

P. Vassilov.

Chapter Two : Precise Origin and Historical Development of the Soviets Idea.

Generally the soviets idea is regarded as a "novelty" sprouted from the Russian revolution of 1917. More "diligent" (!) historians date the first appearance of soviets somewhere around 1905-1906, at a time of significant revolutionary events in Russia. In fact, neither of these explanations is true.

It is true to say that soviets appeared for the first time during the important and tremendous strikes by the Russian proletariat in 1905-1906. It is also a fact that the Russia of 1917 witnessed the most remarkable attempt, to date, in the history of the proletarian revolutionary movement to implement in practice the soviets arrangement on a large scale. And following that experiment, it is equally certain that the idea of soviets has awakened a hitherto unparalleled echo and become popular above all in countries where it was either unknown, as in Bulgaria, for example, or roundly dismissed, being deemed "utopian", as in Germany.

However, it is incorrect to think that the workers' soviets as organs for coordinating workers' struggle at local level appeared first in Russia in 1905-1906 or 1917. This is every bit as mistaken as the belief that the idea of social organisation, and more especially the organisation of production and consumption in the society of the future by means of local soviets of workers surfaced for the first time ever during the Russian revolution.

The origins of the very idea of workers' councils as the organ marshalling the workers in one locality, as well as the emergence of this notion of society's future economic and social activities' being regulated in a given area by the workers' soviets go back as far as the days of the First International. It was present in the branches which were on the left and whose ideologue and most famous inspiration was Mikhail Bakunin.

This view of the workers' soviet as an organ uniting and coordinating the struggles of the proletariat at local level, when that proletariat is organised in its class organisations — the unions — is a natural reflex dictated by necessity itself. Once the workers of a town are united by the union and whenever they seek contact with other unions in some local organisation, it is only logical

2. that they should seek and discover an organ to liaise between and unite them. By means of that organ, they will be able to coordinate their efforts in the town, without losing their trades liaisons nor their autonomy of action.

For such co-ordination, the most apt organ is the local workers' soviet, i.e. the union of delegates from all the workers' organisations existing in a given area, elected by the trade union assemblies of the workers themselves, and accountable at all times to those assemblies and subject to recall by them. This organ is neither a local management committee whose members are empowered to take and enforce decisions, nor a mini-parliament wherein the "people's representatives" take their seats, elected for a given term, during which they make laws, whilst the electors unconditionally abide by the laws until the next elections, as is the case in contemporary municipal elections.

The local workers' soviets have been set up under a variety of names and titles, as purely technical, executive organs. They have not had any managerial powers nor any right to resolve or direct, according to their own lights, what should and should not be done. It behoves the people who established them to make the decisions through the agency of their delegates. The requirements of the workers' struggle are their *raison d'être*.

The First International was a labour union set up mainly by national and regional unions. The strongest and most forward-looking branches were the trades organisations of the Jura workers (in French-speaking Switzerland), in Paris and in certain parts of France, England, in the Walloon area of Belgium, in Spain and in Italy. In all these branches, excepting England, the dominant ideas and organisational formats were those peddled and put into practical effect by Proudhon and Bakunin. Through them, Proudhonist and Bakuninist ideas had a predominant influence upon the International as a whole. Marx's influence was pre-eminent only in Germany, but the International's German branch was then one of the weakest and had but slight impact upon the development of the thinking of the International at this fundamental stage.

3.

