider the matter in the same way as do the French and Belgians. For us this sixth question is the most important of all; the other five only come after this. Why? The state is not for us a bourgeois institution – it is the people – direct representation by the people. And if the state is the people, then it can decide whatever it wants, and so it may achieve the International's objectives. Representatives of other nations may reject discussion of this question, because, in their counties they do not now possess the means to accomplish this representation, but they should not refuse to the Swiss,[234] who have these means, the discussion of a matter so important to them.

Bakunin:[235] opposed this sixth point being added to the agenda:

> We are an International Association, which through its resolutions declares that social and political questions are intimately related, but which, by through its very name indicates that political questions must be international, not national.

Rittinghausen:[236]

> You are going to consider at length grand social reforms which you consider as being required to end the deplorable situation in the world of workers. Is it then [any] less necessary to consider the means of execution through which you might accomplish these reforms? I hear many amongst you say that you wish to

> achieve your objectives through *revolution*. Well citizens – revolution – as a material fact, accomplishes nothing. If, after the revolution, you do not manage to formulate your legitimate demands through legislation, the revolution, like that of 1848 will perish miserably; you will be the prey of a most violent reaction, and you will once again be subjected to years of shame and oppression. What then are the means of execution that democracy should employ to achieve its ideas? Legislation by a single person works only to the advantage of that man and his family; legislation by a group of bourgeois called representatives serves only the interests of that class; it is only in taking in hand its own interests through direct legislation, that the people can make them prevail and establish the reign of social justice. I therefore insist that you put on the agenda of this congress the question of direct legislation by the people…

Murat:[237] then demanded that the agenda be followed and that one should not enter into a discussion of the question.

Robert: protested against the assertions of Bruhin; all Swiss did not share the opinion that consideration of this question is opportune and many of them have only heard of them accidentally. From another viewpoint he did not believe that one could refuse to discuss this question, as with any other question that might be presented, so long as it was well understood that first of all one should address the five questions presented by the General Council, and then others afterwards.

Hins:[238] Since we are discussing now not just whether it is opportune to discuss the sixth point, but the question itself, I would like to add a few words to those of Bakunin. As to the part of sections of the International – I do not understand all this running after governments. One wants, they say, through representation or direct legislation to secure the transformation of current governments which have been the creation of our enemies the bourgeoisie. To this end, one wants to enter these governments and through persuasion, through numbers, through new laws establish a new state.

> Comrades, let us not follow this course; because we could have followed it in Belgium and France, as in other places; rather, let us leave these governments fall and rot; let us not, with our morality, support them. And this is why: the International must be a state amongst states, it should let them go on in their own fashion until our state is the stronger. Then, on their ruins, we will construct our own, all prepared, all ready, such as exists in each section…

Liebknecht:[239] 'To refuse discussion of this question is reactionary; has not the International said in its first decisions that political questions are also in its domain. Why then should we not consider them? All German papers announced it, German programmes contained it, and German delegates ask that it should be discussed. If it was not important for Paris, Berlin or Brussels where social questions, but not political questions may be discussed, it is even more [important] for other countries where this distinction does not exist.'

Murat and *Dereure*:[240] 'declare that they do not oppose the introduction of this sixth point onto the agenda, but it should come after the others.'

Starke:[241] 'supports the necessity of having this question discussed, he again stresses that German papers announced it and that the Swiss desire it.'

Schwitzguébel: 'declares that, as a delegate of a Swiss section, he does not want it at all, nor does his section either; even less so because the matter has not been put on to the agenda to study, as other questions.

Robin: agrees that others who wish to meet to discuss this sixth question should do so.' And *Langlois:*[242] 'proposed, for example, an extraordinary evening session, which all should be free to attend. After Jung's reading, the seventh and eight point as proposed by Robert and Goegg, [see above] were unanimously accepted. The sitting adjourned at 6.15.' [243]

Pindy[244] *read the Congress commission's report stressing the question had two facets:*

In what fashion should resistance societies (trades/workplace organisations) be formed, in order, on the one hand to prepare for the future and – as far as possible – to take care of current needs; and on the other hand how should our ideas about the organisation of work in the

future help us to establish resistance societies usefully in the present; these two aspects of the question reciprocally complement and reinforce each other. Indeed, we conceive of two types of organisation amongst workers: at first local organisation helping workers in one place to develop daily contact; then an organisation between various areas, localities, regions, etc. A first type. This sort of organisation corresponds to political relations of current society and advantageously replaces them: up to now this is the type of organisation typical of the IWA. This state of things implies that as for resistance societies, that local federation of these societies should help each other, through loaning funds, through the organisation of meetings to discuss social questions, through common decision-making on matters of collective interest.

But as industry grows larger, in addition to this first sort, and at the same time, another form of organisation [also] becomes necessary….

The organisation of various trades by town and district creates another advantage: each trade, when the occasion comes for it to go on strike, can be supported by others, it pursues its struggle up to the point that it has achieves pay parity, a prelude to functions being made equal [l'équivalence des fonctions].

Moreover, this type of organisation [both] creates the commune of the future just as the other type forms labour organisation for the future. The organisation is replaced by the united councils of trades' bodies, and by committees of their respective delegates, which will regulate the relations of work that will replace politics.

To conclude and because organisations in towns and districts already partially exist, we propose the following resolution:

> Congress agrees that workers should actively work to create resistance funds in various trades. As such societies are formed, sections, federal groupings and central councils should be requested to advise societies of the same trade, in order to provoke the creation of organised national trades' bodies. Until the time comes for wage-labour to be replaced by a Federation of Free Producers these federations should be responsible for the collection of information relative to their particular industries, for

shaping common measures that should be taken, for regulating strikes and for working to ensure their success. Congress invites the General Council to serve, in case of need, as an intermediary pending the unity of resistance societies of every country.[245]

Appendix 2: Resolutions of the Saint-Imier Congress of the International Workers' Association, 15-16 September 1872.

First Resolution: *The position of federations meeting in Congress in Saint-Imier concerning the resolutions of the Congress of The Hague and of the General Council*

Considering that for workers' liberation the autonomy and independence of workers' sections and federations are primary requirements; that recognition of a congress's power to legislative or regulate would be a flagrant negation of this autonomy and freedom; as a principle, Congress denies the legislative power of any regional or general congresses, and recognises their role as being only to make manifest the needs, ideas and aspirations of the proletariat of the different places and countries, so that – as much as possible – they may be unified and harmonised; but never that a congress majority should [be empowered to] impose resolutions on a minority.

Considering also that the institution of a General Council in the International Workers' Association is, through its inherent lethal influence, a seedbed for ongoing violations of the freedom that should be the foundation of our great association; considering that the acts of the London General Council, now recently dissolved were, over the last three years, the living proof of the faults inherent in this institution; that, in order to increase its initially very limited power, it has resorted to the most despicable intrigues, lies, calumnies, in an attempt to sully those who dared to oppose it; that to obtain final realisation of its policies, it prepared the congress of The Hague well in advance with an artificially obtained majority. Obviously the sole aim of this congress was to ensure the triumph and domination of an authoritarian party within the International; and to achieve this goal it did not hesitate to trample on

every vestige of justice and of decency. That such a congress cannot represent the proletariat of those countries represented there;

The congress of delegates of the American, French, Italian, Jura and Spanish federations meeting in Saint-Imier, declare their complete rejection of every resolution of the congress of The Hague, they in no way recognise the powers of the new General Council which it nominated; and, to defend their respective federations against the governmental pretensions of the General Council, and to save and fortify and promote the unity of the IWA, delegates have agreed the basis for a project of pact of solidarity between these federations.

Second Resolution: *Pact of mutual defence, solidarity and e friendship, between the free Federations*

Considering that the greater unity of the International is based, not on the always pernicious or artificial organisation of some centralising power, but, on the one hand on the real commonality of aspirations and interests of the proletariat of all nations, and, on the other hand on the absolutely free and spontaneous federation of free sections and federations of every nation.

Considering that, within the International, there is a tendency, openly manifested by the authoritarian party of German communism at the congress of The Hague, to substitute its domination and the power of its leaders for the spontaneous and free organisation of the proletariat;

Considering that the majority at the congress of The Hague cynically abandoned every principle of the International adopting the ambitious perspectives of that party and of its leaders; and that the new General Council – named by that congress and being endowed with powers even greater than those that it arrogated to itself at the London Conference – threatens to destroy the unity of the International by attacks on that freedom;

The delegates of the American, French, Italian, Jura and Spanish sections and federations, meeting at this congress have agreed, in the name of these section and federations – and pending their definitive acceptance

and confirmation – on the following pact for mutual defence, solidarity and friendship:

(1) Between the American, French, Italian, Jura and Spanish sections and federations and all others who would like to join in this pact, there will be direct and regular correspondence and communication wholly independent of any governmental control of any sort.

(2) If the freedom of any one of these sections and federations should be attacked by a majority of a General Congress, or by a government or General Council created by that majority, all the other sections and federations will [come to its aid and] declare their absolute solidarity.

They loudly proclaim that this pact was concluded with its principal aim being aim to preserve the greater unity of the International endangered by the ambition of the authoritarian party.

Third Resolution: *The Nature of the Political Action of the Proletariat*

Considering:

That the desire to impose on the proletariat one uniform political programme or one line of conduct as the single path that might lead to its social emancipation is a presumptuous ambition as reactionary as it is absurd.

That nobody has the right to deprive autonomous sections and federations of the incontrovertible right to decide for themselves and follow the line of political conduct that they deem best, and that any such attempt would inevitably lead to a most revolting dogmatism;

That the aspirations of the proletariat can have no purpose other than the creation of absolutely free economic organisations and federations, founded upon the labour and equality of all and absolutely independent of all political government, and that this organisation and this federation can only be the consequence of spontaneous action by the proletariat itself, of trades organisations and autonomous communes.

Considering that all political organisation could only constitute domination – to the benefit of one class and to the detriment of the masses – and that the proletariat, if it wished to take power, would itself become an exploiting and dominating class;

The congress assembled in Saint-Imier declares:

(1) That the destruction of all political power is the first duty of the proletariat;

(2) That the organisation of any and every so-called provisional or revolutionary political power, working for this destruction, can be only another deceit and it would be as dangerous for the proletariat as every existing government today;

(3) That rejecting all compromise to procure the achievement of social revolution, proletarians of every country should establish, beyond all forms of bourgeois politics, the solidarity of revolutionary activity.

