

# Exchange between René Berthier and Joël Delhom on Peruvian anarchism

24 May – 3 June 2025

*This text is a summary of an email exchange that took place between 24 May and 3 June between René Berthier and Joël Delhom on the Peruvian anarchist movement.*

The reason I wanted to consult Joël Delhom on the situation of the Peruvian libertarian movement is part of my reflections on the debate surrounding the so-called “Spanish exception”. This is the idea that the Spanish anarchist movement had a particularity that set it apart from movements in other countries. Some anarchists challenge this exceptionality by arguing that the Spanish CNT only organised half of the Spanish working class, with the other half being organised by the UGT. They add that other libertarian mass organisations in other countries organised a larger proportion of workers, citing “Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Cuba, France, Mexico, Peru, Portugal, and Uruguay, where a vast anarchist tradition dominated almost the entire labour movement.”

Peru being on the list is why I asked Joël Delhom, whose interesting article “The anarchist labour movement in Peru (1890-1930). An attempt at synthesis and historiographical analysis” I had read.<sup>1</sup>

Delhom does not dismiss the validity of the argument, but he points out that it would be necessary to “analyse the figures for each country mentioned.”

Regarding Spain, he says,

“the 1920s were a period of decline for the anarcho-sindicalist movement due, as you probably know, to the establishment of Primo de Rivera’s fascist dictatorship (1923-1930) and the collaboration of the socialist UGT (whose general secretary, Largo Caballero, became the equivalent of Minister of Labour). While the CNT was declared illegal, the UGT caught up and surpassed the CNT in membership, placing it in a more favourable position when the Republic was established in 1931, with which it was once again immediately associated.

“Furthermore, after the famous conflict at the Barcelona electricity company La Canadiense in 1919, which highlighted the CNT's power to mobilise and the success of its direct action tactics, Catalan employers imposed a *lockout* (which spread throughout the country from November 1919 to the end of January 1920), unions were closed, and violence erupted in Barcelona with the complicity of local authorities until the establishment of the dictatorship. Going underground exacerbated internal tensions within the labour movement (anarchists vs supporters of the Third International; anarchist syndicalists vs pragmatic syndicalists), and it was in this context that the FAI was founded in 1927.

---

<sup>1</sup> Published in: Joël Delhom, David Doillon et al., ¡Viva la Social! *Anarchists and Anarcho-Sindicalists in Latin America (1860-1930)*, Paris – Saint-Georges d’Oléron, Nada Éditions – Éd. Noir et Rouge – Les Éditions libertaires (col. América libertaria), 2013, pp. 219-247. [https://www.academia.edu/7854835/Le\\_mouvement\\_ouvrier\\_anarchiste\\_au\\_P%C3%A9rou\\_1890\\_1930\\_essai\\_de\\_synth%C3%A8se\\_et\\_d\\_analyse\\_historiographique](https://www.academia.edu/7854835/Le_mouvement_ouvrier_anarchiste_au_P%C3%A9rou_1890_1930_essai_de_synth%C3%A8se_et_d_analyse_historiographique)

“The assassinations, imprisonments and deportations of leaders and activists considerably weakened the CNT until 1930, when it was finally able to resume its legal activities. It thus went from nearly 800,000 members in 1919 to only 300,000 in 1923 and just over 500,000 in 1931 (the UGT reached one million in 1932, compared to only 200,000 members in 1921). “Repression resumed during the Republic in October 1931. On all these points, you can consult the book by Myrtille, a *giménologue*,<sup>2</sup> *Les Chemins du communisme libertaire en Espagne (Divergences, vol. 2, 2018)*, which you should be familiar with. In Latin America in the 1920s, as these South African authors write, the dominance of anarcho-syndicalism was unquestionable.”