At the beginning, and for a long time thereafter, the ideological outlook was confused and nebulous. This is why during the early congresses (Geneva in 1866 and Lausanne in 1867) there was not, on the part of the internationalists any clear-cut stance with regard to the specific forms which social life might assume following the "liquidation" of capitalism and of the State. But the growth of the International as a weapon of combat was matched by a deepening of the ideas which blossomed very quickly. Practical activity and the daily contest between labour and capital progressively led the workers' organisations to a more thorough and far-reaching study of the social question and of the practicalities of settling it. At the Basle congress of 1869, the International attained the high-point of its external development. This congress clarified particularly the question of the new forms that were to be assumed by economic and social organisation the day after the revolution. In the reports submitted on these issues by the delegates, the Belgian Huis and the Frenchman Pindy, the great role that the workers' councils or unions would have to play in the solution of the social question was broached seriously for the first time in the sessions of the International. And the Basle congress stated clearly and categorically that the workers' union organisations are not merely organs for the defence of the workers' interests within the framework of the existing capitalist society, but also the skeleton and embryo of the social organisation to come, right in the very bosom of capitalism. This declaration is imbued with the spirit of Bakunin's teachings on the social revolution namely, that the new society will of itself represent the worldwide union of producers' organisations — from industry, agriculture, transport, culture, etc. — and will draw its inspiration only from "a serious international organisation of workers' associations from every land". ① It is in this light that we have to understand the resolution passed by the congress on this issue, on a motion from the Belgian, Huis: "Congress is of the view that all workers ought actively to work towards the creation of resistance funds in the various trades bodies. As such societies as formed, it invites the branches, federal groups and central councils to so advise the associations of the same corporation as to encourage the formation of national trades associations. These feder-

4.

ations will be charged with assembling all data relevant to their respective industries, directing what concerted steps are to be taken, regularising strikes and working effectively to ensure their success, until such time as wage slavery is replaced by the federation of free producers" (2).

Given that the revolutionary workers of the First International came to the conclusion that the trades unions of today serve to defend the workers and tomorrow will become the unions of free workers which will organise local production, the logical inference from this is that the current organs uniting the local unions into one regional union federation or union, will tomorrow serve as the natural organs of administering and managing new forms of production, consumption and social life. These organs cannot act otherwise, save for the local workers' councils. Today they are made up of all the delegates from all the trades organisations of one area. Tomorrow their functions will be expanded, with delegates from the consumer organisations of the workers and their families on a district basis, according to the requirements of the new situation and new tasks.

And in the comment which this made in the wake of this resolution, it is truly stated: "Yes, the resistance societies will survive the abolition of the wage system, not in name only but as an endeavour: they will then be the organisation of labour. They will then be the resolution of free exchange, effecting a vast worldwide distribution of work" (3).

And this administrative organ will be: "The councils of the trades and industrial organisations (which) will replace the present government and once and for all this representation of labour will take the place of all the old political systems of the past!" (4)

And so was born by natural means the idea of ordering and regulating social and economic activity in the society of the future by means of workers' councils.

It is interesting to note that the other submission on this issue which was examined and enlarged upon at the 1869 congress in Basle, the submission by the Parisian joiner Pindy, arrived at exactly the same conclusions as this apropos of the organs that were to administer life in the future. These reflections

5.

are the inspiration of the revolutionary unions of today.

"According to Pindy, in the society of the future the unions are to form free communes in which government and local administration will be replaced by the councils of delegates from the workers' trades unions" (5).

The same idea is argued by the Bolshevik author, A. Tchekine (Stotski) in a bulky tome: "At the International's Basle congress, one of the French delegates (it is obvious that he refers to Pindy — note by P. Vassilev), argued the need to create trades unions, stressed that they are crucial for two reasons: on the one hand, 'they are a weapon against the exploitation of capital in our own day' and, on the other, 'given that they embrace different trades in a town, they form the commune of the future (...). The government is replaced by the councils of the assembled trades bodies, and by a committee of their respective delegates, overseeing the labour relations that are to take the place of politics'." (6)

In the view of the members of the International's left wing, whose inspiration was Bakunin and which scored a resounding victory at the Basle congress over the parliamentary, democratic and statist ideas of Marx, it was clear that in order to transform society, it had to be dominated and organised by the workers of the factories, workshops, agricultural enterprises, etc., and not by the power of the State and its legislative organ, parliament, contrary to the Marxist thinking. This is the reason why they did not ape the bourgeoisie by attempting to set up a new "workers'" political party so as to achieve mastery of political power and to reform economic and social life from the top down. Instead, the workers organised on the basis of economic production so as to become the masters of economic power, industry, transport and agriculture, the means of production and consumption, without which no truly social régime is a possibility, let alone any emancipation of the forces of labour from the yoke of wage slavery. They wish to reorganise the whole of society's life from the bottom up; the basis of that life is the economy; the workers nonetheless concede that all political power and all direction of certain individuals by others must vanish along with the exploitation of man by his fellow-man. The First International's Bakuninists also rightly understood that this does not mean the elimination of all order, all organisation and all planning and activity of a general sort. For the administration "of things"

6.