Fourth Resolution: *Organisation of Labour Resistance – Statistics*

Freedom and labour are the basis of morality, strength, life and future wealth. But labour, if it is not freely organised, becomes unproductive and oppressive to the worker; and for this reason the organisation of labour is the essential precondition for the authentic, complete liberation of the worker.

However, labour cannot work in freedom without access to raw materials and the entire capital of society and cannot organise itself if the worker, free of economic and political tyranny, has not gained the right to complete development of all his faculties. Every State, which is to say, every top-down government or administration of the masses, being of necessity founded upon bureaucracy, upon armies, upon spying, upon the clergy, cannot ever bring about a society organised on the basis of justice and labour, since, by the very nature of its being, it is inevitably impelled to deny the former and oppress the latter.

As we see it, the worker will never be able to free himself from age-old oppression, unless that insatiable, demoralising body, is replaced by a free federation of all groups of producers on the basis of solidarity and equality.

Already, in several places indeed, attempts have been made to organise labour to improve the conditions of the proletariat, but the slightest improvement has soon been recuperated by the privileged class which is forever trying, without restraint or limit to exploit the working class. However, such are the advantages offered by such organisations [unions/workplace organisations] that, even as things now stand, one cannot do without them. Among the proletariat they increase the sense of fraternity and community of interests; they give some experience in collective living and prepare for the supreme struggle. Furthermore, privilege, authoritarianism and the political State are to be replaced by this free and spontaneous organisation of labour which, once in place, will offer an ongoing guarantee for the preservation of economic [labour] against political [bourgeois] organisation.

Consequently, leaving details of positive organisation to be worked out by the Social Revolution, our broad intent is to build solidarity and organisation. We regard strikes as a precious means of struggle, but we have no illusions about their economic results. We accept them as a consequence of the antagonism between labour and capital; they have as a necessary consequence that workers should become more and more alive to the abyss that exists between the proletariat and bourgeoisie and that workers' organisations should be strengthened, and, through ordinary economic struggles, the proletariat should be prepared for the great and final revolutionary struggle which will, destroying all privilege and all class distinctions, give workers the right to enjoy the full product of their labour within the community and thereby the means of developing their full intellectual, material and moral power.

The Commission suggests that congress should appoint a commission, and that it should be mandated to present to the next congress proposals for the universal organisation of resistance, with detailed labour statistical tables to throw light on this struggle. It recommends the Spanish organisation as the best of those now in existence.

Final Resolution

Congress proposes to send copies of the 'Pact of mutual defence, solidarity, and friendship', and of all its resolutions to all workers' federations throughout the world and to come to an understanding with them all concerning matters of general interest.

Congress invites all the federations which came together and concluded this pact for mutual defence, solidarity, and friendship to consult immediately with all sections or federations which may wish to accept this pact, to agree on the substance and timing of their international congress, hoping that it will be convened within the next six months at the latest.[246]

Appendix Three: Geneva, 1873 Congress.

[A] Strikes and Trades Organisation – Congress discussion (extracts) and resolution.

Joukovsky, reporting for the Commission said: 'that the question of a general strike is subordinated to [the question of] how far the organisation of regional and international trades' has been completed; and to the statistical work that the International must carry out in view of such a strike. Also, a general strike being nothing other than a social revolution – because it would be enough to suspend work for ten days for the existing order to collapse – the Commission thinks that this question is not going to receive a solution from Congress, and all the more so because a discussion would put our enemies in the picture as to what means we might intend to use to [achieve] a social revolution.' …

Alerini, commented on events in Alcoy. When strikers from particular trades were about to stop their action: 'the Spanish Federal Commission (based in Alcoy) proposed the launching of a general strike of all trades in the town, all committing themselves that no trade organisation would resume work until all had achieved satisfaction. This general strike lead to an armed struggle, in which local authorities were overturned, and prominent bourgeois were arrested as hostages; and, when General Velarde presented

himself before Alcoy with the army, he was forced to negotiate; the hostages offered themselves up for mediation: the provincial government promised that there would be no reprisals taken against the insurgents; the conditions that strikers demanded from their managers were accepted, and a tax was imposed on the bourgeois, the product of which was used to pay for the days lost during the strike. In consequence Alerini is a convinced partisan of the general strike as a revolutionary means.'

Guillaume commented that general strikes are the culmination of partial strikes. 'But is it necessary that it should break out everywhere at the same time, on a fixed date following some order? No, such a question should not be considered, nor should it be supposed that such things can be done so. Revolution has to be contagious. It should never be the case that in a country when a spontaneous movement is breaking out, that one should want to defer an explosion using as a pretext that one should wait for other countries to be ready to follow.'

Not all the delegates wanted to pass a resolution on the General Strike. Hales – for the English federation – was opposed and later commented 'General Strike, General nonsense'; Van den Abeele, said the Dutch federation was waiting to hear this congresses decisions, so he would abstain. Finally a resolution was passed unanimously:

'Congress, considers that in the current state of the organisation of the International no complete solution can be given to the question of a general strike, urgently recommends workers to organise international unions of trade by trade, as well as active socialist propaganda.'[247]

[B] Revised General Statutes of the International Workers' Association, 1866/1873.

Considering,

That workers' liberation should be brought about by workers themselves; that workers' struggles to win freedom should create the same rights and duties for all and should not allow the development new privilege;

That workers' subjection to capital is the fount of all servitude – material, moral and political;

That for this reason the economic emancipation of workers is therefore the great goal to which every political movement ought to be subordinated;[248]

That hitherto all such struggles have failed for want of solidarity between workers of various professions and trades within each country, and for the lack of fraternal unity between the workers of different countries;

That the emancipation of labour is not a problem that is simply local or national, rather it concerns all civilised countries and its solution necessarily depends on their practical and theoretical cooperation;

That the movement now growing amongst the workers of the most industrious countries, while it raises new hopes, solemnly warns against falling back into old errors and calls for the combination of movements that are still isolated;

For these reasons:

The Congress of the International Worker's Association, held in Geneva on September 3, 1866, declares that this Association, and every individual or society joining it, will acknowledge *morality, justice,* and *truth* as the basis of their conduct toward to all men, without distinction of nationality, creed, or colour;

Congress considers that its duty is to demand the rights of citizens and men not only for members of the Association, but for whoever fulfils their duties. *No duties without rights; no rights without duties.*

The Regional Federations represented at the International Congress meeting in Geneva on 1 September 1873, inspired by the above declaration of principles, have revised the general statutes of the International Worker's Association, and have adopted them in the following form:

[Articles]

1. The International Worker's Association has the goal of bringing about the unity of workers of all countries on the terrain of solidarity in the struggle of Labour against capital, a struggle that must achieve the complete emancipation of Labour.

2. Whoever adopts and defends the principles of the Association may become a member, subject to the responsibility of the section that admits them.

3. Sections and Federations forming the Association preserve their complete autonomy, that is to say their right to organise themselves as they see fit, to administer their own affairs, without any outside interference and to choose for themselves the path they intend to take, to achieve Labour's freedom.

4. A General Congress of the Association shall meet each year, on the first Monday in September.

5. Each section, whatever the number of its members, has the right to send a delegate to the General Congress.

6. The role of Congress is to be a meeting place for workers of various countries to present their aspirations, and through discussion to bring them into harmony. At the opening of congress each Regional Federation shall present a report on the development of the Association in the past year. Except for matters of administration, there will be no recourse to voting; questions of principle cannot be subjected to a vote. General Congress decisions are mandatory only for those Federations that accept them.

7. Voting at a General Congress will be by Federation, each Regional Federation having one vote.

8. Each year Congress will give the responsibility for the organisation of the following year's Congress to a Regional Federation. The Federation so mandated will serve as the Federal Bureau of the Association. Any section of federation wishing matters to be placed on the agenda of Congress should address these to it three months in advance so that all Regional Federations are made aware of them. Moreover, the Federal Bureau may serve as an intermediary between federations for matters brought to its attention: general correspondence, statistics and strikes.

9. Congress will itself designate the city where the next congress is to be held. On the date appointed for Congress delegates will

come together in regular fashion on the day and place appointed without there being a need for any special notification.

10. In the course of a year, at the initiative of a section or federation, a vote of Regional Federations may change the place and date of a General Congress or convene an Extraordinary Congress, in the light of events.

11. Whenever a new Regional Federation seeks to become a member of the Association, at least three months before the General Congress, it should announce this intention to whatever Federation is acting as the Federal Bureau. The latter will make this known to all Regional Federations and these will have to decide whether or not to accept the new federation, and accordingly it will mandate its delegates to the General Congress, which in the last instance will decide.

Appendix Four – Bakunin's last letter to Élisée Reclus.

15 February 1875 – Lugano

Very dear friend,

Thank you so much for your good words. I have never doubted your friendship, this feeling has always been mutual, and I measure yours by mine. Yes you are right, for the moment revolution has gone back to bed. We are falling back into a time of evolution that is to say of revolutions that are invisible, subterranean and often even imperceptible. The changes that are happening today are very dangerous, if not for humanity at least for certain nations. It is the last incarnation of an exhausted class, playing its last card, protected by the military dictatorship of MacMahon-Bonapartism in France, or of Bismarck in the rest of Europe. I agree with you in saying that the hour of revolution has past, not because of terrible disasters that we have witnessed and the terrible defeats for which we have been the more or less culpable victims, but because, to my great despair I have observed – and continue to observe again day by day – that revolutionary passion, hope and thinking are not to be found at all amongst the masses, and when these are absent it is vain

to complain, nothing can be done. I admire the patience and heroic perseverance of the Belgians and the Jurassians – these are the last Mohicans of the International – and despite every difficulty and every obstacle, in the midst of general indifference – they put up an obstinate front, they continue working calmly, as they did before catastrophe struck, when the general movement was on the rise, and when the least effort created a powerful effect. This work is all the more praiseworthy insofar as they may not see the benefit of it, but they can be sure that the effort will not be lost – nothing is lost in this world – and drops of water, though they may be invisible may go on to form an ocean. As for me, my dear, I was becoming too old, too infirm, too weary, and I should say to you too disappointed, to feel the desire and the strength enough to share in this work. I have very deliberately retired from the fray and I will spend the rest of my days in a contemplation that will not be idle but on the contrary very active intellectually and I hope that I will not fail to produce something of use. Immense curiosity is one of the passions which now dominates me. Once I had had to recognise that bad things had won out and that I was unable to prevent them, I put myself to work to study changes and developments with a quasi-scientific passion, and complete objectivity. What actors are at work, and what a scene! At the root of the entire situation in Europe, are Emperor Wilhelm and Bismarck at the head of a great population of lackeys. Against them are the Pope with his Jesuits and the whole Roman Catholic Church with riches by the million, dominating a large part of the world through women, through the ignorance of the masses, through the incomparably skilled manoeuvring of their innumerable allies, and with their hands and eyes everywhere. The third actor, French civilisation, is incarnated by Mac-Mahon, Dupanloup and Broglie – tightening the screws on a great, but fallen people. Then, around them Spain, Italy, Austria, Russia, each one of them dressing themselves up for special events; further away Britain, unable to decide what it should become and further off the model republic of the USA cosy-ing up to military dictatorship. Poor humanity! It is obvious that it will only escape this cesspit through an immense social revolution. But how will it make this revolution? Never has international reaction in Europe been so formidably armed against every popular movement. Repression has been made into a new science – one taught systematically to lieutenants in the military schools of every nation.