I note the idea that the membership of the Spanish CNT varied over time, with fluctuations linked to the ebb and flow of repression. The relative proportion of CNT members compared to those of the UGT is, in my opinion, not of significant interest. Indeed, if we were to consider the reality of Spanish “exceptionalism”, it would not be based on quantitative data. There is no point in limiting ourselves to the question of membership numbers. I don't know where this “exceptionality” comes from, because I have never heard any Spanish anarchists – and I knew quite a few in my youth – talk about a Spanish exception.

Personally, I don't care whether Spanish anarchism was “exceptional”, but if we were to follow this idea, there are nevertheless a few elements that could confirm it, and these are not to be found in *numbers*, but in *achievements*: to my knowledge, no organisation (apart from the Makhnovists) has ever broken a fascist coup with weapons in hand (even temporarily); nor has any organised the management of society as the Spanish anarchists did; finally, while the revolutionary syndicalism movement was everywhere the breeding ground for the creation of communist parties after the Russian Revolution, the Spanish CNT resisted the advances of the Communist International and refused to join the Red International of Labour Unions.

It is true, however, that having large numbers was a decisive factor. And none of them were able to stand up to the policies of the Communist International as the CNT did. These three facts would, in my opinion, suffice to define a Spanish “exceptionality” despite everything, if we wanted to play that game.

Regarding Peru, J. Delhom emphasises “the importance of anarchist-inspired, if not strictly anarcho-syndicalist, trade union organisation until the 1930s”, but he also says that “anarchism in the Andes is not comparable, in terms of organisational strength, to the Argentine or Spanish cases. It emerged later, faced with very rural societies, whose industry was limited to a few urban centres, and which were racially fragmented, where European immigration was low, and where geography made travel difficult... In such a context, if we consider that anarchist propaganda only began to take shape in 1904, when its first press organs appeared, and that it became predominant in the labour movement in 1911, managing to found a national organisation (FORP) in 1913, barely a decade later, the expansion of Peruvian anarchist syndicalism is quite remarkable.”

And Joël Delhom adds:

“Neither the CNT nor the FORA had, I think, a majority of conscious anarchist or anarcho-syndicalist members. If we are talking about anarcho-syndicalism (and not anarchist syndicalism or revolutionary syndicalism), from my point of view, the organisation must have as its ultimate goal the establishment of a libertarian communist society. The FORA did so

---

2 The *Giménologues* are a small group of friends who became amateur historians in 2004–2005, dedicating themselves to publishing the memoirs of Antoine Gimenez, alias Bruno Salvadori, a volunteer militiaman in the International Group of the Durruti Column who died in Marseille in 1982.

‘explicitly’ in 1905, at its 5th congress, and the CNT only in 1919, nine years after its creation (the year of the peak of the Peruvian anarchist trade union movement, with the local workers’ federation of Lima being founded in December 1918).”

On the debate between “revolutionary syndicalism” and “anarcho-syndicalism”, Delhom writes that after the 1906 Amiens Congress, which saw the abandonment of the essential themes of anarchism, “the anarcho-syndicalist current probably existed without bearing that name, since it was still the term revolutionary syndicalism that was used by the main anarchist activists in the unions”. He adds that “this is also the case in Peru, where, in the wake of the IWA congress in Berlin in 1922, Delfin Lévano (Bakers’ Federation) published in *La Protesta* (Lima, no. 133, January 1925, p. 4) had an article published entitled “Puntos de vista sobre el sindicalismo revolucionario” in which he wrote:

“Others claim that revolutionary trade unionism should have no doctrine, that it should detach itself from all ideological tendencies: in the face of these tendencies, it must remain neutral. This is a serious mistake, comrades. [...] Trade union neutralism smacks of conservatism; it would be sterile and adaptable to the bourgeois environment. [...] No, revolutionary syndicalism, whose action is dedicated to the redemption of the workers, must necessarily give itself a definite orientation; it must have a constructive ideal for the post-revolutionary period. Advocating the unity of workers solely for the sake of unity and the conquest of improvements, without an ideal to guide them towards the future, is not enough and is not the mission of the revolutionary trade unionist proletariat.”

