
Bert Altena

Anarchism as a Social Movement, 1870–1940¹

1. Introduction

One of the characteristics of anarchist movements is their pattern of appearance and disappearance. In fact, there are two different patterns. One is short term and occurred mainly during the period of classical anarchism (i.e. 1870–1914). During these years, in several countries, the anarchist movement disappeared, primarily as a result of political repression, only to reappear again when this repression was relaxed. However, there also is a long-term pattern that has marked the movement since its beginnings, and this has different causes. In this long-term perspective disappearances signified the loss of popularity due, for instance, to the development of the welfare state and to the appeal of competing movements, including communist parties. The resurgence of anarchism, however, can be attributed to certain qualities of the anarchist ideology.

An important difference between the two patterns is the fact that the first is mainly the result of opportunity structures that are beyond the reach of the anarchist movement, while the second also involves the movement itself. Losing out to competitors points to inadequacies in the anarchist movement itself, and a whole range of aspects of the movement can be examined to detect the most important ones. Nevertheless, even in the long run the movement managed to reappear time and again. This essay focuses, therefore,

¹ An abridged version of this article was presented at the *Doktorandenkolleg* of Prof. Stefan Berger, Bochum (8 June 2015). I would like to thank the audience for the stimulating discussion on that occasion. I also would like to thank the editors of this journal, especially Thomas Funk, for their comments and suggestions. Chris Gordon did a wonderful job correcting my English.

on the staying power of anarchist movements. To explain this staying power, we have to take a fresh look at anarchism as a social movement. That involves an assessment of the applicability of modern social movement theories, which is the second object of this essay. First, though, we have to establish whether the anarchist movement can be called a social movement at all, and when such a movement should be called anarchist. Then, various aspects of the structure of the anarchist movement will be analysed to explain its staying power in the short run. This will lead us to an assessment of anarchist cultural activities, which move the focus to the movement's staying power in the long run. We will conclude with a review of the usefulness of social movement theory for the study of anarchism as a social movement.

This contribution is about anarchism as a social movement, not as an ideology. It deals with the years 1870–1940, the heyday of anarchism in Europe, although after World War I and with the coming of authoritarian movements (communism, fascism, Nazism) anarchism lost much of its appeal. Carl Levy even speaks of a “gestalt shift.”² Although anarchist movements can be found in many parts of the world, I will be dealing mainly with European movements. While for a long time it was thought that non-European movements were mere exports from the old continent that could be analysed in terms of the duality of centre and periphery, recent research increasingly shows their rootedness in local, indigenous traditions that were at least just as important as the European influences. Because of the different contexts of the colonialism, post-

² Carl Levy rightly calls the years 1860 to 1870, when authoritarian and anti-authoritarian socialisms collided and crystallised, as the starting point of the movement. Anarchist ideas had been expressed earlier, but one cannot speak of an anarchist movement at that time. Levy therefore proposes a threefold periodisation: pre-anarchism, classical anarchism (1860–1940), and post-anarchism (after 1945). Carl Levy, “Social Histories of Anarchism,” *Journal for the Study of Radicalism*, 4/2 (2010), pp. 1–44, and *idem*, “Anarchism, Internationalism and Nationalism in Europe, 1860–1939,” *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, 50 (2004), pp. 330–342.

colonialism, and neocolonialism of non-European anarchism, these movements have been excluded from the present analysis.³

2. When is a social movement a social movement and when is anarchism anarchism?

Over the past six decades whole libraries have been filled with titles about social movements. By the end of the 1980s experts had concluded: “The breadth and diversity of topics in any field pose a challenge to those who would attempt to summarize the field in a single article. Our task is made all the more difficult by the range of phenomena lumped together under the heading of social movements.” Ten years later, the editors of a collection of essays wrote about “a real ‘growth industry.’” Several theories have been developed and different definitions and approaches have been proposed. The variety of definitions is such that it often seems as if it is not the definition that prescribes which phenomenon should be seen as a social movement, but rather the other way around, as if every researcher uses their own definition to be able to study their object as a social movement. However, whether they are “socially shared activities and beliefs directed toward the demand for change in some aspect of the social order” (Joseph R. Gusfield) or “collective challenges, based on common purposes and social solidarities, in sustained interaction with elites, opponents, and authorities” (Sidney Tarrow), or a combination of three elements (sustained campaigns of claim making, an array of public performances, and repeated public displays of worthiness, unity, numbers and com-

³ See the fascinating essays in: Steven Hirsch and Lucien van der Walt (eds), *Anarchism and Syndicalism in the Colonial and Postcolonial World, 1870–1940: The Praxis of National Liberation, Internationalism, and Social Revolution*, Leiden / Boston 2010; Geoffrey de Laforcade and Kirwin Shaffer (eds), *In Defiance of Boundaries: Anarchism in Latin American History*, Gainesville etc. 2015; Barry Maxwell and Raymond Craib (eds), *No Gods, No Masters, No Peripheries: Global Anarchisms*, Oakland 2015; Levy, “Social Histories” (see note 2), p. 8.

mitment (Charles Tilly), they all act in order to change aspects of the societal order, but usually not that order itself.⁴

Recently, the late Nino Kühnis enthusiastically defended the suitability of collective identity theories for the analysis of anarchism. According to him, collective identity played a key role in the persistence of the anarchist movement, and collective identity theory “offers great insight into social movements due to its versatility, its adaptability, and its non-hierarchical form.” However, this approach focuses on discourse, mostly reconstructed, moreover, from printed sources (such as periodicals), which may leave other important aspects hidden.⁵

Among the many definitions that have been proposed, Joachim Raschke’s very broad one seems to suit the anarchist movement rather well: according to Raschke, a social movement is “a mobili-

⁴ Breadth: Doug McAdam / John D. McCarthy / Mayer N. Zald, “Social Movements,” in: Neil Smelser (ed.), *Handbook of Sociology*, Newbury Park etc. 1988, pp. 695–737; growth industry: Editors, “Preface,” in: Marco Giugni / Doug McAdam / Charles Tilly (eds), *How Social Movements Matter*, Minneapolis / London 1999, p. xi; Joseph R. Gusfield, “Introduction: A Definition of the Subject,” in: *idem* (ed.), *Protest, Reform and Revolt: A Reader in Social Movements*, New York etc. 1970, p. 2; Sidney Tarrow as quoted in: Marco Giugni, “Introduction: How Social Movements Matter: Past Research, Present Problems, Further Developments,” in: Giugni / McAdam / Tilly, *Social Movements*, pp. xxi–xxii; Charles Tilly, *Regimes and Repertoires*, Chicago / London 2006, pp. 183–184; *idem*, *Contentious Performances*, Cambridge etc. 2008, pp. 116–146. Movement stipulates: see also Jürgen Mittag / Helke Stadtland, “Einleitung: Einordnungen und Zugänge im Überblick,” in: Jürgen Mittag / Helke Stadtland (eds), *Theoretische Ansätze und Konzepte der Forschung über soziale Bewegungen in der Geschichtswissenschaft*, Essen 2014, pp. 13–61: 21.

⁵ Nino Kühnis, *Anarchisten! Von Vorläufern und Erleuchteten, von Ungeziefer und Läusen. Zur kollektiven Identität einer radikalen Gemeinschaft in der Schweiz, 1885–1914*, Bielefeld 2015, pp. 35–93; see also: Nino Kühnis, “‘We’ is for Anarchism: Construction and Use of Collective Identity in the Anarchist Press of *Fin-de-Siècle* Switzerland,” in: Jorell A. Meléndez Badillo / Nathan J. Jun (eds), *Without Borders or Limits: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Anarchist Studies*, Newcastle upon Tyne 2013, pp. 45–57: 47; Nino Kühnis, “More than an Antonym: A Close(r) Look at the Dichotomy between the National and Anarchism,” in: Constance Bantman / Bert Altena (eds), *Reassessing the Transnational Turn: Scales of Analysis in Anarchist and Syndicalist Studies*, New York / London 2015, pp. 159–174: 159–161.

sing collective actor who, with a certain continuity on the basis of a strong symbolic integration and a weak diversity of roles, tries either to arrive at fundamental social change, to block that, or to reverse it by means of changing forms of organisation and action.” While it is not clear when exactly symbolic integration is strong, this definition also fails to stipulate when a social movement stops being a social movement. How should we see the relation of such a movement to political activity? In trying to change society, social movements often enter the political arena. They can become part of regular consultative structures and become political parties themselves, but where is the demarcation line between a social and a political movement? Vice versa, some political parties are convinced that political activity is secondary to societal action and they see themselves as merely the political mouthpiece of a genuine social movement. Does a movement stop being a social movement when a political party is merely its mouthpiece or when it is mobilised by a political party? And is the anarchist movement, by explicitly refusing to engage in regular political decision-making processes, not as much a political as a social movement?⁶

According to Raschke’s definition, it does not seem relevant whether a social movement is highly organised, a definition that eliminates shelves of studies in the social movement library on the role of organisations. Because of their anti-organisational character, this would at first sight seem irrelevant for the study of anarchist movements. However, the existing literature on the importance of organisation can sharpen our awareness and help explain its durability in relation to other factors.

These are questions that arise when analysing the anarchist movement. But what is an anarchist movement? If social movement is not easy to define clearly, neither is anarchism. It is indicative that

⁶ Raschke as cited in: Mittag / Stadtland, “Einleitung,” p. 19 (my translation). See also: Thomas Welskopp, “Anti-Saloon-League und Ku Klux Klan: Ressourcenmobilisierung durch ‘charismatische Verbände,’” in: Mittag / Stadtland, *Ansätze*, pp. 241–269: 267–268.

shorthand definitions of anarchism are absent. One of the best descriptions of anarchism is the one Peter Kropotkin proposed in the 1910 edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*: “the name given to a principle or theory of life and conduct under which society is conceived without government – harmony in such a society being obtained, not by submission to law or by obedience to any authority but by free agreements concluded between the various groups, territorial and professional, freely constituted for the sake of production and consumption, as also for the satisfaction of the infinite variety of needs and aspirations of a civilised being.” For anarchism as a whole, what the French historian Jacques Julliard has written about the goal of revolutionary syndicalism applies: it aimed not at “the dissolution of the individual in the group but on the contrary to extract the individual out of the anonymous group.” As such, anarchism is not just a political theory but “a whole way of life,” to borrow Raymond Williams’s definition of culture. Anarchists do not wait for organisations and leaders to become active; they practice anarchism in their daily life while working towards the goals of anarchism. That is the essence of what Sharif Gemie has called “the counter-community” of the anarchists. As a social anarchist, Kropotkin speaks of groups, but individualist anarchists, following William Godwin and Max Stirner, will disagree with that. They will also hate the word “agreement” because agreements can violate the autonomy of the individual. Nevertheless, they, too, should be seen as part of the anarchist movement that strives at individual autonomy and freedom, a pursuit of voluntary consensus and the disappearance of the state, always bearing in mind, with Bakunin, that you cannot really be free if the people around you are not free.⁷

⁷ Peter Kropotkin, “Anarchism,” in *The Encyclopaedia Britannica: A Dictionary of Arts, Sciences, Literature and General Information*, New York etc. 1910⁵; Jacques Julliard, *Fernand Pelloutier et les origines du syndicalisme d’action directe*, Paris 1985², p. 13; Raymond Williams, *Culture and Society, 1780–1950*, London 1958, p. 325; Sharif Gemie, “Counter-Community: An Aspect of Anarchist Political Culture,” *Journal of Contemporary History*, 29 (1994), pp. 349–367. See also: Levy,