Which is to say the production and distribution of goods in the future classless and stateless workers' society, there will have to be organs which meet those needs without contradicting the aim. These organs are envisaged as being the workers' councils which come together and liaise by means of a non-statist system, a federalist arrangement of local workers' organisations.

So it was that the soviets idea came into being. It was subsequently refined and popularised very widely among the workers of the Latin countries at the time, through the press, books and pamphlets of the International's federal wing which followed Bakunin and his friends. It is set forth particularly clearly by Bakunin himself in his pamphlet programme and purpose of the secret revolutionary organisation of the International Brotherhood written in 1866 (7) which is to say, 3 years in advance of the Basle congress when the International thinkers and militants outlined more definitely the forms which society would turn to after its victory over capitalism.

Point 6 of this "programme dealing with the revolution in practice", after saying that the State and all of the State's functions are to be destroyed "radically" and that "all productive capital and instruments of labour" are to be expropriated "by the workers' associations" which are to manage them "collectively" and that "the federative alliance of all the workers' associations (...) will constitute the Commune", then points out that there is a need to lay the foundations immediately of "...". The revolutionary commune, through the delegation of one or two deputies per barricade, one per street or per district, deputies vested with binding mandates, accountable and subject to recall at all times. The communal council thus arrived at, will be able to select from among its membership separate executive committees for each sector of the commune's revolutionary administration! (8).

Thus the soviets idea was thoroughly explored and peddled as the administrative organ of the free communes to come, at the congresses and conferences of the Spanish branch of the International which was the branch most imbued with the principles of Bakuninism. This has been stated by the historian of anarchism, Max Nettlau, who, in his article "On the occasion of the forthcoming congress of the International Workers' Association" (9) writes - "The Spanish federation

7. [this being, of course, the Spanish branch of the first International — Pano Vassilev] saw in the local workers' unions the organisation that was due to embrace all of the workers of one locality from the various areas of production. Thus their delegates would form the local union (the soviet) of the free commune. Entering into the federation with some unions from one sector, they will form a territorial production organisation covering one union region. Then, as was indicated at the Valencia conference of September 1871 which issued a special report on its ideas on the occasion of the International's conference in London, the communes of every land will form one territorial federation which will be able to federate with the federations of other lands. In this fashion, the internal apparatus for the reconstruction of production, distribution and world-wide liaison will be established. This suggestion was all but ignored by the London conference where the marxists had the upper hand (10). The report lay buried in Engels's archives where I discovered it in 1927 and published it thereafter."

There we have further testimony pleading on behalf of our assertion that marxism, with its advocacy of state socialism and parliamentary socialism, is incompatible with the soviets arrangement and, quite naturally, had opposed it. But despite the negative and indeed scornful attitude of the marxists in the International towards this set-up, their federal branches continued vigorously to anticipate the issue of the new forms of administering and regulating society's life in precisely those terms. At the Congress of the Spanish branch held in Zaragoza in April 1872 the question was openly broached and there was specific allusion to consejos locales local soviets or councils which would comprise "all producers" and turn into "administrative councils". In the report submitted to that congress by the federal council, it says among other things: "All of the major instruments of labour which today are in the hands of an idle few, might be transformed overnight by a revolutionary force and placed immediately in usufruct at the disposal of the toilers who presently use them to produce. These toilers, merely by organising themselves into the union, if they had not done so already, and by offering the requisite assurances to the local councils, would obtain full benefit of the instruments of their labour." (11).