Lévano goes even further, after discussing Marxist entryism:

[...] “We must reject this castrating neutralism that is being attempted in workers’ organisations. On the other hand, revolutionary syndicalism has not failed, contrary to what some claim. On the contrary, it remains alive, vibrant and vigorous, thanks to the momentum of libertarian ideas and the deep faith of militant workers in the conquest of well-being for all and freedom for all. Through revolutionary syndicalism towards anarchist communism, such must be the current orientation of our struggles.”

In 1925, there was still talk of revolutionary syndicalism, but it was actually anarcho-syndicalism that was meant. Delfin Lévano's text, which dates from the period when the IWA was being formed in Berlin, is in line with the discourse of the militants at the time: there is talk of *revolutionary syndicalism*, but the principle of opposition to parties makes it clear that this actually is *anarcho-syndicalism*.

This hostile attitude towards parties is, in a way, inherent to anarchism, but in France it has taken a somewhat tortuous path. Initially, a significant part of the movement was hostile to trade unions: these activists believed (I don't know where they got this idea from) that the capitalist system could only grant a fixed total amount of wages, and that if the workers in one company obtained a pay rise, it could only be at the expense of other workers. I think this nonsense stems from a somewhat twisted interpretation of the “iron law of wages”. So being a trade unionist was “bourgeois and reactionary”<sup>3</sup>. Workers had to be discouraged from joining unions, which were a “weakness from a revolutionary point of view”; workers had to be discouraged from joining because they would then become “ferocious, authoritarian and almost governmental conservatives”<sup>4</sup>. Unionised workers were the “worst enemies of the revolution”.

---

3 H. Dhorr, “La Loi des salaires”, *Le Libertaire*, n° 78, 5-11 mai 1897.

4 Imanus, “Les Syndicats”, *Le Libertaire*, n° 17, 7-14 mars 1896.

It was only later that anarchists began to take an interest in trade union action, and they then had two objectives:

- a) To prevent socialists from exerting their influence (from exercising “authority”);
- b) To spread anarchist propaganda. For this part of the anarchist movement, it was not a question of fighting side by side with the workers.

It should be noted that this attitude was only held by part of the anarchist movement. At the same time, another part of the movement was actively involved in the development of revolutionary syndicalism. This dichotomy within the anarchist movement was not limited to France, but was also evident in Spain and other countries.

We can see that opposition to parties was decisive from the outset – but it should be noted that this attitude did not affect the entire anarchist movement.

J. Delhom quotes another article published in *La Protesta* in May 1925, entitled “El Sindicalismo Revolucionario”, which describes it as “essentially anti-political”. He adds:

“Anti-political, but not apolitical, because the author goes on to say that it is ‘not a group of workers without ideas, without ideals of liberation’. One cannot be apolitical if one calls oneself a revolutionary, asserts another article in February 1926 (Un trabajador, ‘El sindicalismo y nosotros’, *La Protesta*, 143, p. 1).”

It seems that the anarchist point of view had difficulty gaining acceptance, since as early as 1921, at the 1<sup>st</sup> local workers’ congress in Lima-El Callao (port of Lima), “political action was rejected, but the adoption of the libertarian communist goal was postponed to a future congress”. By “political action”, what is meant is “participation in elections”.

Here is the motion that was adopted at the local workers’ congress on 27 April 1921

“The local workers’ congress, taking into account the experience gained by the proletariat of this country as in other countries, the real value of its organised strength and the fictitious, null and harmful value of political action,

“Decides

“That workers’ organisations must completely detach themselves from ‘political action’ and combat it insofar as its struggles are those of parties or circles called upon to dominate the people and are incompatible with the trade union organisation which pursues the emancipation of workers through their own efforts.” (*La Protesta* No. 145, July 1926)

Delhom adds that “the creation of the Federation of Libertarian Groups that followed can be interpreted as a response to this failure”.