This rather Catholic approach to anarchism is the opposite of the definition that Michael Schmidt and Lucien van der Walt proposed in 2009. What they have called “the broad anarchist tradition” is essentially a quite narrow description of anarchism. They tie anarchism exclusively to the struggle against capitalism and landlordism: “To end this situation it is necessary to engage in class struggle and revolution, creating a free socialist society based on common ownership, self-management, democratic planning from below, and production for need, not profit. Only such a social order makes individual freedom possible.” This does not quite make anarchism just another word for revolutionary syndicalism, but still Schmidt and van der Walt have expelled many anarchists from the anarchist canon, suggesting we call them libertarian socialists. Discriminating between “anarchism” and “libertarian socialism” neglects the extent to which all sorts of anarchisms were interwoven in the movement. It also threatens to overrate the importance of organisations and trade unions to the movement and it directs attention all too much towards the workplace and thus to the male world. On the other hand, it may tend to play down the importance of anarchism by the deed and the way anarchist assassins of heads of state were aided by the movement at large.⁸

Still, Schmidt and van der Walt have pointed to an intricate problem with anarchism: because of its many different strands, it is not a very clear-cut movement. French historian Gaetano Manfredonia has tried to find a way out of this difficulty by proposing a typology of anarchism, consisting of three types: the insurrectionist, the syndicalist, and the educational type. These should be seen as Weberian ideal types, and Manfredonia hastens to add that an anarchist can belong to the insurrectionist type and at the same time

“Social Histories” (see note 2), pp. 1–44: 4–5.

⁸ Michael Schmidt / Lucien van der Walt, *Black Flame: The Revolutionary Class Politics of Anarchism and Syndicalism*, Oakland CA / Edinburgh 2009, pp. 6–8 and 14–17. Carl Levy deems the terms of reference used by both authors to be too limited and sectarian; Levy, “Social Histories,” p. 2. Charles Tilly, *Social Movements, 1768–2004*, Boulder 2004. Levy, “Anarchism” (see note 2), pp. 330–342.

to the syndicalist or educational type. A good example is Rudolf Rocker, leader of the *Freie Arbeiter-Union Deutschlands*, who saw himself as an anarchist working within the syndicalist ranks. So much for analytical clarity, but the advantage of Manfredonia's approach is that he presents a coherent view of these ideal types with regard to anarchist practice: what kind of subject did these different types present as agents of change, what strategy did they prefer, what role did they assign to the anarchists and to organisations, how did they see the transition to the society of the future, and what role did violence play in their concepts? Such a typology may be very helpful when analysing individual anarchists or anarchist groups and changes in the long history of the anarchist movement.⁹

There are few analyses of anarchism as a social movement, and that is all the more striking since it is about 145 years old. That seems more than Raschke's "a certain continuity." Kühnis, therefore, is right to look for a theory that can explain the staying power of the movement. However, theories like resource mobilisation or "contentious politics" seem to promise better results. Resource mobilisation theory, which Mayer N. Zald, Doug McAdam, and others have developed away from its origin in rational choice and its accompanying methodological individualism, tries to catch many facets of social movements. Contentious politics involves both Tilly's (dialectical) political process theory and his concept of repertoires. Both resource mobilisation and contentious politics suggest many directions in which to investigate and analyse social movements, but they still tend to focus on organisations and their interactions with adversaries or on fairly short-lived popular campaigns. In the end, they want to find the factors that not only explain the durability of the movements but also their success. In this respect, a movement that exists over such a long time and is not

⁹ Gaetano Manfredonia, *Anarchisme et changement social. Insurrectionnalisme, syndicalisme, éducationnisme-réalisateur*, Lyons 2007.

known for its love of formal organisation or its ability to sustain it may be of interest.¹⁰

Social movements are often not able to completely realise their goals, but the anarchist one seems singularly good at that. When were anarchists successful? Jochen Schmück's elaboration of the anarchists' goals gives us a good idea: "They were rather an attempt to realise a concrete social utopia. Their goal was not the conquest of power but the end of all authoritarian societal structures. From a traditional interpretation of politics you would call anarchism's perspective anti-political. In harmony with their goal, anarchists preferred to reach it by raising the consciousness of people." That means they tried to transform society through changing the individual. Schmück rightly points to a tension between the means and the wish to influence the development of society. But when has consciousness been raised high enough, and when are people behaving in such an independent, yet harmonious way that you could call their community "real existing anarchy?"¹¹

Indeed, the goals of the anarchists are rather vague and they are not united by a theory that is neatly rounded. On the contrary, anarchist theory (or at least its emphasis) changes according to time and place, and is therefore "difficult to define in a synthetic fashion," as Jean Maitron remarks. He deduces the "fluidity" of anarchist theory from its dominating principle: liberty. "Since every anarchist wants to put his stone in the edifice, the anarchist bibliography is of a disturbing broadness and variety."¹²

¹⁰ Importance of rational choice: Dieter Rucht, "Zum Stand der Forschung zu sozialen Bewegungen," in: Mittag / Stadtland, Ansätze, pp. 61–89 : 64; Mittag / Stadtland, "Einleitung," in: *idem*, Ansätze, p. 46. But see McAdam *et al.*, "Social Movements" (see note 4), p. 705.

¹¹ Jochen Schmück, "Der deutschsprachige Anarchismus und seine Presse. Ein Forschungsbericht," Archiv für die Geschichte des Widerstandes und der Arbeit, 12 (1992), pp. 177–191: 177 (my translation). See also: James Joll, "Anarchism between Communism and Individualism," in: *Anarchici e anarchia nel mondo temporaneo. Atti del convegno promosso della Fondazione Luigi Einaudi, Turin 1971*, pp. 269–285: 277.

Anarchism, therefore, confronts social movement theory with a whole array of problems: its goals are difficult to reach and to measure, its ideology has many facets, it lacks strict organisations, it disappears and reappears in the short and in the long run, and it lacks the type of collectivity social movement theory usually works with. It is as much a movement of individuals living according to their anarchist principles as a movement dedicated to a fundamental change of society. This combination of personal lifestyle and movement for change should be taken into account when trying to understand the staying power of anarchism.

Maybe it is best first to meet an anarchist of flesh and blood.

3. Structure

*a) Piet Honig*¹³

Piet Honig was born in 1866. At the age of twelve he had to leave school and start working, first as a clerical helper, later as an upholsterer. In 1885 he took part in a major demonstration for universal suffrage, organised in The Hague. It was on this occasion that Piet heard the socialist leader Ferdinand Domela Nieuwenhuis for the first time, and he immediately became a member of the socialist league in Rotterdam. After a while he came to dislike the reformism of the local socialist leaders, the hierarchy, and the dominant role of socialists from bourgeois backgrounds in Dutch socialism generally. In 1888, together with some friends, he broke away

¹² Jean Maitron, *Histoire du mouvement anarchiste en France (1880-1914)*, Paris 1955², p. 24 (my translation); see also: Dieter Nelles, *Zur Soziologie und Geschichte des Anarcho-Syndikalismus im rheinisch-bergischen Raum unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Wuppertals von 1918-1945*, Diplomarbeit Wuppertal 1984, pp. 11-12: "Anarchists recognize only those theories with medium validity" (my translation).

¹³ The following is based on: Piet Honig, *Herinneringen van een Rotterdams revolutionair*, bezorgd door Bert Altena, Utrecht 2005.

and formed an anarchist group. Soon he was a leading anarchist. Within a few years the group would have its own meeting place.

In 1889, during the major harbour strike in Rotterdam, Honig and his friends published their own newspaper, and shortly after they put themselves in charge of publishing *Anarchist*, a national journal that was distributed gratis for a couple of years. Whenever there was enough money, a new issue would be published. For *Anarchist* they formed a special group, “De Vaandelwacht” (“The Colour Guard”), which came into contact with editors of foreign newspapers such as *Autonomie* from London. They probably exchanged journals, but this transnational contact served other purposes too. Together with his friend Hubert van Bloppoel, Honig for instance smuggled pamphlets from Otto Rincke and the London “*Autonomie*” group into Germany.

In April 1893, Piet and his wife Hannie (they were not formally married) stopped working in Rotterdam and decided to move to Paris, the city of light. En route, they stopped off in Brussels just in time to attend the large May Day demonstration there and to march with the anarchist demonstrators. They met a Dutch anarchist and were introduced to the local anarchist circles. Because Honig managed to find a job with an old upholsterer, the couple was able to stay in Brussels for longer and to become involved in the activities of the local anarchists. Piet taught them a new technique for (illegal) billposting: the migrating anarchist could also be an innovating anarchist. Because on one evening he was nearly caught by the police while billposting, the couple moved on to Paris.

In Paris, the Honigs paid a visit to Alexander Cohen, a Dutch anarchist journalist who worked for the newspaper *Aurora* and was a correspondent for Domela Nieuwenhuis’s journal *Recht voor Allen*. Piet wanted to contact the anarchist workers of Belleville, those heroes of the Commune, but Cohen could not provide him with any names. His network consisted of journalists, bohemians, and anarchist avant-gardists, but lacked workers. Therefore, Cohen advised Honig to visit Jean Grave, who had an extensive and dense

network and who pointed the Dutchman to a certain Gustave Brunett. It is worth mentioning that Honig spoke a little French because his father tried to keep the knowledge intact that his grandfather had acquired while serving under Napoleon on his campaign in Russia. Brunett advised Honig where to find work, discussed anarchism with him, introduced him to the German anarchist John Henry Mackay (who just happened to be in town) and took him to a meeting in Belleville, where strategies and tactics were discussed. Influenced by these encounters and discussions, Honig became an individualist anarchist and a supporter of propaganda by the deed. This was the time when anarchist assassinations had started and the police had become more vigilant. Shortly later, Honig was caught when visiting Jean Grave again. After a series of interrogations and after a revolver was found in his lodgings, he was escorted out of the country.¹⁴

Failing to find work in Brussels, he finally returned to Rotterdam, where he became very active in the anarchist movement and tried to win socialists for the anarchist cause. In September 1898, together with his comrade Henk van Steenis, he seems to have planned to assassinate Queen Wilhelmina during her inauguration. On the advice of Dutch comrades who lived in Brussels, among them some professional crooks, both men had started to swindle in order to finance this attempt. However, just one week before the inauguration Honig was convicted for his swindling and nothing came of the plan. Piet went into hiding and, at the end of September, with a new name and passport and twenty-five guilders from Domela Nieuwenhuis, he fled to Brussels.

¹⁴ Vivien Bouhey, *Les anarchistes contre la République de 1880 à 1914. Radiographie du mouvement anarchiste français. Contribution à l'histoire des réseaux sous la Troisième République*, Thèse de doctorat Paris X-Nanterre 2006 (e.g., pp. 72–74 and 313, does not mention Honig's name. The dissertation has been published in a shortened version as: *Les Anarchistes contre la République. Contribution à l'histoire des réseaux sous la Troisième République (1880–1914)*, Rennes 2008. Lists with names are omitted in the published version.