And what do we have, to attack these impregnable fortresses? Unorganised masses. But how should they be organised, when they lack even enough passion to save themselves, when they do not know what they should want, and when they do not want the only things that might save them. What remains is propaganda, such as is made by the Belgians and the Jurassians. That is no doubt something, but really not so much, a few drops of water in the ocean; and if there were no other means of salvation, humanity would have occasion to rot ten times before being saved. One other hope remains, universal war. These huge military states will surely destroy and devour each other sooner or later. But what a perspective! *[Manuscript ends.]*

Appendix Five – Resolutions of the Congresses of Verviers and Ghent, 5 to 8 September, and 9 to 14 September, 1877.[249]

On social revolution

Verviers, 8.9.1877. Considering that if social revolution is by its very nature international, and if it depends on being spread to all counties for its triumph, nevertheless there are certain countries which, because of their social and economic condition are more ready for a revolutionary movement. Congress declares: that it is the duty of every revolutionary to support morally and materially every country in revolution, as it is the duty to spread it, as only through these means is it possible to assure the triumph of the revolution in those countries where it breaks out. *Agreed by all federations except the Jura federation.*

The tendencies of modern production and property.

Verviers, 8.9.1877. Considering that modern means of production tends, insofar as ownership is concerned, towards the accumulation of capital in the hands of a few and increases workers' exploitation; that this state of things – it being the source of all social inequalities – needs to be changed; Congress considers that the achievement of collective property, that is to say the take-over by groups of workers of social capital is a social

necessity; congress also declares that a Socialist party truly worthy of being so-named should make plain the principle of collective property, not in some distant future but rather in its current programme and in its everyday activities.

This was the first matter discussed and voted in Ghent on 11 September 1877; after many delegates had spoken two opposing resolutions were put:

Considering that as long as land and other instruments of production, which are the means for life, are owned and appropriated by individuals or groups, the economic subjugation of the mass of the people, and all the misery that results therefrom, will continue; Congress declares that the state or the Commune, representing and encompassing all people should have possession of land and other instruments of labour. *(Sixteen delegates voted in favour – for the most part German, Flemish – including De Paepe, Greulich, and Liebknecht.)*

Ghent, 11.9.1877. Considering that modern means of production tends, insofar as ownership is concerned, towards the concentration of social wealth in the hands of a few and thereafter all social inequalities. We believe that workers should take over social wealth and transform it into the collective property of federated producer groups. *(Eleven Verviers delegates voted in favour.)*

Politics and political parties

It was noted that a pact of solidarity could not be concluded between all the organisations attending these congresses, given that their principles and means of action differed on essential points. On the evening of 13 September a private meeting was held involving the Flemish, German and a few other delegates that resolved on the creation of a special pact between them, promoting mutual aid between parties whose programmes were analogous with that of the German socialists; it was to have a bureau hosted in Ghent. The delegates who had been in Verviers returned there on the 15th and reported back; a comment noted that labour in Verviers 'was energetically resolved to march beneath the banner of the International and will make every effort to propagate amongst

Belgian workers the principles of revolutionary socialism in opposition to the tactics advanced by the socialists of the Flemish provinces."[250]

Verviers, 8.9.1877; Considering that the conquest of power is a natural tendency for all political parties and that this power has no other goal than the defence of economic privilege; Considering besides, that in reality that current society is divided not into political parties but rather through economic situations – exploiters and exploited, workers and managements; wage-earners and capitalists; considering further that the antagonism that exists between the two categories cannot cease through the will of any power or government, but rather through the united efforts of all the exploited against their exploiters; for these reasons: Congress declares that there is no difference between *political* parties, whether they are called socialist or not, all these parties without distinction, forming its eyes one reactionary mass and it sees its duty as fighting all of them; It hopes that workers who still travel in the ranks of these various parties, instructed by lessons from experience and by revolutionary propaganda, will open their eyes and abandon the way of politics to adopt that of revolutionary socialism.

Ghent, 14.9.1877, the above resolution appeared in Ghent in amended form: Considering that the conquest of power is a natural tendency for all political parties and that this power will have consequences, nothing other than the creation of privileges positions; Considering besides, that in reality that current society is divided not into political parties but rather through economic situations – exploiters and exploited, workers and managements; wage-earners and capitalists; Considering further that the antagonism that exists between the two categories cannot cease through the will of any political power but rather through the united efforts of all the exploited against their exploiters; We declare it is our duty to combat all political parties, whether they are called socialist or not, hoping that workers who still travel in the ranks of these various parties, illuminated by experience will open their eyes and abandon the way of politics to adopt *anti-governmental* socialism. (*Eight Verviers delegates voted for this resolution – three others were absent; eighteen delegates – mostly Flemish and German – voted against.)*

Ghent 14.9.1877. Considering that social emancipation is inseparable from political emancipation; Congress declares that the proletariat, organised as a distinct party opposed to all other parties formed by the wealthy classes, must employ all political means that promote the social emancipation of all its members. *(Voting for this was similar to the preceding resolution; with the Flemish and German voting for and eight Verviers delegates voted against.)*

Ghent, 14.9.1877. Considering that current economic circumstances are the cause of all social injustices, considering that an object of all bourgeois political parties is the defence of this social order, considering furthermore that we have recognised that current order is preserved by force and can only be overturned by force, considering that the means that one should use should be fitting to the goal one wishes to achieve; Congress declares that workers should constitute themselves on their own, against all bourgeois political parties. And to achieve Social Revolution, propaganda and activity should promote agitation for insurrection. *(Four delegates voted in favour: Chalain, De Paepe, Paulin, and Rodriguez, and two against; other delegates abstained.)*

On the organisation of trades' organisations

Verviers, 8.9.1877. Congress, while it recognises the importance of trades' organisations and recommends their formation on an international basis, declares that trades' organisations that have as their goal only the improvement of workers' situation, either through the reduction of working hours, or by the organisation of wage levels, will never accomplish the emancipation of the proletariat, and that trades' organisations should adopt as their principal goal the abolition of the proletariat, in other words the abolition of management and taking possession of the means of labour and the expropriation of their owners.

Ghent, 14.9.1877. Considering that in the struggle against the exploitation of man by man trades' organisations are one of the most powerful levers for the emancipation of labour; Congress suggests to all categories of workers as yet not organised, to create societies of resistance whilst recognising that the final goal of all labour organisations should be the complete abolition of waged-work. *(Agreed nem. con.)*

Key Sources:

Some IWA congress reports are available online, all can be found in: Jacques Freymond, *La première internationale*, (four volumes), Geneva: Droz/IUHEI, 1962-71.

AIT: *Compte-rendu du IVe Congrès tenu à Bâle en septembre 1869*, Brussels, Imprimerie Désirée Brismée, 1869. Available online: on http://books.google.co.uk/

AIT: *Compte-Rendu*, Congrès, Bern, 1876 http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k5544648f/f6.pleinepage.langFR

Bakunin, (Michel Bakounine), the most accessible selection is his *Oeuvres*, edited by James Guillaume in French and published in Paris by P. V. Stock (Available online, e.g. http://fr.wikisource.org/wiki/Bakounine/%C5%92uvres).

Fédération Jurassien: *Bulletin*. Available online see http://www.la-presse-anarchiste.net; http://archivesautonomies.org/spip.php?article75

Federación Barcelonesa: *Federación*. Available online http://mdc2.cbuc.cat/cdm/search/collection/federacion/

The International Working Men's Association, London: *Resolutions of the Congress of Geneva, 1866, and the Congress of Brussels, 1868.* http://archive.org/stream/resolutionsofcon00inte/resolutionsofcon00inte_djvu.txt;

[Ibid.] *Report of the Fourth Annual Congress of the International Working Men's Association, held at Basel, in Switzerland, from the 6th to the 11th September, 1869*; Published by the General Council, 1869; available via http://hdl.handle.net/10622/B6E656DD-15BA-4E47-A6F7-B7132F4544C3

James Guillaume, *L'Internationale: documents et souvenirs 1864-78*, (Four books, 1905, 1907, 1909 and 1910). Books 1 and 2 are available online in one volume (Paris, Société nouvelle de librairie et d'éditions, 1905); books 3 and 4 are available online in a second volume (Paris, Stock, 1909). The page numbering stops at the end of each book. References are given by volume publication date – 1905 for volume 1; 1909 for volume 2, with part numbers and chapter numbers. http://fr.wikisource.org/wiki/Auteur:James_Guillaume

Mathieu Léonard, *L'émancipation des travailleurs*, Paris: La Fabrique, 2011.

Franz Mehring, *Karl Marx – The Story of his Life*, London, Allen & Unwin, 1939. (Available online). The *Marxists* website (http://www.marxists.org/) has this and many other texts.

Chronology (International events and events in particular countries.)

1862: English and French and labour representatives meet at an International Exhibition in London.

1863: German General Workers' Association founded in Leipzig, led Ferdinand Lassalle (Lassalle dies 1864).

1864: Founding of the International Working-Men's Association (IWA), St. Martin's Hall Meeting, London. France – 'Manifesto of the Sixty', for labour rights; conditional legalisation of strikes. Schleswig war, Denmark defeated.