6.

And furthermore, when the question of supplying the needs of the populace in the wake of the social change is examined, it is stated: "These councils, split up into as many commissions as may be necessary, would oversee the retention of collective ownership and, in conjunction with the administrators of the production societies, would see to it that commerce matched the interests and rights of the membership and of the collective generally. To accomplish this, it would be necessary that big stores be set up and that bourgeois small business be transformed as has been said — on along similar lines — apropos of small industry, which is to say concentrated, and wage slavery abolished." (12)

The first attempts at practical application of the idea of this social transformation implicit in the anti-statist, anti-parliamentary and federalist views held by internationalists in Latin countries were made in the French revolutionary labour movement and more especially in Paris in 1871 during the famed Paris Commune, and in Spain at the time of the revolutionary Communes of Alcoy, Barcelona and Cartagena in 1873. We know from the earliest manifestoes of the Paris Commune and the proclamations of the Bakuninists (who attempted to proclaim free communes in Lyons, Marseilles and elsewhere) that the aim of the revolutionary movement in France was the abolition of the State and of all legislative and other organs (parliament, police, army etc.) and their replacement by the national federation of free, autonomous communes.. "the association of which ought to ensure French unity" (13). This federation was to comprise free delegations from the federated communes. "Unity, as foisted upon us to date by the Empire, by the monarchy and by parliamentarism, is naught but despotic, unthinking, arbitrary and onerous centralisation", said the 19 April 1871 manifesto of the Commune. Paris sought "the absolute autonomy of the commune extended to all of the localities of France".. "Paris seeks nothing more by way of local guarantees, provided, of course, that the same principles are realised and practised in the great central administration, delegated by the federated communes".

Bakunin himself was involved in the revolts in Lyons and Marseilles. And in Paris there was Eugène Varlin, Eliséé Reclus and others. The manifestoes and proclamations bear witness to the great influence which Bakuninism

9. had upon the character of events. But regrettably, for a number of reasons, that influence was not strong enough and the great proletarian masses of Paris, as Bakunin noted after the defeat of the Commune, were insufficiently imbued with the socialist awareness vital if they were to be able to give all the impetus that might be desired to the Paris revolution of 1871.

"The people of Paris (-) was socialist much more as a matter of instinct than as a result of an idea or conviction thought through" (14). The outward organisational profile of the Commune, and its actions were not purely federalist and socialist. The statist and parliamentarists were an impediment to that, for they accounted for the bulk of the Commune's ideologues, inspiration and membership. They were old-style republican democrats, influenced by the masses into a revolution with social implications. For that reason the Paris Commune, after a brief span of existence as an authentic free commune, progressively assumed the features of a local State with its own government and parliament which, out of habit, continued to describe itself as a 'communal council'. But the internationalists who were elected onto the communal council, did not for a moment jettison the idea that this council in fact represented a State power and looked upon it purely and simply as an executive organ. However, out of the 60-odd members of the council, the internationalists and Bakuninists numbered only 22. The rest were Jacobins i.e. authoritarians, statists, parliamentarists. "This was a great misfortune for the Commune and for them; they were paralysed by it and they paralysed the Commune" (15). But for all that, the fact is that the Parisian proletariat of 1871 overthrew not just the monarchy but also the machinery of the parliamentary democratic State, and substituted a municipal council for them. Even though, subsequently, governmental power clambered on to this throne the fact that the Parisian revolution went down that road and not that of the State and parliament shows, even then, that the Bakuninist view of the social revolution is not "utopian" and "laughable", as Marx and Engels said it was. In fact that view was a lot more closely attuned to the natural stirrings of proletarian revolution than the marxists' statist and parliamentary notion which was pulverised by the Commune (16). And had the Bakuninists' anti-State influence been stronger in Paris, the municipal council would not, of course, have encompassed local

10. governmental powers. It would have remained a purely administrative organ, as the Bakuninists wanted. And in this specific instance, the council should not have been run as in the days of traditional municipal elections (17). Instead, it would have been made up of direct delegates, revocable at all times, from the workers' organisations of producers and consumers, as was the case in Spain in 1873 during the upheavals in Alcoy, Barcelona and Cartagena. There, the "soviet system" was implemented for the first time, albeit only briefly and at local level.