After a time he settled in Mechelen, an important centre of Belgian anarchism. He would remain in Belgium until 1951, when he returned to Utrecht, where he died in 1953. In Mechelen, he helped foreign anarchists who were in trouble and were sent to him by comrades in Brussels. He could help them find addresses elsewhere. Among them was Joseph Thioulouse, who had been in Montjuïc prison near Barcelona. For a couple of years Thioulouse lived, worked, and wrote propaganda material in the Netherlands.

In Belgium, Honig lived and worked as an individualist anarchist, very much influenced by John Henry Mackay, Max Stirner, and the Dutch individualist anarchist Jaak Lansen, who had translated the German philosopher into Dutch. He also remained in contact with his more socially minded Belgian comrades, at times preparing lengthy reports on important themes such as anarchist economics. He continued to correspond with Mackay and Lansen, but he was also a prolific correspondent for the Dutch anarchist paper *De Vrije Socialist* until its editor, Gerhard Rijnders, died in 1950.¹⁵

Honig's life points to several aspects of anarchism as a social movement. He is a good example of how to handle Manfredonia's typology. Individualist anarchists often did not start as individualists. Honig became an anarchist because of his dissatisfaction with the socialist movement and he became an individualist because of Mackay's intellectual critique of social anarchism. As an individualist anarchist he clearly belonged to the broad anarchist movement, helping other anarchists, corresponding and debating with them, writing in their newspapers and giving advice. Even though he was an individualist, he was clearly a useful member in the broad anarchist network in Belgium. His experiences with this network and with networks in Paris show how open they were to foreigners: on 1 May you joined anarchists in Brussels, and there you were, billposting with them in the middle of the night. On the advice of Al-

¹⁵ [P.J. Honig], De individualistische levensleer en geld-theorie in verband met het economisch bedrijfsleven in een statenloze samenleving (Mechelen 1941–1942), in: International Institute of Social History, archive-Honig.

exander Cohen you climbed the stairs to Jean Grave's attic in Rue Mouffetard, got an introduction, and there you were in the heart of the Belleville anarchist movement. Apparently these networks served many purposes, from giving information to helping people work or find a safe haven. The networks could also be used for transferring illegal publications, and they could even be connected to networks of professional crooks. His trade as an upholsterer made it possible for Honig to travel and earn his money wherever a good hand was needed. Trade was the basis for working-class anarchists on the move, and the anarchist networks were there to help them find work. The autobiography of Josef Peukert displays very similar characteristics.¹⁶

b) Class

Honig's life suggests that class and gender played a role in the anarchist movement, but do these categories exhaust the analysis of this movement? Class certainly should be at the centre of analysis when a movement based itself on one class, as social democracy based itself on the working class. Class may also be a valuable category for explaining the success or failure of a movement.¹⁷

Except for the syndicalists, the anarchist movement never based itself on just one class. As might be expected from the type of society we are dealing with, during the "classical" period it was predominantly a working-class movement. In some countries (in Spain and Ukraine, but also in the Netherlands), anarchism could be quite strong among agricultural workers, but in other countries it was a more urban phenomenon. In France, for instance, most anarchists were urban-based artisans. Maitron has surmised that, among the artisans, sedentary workers were overrepresented,

¹⁶ Josef Peukert, *Erinnerungen eines Proletariers aus der revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung*, Frankfurt am Main 2002 (reprint).

¹⁷ See, for instance: Frances Fox Piven / Richard A. Cloward, *Poor People's Movements: Why They Succeed, How They Fail*, New York 1977.

people like Hobsbawm and Scott's famous revolutionary shoemakers. Yet, even during this period, Domela Nieuwenhuis, Reclus, Kropotkin, and other anarchists from bourgeois or even aristocratic backgrounds were participating in the same anarchist movement as Honig and Brunett. The anarchist movement, therefore, should not be analysed as an expression of one class, though class can be valuable in understanding the changes within the movement in the long run. One might expect that changing class composition will have led to changes in the character and focus of the movement. Class differences also played a role in the inner life of the movement, as we saw with Honig's disapproval of the early socialists or with the networks of Alexander Cohen. Here class happens, too, to borrow E. P. Thompson's famous "definition" of class, but the problems this could pose within the movement are scarcely analysed.¹⁸

In the literature I have found five distinctive elements relating to class:

1. Workers seem to have been more praxis-oriented while intellectuals focused on theory and wrote about it in at times quite difficult prose. We should not underrate a general anti-intellectualism within anarchism which was inspired by anti-Marxism and pride in the working class, which should liberate itself.¹⁹

¹⁸ See: Carl Levy, "Introduction: Historical and Theoretical Themes," in: *idem* (ed.), *Socialism and the Intelligentsia, 1880–1914*, London / New York 1987, pp. 1–35. For class differences within Dutch social democracy: Bert Altena, "Bürger in der Sozialdemokratie. Ihre Bedeutung für die Entwicklung der Sozialdemokratischen Arbeiterpartei (SDAP) in den Niederlanden 1894–1914," in: *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 20 (1994), 4, pp. 533–549. Eric Hobsbawm / Joan W. Scott, "Political Shoemakers," in: Eric Hobsbawm, *Workers: Worlds of Labor*, New York 1984, pp. 103–131. Notice the difficulties Rolf Bigler sees in an all too straightforward connection between profession (watchmaker) and conviction (Fédération Jurassienne): Rolf Bigler, *Der libertäre Sozialismus in der Westschweiz. Ein Beitrag zur Entwicklungsgeschichte und Deutung des Anarchismus*, Cologne 1963, pp. 236–253.

¹⁹ Václav Tomek, "Tschechischer Anarchismus um die Jahrhundertwende," in: *Archiv für die Geschichte des Widerstandes und der Arbeit*, 12 (1992), pp. 113–115. Paul Avrich, *The Russian Anarchists*, Princeton 1967, pp. 22, 91; John Hart, *Anarchism and the Mexican Working Class, 1860–1931*, Austin 1978, pp. 9–10.

2. Intellectuals may have been prone to an individualist conception of anarchism, but Ulrich Linse found that among the followers of John Henry Mackay in Germany there were many workers from the labour aristocracy who, according to him, had petit-bourgeois leanings.²⁰

3. Problems of attitude and cohesion were the result. Whereas some intellectuals used the movement to become a new Demos-thenes, others felt guilty about the state of the working classes. Only by being helpful or by personal sacrifice, like a term in jail, could intellectuals convince the workers of their sincerity, but then they could become almost sacrosanct.²¹

4. Workers and intellectuals developed different forms of internationalism. That of the intellectuals seemed to have developed through intense networking, whereas the internationalism of the workers was more limited, yet resolute and ritualised.²²

5. After 1917, according to Eric Hobsbawm, libertarian workers adapted much quicker to Bolshevism than the intellectuals, for whom ideological and programmatic differences were much more important than for the workers.²³

Czech philosopher and historian Václav Tomek, though, is right to call many differences between anarchist workers and anarchist intellectuals complementary. It remains to be seen to what extent

²⁰ Tomek, "Anarchismus" (see note 19), pp. 101–104; Ulrich Linse, *Organisierter Anarchismus im Deutschen Kaiserreich von 1871*, Berlin 1969, pp. 67–68, 82.

²¹ Jean Maitron, "La personnalité du militant ouvrier français dans la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle," *Le Mouvement Social*, 33/34 (1960–1961), pp. 67–86, 84; Nelles, Wuppertal (see note 11), pp. 54–56; Max Nettlau, "Fernand Pelloutiers Platz in der Entwicklung des Syndikalismus," *Die Internationale. Zeitschrift für die revolutionäre Arbeiterbewegung, Gesellschaftskritik und sozialistischen Neuaufbau*, 1/2 (1927), p. 50.

²² Constance Bantman, "Internationalism Without an International? Cross-Channel Anarchist Networks, 1880–1914," in: Magaly Rodríguez García, *Labour Internationalism: Different Times, Different Faces*, *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire / Belgisch tijdschrift voor filologie en geschiedenis*, 84 (2006), 4, pp. 961–981; 970.

²³ Eric J. Hobsbawm, "Bolshevism and Anarchism," in: *Anarchici*, pp. 473–468: 478.

these differences were beneficial to the movement as a whole, or if there could also have been some negative effects. One case in point might be the role of education and the fact that intellectuals may have stimulated the rise of elites within the movement. Intellectual elites may have guided the course of the movement, seeing it as more than a class struggle for the expression of the working class. Some maintained that anarchism was for the benefit of the whole of humanity, not of the workers alone. Others feared hierarchy and organisational rigidity as a consequence of taking in the trade unions. In discussions about the place of syndicalism within the movement, it was not only generation that played a role (at the Amsterdam international congress of 1907 syndicalism was presented as a renewal of the movement) but also the place of class within the movement.²⁴

c) *Gender*

Like many social movements, the anarchist one was predominantly a male affair. In his memoirs, Honig, for instance, constantly plays down the personality of his wife, who was a dedicated feminist in her own right. This negative portrait is probably no exception from the rule. Gender may have overlapped with class in that sense that, within the working class, the outdoor activities of women were constrained, however important the woman was for the maintenance of the family (household finances!) and its representation in public. Maybe the most important constraint on female influence within the movement was the mentality of the anarchist husband who thought that, as head of the family, he should represent it in societal struggles and working-class organizations. Male chauvinism cannot be overlooked when analysing the anarchist movement.

²⁴ Bouhey, *Anarchistes* (see note 14), pp. 315–318. Maitron, *Histoire* (see note 12), p. 125. Amsterdam: Congrès anarchiste tenu à Amsterdam, Août 1907. *Compte-rendu analytique des séances et résumé des rapports sur l'état du mouvement dans le monde entier* (Paris 1908).

The analysis of gender relations within the movement is still in its infancy, while its implications for the representation of the movement in society at large have received hardly any attention at all.

Ulrich Klan and Dieter Nelles have shown that those women who showed up in the syndicalist movement in the Rhineland were either unmarried or divorced, or they had no more than two children. Their presence did not remedy the anti-feminist feelings of many syndicalist comrades in the region. The Rhineland syndicalists were not alone in their deprecation of women. “Without a family, woman has no *raison d’être* on earth whatsoever,” the French delegation wrote to the 1866 congress of the First International. It was not until 1935 that the French CGT changed its programme to acknowledge the presence of women more positively. Though not all anarchist movements were as anti-female as the French ones, there is reason to extend Francis Shor’s analysis of “virile” syndicalism to the anarchist movement as a whole.²⁵

One might, as Shor does, account for the devaluation of women by a certain manly pride arising from feelings of resistance to the repression they experienced in industrial capitalism. Arguments about pride and independence abound in anarchist discourse: “you do not have to be a slave” or “not even a slave chooses his own master” (in the case of vote abstention) are well-known expressions. Does “virile” anarchism also contain a propensity for violence or for seeking the adventures of living in semi-legality? Does it explain a predilection for direct action? “Virile” anarchism seems important with regard to sexual relations. It could explain why

²⁵ Ulrich Klan / Dieter Nelles, “Es lebt noch eine Flamme.” Rheinische Anarcho-Syndikalisten/-innen in der Weimarer Republik und im Faschismus, Grafenau-Döffingen 1990, pp. 293–303. In his autobiography, I was struck by Piet Honig’s silence about his wife. Sometimes he described her as rather simple-minded, while, in contrast, according to messages in the socialist and anarchist press, she must have been a firm feminist. French delegates: bear in mind the role of women during the Commune and in production generally: Maitron, “Personnalité” (see note 21), p. 84. Francis Shor, “‘Virile Syndicalism’ in Comparative Perspective: A Gender Analysis of the IWW in the United States and Australia,” *International Labor and Working-Class History*, 56 (1999), pp. 65–77.