1865: French IWA leaders travel to London to insist that the General Council should not take on a leadership role: 'The General Council is only the heart of the IWA, congress will be its head.' IWA Conference in London. American civil war ends.

1866: Geneva: First IWA Congress, 66 delegates attend of which 33 are Swiss. Austrian Empire defeated in war with Prussia and Italy. First issue of *Der Vorbote* published in Geneva by J. Becker, it is distributed widely to German readers in Europe and North America, (ceases in 1871).

1867: Lausanne: Second IWA Congress 64 attend of which 32 Swiss. ***Belgium*** - Miners' strike defeated, soldiers kill three workers. ***France*** – many internationalist arrested. Riots in Lille.

1868: Brussels: Third IWA Congress 99 delegates of which 7 Swiss – collective property ownership endorsed, workers called on to stop work in case of war. ***Belgium*** – March, army breaks up a 3,000 strong miners' occupation in Charleroi, six killed. ***Cuba*** – independence movement. ***France*** – IWA officials imprisoned. Government announces toleration of unions; membership mushrooms. ***Spain*** – military revolt, Queen Isabella deposed. ***Switzerland*** – Geneva, strike of some 2500 building workers; IWA members. P. Coullery and J. Frey elected to local government. Founding of the Alliance for Socialist Democracy. First issue of *L'Egalité* published (it runs to 1872), it replaces P. Coullery's *La Voix de l'Avenir*. ***UK*** – beginnings of the TUC

1869: September, Basel: Fourth IWA Congress 78 delegates, of which 25 Swiss; General Council motion on inheritance defeated; unions defined as foundation of a new labour-run society, discussion of electoral politics not prioritised. ***Belgium*** – violent strike conflicts in Seraing and in the Borinage. ***France*** – elections show decline in support for the government, army kills 14 miners, widespread strike wave. ***Germany:*** August, Eisenach, foundation of the Social-democratic Workers' Party of Germany, it supersedes Becker's German language organisation. ***Italy*** – first IWA section organised. ***Spain*** – IWA, inspired by Fanelli, organises. ***Switzerland*** – January, Francophone-Swiss regional IWA federation created; strikes in Basel, Geneva and Lausanne; Swiss IWA membership peaks around 6,000.

1870: March, Marx sends an IWA *Confidential Communication* to German Social-democrats vilifying Bakunin. July, Franco-Prussian War. September, Napoleon III defeated at Sedan, fall of the Third Empire, communes declared in Lyons and Marseilles. IWA Congress due to meet in Paris is relocated to Mainz and then cancelled; items for its agenda: industrial labour, rural organisation, public debt, relations between labour's social and political movements, property, banks, co-ops and mean of avoiding war. Engels moves to London.

Belgium – demonstrations denounce army repression of strikers. ***France*** – January, strike at Le Creusot. ***Spain*** – June, first Spanish IWA congress in Barcelona, 90 delegates representing 40,000 workers. November, Amadeo of Savoy becomes King. ***Switzerland*** – March, J. Becker resigns from the Geneva Alliance. April, Saint-Imier, split in the Francophone-Swiss IWA regional federation leads to creation of rival federations: one based in the Jura, the other based in Geneva. August, Geneva IWA expels Bakunin and his allies. Swiss Social-democratic party founded (expires 1872), with *Tagwacht* as its journal.

1871: January, armistice suspends Franco-Prussian war. September – London IWA Conference, General Council majority endorses political parties and votes itself extended powers. ***France*** – February, elections, two IWA members elected. March, Paris Commune formed in revolt against republic based in Versailles; May, Commune vanquished: some 20,000 are shot, more deported; IWA banned; June, France invites other governments to supress the IWA: 'an association for hate and war.' Communard refugees spread radical influences. ***Germany*** - Bebel and Liebknecht imprisoned. ***Italy*** – Mazzini's antipathy to the Commune exposed by a tract prepared by Bakunin; first IWA sections dissolved by the police. ***Spain*** – short-lived constitutional monarchy; June, Spanish federation office moves to Lisbon to escape persecution. Strike wave, defeat in Cartagena. Valencia – IWA congress. ***Switzerland*** – November, Sonvilier Jura congress rejects London conference resolutions. ***UK*** – October, formation of British IWA Federation; Trade Union Act gives unions some protections, but picketing is made illegal.

1872: Fifth IWA congress, 2-7 September, in The Hague with some 61 delegates attending (of which 21 members of the General Council). Bakunin and Guillaume are expelled and the General Council is relocated to New York. 15-16 September, Extraordinary Saint-Imier IWA congress, fifteen delegates (2 Swiss) repudiate the decisions taken in The Hague. November, followers of Blanqui leave the IWA, declaring that it had failed to do its duty and had 'fled across the Atlantic.' ***Belgium*** – December, repudiation of decisions of The Hague by Belgian congress meeting in Brussels. ***France*** – March, new law bans organisations promoting strikes, prohibits affiliation to the IWA (repealed 1901). November, 22 out of 23 delegates at a French IWA meeting support electoral abstention. ***Italy*** – Cafiero, who had hitherto acted for Engels in Italy, announces his support for anti-authoritarians. August, Rimini IWA conference, Italian federation breaks with General Council (no delegates are sent to The Hague). November, policy of preventing disorder announced in parliament. ***Spain*** – January, IWA banned; April – Carlists launch reactionary insurrection in the north; Saragossa, IWA congress, conflict between 'anti-authoritarians' and 'Marxists'; the latter, a minority, set up a new Madrid federation. December, congress of Cordoba, (44 delegates representing 20 to 45,000 workers) repudiates decisions of The Hague congress. ***Switzerland*** – wood workers win a strike in Zurich. ***UK*** – First Congress of the British IWA federation. ***Uruguay*** – IWA formed. ***USA*** – conflicts divide IWA rival general councils form (Spring Street vs. Tenth Ward); several strikes demand 8-hour day.

1873: January/February, New York General Council suspends Jura federation. The Spring Street USA federation and the Dutch federation repudiate the decisions taken at The Hague. British IWA federation breaks with General Council. May – New York General Council declares that all the IWA bodies that have rejected the resolutions of The Hague have 'placed themselves outside' the IWA. 1-6 September, Geneva, Sixth IWA Congress – attended by some 24 persons (of which 4 Swiss) representatives from the Belgian, Dutch, English, Italian, Jura, and Spanish federations and others; 7 -13 September, a pro-General-

council-congress also meets in Geneva (Marx and Engels term it a fiasco). ***France*** – a list of IWA members is revealed to the police, two (of three) delegates of the General Council are exposed as turn coats; ongoing persecutions, labour organisation is banned. Anti-authoritarians organize a congress in Lyons and publish *La solidarité révolutionnaire*. ***Italy*** – March, Bologna, second federal congress; planning for a rising disrupted by state repression. December – Italian Committee for Social Revolution founded to prepare insurrectionary movement. ***Spain*** – January, IWA congress in Cordoba; February – Amadeo resigns, republic proclaimed. June-July, cantonalist regional movements and risings; some places e.g. have a strong working class following e.g. Alcoy, Sanlúcar de Barrameda (Cadiz); general strike in Barcelona; repression (300 shot in Seville). ***Switzerland*** – June, a labour congress in Olten creates the Labour Union (Arbeiterbund).

1874: March, Lugarno conference – Italian federations' plans for insurrection not supported by other IWA bodies. Brussels, Seventh IWA congress (16 persons, of which 10 Belgians). ***France*** – April, Lyons, 26 labour activists imprisoned or deported in a mass trial, disrupting the IWA. Blanqui-ist manifesto issued. ***Germany*** – January, Socialists win 350,000 votes (6.8%) in national elections; ***Italy*** – attempted insurrection in Romagna, Castel del Monte; IWA banned. ***Spain*** – January, defeat of last rebel administration in Cartagena; June, (clandestine) 4th congress in Madrid; IWA banned.

1875: ***Belgium*** – foundation of a Labour Council (Chambre) in Brussels. ***Germany*** – September, congress in Gotha and formation of German Socialist Workers' Party. ***Italy*** – trials of IWA members – antipathy towards government secures acquittal. ***Spain*** – monarchy restored; annual IWA international congress unable to meet there; repression continues, federation still grows nevertheless, by 1882 it has 80,000 members. ***Switzerland*** – July, Saint Gotthard tunnel, militia opens fire on Italian strikers killing four of them, and wounding ten.

1876: October, Bern, Eighth IWA congress, 28 delegates (18 Swiss based) plus invited guests. It agrees to call for a general socialist congress open to all socialists. Dissolution of the 'Marxist' IWA. Death of Bakunin. ***Belgium*** – Regional congress agrees to campaign against child labour. ***France*** – state of siege lifted, Paris – labour congress. ***Italy*** – Florence, clandestine third congress of Italian IWA; insurrectionary deeds advocated as the most effective means of propaganda. ***USA*** – Workingmen's Party formed.

1877: Russian-Turkish war (ends 1878). September, two congresses meet (1) in Verviers, ninth and final international IWA congress, with 20 persons present. (2) in Ghent, a Universal socialist congress, attended by eleven from Verviers and 31 others (of 42 persons present, 27 are Belgians). The IWA breaks up; preparatory work facilitates later emergence of the Second (Social-democratic) International. ***Belgium*** – May, two congresses meet, an IWA congress and a second congress that results in the formation of the Flemish Socialist Workers' Party. June, a labour congress leaves open what 'politics' local bodies should adopt. December, last congress of the Belgian IWA Federation, it relocates the international's federal bureau, moving it from Verviers to Brussels where it ceases to function. ***France*** – August, IWA Federation formed, recognised as such at the Verviers congress, it held a clandestine congress in La Chaux-de-Fonds, and published *L'Avant-Garde*. ***Germany*** – January, Socialists win 493,000 votes (9.1%) in national elections. Bebel and Liebknecht imprisoned. ***Italy*** – April, unsuccessful 'propaganda by the deed' guerrilla launched in Benevento. 'Legalist' libertarian congress in Milan. ***Spain*** – women protest against tax increases on foods and goods. ***Switzerland*** – March, confrontation between Jura federation supporters and police in Bern, 30 IWA members

(inc. Brousse and Guillaume) fined and/or imprisoned (945 days in all), Bern IWA disorganised; referendum approves a maximum eleven hour day, and a ban on child labour. ***Uruguay*** – IWA Federation formed, also recognised in Verviers. ***USA*** – Socialist(ic) Labor Party formed.