The Local Workers' Federation of Lima, founded in 1922, Delhom continues,

“found itself immediately divided to such an extent that in 1925 it did not invite the Federation of Libertarian Groups to the commemorations of 1 May. In response, masons and carpenters attempted to bring together anarchists on the fringes of the local workers' federation within a Regional Federation of Libertarian Workers of Peru, which may or may not have ever come into being. The Federation of Bakers, the historic spearhead of the anarchist labour movement, was also not invited to participate in the 2<sup>nd</sup> local workers' congress in Lima in 1927. The congress declared itself in

favour of ideologically neutral revolutionary syndicalism, and therefore against Marxists and anarchists, in order to preserve proletarian unity.”

The abandonment of the principle of “proletarian unity”, or more prosaically, trade union unity, was the logical consequence of the arrival on the social struggle scene of options competing with revolutionary syndicalism. When the militants of the French CGT asserted that nothing was foreign to the union, they meant that the union organisation was what Pouget called the “workers’ party”, that is, the organisation through which the working class would take charge of all the activities that would lead to its emancipation. Many anarchist trade unionists had adopted this principle, but others saw the union as a competitor, an organisation that denied them the right to exist<sup>54</sup>. In France, the arrival of the finally unified Socialist Party in 1905, and later the Communist Party, rendered the principle of proletarian unity obsolete, as it was no longer possible to “play the game”. It had become illusory to think that everyone would leave their political affiliations outside the union: taking control of the trade unions had become a strategic issue for the left-wing parties.

*La Protesta* ceased publication in 1926 until 1930, but, according to J. Delhom,

“in November 1930 (No. 148, p. 4), there was still an article entitled ‘El Sindicalismo Revolucionario’, in which the anonymous author urged readers to re-establish authentic revolutionary syndicalism, *i. e.* inspired by anarchism, which had been represented by the FORP and had been lost in the local workers’ federation, which was officially neutral but infiltrated by Bolshevism. Anarcho-syndicalism, therefore, could not develop in Peru.”

I asked J. Delhom if he had any idea when the term “anarcho-syndicalism” first appeared in the anarchist press in Peru. I had researched the anarchist and “bourgeois” press of the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries for the use of the terms “anarcho-syndicalism” and “anarcho-syndicalist”. I found that the word “anarcho-syndicalist” appears occasionally, used interchangeably with “anarchist syndicalist” and “syndicalist anarchist”, but to refer to one or more individual anarchists engaged in trade union activity. However, the term “anarcho-syndicalism” is not found to refer to a *movement*.

After the Russian Revolution, “anarcho-syndicalist” became a term of contempt used by communist militants (often ex-syndicalist) to refer to revolutionary syndicalists who refused to join the Red International of Labour Unions; the term was later on taken up by militants and event later by the leaders of the movement. It was at this point that an “anarcho-syndicalist” current emerged, in other words anarcho-syndicalism as we understand it today. It seems to me that the common use of the term “anarcho-syndicalism” appeared in France quite late, after the Great War, and in a polemical form, the term being intended to mark a shift away from “classical” revolutionary syndicalism. It is symptomatic of the split between those who adhered to communist ideas and those who opposed them.

I wrote to J. Delhom that

“...one of the points of rupture between SR and AS is precisely the rejection of ‘trade union neutrality’: the Russian Revolution and the intervention of communists in French politics led anarcho-syndicalists to oppose political parties. This is very clear in the texts of the CGT-SR, even if they were slow to adopt the term ‘anarcho-syndicalism’. Daniel Colson shows this very well in his book *Anarcho-Syndicalisme et Communisme. Saint-Étienne 1920-1925*. Colson points out that references to anarcho-syndicalism among activists preceded the use of the term in official texts by several years.”

---

5 Maurizio Antonioli décrit ce phénomène avec beaucoup d’érudition dans *Bakounine entre syndicalisme révolutionnaire et anarchisme*, Éditions Noir & Rouge.