“free love” did not always mean the same to men and women. Were “virile anarchists” less scrupulous about pornography? In this respect quite some research remains to be done.²⁶

Although women were a minority in the anarchist movement, there was one activity in which women could participate equally: cultural events. Women were active in the performance of plays; they also sang in choirs. In some countries they made other important contributions to the anarchist cause. Temma Kaplan, for instance, has shown how important female activism was for the representation of anarchism in Barcelona’s neighbourhoods and streets, where women defended the dignity of the working class by fighting poor hygiene or high prices. During general strikes, housewives, domestic workers, and prostitutes stood up to defend the quality of life of ordinary citizens. Very positive comments on women by male anarchists can be found too. Often, they had a symbolic connotation: the woman as a mother, a Joan of Arc, or a Marianne. They could also refer to specific women as role models: women like Louise Michel or Emma Goldman. These were the heroines of the anarchist movement, but the precise significance of these models still needs to be explored. The woman as a mother was in any case a powerful image, and it gave mothers an important, though very traditional, role in the eyes of the anarchists. Mothers had to take care of the children and educate them properly. They also had care for their husbands and support them during strikes. The most curious role women were probably ever expected to fulfil can be found in a plan by Ferdinand Domela Nieuwenhuis. In 1915, he proposed that feminists should organise a crusade of mothers to stop World War I. They were supposed to place themselves on the battlefields, between the fighting troops, and exhort the men to stop their fighting. That the feminists took

²⁶ Dutch anarchist Henk Eikeboom (together with his wife) wrote and sold pornography as well as editing journals and writing poems: Pzisko Jacobs, Henk Eikeboom, *Anarchist*, Haarlem 1986, pp. 70–71.

no notice of this idea was a major disappointment for the Dutchman.²⁷

d) Individuals, groups, networks

To really understand the ups and downs of the movement, class, gender, and organisations will not suffice as categories of analysis. The anarchist movement needs a different approach. While social movement theory centres on “social movement organisations,” in the case of anarchism it seems better to start off with the individual anarchist. Not only is the anarchist movement essentially a movement “from below,” with individuals at its centre, but starting from the individual anarchist is also the only way to see the whole range of anarchists and the broadness of their identity. From a methodological point of view, this means individual biographies and prosopographical studies are very relevant for the study of anarchism.²⁸

To explain the central place of the individual in the anarchist movement, it is important to stress that a certain disposition was expected from every anarchist, a disposition that went further than just paying dues. According to Vivien Bouhey, companionship was the essence of anarchist identity:

²⁷ Spain: Temma Kaplan, *Anarchists of Andalusia 1868–1903*, Princeton 1977, p. 207. *Idem*, *Red City, Blue Period: Social Movements in Picasso’s Barcelona*, Berkeley etc. 1992, pp. 61, 106, 112. See also: Martha A. Ackelsberg, *Free Women of Spain: Anarchism and the Struggle for the Emancipation of Women*, Oakland etc. 2005, pp. 37–53. For a more positive stance towards women in Germany, see, for example: Dirk H. Müller, *Gewerkschaftliche Versammlungsdemokratie und Arbeiterdelegierte vor 1918. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Lokalismus, des Syndikalismus und der entstehenden Rätebewegung*, Berlin 1985, p. 50. Domela: Bert Altena, “‘No Man and No Penny’: F. Domela Nieuwenhuis: Anti-Militarism and the Opportunities of World War I,” in: Ruth Kinna / Matthew S. Adams (eds), *Anarchism 1914–1918: Internationalism, Militarism and War*, Manchester (forthcoming 2016).

²⁸ Constance Bantman / Bert Altena, “Introduction: Problematizing Scales of Analysis in Network-Based Social Movements,” in: Bantman / Altena, *Transnational Turn*, pp. 3–25: 10, where Pietro di Paola’s prosopographical research project is mentioned.

1. Among anarchists, “*compagnon*” replaced the “*citoyen*” of the republicans and early social democrats.

2. Being a “*compagnon*” meant maintaining good relations with other “*compagnons*,” for example during get-togethers or commemorative meetings.

3. That implied duties: to be hospitable to comrades; to maintain anarchist networks and help comrades; more specifically, to help comrades who were victims of repression or who were political prisoners, wherever in the world; to help their families; to defend anarchist principles; and (after 1890) to avenge anarchist martyrs.²⁹

Such an interpretation of comradeship suggests anarchists did not think of organisation and movement as cut loose from individual members, as entities at another level, but rather that individual members made them. Anarchist organisations were weak because the members should be strong.

We have to take this into account when we adopt Maitron’s description of the anarchist group: “What then is an anarchist group? It is a very distinct organism that looks nothing like sections or groups of other parties. There is no steering committee, there are no fixed contributions, and no comrade is obliged to tell where he comes from, what he does, and where he will go. The group’s meeting place is a place of passage where everybody talks as he wishes, it is a place of education not of action.” Often the group was no more than a regular gathering of individuals from the same street or neighbourhood sharing the same tastes and convictions. After World War I, Jean Grave was rather critical of this organisational fluidity: “out of ephemeral groups, even if they are constantly replaced by new ones, you cannot build serious federations.” Although he accepts the fluidity of the groups, Vivien Bouhey has amended Maitron’s description by arguing that many anarchist groups had more structure and were not only units of education. They were also combat groups against the bourgeois state. They

²⁹ Bouhey, *Anarchistes* (see note 14), pp. 163–155, 396–400. Published version: pp. 69–72.

often hired or bought their own meeting place, which implies a certain level of organisation; others came together in specific pubs. Usually they would place the group's library in their localities. Outside France this acquisition of anarchist places was a common practice too. Some groups had statutes, a president, a secretary, and a treasurer, and most of them held regular meetings.³⁰

Considering its organisational habits, it is very difficult to chart exactly the numerical development of anarchism in a town, region, or state. You need a good database, names (and not the many pseudonyms!), and preferably *faits et gestes*. The same anarchist could be a member of several groups, especially when they were formed for specific purposes: the publication of a newspaper, propaganda for free thought or anti-militarism, or just theatre clubs. Since the groups remained fairly small, centres of anarchism could host a considerable number of them. In addition, anarchist groups could be very ephemeral and poor administrative practices abounded, which makes it even more difficult to quantify membership. On the other hand, not every anarchist was a member of an organisation and not every anarchist has left their traces in history. That goes especially for the humble worker in the anarchist vineyard, as Jean Maitron tells us: "prisoner of daily action, he has kept no books and the organisation, no matter how much it was his own, has kept hardly any archive, if, indeed, it has left any archive at all."

³⁰ Maitron, *Histoire* (see note 12), p. 117. George Woodcock wrote, "The loose and flexible affinity group is the natural unit of anarchism." Bantman, "Internationalism" (see note 22), p. 962. Grave as cited in: Max Nettlau, *Anarchisten und Sozialrevolutionäre. Die historische Entwicklung des Anarchismus in den Jahren 1880–1886* (*Geschichte der Anarchie, Band III*), n. p. 1996 (reprinted from the original publication by Asy Verlag, Berlin 1931), p. 62 (my translation). Bouhey, *Anarchistes* (see note 14), pp. 92–101. Common practice: see Constance Bantman, *The French Anarchists in London, 1880–1914: Exile and Transnationalism in the First Globalisation*, Liverpool 2013; Tom Goyens, *Beer and Revolution: The German Anarchist Movement in New York City, 1880–1914*, Urbana / Chicago 2007; Pietro di Paola, *The Knights Errant of Anarchy: London and the Italian Anarchist Diaspora (1880–1917)*, Liverpool 2013. Richard Bach Jensen, *The Battle Against Anarchist Terrorism: An International History*, Cambridge / New York 2014, p. 39.

The same goes for anarchist newspapers and archives, which “tend to be reliable, but typically reticent.” Usually, the groups were quite open to outsiders, even if they screened new members. In times of repression, however, they would be much more cautious, to the point of being closed to new members. In that case, the group could also decide to go into hiding as an organisation, but then the members would still meet informally at certain pubs or continue their activities under another umbrella: as a teetotallers club, a theatre club, or whatever. That is when anarchism seemed, in the short run, to have almost disappeared.³¹

e) A networked movement

The anarchist movement resembles a network model, but it is not a simple model. Although the term “network” has connotations of flatness, even the anarchist one had hierarchies. Sometimes these overlapped.³²

To get an idea of the anarchist network structure, we should start examining the local situation. There we can discern three levels of organised activity and subsequently three possible nodes for networks. At the basis of the movement in a town were the individual anarchists who maintained various informal contacts and were part of multiple networks: family (including migrants to other parts of the world), work-related or leisure-based networks,

³¹ With some exasperation, therefore, Willy Buschak has written about the groups in Buenos Aires: Willy Buschak, “Das Leben des Emilio Lopez Arango,” *Archiv für die Geschichte des Widerstandes und der Arbeit*, 11 (1991), pp. 101–125: 107. See also: Maitron, *Histoire* (see note 12), pp. 118–119. Jean Maitron, “Un ‘anar’, qu’est-ce que c’est?,” *Le Mouvement Social*, 83 (April–June 1973), pp. 23–24; Maitron, “Personnalité” (see note 20), p. 67. Davide Turcato, “Italian Anarchism as a Transnational Movement, 1885–1915,” *International Review of Social History*, 52 (2007), p. 408; Jensen, *Battle* (see note 30), pp. 9–10.

³² For a survey of the literature on hierarchy in structures: Robert Allen Irwin, *Hierarchy, Egalitarian Politics, and the Structure and Effectiveness of Social Movement Organizations* (Ph.D., Brandeis University 1997). See in general for the anarchist movements also: Bouhey, *Anarchistes* (see note 14), pp. 35–67 and 309–318.

friends inside and outside the movement. These anarchists could form a small group with the single purpose of organising a meeting or campaign. Constance Bantman has aptly called this world “informal anarchism.” At a second level were anarchist groups with longer permanence: groups that used to meet regularly in pubs or other localities. Typically, these groups would temporarily alternate between openness and almost hermetical closure. The more closed a group was, the greater the chance that it was better structured. Closure was, however, only one strategy for coping with repression. Groups could change their name, become active in another field, or go undercover, like the famous gymnasts’ unions of the early German radical democrats. At a third local level, delegates from these groups could assemble in order to coordinate bigger actions, organise large meetings, or publish a journal. These coordinating bodies could have a more permanent character and they were usually very flexible in terms of openness.³³

On a national scale, the anarchist world displays a geographical hierarchy. In the important centres of anarchism, talented propagandists abounded and the important journals were published there. They established contacts in surrounding regions, either because people from those regions had migrated to the centres or because the centres had sent out propagandists, and the journals catered to those regions. This way second-rate centres could develop.³⁴

The local groups maintained contact not only with other groups in town or in the country, but at times even on a transnational scale. Maybe it is better to say that certain group members maintained those contacts, which means the contacts could remain intact even when the group itself disappeared. Correspondence was an important means of maintaining contact. Journals provided addresses of secretaries. Letters were an important medium providing inside information. On the other hand, letters could make the an-

³³ Bantman, “Internationalism” (see note 22), p. 62.