1878: No annual IWA international congress is convened. ***Cuba*** – independence movement defeated. ***France*** – labour congresses, state bans some meetings and arrests follow; James Guillaume moves to Paris, *L'Avant-Garde*, organ of the French federation ceases publication. The French government bans an international congress, scheduled to convene in Paris. ***Germany*** – assassination attempt on Kaiser, anti-socialist laws prohibit meetings and publications. Liebknecht writes 'We want to kill those [anti-socialist laws] with our lawfulness'. ***Italy*** – Cafiero, Costa et al. imprisoned; trial and acquittal of the Benevento insurgents; failed assassination attempt against Italian King Umberto; revival of IWA organization, insurrection mooted, clandestine congress in Pisa. ***Spain*** – October – failed assassination attempt against King Alfonso; Mano Negra (Black Hand) organisation formed(?). ***Switzerland*** –*Bulletin* ceases publication. The Jura federation congress meets in Fribourg; it decides against working to organise a new international congresses. **USA** – rail workers' strike and shootings.

1879: ***Belgium*** – Formation of Belgian Socialist party.

France – Marseillais labour congress, Federation of the party of socialist workers of France created; Blanqui elected deputy. ***Spain*** – rural risings and riots. ***Switzerland*** – Brousse imprisoned for inciting anarchism. Kropotkin begins publication of *Le Révolté*. Jura congress meets in La Chaux-de-Fonds.

1880: ***Belgium*** – Mass demonstration in Brussels. Christmas, revolutionary/anarchist congress in Verviers calls for an international congress to meet in London. ***France*** – Amnesty for Communards. ***Germany*** – Radicals (Johann Most and Wilhelm Hasselmann) expelled from Socialist party. ***Italy*** – regional congresses held. ***Switzerland*** – August, La Chaux-de-Fonds, congress of the Jura federation attended by Kropotkin, Élisée Reclus and Cafiero. Meeting of anarchists from northern Italy in Chiasso. Foundation of a national Swiss trades' union association.

1881: London – International anarchist congress. Chur (Switzerland) – international socialist congress. ***France*** – the funeral of Auguste Blanqui serves as a mass demonstration of Paris labour; labour congress in Paris, conflict between those for and against electoral priority. ***Russia*** – Tsar Alexander II assassinated. ***Spain*** – foundation congress of the Regional Workers' Federation (FRTE). Further congresses meet over the next seven years. Libertarians are polarised between 'syndicalism' and 'anarcho-communism'.

1882: ***Spain*** – congress in Seville, 254 delegates; ***Switzerland*** – Jura federation congresses in Lausanne and Geneva.

1883: ***Italian*** congress in Chiasso (Ticino, Switzerland). ***Spain*** – congress in Barcelona, 140 delegates; ***Switzerland*** – Jura federation congress in La Chaux-de-Fonds.

[1] http://www.marxists.org/archive/draper/1966/twosouls/index.htm?PHPSESSID=35fb8e862c3404829cd69fc281a1c371

[2] 'Circular letter to my friends in Italy', October 1871, in Michel Bakounine, *Oeuvres*, Vol. 6, Paris: Stock, 1913, p. 336.

[3] Bakunin writes of a Federation-republic of the frankly popular and socialist Republic, of Anarchy. It is the politics of social revolution desiring the abolition of the state and the wholly free popular economic organisation, on the path of a bottom to top federation. *Oeuvres*, Vol. 6, p. 352.

[4] Engels ridiculed critics, writing that they wanted 'no party discipline, no centralisation of forces at a particular point, no weapons of struggle' and likening them to early Christians, passively turning the other cheek.
January, 1872. Karl Marx & Friedrich Engels, *Collected Works*, London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1989, Vol. 23. p. 67.

[5] Since the French revolution: 'there have been in reality but two powers on the continent of Europe – Russia and absolutism, the revolution and democracy.' 'The Real Issue in Turkey' in in *Collected Works*, Vol. 12, London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1987, p. 17.

[6] Arthur Lehning, Ed., Bakounine; *Les conflits dans l'Internationale*: 1872, Antony (France), Ed. Tops-H. Trinquier, 2003, p. 24.

[7] Ibid. p. 28.

[8] Ibid. p. 57.

[9] (1844-1916) Swiss, teacher, printer and editor, a leading member of the Jura federation, lived in Paris after 1878.

[10] Guillaume would refer to nationalistic remarks in letters between Marx and Engels – quoted below – to justify his choice.

[11] The King of Prussia had been overthrown as Prince of Neuchâtel, but still had supporters there in this period. Dr Coullery, an early IWA supporter, sought an electoral alliance with a royalist party. James Guillaume, *L'Internationale: documents et souvenirs 1864-78*, Paris: Societé nouvelle de librairie et d'éditions, (Four books: 1905, 1907, 1909 and 1910) Book 1, 1905, p. 61. (Guillaume's four book study were consolidated into two volumes, each containing two books, the second two-part volume, published in Paris by Stock in 1909. References are given by part, chapter and page number. It is Available online: http://fr.wikisource.org/wiki/Auteur:James_Guillaume .)

[12] (1819-1903), Swiss, a doctor, helped promote the IWA, a liberal conservative.

[13] Bakunin made a translated into Russian of Marx and Engels' *Communist Manifesto*, for publication in Herzen's journal *Kolokol*.

[14] (1837-1912), French, educationalist and freethinker, active in the IWA, briefly a member of the London General Council, from which he was expelled for his defence of the Jura federation.

[15] (1809-1886) German, in exile in Geneva after 1860; a long-term collaborator of Marx, helped promote a German language IWA network and published *Der Vorbote*. He was also the vice-president of the Alliance for Socialist Democracy, and for a year or more collaborated therein with Bakunin. Subsequently he broke with him and acted in concert with Marx and Engels.

[16] One of Bakunin most avid critics – Nikolai Utin – attended public meetings of the Alliance – Bakunin opposed his joining it.

[17] Wolfgang Abendroth misleads in writing that Bakunin had 'little time' for trade union work, see his *Short History of the European Working Class*, New York: Monthly Review, 1972, p. 35.

[18] Programme et règlement de l'Alliance internationale de la Démocratie Socialiste. (1868) in James Guillaume, *L'Internationale,* Book 1, 1905, pp. 132-133.

19 Marx to Engels, September 11, 1867, in *Collected Works*, Vol. 42, London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1987, p. 424.

[20] *La Marseillaise*, 22 July. The 1868 IWA congress had discussed what should be done to prevent war and had resolved to call for a general work stoppage. In a letter to Engels of 16 September, Marx remarks on: 'Belgian nonsense that it was necessary to strike against war.' Marx & Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 43, London, Lawrence & Wishart, 1987, p. 101.

[21] Marx to Engels, 20 July 1870, *Collected Works*, 1989, Vol. 44, p. 3; our emphasis. Back in 1851 they had seen the German working class as 'far behind' that of France and England. *New York Daily Tribune*, October 25, 1851; (*Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany*).

[22] They were published by a committee in Brunswick on 5 September. See also Marx & Engels, *Collected Works*, 1989, Vol. 44, p. 68. These views were noted by Bakunin in a letter to *La Liberté* of Brussels, 1-8 October, 1872. Michel Bakounine, *Oeuvres*, Vol. 4, Paris: Stock, 1910, p. 370.

[23] *Collected Works*, 1989, Vol. 44, p. 47.

[24] Bakunin praised their courage.

[25] Letter of Engels to Marx in London; 15 August 1870. Our emphasis. http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1870/letters/70_08_15.htm; see also a letter dated July 31, *Collected Works*, 1989, Vol. 44, p. 18. 'We seem to have won the first serious encounter.'

[26] Bakunin saw big states as predators, intent on swallowing new territories; his antipathy was directed against such big states and against centralisation, even in small states. Arthur Lehning, Ed., Bakounine; *Les conflits dans l'Internationale*: 1872, Antony (France), Ed. Tops-H. Trinquier, 2003, p. 37.

[27] Our emphasis. It should also be noted that Marx and Engels frequently disparaged Wilhelm Liebknecht, and many other leftists.

[28] The employment of a seventh delegate is not noted. From: Jacques Freymond, *La première internationale*, Vol. 2, Geneva: Droz, 1962, pp. 110-111.

[29] Jean Maitron, *Le mouvement anarchiste en France*, Vol. 1, Paris: Gallimard, 1992, p. 46.

[30] *The General Council of the First International, 1868-1870: Minutes*. Moscow: Progress Publishers, n.d; Vol. 3, pp.157ff.

[31] Marx did not attend the first sessions of the General Council after the congress, and his absence was perhaps telling. One might speculate that a discussion of the congress was held only on his return, involving Engels – who only later became a member of the General Council.