The crushing of the Paris Commune "amid the blood of its bold defenders", the bloody repression of the insurrection by the Spanish proletariat in 1873 and of the Italian in 1876 and the thoroughgoing reaction which followed upon these events in those countries, where the Bakuninist wing of the International was by far the more powerful, culminated in the smashing of the workers' trades organisations imbued with the anarchist spirit. The International was ruthlessly repressed and in France was considered an "outlaw" organisation, and vanished shortly afterwards.

Those anarchists who survived, especially the French ones, emigrated or else retreated into tiny purely ideological and secret coteries, secret on account of the circumstances and poorly organised. Constant harassment drew them into terrorist activity which was hard to sustain and dismal in its effects against the reaction (9). The revolutionary literature which nourished and spawned the soviet idea, was destroyed and disappeared.

The soviet ideal went into a decline and it ceased to motivate the action of revolutionaries in this new setting. This led to a new and peculiar revolutionary mentality among the members of the underground and purely ideological groups, which were more individualistic than collectivist or communist. It was precisely this situation and this "new" mentality which paved the way for the emergence of an "anarchist" current in a variety of guises, complete with a fairly negative attitude towards the mass trades organisations of the workers. Terrorist practice naturally led to a personality cult and to a reversion of individual heroism. This climate also saw the equally natural emergence of the many-faceted theory of "the important role of the individual in history" which directly contradicts Bakunin's view which

11. awards only a very modest significance in history to the individual per se. It was also in this climate that the notion of the great and exaggeratedly significant role of purely ideological groups, taking precedence over the secondary activity of the working class's mass trades organisations, was forged. Given the circumstances, it is scarcely astonishing that the anarchists of the day should have given a lot more consideration to negative and destructive action than to the positive business of creation with an eye to the approaching social revolution. Constructive elements and the authors of the future rebuilding of society, i.e. the workers' economic organisations, were scorned.

Greater emphasis was laid on merely negative and destructive aspects: "the fighters", the purely ideological groups of the "revolutionary minority". And even the unadulterated Nechaevian idea surfaced (18): namely that it is utterly pointless even to spare a thought about the day after the destruction of the old order in that this diverts attention away from the principal task: the elimination of all that is old, rotten and in place. Quite obviously, given the dominion of such notions in anarchist circles, it was above all not a question of organisations which "on the morrow" might oversee the new social relationships. The soviets idea was for a long time eclipsed.

However, from the close of the period of savage repression on, and with the return of emigrés and the banished (19) as well as the release of certain comrades, the labour movement began gradually to assume a revolutionary aspect. In Spain the term of the eclipse and outlawry of the trades union movement was more short-lived. The majority of anarchists had hardly severed their links with the ranks of unionised workers, despite the persecutions and the blood-letting. As soon as the unions were re-established, the soviets idea surfaced again at the first union conferences held across the country at the end of 1876. These touched upon the issue of "Practical measures which should be adopted following destruction of the present state". The draft, passed almost unanimously as a motion from the federal commission, stated among other things:

"1. - Following the outbreak of insurrection, those localities in which the members of the International may have the upper hand, shall declare themselves

12 free and independent and released from all national bonds."

" 2.- Each of them will immediately declare that everything situated within its boundaries belongs to it and that nothing belongs to anyone in particular, save furniture and clothing for private use."

" 8.- The local councils are to sub-divide into as many commissions as may be necessary for defence, food, administration, labour, education, regional and federal liaison, etc."

" 11.- Through the agency of special commissions, the departmental and regional congresses themselves shall assume the running of all affairs which may not be susceptible to handling by the localities, such as departmental and regional defence, the organisation of public services, shipping, railways, posts, telegraphs, etc. The regional congress is to appoint the region's Representatives to the world congress and to other regions" (20).