³⁴ Bouhey, *Anarchistes* (see note 14), pp. 163–165.

archist movement vulnerable. In times of repression, or when dealing with matters illegal, special procedures were followed. Then, letters were coded, written in special ink, or sent to a trustworthy third person who would personally deliver such a letter. Much of this type of correspondence was destroyed after the addressee had read it. Nevertheless, contact by mail remained hazardous. A clever spy like the Italian Carlo Terzaghi could obtain considerable confidential information through his correspondence with militants. Moreover, archives of the police and other state authorities prove that many letters were intercepted.³⁵

Travellers were also important for the maintenance of the anarchist networks: resellers of anarchist literature or nationwide travelling propagandists gathered regional information and provided their comrades with counsel or the addresses of other anarchists. The travelling resellers also circulated inside information between the centres and the peripheries. Given the importance of these propagandists as opinion leaders, one sees perhaps what Marcel van der Linden and Wayne Thorpe have called, in a slightly different context, “radiation effects.”³⁶

³⁵ Destroying: Bouhey, *Anarchistes* (see note 14), pp. 131–133, 392. The same goes for communists during the 1950s: A. A. de Jonge, *Stalinistische herinneringen*, The Hague 1984, p. 9. Marc Vuilleumier, “La police politique à Genève, un aperçu de ses activités (1880–1903),” *Bulletin de la Société d’Histoire et d’Archéologie de Genève*, 23 (1993), pp. 91–111: 102. On Terzaghi’s activities abroad see also: P. O. R. van der Mark, *Revolutie en reactie. De repressie van de Italiaanse anarchisten 1870–1900* (Ph.D., University of Groningen 1997, [<http://dissertations.ub.rug.nl/faculties/arts/1997/p.o.r.van.der.mark/>]), pp. 42–54, 221–226, 235–247. Intercepted: in March 1898, before the planned attack on the Dutch queen, the Geneva police asked the Rotterdam police for information about Honig, *Herinneringen*, p. 396; Nationaal Archief The Hague, 2 September 1905, Geheim archief van Justitie, 6500 (geheim archief 1900) contains letters sent by the Dutch anarchist Jan Cremer from Paris to a friend in Hengelo. See also the files of international socialists and revolutionaries in: Municipal Archive Brussels, Police, Documents relatifs aux membres de l’Internationale Socialiste, 1865–1914.

³⁶ Marcel van der Linden / Wayne Thorpe, “The Rise and Fall of Revolutionary Syndicalism,” in: *idem*, *Revolutionary Syndicalism: An International Perspective*, Aldershot 1990, pp. 1–25: 15.

Next to correspondence, propagandists, and resellers, the network gained coherence from efforts to support journals, strikes, anarchists in jail, and their families at home. In general it seems logical that the anarchist networks were maintained more intensely on a local and regional than on a national level. Bouhey has also shown the importance of networks for mutual assistance between regions (between, for example, the Ardennes and the region around Reims).³⁷

Exchanging letters could be the starting point for the emergence of transnational networks, since migrants would remain in contact with relatives or friends who had stayed behind. As Carl Levy, Constance Bantman, and Davide Turcato have shown, many anarchist networks involved important transnational ties. With regard to the study of anarchism, a warning against methodological nationalism is warranted. Anarchists abroad provided not only financial but also ideological support to anarchist movements in their home country, especially in times of repression. They wrote manifestos and edited journals to be smuggled into their home countries. Václav Tomek explains the radicalisation of Czech workers after 1880 in terms of the influence of foreign journals mailed by their comrades in the United States. As the experience of Piet Honig shows, this could entail the cooperation of comrades in other countries. Foreign centres – London is a good and well-studied example – developed into meeting points for leading anarchists exiled from different countries. We still need to fully explore how important these transnational networks were for the anarchist movement in the country of origin and in the centres of exile. Pietro di Paola has shown that the many colonies of exiled anarchists were vital for the anarchist scene in London and for anarchism in Britain as a whole. When, after 1918, many revolutionaries returned home, British anarchism was seriously weakened. It seems, however, that for the exiled anarchists the place of origin was much more important than their place of exile. For a long time anarchists have been

³⁷ Bouhey, *Anarchistes* (Ph.D. version; see note 14), p. 560.

dealt with as a specimen of Oscar Handlin's uprooted people, but in fact their attachment to their place of origin seems to characterise their attitude much better. To a certain extent this can be explained in terms of the fact that this exile was the result of forced migration. For people who migrated for economic reasons, the situation was different, but they also retained a keen interest in what happened in their home country. Non-English newspapers in the United States, for instance, would carry regular correspondence from the country of origin.³⁸

These national and transnational contacts notwithstanding, many anarchists had quite a localist perspective: organisations on a regional or national level were established only when absolutely necessary, and they usually took the form of federations. These federations, whether syndicalist or not, adhered to the principle of local autonomy. This was not just a sign of localist narrowness. Apart from the strength of local bonds, the importance attached to the autonomy of the individual was essential. During the last part

³⁸ Transnational: such contacts could be long-lived. After having left the Netherlands in 1913 for the United States, by 1930 J. J. Paasse was still sending money to his old friend Willem Angenent in Vlaardingen to support the F. Domela Nieuwenhuis Foundation in Amsterdam: *Syndicalist*, 12 May 1930. Carl Levy, "Currents of Italian Syndicalism before 1926," *International Review of Social History*, 45 (2000), pp. 209–250 (e.g., p. 215); Bantman, "Internationalism" (see note 22); Turcato, "Transnational" (see note 31), pp. 432, 443; Bouhey, *Anarchistes* (see note 14), p. 392. In general see also: Bantman / Altena, *Reassessing* (see note 5). Methodological nationalism: Andreas Wimmer / Nina Glick Schiller, "Methodological Nationalism and Beyond: Nation-State Building, Migration and the Social Sciences," *Global Networks: A Journal of Transnational Affairs*, 2 (2002), pp. 301–334. Tomek, *Anarchismus* (see note 19), p. 99. Oscar Handlin, *The Uprooted: The Epic Story of the Great Migrations That Made the American People*, Boston 1973². Papers for and by immigrants: Christiane Harzig / Dirk Hoerder (eds), *The Press of Labor Migrants in Europe and North America, 1880s to 1930s*, Bremen: Labor Newspaper Preservation Project, Universität Bremen 1985, pp. 9–13; see also, for instance, *La Tribune Libre* (Charleroi, Pennsylvania). Adjustment: Jacy Alves de Seixas, *Mémoire et oubli. Anarchisme et syndicalisme révolutionnaire au Brésil: mythe et histoire*, Paris 1992, pp. 7–13. Centres: di Paola, *Knights* (see note 30), pp. 209–210. On Handlin: Dirk Hoerder, "Migration Research in Global Perspective: Recent Developments," *Sozial.Geschichte Online*, 9 (2012), pp. 63–84: 63–65.

of the nineteenth century, this individualism was strengthened by trade habits: through their travels as journeymen, many workers had experienced life in quite distant places and developed a certain pride in being independent.

To the anarchists in the country of origin, sustaining transnational relations meant more than just financial or ideological help, it meant experiencing themselves as parts of one worldwide movement of comrades. In May 1899, members of the group *Les Libér-taires* were informed through a letter from Sébastien Faure about an international counter-conference in The Hague that was to take place at the same time as the official international peace conference there. The discussions between Malatesta and Monatte at the International anarchist congress in Amsterdam in 1907 stirred debates among the syndicalists of Le Havre. From Ancona, Luigi Fabbri counted as many Italian anarchist newspapers published abroad as newspapers published in Italy.³⁹

Paradoxically, but also in keeping with the localism of many anarchists, a true international anarchist organisation, like that of the social democrats, would emerge only after 1923. Constance Bantman, following George Haupt, distinguishes between the internationalist intellectual elite and the ordinary *compagnons*. “While the shared activities of the militants at grass-roots level were rather formulaic and the actual attainments of the so-called Anarchist Internationals usually mediocre, a handful of international activists, through their networks and connections, did a lot for the progress of anarchism, both at national and international level.” The history before 1923 shows that the comrades were too individualistic to allow for a formalised International. Because of their involvement in transnational networks, the big names did not need a formal organisation. Neither did the ordinary workers at the grassroots level:

³⁹ [S. n.], Histoire méconnue et oubliée du syndicalisme Havrais, 1907–1939, I Le Havre: 1996–1997, p. 13. Luigi Fabbri to F. Domela Nieuwenhuis, Fabriano (6 May 1915), Rossijskij Centr Chranenija i Izučenija Dokumentov Novejšej Istorii, Fond 208 (international correspondence F. Domela Nieuwenhuis), p. 275.

not because they were unable to move beyond formulaic activities but because they practised internationalism. Honig helped Thioulouse and, from Belgian Mechelen, brought him into contact with Dutch comrades. With their help Thioulouse would remain in the Netherlands for four years. How could a formal international organisation be of better help to these anarchists, who valued the autonomy of the individual above anything else anyway? Moreover, a formal organisation would have been useful only if it had had firm connections to the grassroots level. At the London international conference of 1881, however, individual anarchists who had come on their own account were admitted along with formally delegated anarchists. At the Amsterdam congress of 1907 it was expressly decided that the results of the debates were not to be taken as decisions to be applied by the anarchist movement, but rather as advice. Yet debates at those congresses could educate ordinary anarchists; we saw how the syndicalist comrades of Le Havre were stirred up.⁴⁰

In 1923, a syndicalist International was founded. It succeeded in drawing together quite a few national syndicalist federations, but its most important activity remained countering communism (especially the Red International of Trade Unions), fascism, and Nazism. It was particularly active during the Spanish Civil War.⁴¹

The local, regional, national, and transnational networks were also used for matters that had to remain secret. As the life of Piet Honig shows, these networks could be quite extensive in terms of geographical scale. Some of the most common secret deeds were

⁴⁰ Bantman, "Internationalism" (see note 22), pp. 962, 974. Georges Haupt, "Groupes dirigeants internationaux du mouvement ouvrier," in: *idem*, *L'historien et le mouvement social*, Paris 1980, pp. 267–293. London: Charles L. Hartman (=Eduard Nathan Ganz) to Max Nettlau, Bad Homburg, 7 March 1931, in: IISH, Nettlau Archive, 592. Amsterdam: Congrès Amsterdam (see note 24).