[32] *Collected Works*, 1989, Vol. 44, p. 220, emphasis added. See also: R.P. Morgan, *The German Social Democrats and the First International*, Cambridge University Press, 1965, p 183.
[33] Notably Eugène Varlin.
[34] Cited by Maxime Leroy, *La Coutume ouvrière,* Paris: Giard & Brière, 1913, pp. 75-76.
[35] Motion adopted at Saragossa IWA congress, 1872; cited by Mary Nash, *Rojas*, Madrid: Taurus, 1999, p. 59.
[36] Nunzio Pernicone, *Italian Anarchism, 1864-1892*, Oakland & Edinburgh: PM Press, p. 79. The report of the 1877 IWA congress noted the presence there of a report from the women's section of Verviers.
[37] Marx to Liebknecht, 2 March 1871, *Collected Works*, 1989, Vol. 44, p. 114.
[38] Louis Blanqui (1805-1881) was a famous active insurrectionary French radical; in 1871, whilst in prison, he was elected to the presidency of the Paris Commune.
[39] Pierre-Josephe Proudhon, (1809-1865), French, Mutualist socialist. His writings influenced many francophone labour activists (property is theft).
[40] Née Victoire Léodile Béra, (1824-1900), French, writer, feminist, libertarian socialist, active in the Commune and the IWA, returned to France in 1880.
[41] *La Sociale*, No. 39, 8 May 1871.
[42] Engels: *The Prussian Military Question and the German Workers' Party*, 1865.
[43] The Grütli Swiss labour association had been founded in the 1830s, it excluded the non-Swiss.
[44] James Guillaume, *L'Internationale,* op. cit, Book 1, 1905, p. 61.
[45] Bakunin writes of workers being transformed by vanity and ambition into bourgeois. Arthur Lehning, Ed., Bakounine; *Les conflits,* op. cit, p. 174; Marx's comments are in D. Fernbach (Ed.) [Karl Marx], *The First International and After*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1974, p. 336.
[46] James Guillaume, *L'Internationale,* Book 1, 1905, p. 61.
[47] Engels had written: 'Universal conscription is the necessary and natural corollary of universal suffrage; it puts the voters in the position of being able to enforce their decisions gun in hand against any attempt at a coup d'état. This quotation and ones immediately above are from Engels pamphlet, 'The Prussian Military Question and the German Workers' Party', 1865. *Collected Works*, Vol. 20. For another perspective see texts by R. Grimm in A.J. Brossat & J.Y. Potel, *Antimilitarisme et Révolution*, Vol. 1, Paris: UGE, pp. 225-233.
[48] R.P. Morgan, *The German Social Democrats,* op. cit, chapter 6.
[49] Marx and Engels had begun to talk of ways of discrediting Bakunin; attacks on him were defeated at the Basel IWA Congress. They were repeated at the London conference in 1871 where Bakunin was absent. He was accused of taking orders from the Russian police. Mathieu Léonard, *L'émancipation des travailleurs*, Paris: La Fabrique, 2011, p. 278.
[50] Thus the common 'Marxist' view, that at this time the more advanced IWA sections supported Marx, and the more backward ones supported Bakunin – is fallacious
[51] Dick Geary, 'Socialism and the German Labour before 1914,' in Dick Geary, Ed, *Labour and Socialist Movements in Europe before 1914*, Oxford: Berg, 1989, p. 101-2.
[52] Klaus Saul, 'Repression or Integration? The State, Trade Unions and Industrial Disputes in Imperial Germany,' in Wolfgang Mommsen, & Hans Gerhard Husung, Eds., *The Development of Trade Unions in Germany and Great Britain 1880-1914*, London: Allen & Unwin, 1985, p. 340.
[53] 21 January 1871, in *Collected Works*, 1989, Vol. 44, p. 101.

[54] James Guillaume, *L'Internationale,* 1905, Book 1, second part, p. 225.
[55] It does not follow that a demand addressed to the state by a group of party activists is necessarily owned by the working class as a whole.
[56] The resolution, and extracts from its motivation, are presented in appendix 1.
[57] Engels' letter to Bernstein, of 12-13 June 1883 is interesting. It suggested that political prospects for the future depended on bourgeois parties ruining themselves first, before our turn came. Marx & Engels, *Collected Works,* Vol. 47, 1995, p. 32ff.
[58] 'The Bakuninists at Work' First published in *Der Volksstaat*, 31 October 31 to 5 November 1873; http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1873/bakunin/ our emphasis.
[59] I am indebted to Jeanne Moisand for allowing me to refer to her 'Révolutions dans le monde espagnol et réseaux internationalistes (1873)' forthcoming in a collection of contributions from a colloquium 'Il y a 150 ans, l'Association internationale des travailleurs' (June 2014) to be published by Brill. This phrase from Engels comes in 'The Bakuninists at Work' op. cit.
[60] *La Federación* (Barcelona), V, 183; 15 February 1873, http://www.cedall.org/Documentacio/Castella/cedall203410103.htm
[61] Marx to Friedlich Adolph Sorge. 19 September 1879, in Colledted Works, Vol. 45, p.414.
[62] But distance was not the only factor: the greater number of delegates attending from France reflected the widespread organisation of sections there, and contrasted with the absence of active support in Germany.
[63] The *Bulletin de la Federation jurassienne,* 1.4.1877.
[64] (1841-1893), French, a Communard, in exile worked with the Jura federation. Listed for expulsion at The Hague but not actually expelled. He returned to France in 1880, later a reformist socialist.
[65] (1826-1901), like Malon an activist and Communard; whilst in exile a member of the Jura federation.
[66] K. Steven Vincent, *Between Marxism, and Anarchism: Benoît Malon and French Reformist Socialism*, University of Chicago Press, p. 45.
[67] Nikolai Isaakovich Utin, (1841-1883), Russian radical exile, returned to Russia in 1878, and was licensed to supply Vodka. Utin was Marx's chief informer concerning Bakunin.
[68] Ibid, p. 47.
[69] Might appear so: at times the Jura Federation was prepared to acknowledge that faced with similar circumstances they might have taken the same course as that adopted by German Social-democrats.
[70] *The General Council, Minutes*, op. cit, Vol. 3, pp. 157-9.
[71] James Guillaume, *L'Internationale,* Book 1, 1905, pp. 195-6.
[72] See appendix 1 for extracts of the debate and the resolution passed.
[73] Jacques Freymond, *La première internationale*, Vol. 2, p. 109.
[74] *Report of the Fourth Annual Congress of the International Working Men's Association, held at Basle, in Switzerland, from the 6th to the 11th September, 1869*; Published by the General Council, 1869, p. 33;
http://hdl.handle.net/10622/B6E656DD-15BA-4E47-A6F7-B7132F4544C3
[75] Ibid, p.18.
[76] Freymond, *La première internationale*, Vol. 2, p. 115. The *Report* leaves one with a different impression – it was the sixth day of the congress and some delegates were wanting to go

home. So impatience 'prevented the resolutions being seriously considered.' It was carried by a show of hands.

[77] Herman Greulich, (1842-1925), bookbinder, representing the Zurich IWA; a German by birth, active for many years in the Swiss social democratic movement.

[78] Jacques Grosselin, a watchmaker, representing international sections of the Geneva IWA. Freymond, *La première internationale*, Vol. 2, p. 114. Later a member of the local government executive, assitant mayor.

[79] *Report* p. 31-2.

[80] Ibid, p.27.

[81] James Guillaume, *L'Internationale,* Book 1, 1905, p. 202.

[82] 1-3 July 1871, in: *Collected Works*, 1989, Vol. 44, p. 163.

[83] Letter from Engels to Theodore Cuno, 24 January 1872; op. cit, pp. 306-7

[84] Frederick Engels: 'To the Spanish Federal Council of the International Working Men's Association', 13 February 1871, in: *Collected Works*, 1989, Vol. 22, p. 278.

[85] Arthur Lehning, Ed., Bakounine; *Les conflits,* op. cit, 2003, p. 162.

[86] February-March, 1872, quoted in Arthur Lehning, *Les conflits,* p. 75-6.

[87] Last section of the *Manifesto*: 'In Switzerland, they support the Radicals, without losing sight of the fact that this party consists of antagonistic elements, partly of Democratic Socialists, in the French sense, partly of radical bourgeois.'

[88] Jacques Freymond, *La première internationale*, Vol. 3, Geneva: Droz, 1971, p. 229.

[89] *Égalité,* 28 August 1869; in Michel Bakounine, *Oeuvres*, Vol. 5, Paris: Stock, 1911, pp 191-2.

[90] R.P. Morgan, *The German Social Democrats,* op. cit, pp. 192-4.

[91] See Engels' letter to Bernstein, 12-13 June 1883, in Marx & Engels, *Collected Works,* Vol. 47, p. 35-6.

[92] A detailed account of this process can be found in: Wolfgang Eckhardt, *The First Socialist Schism: Bakunin vs. Marx in the International Working Men's Association*, Oakland: PM Press, 2015.

[93] He concluded that in Italy, Cafiero, was in a situation that had been encountered before, 'the same position as some of us were in 25 years ago in Germany when we first founded the social movement. At the time we had among the proletarians the only few men in Switzerland, France and England who had absorbed socialist and communist ideas… 16 July 1871, in: *Collected Works*, 1989, Vol. 44, p. 172-3.

[94] 'Rapport sur l'Alliance' and 'Protestation de l'Alliance' 1871, in Michel Bakounine, *Oeuvres*, Vol. 6, Paris: Stock, 1913. See also his letter to comrades in the Jura, February-March, 1872, in Arthur Lehning, Ed., Bakounine; *Les conflits,* 2003, p. 74.

[95] Sam Dolgoff, Ed, *Bakunin on Anarchy*, New York: Vintage Books, pp. 245ff. https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/bakunin/works/1871/program.htm#s1

[96] Letter to *La Liberté* of Brussels, 1-8 October, 1872. Arthur Lehning, Ed., Bakounine; *Les conflits,* 2003, p. 148; Michel Bakounine, *Oeuvres*, Vol. 4, Paris: Stock, 1910, p. 370.

[97] Ronald Creagh, *Histoire de l'anarchisme aux Etats-Unis d'amerique: Les origines: 1826-1886*, Grenoble: Editions La Pensée Sauvage, 1981, pp. 153-4.

[98] *Mémoire présenté par la Fédération jurassienne de l'Association internationale des Travailleurs à toutes les Fédérations de l'Internationale*, Sonvillier: Fédération jurassienne, 1873.

[99] D. Fernbach (Ed.) [Karl Marx], *The First International and After*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1974, p. 336ff; *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, pp. 487ff.

[100] For some critical remarks see: A. Zurbrugg, 'Socialism and Strategy', in *Anarchist Studies,* Vol. 22.1, London, Lawrence & Wishart; available online www.lwbooks.co.uk/.../anarchiststudies/.../AnarchistStudies_22_1_Zurbr...

[101] Published in *La Science populaire*, Verviers, 17.11.1872; and seven days later in the Brussels *L'internationale.* Arthur Lehning, Ed., Bakounine; *Les conflits,* 2003, p. lvi.

[102] A hundred years later David Fernbach wrote that Bakunin had launched a general offensive against the General Council in Swiss papers that he 'controlled', see his introduction to Marx's writings *The First International,* op. cit, Penguin, 1974, p. 46.

[103] Jacques Freymond, *La première internationale*, Vol. 2, pp. 233-6

[104] The Spanish IWA congress meeting in Cordoba noted that the opposite was true, there was no bad faith, members of the Alliance helped establish and develop the IWA in Spain. Jacques Freymond, *La première internationale*, Vol. 3, Geneva: Droz, 1971, p. 353.

[105] These were first published some thirty years later, in *Neue Zeit*, in July 1902.