“The entire history of the anarchist movement since the Bakunin Alliance has been marked by the question of the relationship between mass organisation and political organisation, and the question has still not been resolved.”

Joël Delhom qualifies my statement:

The term “anarcho-syndicalism” is also “...the mark of the rejection of the strict ideological neutrality of revolutionary syndicalism defined by the Amiens Charter against “sects”, in addition to the refusal of any allegiance to political parties. This was the outcome of the famous debate on the question of trade unionism as a means or an end to workers’ emancipation (Malatesta vs Monatte, Amsterdam, 1907). In Spain, as you know, the issue was not completely settled at the founding congress of the CNT three years later, although the resolution that was adopted recognised that trade unionism could not be “considered an end in itself”. José Negre, in particular, wanted to prevent the CNT from becoming like the FORA.”

The SR militants who had turned to anarcho-syndicalism understood that the split had become inevitable. Obviously, my research concerning the use of the word “anarcho-syndicalism”, which does not cover a very large number of newspapers from the period, could be contradicted by more extensive research, but it remains certain that “anarcho-syndicalism” was initially a derogatory term used by communists, as one sees when reading the communist press of the time. The founding documents of the Berlin IWA, which is unquestionably “anarcho-syndicalist”, do not refer to anarcho-syndicalism but to revolutionary syndicalism: they consider themselves to be the *true* revolutionary syndicalists, and it would take several more years for the term to be adopted, notably by the CGT-SR.

So I asked J. Delhom: is there any way of knowing when the term “anarcho-syndicalism” first appeared in the anarchist press in Peru?

Here is his answer:

“As for your question, which I have asked myself both in relation to Spain and Peru, I do not know the answer. I suppose that if D. Lévano did not use anarcho-syndicalism in 1925, the expression could only have been used rarely before, if at all. In 1926, I still find in *La Protesta* the expressions “anarco-obrero” and “liberto-obrero” to describe anarchist syndicalists, whom we could refer to as anarcho-syndicalists. In the few issues from the 1930s, I find the assertion of convergence between revolutionary syndicalism and anarchism (Espartaco, ‘Sindicalismo y Anarquismo’, *La Protesta*, no. 201, 10 February 1934, p. 3). Finally, in an article from June 1947 (*La Protesta*, no. 3, p. 2) entitled ‘Puntos de vista anarcosindicalista’ and signed by R. Montoya T., the expression appears. It states that trade unions are ‘the cornerstone of the future society’. Obviously, a systematic search of the press would be necessary to answer your question.”

According to J. Delhom, the expression “anarcho-syndicalism” in Spain appears “in a book bringing together articles by Lopez Arango and Abad de Santillan, originally published in the Argentine *La Protesta*, entitled “*El anarquismo en el movimiento obrero*” (Barcelona, Cosmos, 1925). It was republished in digital format in 2014 (see p. 90 of this edition, attached). I assume you are familiar with this book. In a way, it sets out the debate in Spain on these issues. I don't know if the expression had been used before in the press. Santillan already uses it in *La Protesta* in July 1923, notably in a polemic with Shapiro”.

According to Delhom, the rejection of neutrality is central to anarchism:

“From 1870 in Spain and 1903 in Peru, it was at the heart of anarchist action in the trade unions, against the republicans, socialists and populists, before focusing on the communists. For me, in the Hispanic world, the rejection of parties is a less decisive criterion for distinguishing between SR and AS than the rejection of ideological neutralism.”