⁴¹ Wayne Thorpe, "The Workers Themselves:" Revolutionary Syndicalism and International Labour, 1913–1923, Dordrecht / Amsterdam 1989; Vadim Dam'e, *Zabytyi Internatsional. Mezhdunarodnoe anarcho-syndikalistskoe dvizhenie mezhdumia mirovymi voynami*, 2 vols, Moscow 2006 and 2007.

the preparation of illegal activities and the transfer of money from dubious sources (swindling, counterfeiting, robbery, and theft). The French police suspected that internationally organised gangs, especially of well-known London-based exiled anarchists, played an important role in all this. At times, these illegal activities required much organisation: for counterfeiting you needed materials and machinery, to make bombs you needed dynamite, for instance, and, often, knowledge, experience, and money to pay for materials were required.⁴²

Its outright opposition to the bourgeois state and bourgeois *mores* opened the movement to shady people and to actions that would have no place in a future anarchist society. Apparently, the relation between means and ends was a troubled one in many an anarchist's consciousness, as can be seen in the response of the anarchist movement to the wave of assassinations during the 1890s. It is clear that people like Ravachol, Emile Henry, Pauwels, and Santo Caserio were part of anarchist networks and used these networks to prepare their attacks. They could draw on the hospitality that every anarchist was required to observe. Santo Caserio told his judges: "With regard to the journey from Lyons: I enjoyed it very much because every forty or fifty kilometres I found small groups of comrades, all of them French, but they were very good and helpful to comrades."⁴³

⁴²Bouhey, *Anarchistes* (see note 14), p. 287; Bantman, "Internationalism" (see note 22), p. 970. Explosives: see Johann Most, *August Reinsdorf und die Propaganda der Tat*, Frankfurt am Main 2002⁸, pp. 55–56, on what happens if you buy a cheap fuse that is not waterproof. Organisation of assaults: Bouhey, *Anarchistes* (see note 14), and Giuseppe Galzerano, *Gaetano Bresci: vita, attentato, processo, carcere e morte dell'anarchico che giustiziò Umberto I*, Casalvelino Scalo 2001.

⁴³Bouhey, *Anarchistes* (see note 14), p. 524 (my translation); Manfredonia, *Anarchisme* (see note 9), pp. 30–50; Jensen, *Battle* (see note 30), pp. 38–39. For Émile Henry and his conduct in anarchist circles: Alexander Cohen, In *Opstand*, Amsterdam 1976, pp. 210–213. Illegal practices could also become the basis of very good practices. For how Helmut Kirschev and his comrades were able to flee Nazi Germany, see: Helmut Kirschev, *A las barricadas. Erinnerungen und Einsichten eines Antifaschisten*, Wuppertal 2000, pp. 69–72. See also: di Paola, *Knights* (see note 29),

At that time, anarchists were slow to criticise propaganda by the deed, but during the 1890s many started to have doubts about this strategy. Killing people does not make your movement popular, its message to society is vague, it shows a quite authoritarian attitude, and it provokes governments to damaging repression and to an international coordination of that repression. As a result, anarchists started to organise workers into anarchist-inspired, revolutionary syndicalist trade unions, expecting three things:

- (1) the opportunity to create a mass following;
- (2) that anarchism could become one of the main tendencies in the labour movement;
- (3) that the anarchist revolution would be replaced by the general strike, which promised to be less violent.

Revolutionary syndicalism has received considerable attention from historians, but not all anarchists accepted it as a new form of anarchism. In his famous debate with Pierre Monatte at the Amsterdam 1907 congress, Errico Malatesta said: “The anarchist revolution that we want goes much further than the interests of one class: it wants the complete (economic, political, and moral) liberation of mankind, which at the moment is enslaved.” Malatesta was not alone in taking this view. Nevertheless, since the revolutionary syndicalists fought against the state and parliamentary politics, they should be seen as part of the broad anarchist movement. Because of their anarchist inspiration, they were careful not to focus too much on organisation and they disliked strong strike funds. Moreover, they were often members of other organisations within or linked to the anarchist movement, such as cultural groups or organisations of teetotallers and freethinkers. The French CGT, moreover, was very anti-militarist, especially between 1906 and 1912.⁴⁴

pp. 66–78, on Luigi Parmeggiani.

⁴⁴ Repression: see the work of Richard Bach Jensen, *Battle* (see note 30). Interestingly, states perceived anarchism as a transnational movement much more than the anarchists themselves: Raymond Craib, “Sedentary Anarchists,” in: Bantman / Altena, *Reassessing* (see note 5), pp. 139–157. Jacques Julliard, “La C.G.T. devant la guerre (1900–1914),” *Le Mouvement Social*, 49 (Oct.–Dec. 1964), pp. 47–

The importance of syndicalism for the anarchist movement as a whole and in local contexts should not be underestimated. However basic and frail their organisational structures were, they guaranteed some permanence and could often provide local anarchist groups with funds for cultural activities and spaces for gatherings and festivities.⁴⁵

f) *The press*

Personal ties, trade unions, travelling propagandists, resellers and cultural activities were important means to hold the fabric of the anarchist webs together. Another one was the press, about which something has been said already. Anarchists could disseminate their propaganda in a number of ways: by informal talk in pubs and at

62: 47–48.

⁴⁵ Malatesta: Congrès Amsterdam (see note 24), pp. 84–85. For the ideas of Jean Grave: Bouhey, *Anarchistes* (see note 14), p. 680. Élisée Reclus also criticised the focus on the working class as an agent of change: Gemie, “Counter” (see note 7), pp. 355–357. Max Nettlau accounted for anarchists defending a bourgeois like Dreyfus in terms of the fact that they worked for the improvement of mankind, not just of one class: [Max Nettlau], “International Notes,” *Freedom. A Journal of Anarchist Communism*, February 1898. Domela Nieuwenhuis wrote in *De Vrije Socialist*, 3 June 1911: “for us, socialism is a world view and a view of life, which has to penetrate the life of society in all its aspects, whereas [the leader of the syndicalists] Kolthek will be satisfied when a well-organised working class is ruling society instead of a capitalist class [...]. For us, the working class is only a part of the big social question, which is in itself much broader because it means a total transformation of society in mind and body [...]. However, we fear the tyranny of the working class as much as we fear the tyranny of the capitalist class.” See also the editorial in *De Vrije Socialist*, 5 October 1901. In the Czech lands, in 1911 it was proposed to hold separate congresses of syndicalists and anarchists: Václav Tomek, “Anarchismus als eigenständige politische Partei oder als breite Gefühls- und Ideenströmung? Dokumente zu einer Diskussion über die Zukunft des tschechischen Anarchismus im Jahr 1914,” *Archiv für die Geschichte des Widerstandes und der Arbeit*, 13 (1994), pp. 63–91: 65. For research on revolutionary syndicalism: Bert Altena, “Analysing Revolutionary Syndicalism: The Importance of Community,” in: David Berry / Constance Bantman (eds), *New Perspectives on Anarchism, Labour and Syndicalism: The Individual, the National and the Transnational*, Newcastle upon Tyne 2010, pp. 180–221.

work, through speeches during actions and meetings, by disturbing meetings of opponents, singing songs, reading poetry, staging plays, by caricatures, and by the oral propaganda of ambulant resellers of pamphlets, books, and newspapers. Of these means, printed propaganda was probably the most effective and the most enduring. Sometimes special groups were formed for the publication of journals; in other cases a committee of delegates from several groups (in the region for example) monitored the course of the paper. In that case, the journal was more closely tied to the basis of the anarchist movement.⁴⁶

How does the newspaper landscape relate to the anarchist networks in general? Firstly, notwithstanding their diversity, newspapers as key platforms of communication were an important force keeping the anarchist community together. Max Nettlau valued the anarchist papers as “delightful meeting places, welcome oases in the desert of reaction and meanness, where even when living at a distance we meet friends and comrades.” Second, although newspapers usually rested on nodes in the networks, as important centres of correspondence they were also nodes themselves. If the editors of a newspaper moved to another place, the written correspondence would usually move with them. Third, the newspapers could canalise streams of money intended for all sorts of purposes.⁴⁷

Because of the frequent changes in titles and the fact that anarchists in exile frequently produced only a single issue of a new journal, whether to circumvent the police or because they lacked

⁴⁶ Singing, theatrical plays, etc.: Christiane Passevant / Larry Portis, *Dictionnaire des chansons politiques et engagées. Ces chants qui ont changé le monde*, Paris 2008, pp. 13–17; Isabelle Felici, “Anarchists as Emigrants,” in: Bantman / Altena, *Reassessing* (see note 5), pp. 83–100: 90–95; Pietro di Paola, “The Game of the Goose. Italian Anarchism: Transnational, National, or Local Perspective,” in: Bantman / Altena, *Reassessing* (see note 5), pp. 118–139: 126–131. Bert Altena, “Workers’ Movement and Culture at Flushing, 1875–1928: A Cycle?,” in: Lex Heerma van Voss / Frits van Holthoorn (eds), *Working Class and Popular Culture*, Amsterdam 1988, pp. 83–97.

⁴⁷ [Max Nettlau], “To the Editor of Freedom”, *Freedom*, September–October 1900.

the money to publish more issues, it is difficult to establish a solid quantitative account of the anarchist press. Nino Kühnis, for instance, has collected an impressive amount of bibliographical details on all Swiss anarchist journals, but he seldom gives circulation figures. We often lack precise data concerning the circulation of journals. Bouhey estimates that the average circulation of French anarchist papers was 2,500, with a maximum of 5,000. Julliard calculates that the circulation of CGT's *La Voix du Peuple* was between 5,000 and 7,000. David Berry has given higher (up to 20,000) figures for the leading anarchist papers in France during the early 1920s. These were newspapers that catered to a national and indeed international readership. But during the first decade of the twentieth century, a small Dutch journal like *Naar de Vrijheid* (1903–1916), published for the town of Zaandam and its environs, ran between 1,300 and 1,600 copies. In the Netherlands, the more important anarchist journals could provide their editors with a decent existence, at least to some extent. Perhaps this explains why certain journals had the same editor for a long time: if the journal was not his own, it at least provided him with a salary. Since journals were important voices of and within anarchism, the staying power of editors seems to reflect Michels' iron law of oligarchy, albeit in circumstances without much formal organisation. Since the editors held on to their position for a long time, their personal networks would sustain the journal for a long time too. This could result in a complete generational change once the editor left. Because of the lack of strong organisations embedded within local or national structures, generational changes could be more profound than in other social movements.⁴⁸

⁴⁸ Change of titles: Turcato, "Transnational" (see note 31), p. 436. Bouhey, *Anarchistes* (Ph.D.; see note 14), p. 239; Julliard, "CGT" (see note 44), p. 54. Kühnis, *Anarchisten* (see note 5), pp. 191–465. David Berry, *A History of the French Anarchist Movement, 1917 to 1945*, Oakland / Edinburgh 2009, p. 85. *Naar de Vrijheid*: the copies at the Documentatiecentrum Vrij Socialisme at Appelscha carry the circulation figures. In 1905, Domela Nieuwenhuis earned 800 guilders a year from *De Vrije Socialist*, which was published twice a week. That was more or less the

Aside from those just mentioned, journals performed several additional functions in the anarchist world. They reported on matters important to anarchists and commented upon certain events or upon their representations in other newspapers. Their editors were opinion leaders and, therefore, journals usually developed into mouthpieces of particular tendencies within anarchism. As such, they had both a separating and a uniting effect on the anarchist world. Because they interpreted the world, debated with one another, and became records of history, the journals could also improve their readers' understanding of anarchism. Apart from political enlightenment, they performed cultural functions, for instance by publishing poems and serialising novels or plays.⁴⁹

It was not only as opinion leaders that newspapers structured the anarchist world. They published reports about local activities, announced meetings, the publication of new books or pamphlets, and printed reviews. In doing so, they connected sedentary anarchists to the movement outside their locality. They helped ambulant propagandists find accommodation on their tours and collected money for various purposes. Because they had an established address, the papers of national importance also functioned as contact points on an international level. Maitron is right: the anarchist press performed an important role as intermediary and coordinator. As centres of connection, newspapers could participate in the un-

yearly salary of a skilled town worker: F. Domela Nieuwenhuis to Johanna Domela Nieuwenhuis, 29 December 1905, in: Bert Altena and Rudolf de Jong (eds), "En al beschouwen alle broeders mij als den verloren broeder." De familiecorrespondentie van en over Ferdinand Domela Nieuwenhuis, 1846–1932, Amsterdam 1997, p. 544. Robert Michels, *Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy*, New York 1962, pp. 325–371. Generational change: Honig must have noticed that, when Gerhard Rijnders died in 1950, the new editors of *De Vrije Socialist* were not only younger, but also brought with them a new network of correspondents.