[106] Becker was consulted as to whether a pro-General Council majority might be facilitated if a congress was held in Geneva. A survey of the composition of the pro-General Council majority at The Hague was published by Max Nettlau in *Freedom,* (London?) February-April 1907, 'Marx and Engels and the IWMA'.
http://bakuninlibrary.blogspot.co.uk/2013/01/max-nettlau-marx-and-engels-and-iwma.html

[107] 1842-1911, socialist, married Laura Marx.

[108] Frederick Engels, The General Council to all members of The International Working Men's Association, 4-6 August 1872; *Collected Works*, 1989, Vol. 23, p. 211.

[109] Today the population of cantons Neuchâtel and Jura is around a quarter of a million – it was smaller 150 years ago. Marianne Enckell, *La Fédération jurassienne*, Genève: Éditions Entremonde, 2012, p. 61.

[110] After the defeat of a building workers' strike in 1870, hundreds left the city or lost their jobs.

[111] The delegates of the Spanish federation wrote that 'procedure followed up to the present at International congresses of adopting decisions by the majority of the delegates present is not equitable.' And suggested that voting should reflect membership in the IWA bodies. https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/iwma/documents/1872/hague-conference/statements.htm

[112] The status of these delegates was challenged. Membership in the Spanish federation was estimated at 50,000: Marianne Enckell, *La Fédération,* op. cit, p. 79.

[113] Jacques Freymond, *La première internationale*, Vol. 3, Geneva: Droz, 1971, pp. 226-228.

[114] Charles Thomann, *Le Mouvement anarchiste dans les Montagnes neuchâteloises et le Jura bernois*, La Chaux-de-Fonds, Imprimerie des Coopératives Réunis, p. 67. [Available online].

[115] See appendix 2.

[116] Freymond, Vol. 3, p. 151.

[117] For example: Mark Leier, *Bakunin*, New York: Seven Stories, 2006, p. 299.

[118] Constance Bantman: 'Anarchismes et anarchistes en France et en Grande-Bretagne, 1880-1914 : Échanges, représentations, transferts', 2007, p. 38.

[119] 'Pretended Splits in the International', 1872. http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1872/03/fictitious-splits.htm - our emphasis.

[120] (1840-1913) A woodworker and button maker, a leading German Social-democrat for some forty years.

[121] Engels to Bebel; 20 June 1873; *Collected Works*, 1989, Vol. 44, pp. 512-
[122] Vol. 44, p, 535.
[123] See 'Records of Marx's Speeches on Trade Unions, in *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, pp. 614-5.
[124] Interestingly a letter from Becker to Sorge, of 30 May 1867, sets out underhand steps to establish IWA influence.
[125] Franz Mehring, *Karl Marx – The Story of his Life*, London, Allen & Unwin, 1939, p. 494.
[126] Jacques Freymond, *La première internationale*, Vol. 3, Geneva: Droz, 1971, pp. 226-7.
[127] Engels to Paul Lafargue, 25 November 1871, in: *Collected Works*, Vol. 44, p. 271.
[128] Bakunin first joined the central, city Geneva IWA section, then helped found the Alliance section, and was also a member of the Jura federation. He was expelled from the Geneva central section, in absentia, in August 1870, after the split in Romande, French-Swiss Federation, in April.
[129] 'Protestation de l'Alliance' 1871, in Michel Bakounine, *Oeuvres*, Vol. 6, Paris: Stock, 1913, pp. 96-7. First published in L'Almanach du Peuple (1872).
[130] Franz Mehring, *Karl Marx*, p. 394.
[131] For example see Engels' letter to Sorge of 4 January 1873: 'What we here and you there can do for the jewellers is a drop in the ocean and will not advance their cause – the days of the great Genevan strike are past and will never come back; until the internal affairs of the International have been put in order, we shall not have the means to carry out any strike. *Collected Works*, 1989, Vol. 44, p. 466.
[132] Records show that the costs of printing various leaflets and pamphlets, see *Collected Works*, 1989, Vol. 45, pp. 44-5. The cost of printing one polemic against the Alliance – some £30 – were advanced by Engels. This may have approximated to the annual income of the IWA at the time. In its first year the IWA had an income of only some £30, and it may have grown to £50 or so, before falling away after 1870.
[133] 'The original conceptions of Marx or those of Johann Philipp Becker had been overcome by those of Schweitzer, Liebknecht or Bebel.' R.P. Morgan, *The German Social - Democrats and the First International*, Cambridge University Press, 1965, pp. 227-8. See also, F. Engels' letter to A. Bebel, 18-26 March, 1875, in Collected Works, Vol. 24, pp. 68ff.
[134] Ibid, p. 72. Marx wrote shortly after: 'Every step of a real movement is more important than a dozen programmes.' (Letter to W Bracke of May 5: iIbid. p. 78.)
[135] Personal hatred also played a part: Utin acting on instructions made a personal attack against Bakunin. Woodford McClellan, *Revolutionary Exiles*, London: Frank Cass, p. 94. (McClellan also refers to IISG, Jung, 864b, 889 and *L'Egalité*, 2 April 1870.)
[136] Jean Maitron, *Le mouvement anarchiste en France*, Vol. 1, Paris: Gallimard, 1992, pp. 57-8.
[137] The Romande federation condemned Coullery for his taking legal proceedings to recover payment of the bill for the printing of a report on the Brussels IWA congress against James Guillaume personally. James Guillaume, *L'Internationale,* Book 1, 1905, p. 214.
[138] Paul Lafargue, Marx's son-in-law, whilst in Spain on a mission for the General Council, published the names of 'ten traitors to the International', thereby revealing their identities and facilitating their arrest. Mathieu Léonard, *L'émancipation,* p. 294.
[139] *La Federación*, (Barcelona) No. 229 of 3 January 1874 sets out the aims of the Spanish Alliance of Socialist-democracy.
[140] Marx & Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 215.
[141] James Guillaume, *L'Internationale,* Book 2, 1907, p. 239.

[142] A letter from Marx to Engels of 16 September, 1868 noted: 'The method of conducting the babble in public and the BUSINESS on the quiet has worked splendidly.' Marx & Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 43, 1987, p. 100.
[143] Compare the above letter with a letter of Marx to Ludwig Kugelmann of 13 October 1866: Marx writes that the London council of the English trade unions might declare itself to be the British section of the IWA, and, 'If it does so, the control of the working class here will in a certain sense pass into our hands'… Marx & Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol 42, 1988, p. 329.
[144] Utin took part in such open meetings despite Bakunin's aversion to him, and his warning that Utin should not be allowed to join the Alliance.
[145] Jura *Bulletin*, 15 January 1873, in Arthur Lehning, Ed., Bakounine; *Les conflits,* 200, p. lx.
[146] Frederick Engels, Supplement to the preface of 1870 for 'The Peasant War in Germany', Marx & Engels, *Collected Works*, 1989, Vol. 23, pp. 630-631.
[147] (1846–1919), German, journalist, Social-democrat, he opposed his party's support for the war in 1914.
[148] Franz Mehring, *Karl Marx,* op. cit, 1939, p. 510.
[149] It served as a model for 'Marxist' party-builders: a self-appointed leadership fealt empowered to purge enemies. The 'Party' might be defined as a body of chiefs and followers, in which chiefs ruled and could chasten enemies. Political leadership came from a self-selecting centre and outweighed political leadership created through experience, in debate and experience.
[150] (1845 – 1922), French, journalist and socialist politician; in exile up to 1876. He once wrote for the *Almanach du Peuple* (1873): 'Universal suffrage has provided it [the bourgeoisie] with the electoral army, which it needed to stay in power.'
[151] This police agent was one of the five men who, at IWA congress in The Hague, had drawn up the charge sheet against Bakunin and Guillaume in preparation for their expulsion.
[152] Auguste Serraillier [Sérailler] (1840-18??), French, shoemaker, member of the London General Council in 1869; nominated by the New York General Council as its chief agent in France in December 1872.
[153] (Guillaume says Calas was a police spy.) No. 193, 26 April 1873, http://cataleg.bnc.cat/record=b1571080~S10*cat
http://mdc2.cbuc.cat/cdm/ref/collection/federacion/id/389
[154] Friedrich Sorge (1828-1906), German, a teacher, a refugee after 1848, emigrated to the USA, General Secretary of the New York General Council in 1872, widely seen as Marx and Engels' factotum.
[155] *Collected Works*, 1989, Vol. 44, p. 407.
[156] It was asserted that German socialists, when on trial, had said that there was no IWA structure in Germany and that no dues had been paid to the IWA. See penultimate page of the *Mémoire présenté par la Fédération jurassienne*
[157] A commitment to morality, justice, and truth was included in the IWA's statutes.
[158] (1839-1889) German, a tailor; IWA General Secretary 1867-1871, broke with Marx in 1872 and subsequently worked in the trade union movement.
[159] (1830–1901) Swiss, watchmaker, active in London on IWA General Council from 1865-1872, presided at congresses in Geneva, Brussels, Basel; broke with Marx 1872, worked in trade union movement.