In his email, J. Delhom writes: “It's just that I get the impression that you attribute less importance to the rejection of neutrality than to the rejection of parties, as if the former were absent before the Russian Revolution. As early as 1870 in Spain and 1903 in Peru, it was at the heart of the anarchists' action in the trade unions, against the republicans, socialists and populists, before focusing on the communists.” Delhom takes care to specify in an email dated 10 June 2025 that what is “at the heart of anarchist action in trade unions” is the *rejection of parties*, “of political action and political mediation in labour disputes”:

“Revolutionary syndicalism inherited this anti-politics from anarchist syndicalism, but when revolutionary syndicalism defined itself as ideologically neutral in the face of the rise of socialism, anarcho-syndicalism added to its rejection of politics a rejection of trade union neutralism, which is why the latter (neutralism) is, in my opinion, the real criterion that distinguishes anarcho-syndicalism from the revolutionary syndicalism that preceded it. From revolutionary syndicalism, anarcho-syndicalism retains the idea that the model of trade union organisation prefigures that of the society of producers and thus becomes an end in itself rather than a mere means to achieve the proletarian revolution.

“What anarchist syndicalists oppose, seeing it as just one means among others, is the risk of centralisation (see the rejection of industrial federations in Spain) and the tyranny of one class over others, libertarian emancipation being a universal aspiration. The Russian Revolution only accentuated the pre-existing anti-politics and also called into question the principle of neutrality. Faced with the Bolshevik challenge, anarchists put libertarian communism back at the heart of trade union action as a revolutionary goal: this was anarcho-syndicalism. The latter therefore seems to me to be the result of ideological one-upmanship in a context of strong rivalries. Please forgive me for these simplifications and the schematic nature of my presentation.”

During our discussions, I suggested that it was illusory to think that a majority of union members could adhere to anarchism (in the case of the Spanish CNT) or communism (in the case of the post-WWII CGT). The activists and members of the CGT were far from all communists, but they trusted the communists (more the middle-ranking cadres than the leadership, incidentally) because the latter were *always there*, on the front line. But also because the communists controlled the apparatus.

I said that the power of the CNT in Spain was due to the fact that there were enough anarchist activists to hold the apparatus together, and because these anarchists brought with them many militant activists who were trusted by a large number of union members. It was not a question of adherence to anarchist doctrine, but of pragmatism.

J. Delhom adds:

“Yes, pragmatism, training resulting from trust gained on the basis of the exemplary behaviour (selflessness, loyalty, courage, etc.) of these anarchist militants in action. When I wrote about Peru: the anarchists never succeeded in convincing a majority of union members to adopt libertarian communism as the goal of their organisation, I was not talking about conscious

adherence to anarchist doctrine; I meant that this trust was insufficient as a driving force to carry a majority that far, which also means that the opposition encountered by the anarchists was vigorous. And it is likely, as you suggest *a contrario* with the Spanish case, that their numbers in the organisation were insufficient, that the cultural socialisation of anarchism in working-class neighbourhoods (so important in Spain and especially in Catalonia) lacked the time to consolidate in Lima.”

This brings us back to the question of the relationship between mass organisation and political (anarchist) organisation. In the case of Spain, it was difficult for workers to be “reformist” since the slightest strike could turn into a bloodbath. Wherever forms of mediation were established (trade union negotiations, universal suffrage, parliamentarism, etc.), revolutionary movements disappeared. This is normal: if rank-and-file workers are convinced that they will improve their lot through negotiation or through the intervention of their MP, rather than risking being shot, they will choose negotiation or their MP. I believe that the decline of revolutionary syndicalism in France dates back to 1908-1910, when, after a series of failed strikes, the confederal leadership decided that it was preferable to prioritise negotiation rather than permanent confrontation.

Finally, we discussed the causes of the disappearance of anarcho-syndicalism in Peru. In one of my messages, I put forward a number of hypotheses, but these were not limited to Peru. In my opinion, anarchists were marginalised because:

a) Other poles of identification for the proletariat emerged with the implementation of a parliamentary strategy, with the working class finding mediation more satisfactory than permanent confrontation (which happened with the French CGT around 1908-1910). J. Delhom made the following comment on Peru: “Agreed; the social reforms introduced by the populist governments (which I would describe as *early* in order to distinguish them from those of the 1940s) also played a role.”