⁴⁹ Martin Baxmeyer, *Das ewige Spanien der Anarchie. Die anarchistische Literatur des Bürgerkriegs (1936–1939) und ihr Spanienbild*, Berlin 2012, pp. 227–231; Kirwin R. Shaffer, *Anarchism and Countercultural Politics in Early Twentieth-Century Cuba, Gainesville etc.* 2005, pp. 198–308.

derground networks of the anarchist movement. They exchanged, for instance, coded messages. In times of repression they often had parallel distribution networks for forbidden publications and for the distribution of other materials, such as letters or money. Women and ambulant comrades performed these tasks.⁵⁰

It took years to establish a well-functioning network of correspondents. Jean Grave needed four years to recruit a decent group. Anyone who looks through *La Révolte* in the 1890s, or *Les Temps Nouveaux*, will be struck by the sheer breadth of his network and the quality of the correspondents' contributions. Thanks to his national and international network, Grave brought anarchism from the whole world to the table of the individual reader. Not only did the journals report on movements in other countries (Grave's journals are indispensable for reconstructing the history of Dutch anarchism during the 1890s); they were also read abroad. If we can trust the quality of Maitron's list of subscribers to *La Révolte* in 1894, 72.5 per cent of them lived in France. The highest number of subscribers – apart from those from the US (62) – lived in neighbouring countries (Italy: 33; Great Britain: 28; Switzerland: 27; Belgium: 24; Algeria: 21; The Netherlands: 17; Romania: 12). To take another journal: the German *Autonomie*, published in London, was read in Western and Central Europe. Beyond that, international networks were important for the newspapers because in times of repression some papers could be printed abroad (for example, French papers were printed in Belgium or Switzerland). They also often received much-needed financial support from subscribers abroad.⁵¹

Like the networks, the anarchist press landscape displayed elements of a hierarchical structure. Often this was due to the standing of the editor. A first distinction can be made between journals

⁵⁰ Maitron, *Histoire* (see note 12), p. 132.

⁵¹ Maitron, *Histoire* (see note 12), p. 138. In the case of *La Révolte* one can also get an impression from the receipts of subscription money from abroad. *Autonomie*: Linse, *Organisierter* (see note 20), p. 135. Bouhey, *Anarchistes* (Ph.D.; see note 14), p. 481; Turcato, "Transnational" (see note 31), p. 433.

with a national and even international readership, and more regionally oriented newspapers. The latter functioned as a source of news for the “national” newspapers. However, their opinions were not negligible, since their editors were usually experienced propagandists themselves. Some newspapers also functioned as much more important centres of communication, coordination, and liaison than others. The latter were mostly the voice of a tendency within anarchism and would mostly reach a smaller audience. E. Armand’s *L’Endehors* structured its own following, but its main function was to convey the editor’s interpretation of anarchism.⁵²

4. Culture

While groups could be very ephemeral, newspapers short-lived, and bombings gave anarchism a negative connotation that seems to persist forever, it is hard to believe the survival of the movement was rendered possible solely by its network structure. Therefore, we should also look at the cultural activities of the anarchist movements. These inspired anarchist behaviour and were an important source of resilience in the short and long run. René Bianco noted that only a minority of the 225 meetings he recorded in Marseilles concerned economics or the social structure, 36 gave a general exposé of anarchist ideology, and 28 focused on religion. Most of them, however, were cultural events. Cultural performances were an integral part of the anarchist counter-community, but they needed the opportunity to flourish. One could speak of a cultural opportunity structure. Rudolf Rocker thought that the small size of towns and the absence of large-scale industrialisation there played a role, but the social stratification of a community may have been more important. Where bourgeois culture was very well developed and where it dominated the cultural scene, the anarchist

⁵² Turcato, “Transnational” (see note 31), p. 413. Bouhey, *Anarchistes* (Ph.D.; see note 14), pp. 244–245, 470–471.

culture of professional artists (such as painters or poets) could flourish, but, since anarchist networks could be class-based, cultural expressions of the lower strata were at a disadvantage. In those cases, anarchist culture remained weak and, as a consequence, a counter-community could not be fully established. It is no coincidence that anarchist movements thrived where the lower strata were able to establish a lively culture of their own in a space of their own. Often, they tried to demarcate their urban space by billposting or ritualised demonstrations.⁵³

Where anarchist cultural associations flourished, anarchists could disseminate their message in a great variety of ways: musically, through theatrical plays, by taking possession of the street or collectively hiking through the countryside, by establishing free-thinking societies, and through their libraries and Sunday schools, for instance. The creation of a lively anarchist culture strengthened feelings of pride and independence among the anarchists, the more so since it was based on the movement's common values. Cultural activities made anarchism embodied knowledge. They answered a deeply felt need for education and cultural elevation, but they also reflected the necessity of preparing people for active engagement in the movement and for the future society. That explains the extensive efforts of anarchists to educate people according to their principles, by establishing schools, publishing alternative readings of history and the Bible, anarchist novels, poems, and songs. Self-education was intended to prevent a situation in which only people

⁵³ Bianco: Bouhey, *Anarchistes* (Ph.D.; see note 14), p. 206. See also the list in: Goyens, Beer (see note 30), p. 153. Rucker: Nelles, Wuppertal (see note 12), p. 246. Social stratification: Bert Altena, "Een broeinest der anarchie." *Arbeiders, arbeidersbeweging en maatschappelijke ontwikkeling. Vlissingen 1875–1929* (1940), Amsterdam 1989; Altena, "Analysing" (see note 45). The relationship between sociability and anarchist culture can also be seen in: Erhard Lucas, *Arbeiterradikalismus. Zwei Formen von Radikalismus in der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung*, Frankfurt am Main 1976, pp. 94–95, 107–108, Bigler, *Sozialismus* (see note 18), pp. 230–232, and Kaplan, *Barcelona* (see note 27), p. 24, for example. Billposting, demonstrations: Kaplan, *Barcelona* (see note 27), pp. 9–14; Goyens, Beer (see note 30), pp. 167, 177–182.

with formal higher education could assume leading positions within the movement. In general, culture produced surroundings that made it easier to live according to anarchist principles: neo-Malthusian, vegetarian, nudist, atheistic principles, principles of free marriage and free love. In times of repression it was possible to continue many of these practices, since only anarchism as a *political* movement was repressed.⁵⁴

It is on this cultural side of anarchism that we encounter many individualist anarchists. Through their ideas and practices, they influenced the whole movement. An example is Émile Armand, who preached neo-Malthusianism and free love and whose influence outside France was noticeable in Belgium and the Netherlands. Another example is John Henry Mackay, whose novels and poems inspired many anarchists inside and outside Germany.

The cultural activities supported the staying power of the anarchist movement because they made anarchism attractive for non-anarchists and anarchists alike. They were binding factors in the movement, on a national and international level. Events commem-

⁵⁴ Embodied knowledge: Gabriel Ignatow, "Theories of Embodied Knowledge: New Directions for Cultural and Cognitive Sociology?," *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 37 (2007), 2, pp. 115–135. Education: Ulrich Linse assumes awareness of insufficient education made workers sensitive to revolutionary ideologies and fuelled their hatred of capitalism and contempt for intellectuals. Linse, *Organisierter* (see note 20), pp. 68–72. Awareness of insufficient education can lead to deference too; *Klan / Nelles, Flamme* (see note 25), pp. 44–46; pp. 190–344, is almost entirely concerned with syndicalist culture. Schools: see for instance Louise Michel's international school at Fitzroy Square, London: Constance Bantman, *Anarchismes et anarchistes en France et en Grande-Bretagne, 1880–1914: Échanges, représentations, transferts* (Ph.D., Université Paris XIII 2007), pp. 302, 333–334; *idem*, "The Dangerous Liaisons of Belle Époque Anarchists: Internationalism, Transnationalism, and Nationalism in the French Anarchist Movement (1880–1914)," in: Bantman / Altena, *Reassessing* (see note 5), pp. 174–193; 178–179. For the ideas of Élisée Reclus and James Guillaume on education see: Federico Ferretti, *Élisée Reclus. Pour une géographie nouvelle*, Paris 2014, pp. 198–211. Notice also the popularity of Francisco Ferrer and his rationalist school. Poems and novels: Baxmeyer, *Das ewige Spanien*, pp. 138–174; Shaffer, *Anarchism* (see note 47), *passim*.

orating martyrs (the Commune, the martyrs of Chicago), the use of symbols (the black flag), and the singing of songs united the anarchist movement emotionally. The symbols and songs were meaningful to anarchists of all nationalities, and they had an internationally binding character for the movement, as evidenced by meetings attended by anarchists from various countries.⁵⁵

The syndicalist movement could be of great help in maintaining a decent level of anarchist culture, because it provided localities and an organisational base that guaranteed a steady audience. Therefore, as is beautifully shown by Kirwin Shaffer, syndicalism was very important for the unfolding of an anarchist culture. Reciprocally, the development of that culture increased the staying power of revolutionary syndicalism.⁵⁶

Recently, José Moya has argued that an important explanation of anarchism's staying power is its attractiveness to young people. This, I would suggest, is precisely due to anarchist culture, which transfers anarchist lifestyles from the future to the present. To cite Max Nettlau once more: "Anarchy is not a thing that will benefit us only in a distant future when it is introduced 'officially,' [...] but it benefits us in our minds and daily life; we have opportunities to act upon it in endless small matters and, whilst we hold to it, there is no room for despondency nor despair." The anarchist movement could bear political repression by the state because of its cultural aspect. In times of repression, it may have been difficult to sing anarchist songs and perform libertarian plays, but as an individual you could continue living as a vegetarian, a teetotaler, or an atheist, in a

⁵⁵ Bantman, "Internationalism" (see note 22), p. 973. Di Paola, Knights (see note 30), pp. 169–175.