But then (in 1876) the national congress was unable to proceed because of the repression which prevented full-fledged public organisation. This was possible only in 1881 with the holding in Barcelona of the first labour congress of the new Spanish Federation. That congress produced nothing in particular. In 1882 the second congress met in Seville and the preparatory commission on this occasion issued a manifesto that is very interesting in terms of content and historical importance. After greeting the workers' delegates assembled on "the banks of the Guadalquivir", the manifesto emphasised that the new movement drew its inspiration from "anarchist" and "federalist principles". It gave a general outline of organisational format. And again, it boiled down to workers' councils, their role and their functions:

" At branch level, the human being... autonomous... deliberates and votes meeting and publicising all that he wants and how he wants, and the exercise of his individual rights is dependent only upon his own activity, unless he fails to meet his duties or resorts to non-regulation procedures."

" The local federation, by virtue of its existence, of course is possessed of a perfectly juridical social identity, which is to say it has rights and duties and is made up of delegates sent by the trades sections which may exist in the

13.

locality. This legal entity goes by the name of Local Council. However, though the members of the local federation, just like anybody else who may attend a meeting — regardless of the federation to which they belong, provided that they have abided by their obligations — may take part in the discussions in this council, with as much entitlement as the delegates who make it up, only those delegates from the trade sections which do make up the local council may participate in the voting" (21).

Parallel with this, one sees the rebirth in France of the old Bakuninist, federalist, anti-statist socialism under the name of "revolutionary syndicalism" or "anarcho-syndicalism". The notion of "workers' councils" surfaces again, as does their role in the future reconstruction of society. At the Tours congress of the federation of the Bourses du Travail (22) in 1896, the outline of the future society was given in the report submitted by delegates Claude Guiot (on behalf of the Nîmes Bourse du Travail) and Fernand Pelloutier (23) (on behalf of the federal committee of Bourses du Travail).

"Each trade is organised as a union; each union appoints a council, which we might term a labour trades council: these unions are in turn federated on the basis of trade, nationally and internationally."

"Ownership is no longer individual: the land, mines, factories, workshops, means of transport, houses, etc. become socially owned (...). Society requires so much wheat, so much clothing: the farmers and tailors receive from society either in money, so long as this may persist, or in exchange value, the wherewithal to consume or to use products manufactured by the other workers. (...) The Bourses, acquainted with the amount of products that should be manufactured, so inform the labour trades councils of each corporation which deploys all of the trade's members on the manufacture of the required products." (24).

With the subsequent growth of French revolutionary syndicalism, especially in the 1900-1907 period, the councils ideas gained more and more ground. The spread of the ideas of revolutionary syndicalism beyond France led at the same time in the same direction in which the councils had pointed in the days of the First International and Bakunin. One need only cast an eye over the books

14.

pamphlets and articles of revolutionary syndicalists, or more precisely the anarcho-syndicalists of the day like Pelloutier, Pataud, Griffuelhes, Yvetot, Manette and many others, to realise that the appearance of the soviets idea in Russia has in no way enriched the concept. The propagandists and ideologues of anarchist revolutionary syndicalism had already established and adapted the concept 15 or 20 years before: and Bakunin and his companions, members of the International, anti-statists and federalists all — had done so 50 years previously.

When the councils idea was built up and developed in anarcho-syndicalist circles, the marxists (and among them the Bolsheviks) wanted none of it and most of them — who now pass for steadfast advocates of the soviets — looked upon the idea as an "idealistic utopia". Their socialist "science" could not accept that one might arrive at socialism by a route other than the parliamentarism and democratic republic that Engels had proclaimed as "the specific form of the dictatorship of the proletariat".

And the facts show that the initial stage of the Russian revolution was the stage of the soviets and the councils, and not of democracy and parliamentarism and this indicates yet again how the "anarchist utopia" is stronger than "marxist science".

Notes.