[160] https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/iwma/documents/1872/hague-conference/statements.htm
[161] In *Collected Works*, Vol. 44, 1989, p. 477.
[162] *Volksstaat*, 9 October 1872; quoted in Arthur Lehning, Ed., Bakounine; *Les conflits,* 2003, p. 185.
[163] Letter to Sorge, 27 September, 1873, in *Collected Works*, 1989, Vol. 44, p. 534. A further conference was held in the US in 1876 and closed down the 'Marxist' IWA; no one from Europe travelled to attend it.
[164] The New York Council later wrote that it would continue to apply the resolutions of The Hague: notes on congress proccedings in Geneva had arrived in a jumble on slips of paper, some written in pencil and with crossings out, the congress secretary had disappeared taking with him the originals of the resolutions passed. Jacques Freymond, *La première internationale*, Vol. 4, Geneva: Droz, 1971, pp. 249.
[165] *Collected Works*, Vol. 44, pp. 524, 534, 537.
[166] Engels to Sorge, letter of 12 September 1874, in *Collected Works*, Vol. 45, 1989, p. 41. Engels equates the life of the International with Sorge's general secretary-ship. Would Joseph Stalin applaud?
[167] *The Times* of London, 10 September 1872.
[168] See appendix 3[b] below.
[169] But not the German Social-democratic Workers' Party or its kin in Switzerland or Austria.
[170] I am over sixty, I have a bad heart, younger people need to make the effort to take on the struggle to roll back the stone against Sisyphus, 'against reaction now triumphant everywhere'… 'From now on I will trouble no one's rest; let others in turn leave me in peace.' *Journal de Genève*, 25.9.1873.
[171] See appendix four for his thoughts on future prospects.
[172] Franz Mehring, *Karl Marx*, op. cit, 1939, p. 470.
[173] http://fr.wikisource.org/wiki/Lettre_in%C3%A9dite_de_Bakounine_%C3%A0_Celso_Cerretti
[174] Ibid.
[175] Bakounine, *Oeuvres*, p. 260
[176] Ibid, p. 420.
[177] Bakunin often sought to develop 'parties' – he thought in terms of inner and outer circles of friends who acted as catalysts in the wider movement. At times these networks may have provoked hatred from antagonists. In 1872 he talked of transforming the IWA into some sort of revolutionary socialist or anarchist body. He was dissuaded from this by Guillaume, and adopted Guillaume's approach that sought to preserve an open, non-ideological IWA. Marianne Enckell, *La Fédération,* op. cit, p. 104.
[178] The report of the second Spanish regional congress, 4-11 April 1872 gives details of the extent of local organisation. Asociación Internacional de Trabajadores II Congreso Obrero de la Federación Regional Española; available online http://www.anselmolorenzo.es/documentos/Congreso/congreso02.html
[179] A recent thesis describes the ongoing IWA as being something of a small group outside Spain: 'groupusculaire, sauf en Espagne' Constance Bantman: 'Anarchismes et anarchistes en France et en Grande-Bretagne, 1880-1914 : Échanges, représentations, transferts', 2007, p. 38.

[180] De Paepe (1842-1890) a Belgian polymath, turned doctor, an influential radical socialist thinker and activist, a founder of the Brabant Socialist party.
[181] Report on the Bern IWA congress, available online http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k5544648f/f79.pleinepage.langFR p. 77
[182] (1853–1932) Italian, plumber, electrician; an eloquent writer. His influence spread in long years of exile.
[183] AIT: *Compte-Rendu*, Congrès, Bern, 1876, p. 95.
[184] AIT: *Compte-Rendu*, Congrès, Bern, 1876.
[185] (1851–1910) sometime anarchist. After 1879 a socialist and a member of the Italian legislature.
[186] *Bulletin de la Federation jurassienne*, 29.4.1877
[187] I am indebted to Mathieu Léonard, for allowing me to refer to his paper, 'Carlo Cafiero et l'Internationale en Italie. De Marx à Bakounine', from the colloquium 'Il y a 150 ans, l'Association internationale des travailleurs' (June 2014) to be published by Brill.
[188] AIT: *Compte-Rendu*, Congrès, Bern, 1876, pp. 80ff.
[189] Ibid, pp. 86-7.
[190] Nicolaij Ivanovic Zukovskij (Zhukovski/ Joukowsky / Joukovsky) (1833-1895), Russian, from 18764 based in Geneva, libertarian activist and printer.
[191] Herman Greulich (1842-1925) A German, and a naturalised Swiss, active over many years in Swiss trade union and Social-democratic organisations, parliamentarian.
[192] Socialist politician. (1856-1943). His work: *Le parti ouvrier et son programme*, Brussels, (2nd edition) 1886, was written as a political ABC, available online. http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k68319c
[193] *Bulletin de la Federation jurassienne*, 13.5.1877.
[194] Police report: 'Congres ouvrier tenu à Bruxelles les 3 et 4 juin 1877.'
[195] *Bulletin*, 1.7.1877
[196] *Bulletin*, 17.6.1877.
[197] A public meeting revealed that many of the Grütli's members usually voted for conservatives.
[198] The Jurassians pointed out that it was odd that Greulich's project whilst it sought to exclude themselves from a Swiss Labour Union, should support a Universal all-encompassing congress of socialists.
[199] *Bulletin*, 27.5.1877. This congress was convened by Greulich's Arbeiterbund; Grütli associations were invited to attend whilst the Jura Federation was not. *Bulletin*, (29.4.1877). Subsequently the Grütli congress decided against supporting this party and the project foundered.
[200] *Bulletin*, 23.9.1877, p.4.
[201] Police report: 'Congrès socialiste préparatoire tenu à Bruxelles, les 19 août 1877.'
[202] See appendix 5.
[203] The congress was attended by delegates from French, Italian, Jura and Spanish regional federations and from sections or groups in Belgium, Egypt, Germany, Greece and Russia.
[204] The Jura federation's *Bulletin* editions of 23 and 30 September 1877 report on the Verviers and Ghent congresses. The edition of 4 February 1878 reported on the Belgian Regional congress of 25-6 December, 1877.
[205] Charles Thomann, *Le Mouvement anarchiste,* op. cit, p. 117.

[206] Such non-aggression was poorly observed even in this congress; one IWA delegate, Costa took issue with the word 'conspirator' [intrigant] being applied by another delegate, Zanardelli, towards those involved in the Benevento events. *Bulletin*, 30.9.1877, p. 7.
[207] Désiré Brismée, (1822-1888), printer and life-long radical activist.
[208] These policies are set out in appendix 5.
[209] *Bulletin*, 3.6.1877.
[210] *Bulletin*, 24.6.1877.
[211] Johann Most (1846-1906) was a journalist and German Reichstag deputy (1874-80). He was imprisoned for his radical politics, turned to anarchism and in 1880 was expelled from the Social-democratic party. Forced into exile, he relocated to the USA where he suffered further spells of imprisonment.
[212] *Bulletin*, 30.9. and 20.10.1877.
[213] *Bulletin*, 28.10.1877.
[214] *Bulletin*, 25.3.1877.
[215] *Bulletin*, 28.10.1877. An earlier bulletin (12.8.77) had reminded readers that Marx had accused Bakunin of being a Russian spy, and reproved editors who continued such thinking, exciting the German *people* to hate the Russian *people*.
[216] Franz Mehring, *Karl Marx*, op. cit, p. 515.
[217] National laws restricting the form of trade union and party organisation had substantial influence.
[218] Angaut, 'The Marx-Bakunin Conflict', op. cit.
[219] Bakounine, *Oeuvres*, Vol. 4, Paris: Stock, 1910, p. 255ff.
[220] Letter to F. Domela Nieuwenhuis, 22 February 1881, 'the Commune was in no wise socialist, nor could it be.'
[221] Although some of Marx's contemporary writings came close to endorsing federalist and communalist concepts these views were at odds with preferences for a unitary centralised republic. Since Marx perspectives varied – with some written for a public audience and others, perhaps more genuine, expressed in private correspondence – Marx's 'Marxism' was not a monolithic doctrine.
[222] Engels acknowledged that electoral politics might be fraudulent but often had high hopes for such methods, see for example his comments of 1895, in his Introduction to Karl Marx's '*The Class Struggles in France 1848 to 1850';* in W. O. Henderson, Ed, *Engels: Selected Writings*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967, p. 289; http://www.marxists.org/archive/
[223] November 1871. Mathieu Léonard, *L'émancipation.* pp. 288-9; Nunzio Pernicone, *Italian Anarchism*, op. cit, pp. 40, 49.
[224] Engels condemned the Spanish IWA writing theirs was a model of how not to make a revolution. He seems to have favoured some sort of joint work of supporters of the General Council with Francesc Pi i Margall. (See articles subsequently republished in *The Bakuninists at Work.* http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1873/bakunin/reproached.) Initially the Spanish IWA worked to avoid a confrontation with the state. Later, faced with violent state repression, they concluded they could not avoid confrontation. In one manifesto they refused to support 'today's' middle-class or bourgeois republicans, who were monarchists yesterday, and earlier.
[225] Nunzio Pernicone, op. cit. p. 51.

[226] 'La Commune', *Le Révolté*, 1 and 15 May 1880. In Caroline Cahm, *Kropotkin and the Rise of Revolutionary Anarchism, 1872-1886*, Cambridge University Press, 1989, p. 51.
[227] Other germs also evolved and in later years the records of words and deeds of Marx and Engels would be harnessed to the service of both reformist socialism and Stalinist communism.
[228] Hermann Jung was a watch maker in Clerkenwell and was a delegate for the General Council. He acted for many years as secretary for Switzerland on the IWA General Council. He collaborated with Marx for many years but broke with him in the run up to the congress in The Hague.
[229] Bruhin was a publicist, and procurer-general of the Basel city-state, delegate for the Basel sections.
[230] Brismée, a printer, delegate for a Brussels section.
[231] Robert, professor, a delegate for sections in La Chaux-de-Fonds.
[232] Goegg, edited *Das Felleisen*, delegate for German workers in Switzerland, from Geneva.
[233] Bürkli, was a delegate for a consumer society in Zurich.
[234] Swiss women only acquired the right to vote in national elections in the 1960s.
[235] Bakunin was a delegate for sections in Lyons and Naples.
[236] Rittinghausen, a publicist (editor?) a delegate for sections in Cologne.
[237] Murat, a delegate for mechanics' sections in Paris.
[238] Hins, a professor, a delegate for the Belgian General Council.
[239] Liebknecht, a delegate for the Eisenach party congress and the *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*.
[240] Dereure, a delegate for shoemakers' sections in Paris.
[241] Starke, a cleaner, a delegate for shoemakers' sections in Basel
[242] Langlois, publicist, a delegate for metal workers' sections in Paris.
[243] Adapted from Jacques Freymond, *La première internationale*, Vol. 2, op. cit, 1962; and from Association internationale des travailleurs: *Compte-rendu du IVe Congrès tenu à Bale en septembre 1869*, Brussels, Imprimerie Désirée Brismée, 1869. Available online: on http://books.google.co.uk/
[244] Pindy, a delegate for carpenters' sections in Paris.
[245] Jacques Freymond, *La première internationale*, Vol. 2, 1962, pp. 108-9.
[246] James Guillaume, *L'Internationale,* 1909, part 5, chapter 1, pp. 6ff.
[247] James Guillaume, *L'Internationale,* 1909, part 5, chapter 5, pp. 116-118, 121.
[248] James Guillaume, ibid pp. 128-130. See also note 233.
[249] Taken from the *Bulletin de la Fédération Jurassienne*, 23 and 30 September, 1873.
[250] *Bulletin,* 30.9.1877, p. 10.