⁵⁶ I am not sure whether one will find Carl Levy's "second culture" everywhere: Carl Levy, "Italian Anarchism, 1870–1926," in: David Goodway (ed.), *For Anarchism: History, Theory, and Practice*, London / New York 1989, pp. 25–79; 45; Levy, "Syndicalism" (see note 38), pp. 228–229. Shaffer, *Anarchism* (see note 48). For the cultural activities of the German syndicalists: Hartmut Rübner, *Freiheit und Brot. Die Freie Arbeiter-Union Deutschlands. Eine Studie zur Geschichte des Anarcho-syndikalismus*, Cologne / Berlin 1994, pp. 159–236.

free marriage, with only two children, raised according to anarchist principles; you could meet your comrades in the pub for the occasional talk, and walk in the countryside with your friends. From this basis, the movement would rise again once repression relaxed. Anarchism's whole way of life is also, however, a plausible explanation of the movement's long-term staying power. By promoting an anarchist lifestyle here and now, it offered and offers a principled structure within which everybody can find guidance on how to organise their life alongside being part of a movement for fundamental societal change. That made and makes anarchism especially attractive for young people.⁵⁷

5. Social movement theory reconsidered

Anarchism as a social movement displays characteristics that make it a difficult object of analysis for social movement theory. Firstly, it is the opposite of a single-issue movement because it addresses a whole range of issues and, in doing so, it either attacks the state or ignores it. Therefore, success in dealings with the state, one of the hallmarks of social movement theory, cannot be used as a yardstick of anarchism's success or lack thereof, and that goes for dealings with other "adversaries" as well. Secondly, the structure of the movement has implications for the methodology used. The broad reach of the networks and the press make anarchism a national and transnational movement, but most of the time the action is local and sometimes regional. To take the nation-state as the point of departure for analysis, as social movement theory usually does, does

⁵⁷ Of course, the harshness of repression is an important factor here. I wonder whether anarchists who stayed behind in Francoist Spain had many opportunities to live anarchist lives. For this see: Hanneke Willemse, *Gedeeld verleden. Herinneringen van anarcho-syndicalisten aan Albalade de Cinca, 1928–1938*, Amsterdam 1996. José Moya, "Epilogue. Transference, Culture, and Critique: The Circulation of Anarchist Ideas and Practices," in: de Laforcade and Shaffer, *Defiance* (see note 3), pp. 326–335. [Max Nettlau], "To the Editor of Freedom," *Freedom*, September–October 1900.

not seem the best way to proceed. Although nation states set a lot of rules and generally have a unifying effect upon regions, during the twentieth century the anarchist movement remained, first and foremost, a localised movement. As a network movement, anarchism is rather flat. There is little hierarchy in the anarchist world. Leading anarchists derive their position from their abilities, insights, and exemplary lives. Anarchist hierarchy is not authoritarian hierarchy. In the third place, the decentralised character of the anarchist movement not only emphasises the role of the individual anarchist; it also makes anarchism a many-faceted movement. At one and the same time, anarchists in one place may be wrangling with landlords, while elsewhere they are confronting the police or judicial rulings, or staging a play or poking fun at the church. Usually, the basic unit is the individual anarchist or a group of individuals, and the goal of the movement is always the liberation of the individual from all sorts of constraints. Because the state and the employers are the most important elements in society for curbing individual freedom, anarchists oppose them, but their real goal remains the optimal deployment of individual liberty. That goal, fourthly, defies measurement, and as a consequence anarchism, to a large extent, eludes social movement theory. It is even worse: because of the perceived close connection between means and ends, the principle of freedom and individual autonomy stands in the way of proposing new structures for post-revolutionary society, or even of inciting people to revolution. F. Domela Nieuwenhuis once remarked: "We can give advice and point to causes; we do not have the workers on a string and cannot pull them to where we want them to be. Neither do we want this because then they would act not on their own initiative, but on our command." In the fifth place, the movement is also elusive because it is difficult to determine where anarchists are active and in what numbers. Administration was not the forte of many anarchist organisations, and membership lists are generally lacking.⁵⁸

⁵⁸Domela Nieuwenhuis: *De Vrije Socialist*, 29 July 1916.

Therefore, we should not be overly optimistic about the extent to which research into anarchism as a social movement can benefit from social movement theories. If the goal is, with or without the help of social movement theory, to try to formulate social or historical laws concerning anarchism, the experiment seems quite pointless. Neither is social movement theory the ready-made compass that helps us out of the factual jungle of anarchism. Social movement theory is much more promising when studying single-issue movements started by anarchists.⁵⁹

Another problem is that much social movement theory takes a structural approach to social movements. It starts its analysis of social movements by considering the movement and its organisations as a whole, but for the anarchists themselves organisation came second and the individual member was at the centre of their movement. The intimate relationship between individual and organisation, so typical of the anarchist movement, is difficult to grasp with most social movement theories.

Still, the theories studied for this contribution contain insights that may be useful. It is not possible to discuss them all, but some can help systematise research into anarchism as a social movement and clarify some of its elements.

I have chosen insights of social movement theory that can help in examining the staying power of anarchism on the one hand and its periods of weakness on the other. The first is what McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald call “micro-mobilisation contexts”: how are individuals recruited into the movement, and why? These contexts may change over time: at first the context may have been the world of disappointed radical socialists, like Honig. Later, during the twentieth century, the family and the local socialising community may have become important, or, later still, the world of high-school and university students. Activists who were initially mobilised in single-issue movements, like feminist, ecological, or anti-militarist movements, may turn to anarchism. These different con-

⁵⁹ Historical laws: Tilly, *Social Movements* (see note 4), p. 9.

texts will have an impact on the anarchist movement itself. Variations and discontinuities in mobilisation contexts may explain the characteristics of phases in the history of the anarchist movement.

A second important point is the financing of the movement. Anarchists lived according to their critique of socialist and other trade unions: bloated strike funds could impair the will to act, and people should be free to decide what to donate to the movement. Yet a lack of funds will curtail a movement, and the weak organisational structure of the anarchist movement always made funding a problem, or was partly the result of it. The need to find money could have effects on the level of organisation of the movement and may have curbed its activities. One often sees that the importance of maintaining a journal led to stronger organisational structures, especially if one or several groups owned the journal. Lack of money could also impair the duration of campaigns. Reliance on illegally obtained money was a weak guarantee for durable organisations too.

Third: according to McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald, social movement organisations are a feature of a mature movement, and for a movement to survive it is important that it be well organised. Somehow, anarchism does not meet this requirement. Although anarchist organisations were weak, the movement was able to survive. At times of low profile, it consisted almost of journals alone. It might well be that these journals could survive even if the readership was very small, because journals can vary their size and economise on the production process: if they cannot be printed, they can be mimeographed or photocopied. You can also economise on publication frequency, as happened with Honig's *Anarchist*: if there was no money, the journal was not printed. Still, somehow anarchist opinions continued to be published, and they can be seen as a germ from which the movement could grow again. Besides, as stated earlier, anarchism was expressed and lived in a number of ways.

Fourth: the concept of political opportunity structures is very useful as a means of measuring the conditions under which the anarchist movement had to work. Especially with regard to short-term ups and downs, political opportunity structures are a vehicle by which to engage the anarchist movement in dialogue with society as a whole. As to the ups and downs of the movement in the long term, however, this concept should be supplemented by taking into account the varying urgency of realising an anarchist society. Societies can be in such a state of equality and well-being that just living according to anarchist ideas seems good enough for the members of the movement, the more so because the ideal anarchist society is difficult to imagine. The state, especially the welfare state, can fulfil so many functions in society that the goal of reaching an anarchist state of affairs may appear almost unreachable.

Fifth: ultimately, analysing other movements may be more attractive. The question of framing seems especially important in this respect: the interpretation of society and its problems and the efficacy of such interpretation in terms of stimulating the membership of the movement. Although a lot of studies have focused on anarchist theory, less attention has been paid to the question of whether these theories were able to retain their appeal. Did anarchist movements, for instance, always analyse the changing role of the state in capitalist society sufficiently? For Bakunin, the abolition of the state was a necessary precondition for the liberation of mankind and the development of a new free society, but can the same still be said for the growing welfare states from the 1920s to the 1970s? Is it sufficient to analyse modern society using the theoretical apparatus that anarchists from the classical era (1870–1914) have bequeathed us? These are important questions because a movement needs an adequate interpretation of the world. As Gareth Stedman Jones has argued with respect to Chartism: when ideology and discourse lose meaning, a movement can disappear quite suddenly. For a long time, anarchist analysis has lagged behind the development of capitalist society; nevertheless, the move-

ment is still around. That can be explained in terms of the fact that anarchism, as a multi-issue movement, is about more than the state and revolution. It can address the needs of all sorts of groups: workers in the classical period and students, squatters, anti-militarists, and environmentalists today. Framing and identity are closely related. The first strengthens the latter, and in anarchism both give the individual an important place in society and history. That makes anarchist principles themselves an important factor in the staying power of the movement, even if the analysis of the state and of capitalism is not adequate. On the other hand, stimulated by the alter-globalisation movement, the need to have up-to-date economic ideas is now clearly being addressed.⁶⁰

Lastly: it is not organisations but networks that are important to the movement. Next to the individual, they should be at the centre of every analysis of anarchism. Social movement theory can be useful here, insofar as it focuses on networks and puts the individual activist at the centre. The technological side of their communication structures requires special consideration. Travelling anarchists, journals, and correspondence networks may enhance international solidarity, but what about contact by telephone (for example, telephone chains as used by squatters during the 1980s) or use of the Internet?

6. Conclusion

Social movement theories contain some useful elements for the study of anarchism. They help systematise and broaden our analysis; they can improve our understanding by helping us to analyse the contrasts between the anarchism and the movements they usually focus upon. However, for the social analysis of anarchism they

⁶⁰ Gareth Stedman Jones, "Rethinking Chartism," in: *idem*, *Languages of Class: Studies in English Working Class History, 1832–1982*, Cambridge etc. 1983, pp. 90–178. Deric Shannon *et al.* (eds), *The Accumulation of Freedom: Writings on Anarchist Economics*, Oakland etc. 2012.

also have serious drawbacks. They generally see individual participants in movements as objects of recruiting and mobilisation processes only. As we have seen, the relationship between the individual activist and organisations or networks was/is quite different in the anarchist movement. Under the impact of the alter-globalisation movement, social movement theorists are only now beginning to study networks as the “skeleton” of a movement. For the study of the alter-globalisation movement, the transnational dimension of social movements cannot be ignored either, but for the anarchist movements the network and transnational dimension were there from the start. The movements defied and ignored the state and its usual decision-making structures, whereas social movement theories have usually postulated the opposite.

Groups made the anarchist movement flexible, and networks connected individuals and groups, thereby increasing the coherence of the movement and making it a transnational one. Since the authority structure within the movement was bottom-up, starting with the individual activist, it was generally difficult for the anarchists to establish communication lines to decision-making echelons in the national society. Reliance on the initiative of individual members and on direct action may have hindered the movement in changing society at large. One would expect that, as a result of this failure, the movement would disappear, but that is not the case, because anarchism is a multi-issue affair, and it connects the private and the public. It inspires personal lifestyles, and it can take many roads to the ideal society, as far beyond the horizon as that society may be.

As a multi-issue movement, the anarchist movement had and has many faces. Its goals were political, economic, and cultural; it strove to create a whole new society centred on the individual. Usually, social movement theory does not deal with such multi-faceted movements but theorises from single-issue movements. Quite often, these movements had a short life, or only a part of their active life is studied. Anarchism and, for that matter, socialism, too, are long-standing movements, and one cannot claim they have reached their

goals. Though both are obviously social movements, because of their longevity, they are not ideal objects of social movement theory. It may well be that the usefulness of these theories increases when special campaigns conducted by these movements are studied. In the case of short-lived or medium-range campaigns, and of the ups and downs of the movement in the short term, social movement theory seems to be more useful than with regard to the broad anarchist movement in the long term.