- ① Bakunin in *The policy of the International* published by *L'Égalité* of 28.8.1866 or some weeks in advance of the Basle congress (Text from Bakounine, Le socialisme libertaire, edited by F. Rudé, 1973, p. 181).
- ② In point of fact, Pindy... quote from Compte-rendu du IV^e Congrès international tenu à Bâle en septembre 1869, Brussels edition 1869, p. 143 and La Presse Internationale (Recueil de documents), Geneva, 1962, tome II, p. 109.
- ③ Op. cit. p. 109., p. 111. In fact the quotation in Bulgarian does not figure in the

15. original and we have gone for the nearest idea. The Bulgarian text reads literally 'The organisation of local trades groups and general industrial unions will subsequently give rise to an administrative administration of the commune and a general representation of labour at the regional, national and international level' (French translator's note).

- ④ Rocker, op. cit. p. 47.
- ⑤ N.K. Lebedev K istoriiu Internatsionala: Etapi mezhdunarodnogo obedinenia trudiashchikoi (On the History of the International: the Stages of international labour unity) p. 47, Moscow, Golos Truda, 1920.
- ⑥ A. Tchekine (Stotski) Uchenie o profesionalnom dvizhenie (Lesson of the Trades Union Movement), Moscow, Gosizdat, 1926. (We have been unable to find the quotations from Pindy with the exception of the last one (Op. cit. Brussels, p. 143 and Geneva, p. 109), but the first word is not 'government' but 'group'—Translator's note).
- ⑦ Text reproduced in Daniel Guérin Ni Dieu ni Maître, Ed. Maspéro, tome I: the text is dated by him "undoubtedly from 1868".
- ⑧ Bakunin in Ni Dieu ni Maître, tome I, pp. 224-225.
- ⑨ Rabotnik (Worker), No 3, XII, 1930.
- ⑩ It was at this very conference that the Spanish delegate Anselmo Lorenzo for the first time submitted an exposé and argument in favour of the soviet idea, whereupon the marxists introduced their resolution on the need to found a workers' political party and for it to participate in parliament in order to secure control there.
- ⑪ Anselmo Lorenzo El Proletariado Militante, Madrid, Ed. Alianza, 1974, pp. 275-27.
- ⑫ Anselmo Lorenzo, op. cit. p. 276.
- ⑬ Manifesto by the Paris Commune, 19.-IV - 1871 (in Charles Rihs, La Commune de Paris, 1871: Sa structure et ses doctrines, Ed. Seuil, 1973, pp. 164-165).
- ⑭ Bakunin The Paris Commune and the Idea of the State. We have lifted the text from the very serious edition of Fernand Rude' Bakounine et la guerre à la Commune, Arthéropos, 1972, p. 411.
- ⑮ Bakunin, op. cit. p. 411.
- ⑯ Orgueyan Kak i ot kakvo se razvi' revoliutsionarno sindikalizm (How and Thanks

(16) to What Revolutionary Syndicalism Developed)

- (17) See Kropotkin Paroles d'un Révolté, Ed. Flammarion 1978, p. 111 (La Commune II)
- (18) Nechaev had a revolutionary suspected of treachery executed. Ever since Bakunin's denunciation of him, his name has been synonymous with jesuitry, unscrupulousness and lack of respect among revolutionaries (Translator's note).
- (19) In fact terrorism appeared at a later date in a variety of groups (Translator's note)
- (20) The system of banishment was then current in France. It was later taken up by Lenin and others. (Translator's note).
- (21) Anselmo Lorenzo, op cit. pp 356 - 357.
- (22) Anselmo Lorenzo, op. cit. pp. 427 - 428.
- (23) This was an anarcho-syndicalist organisation that, when the Confédération Générale du Travail was set up, amalgamated with it. The finest French anarcho-syndicalists of the late 19th century were active in these unions.
- (24) Fernand Pelloutier, famous anarchist and founder of French revolutionary syndicalism.
- (25) A. Tchekine (Stotski), Op. cit. (French text in Pelloutier, Histoire des Bourses du Travail, Paris, Gordon et Breach, 1971, pp. 251 - 252