b) The myth of the Russian Revolution diverted workers from anarchism – anarchists and revolutionary syndicalists being, moreover, among the main founders of the Communist parties. To which Delhom adds: “In Argentina and Spain, the prestige of the Russian Revolution and the ideological confusion it caused (reliable information was often sketchy) allowed an anarcho-Bolshevik current to emerge.”

c) Anarchism in general was unable to find a response to the policies of the Communist International, except in Spain, where the CNT refused to join the Red International of Labour Unions, “after some hesitation and bitter discussions,” adds Delhom.

d) Internal quarrels, mainly due to the fact that one part of the libertarian movement clung to outdated rhetoric and themes, while the other wanted to be modernist. Joël Delhom comments: “I would say rather that the ideal of a frugal rural and artisanal society (where people work to meet their basic needs) was gradually replaced in the 1910s and 1930s by that of a productivist industrial society corresponding to a consumerist urban society. In my work on shoemakers in Barcelona, I observed the growing influence of productivism among anarcho-syndicalist activists and the conflict during strikes between skilled workers who had undergone long apprenticeships and unskilled workers who had arrived in industrial cities as a result of rural exodus.”

If J. Delhom attaches “great importance to the effects of repression (imprisonment, deportation, assassination) and co-optation, especially in a context of rivalry and division, it is because [he] believes that the next generation of activists was virtually non-existent and insufficiently prepared from an ideological point of view”:

“This can even be seen in Spain in the 1920s. I also observed the disorganisation of the grassroots trade union committees of shoemakers during the Spanish Civil War, when experienced activists voluntarily left for the front or were mobilised (some left to fight out of disgust at the increasingly centralised bureaucracy; see my article “More red than black. The anarcho-syndicalist experience of socialisation in the leather industry in Barcelona (1936-1938): from anarchist renunciation to socialist dirigisme”, *Actuel Marx* [Paris, PUF], 2019/2, no. 66, pp. 64-80.)

“But I also agree that negotiation and reformism, often after a period of extreme hardening on the part of the capitalists and the state marked by *lockouts* and severe repression, changed the situation.”

## Conclusion

When we examine the situation of the Peruvian anarchist movement with a historical approach, as Joël Delhom does, rather than from ideological *preconceptions*, we get a very different picture. We see an extremely active anarchist movement, which powerfully rallied a large part of the Peruvian labour movement; which had to face state repression, but which also faced competition from other currents and which ultimately failed to rise to the challenge of the Russian Revolution which, as almost everywhere else, marked the beginning of the decline of the revolutionary syndicalist/anarcho-syndicalist current. We also see that anarchism never united the whole, or even an overwhelming majority, of the Peruvian proletariat. Finally, we note that, contrary to widespread belief, the reference to anarcho-syndicalism came late and only gradually gained acceptance. Historical reality is always more complex than the preconceived notions we have about it.

However, we can only agree with Joël Delhom when he says that, despite the difficulties, “the expansion of Peruvian anarchist syndicalism is quite remarkable”.

\* \* \* \* \*

## Published works (selection)

- Joël Delhom, Daniel Attala (dir.) : *Cuando los anarquistas citaban la Biblia. Entre mesianismo y propaganda*, Madrid, Libros de la Catarata (col. Investigación y debate ; 129), 2014, 288 p.
- Joël Delhom, David Doillon et al. : *¡Viva la Social! Anarchistes et anarcho-syndicalistes en Amérique latine (1860-1930)*, Paris – Saint-Georges d’Oléron, Nada Éditions – Éditions Noir et Rouge – Les Éditions libertaires (col. América libertaria), 2013, 249 p.
- Manuel Sirvent Romero, *Un militante del anarquismo español [memorias, 1889-1948]*, ed., introd. y notas de Joël Delhom, con la colaboración de Pierre-Luc Abramson y Melodía Sirvent, Madrid, Fundación de Estudios Libertarios Anselmo Lorenzo (col. Biografías y memorias ; 6), 2012, LXXXV + 418 p.
- Joël Delhom, « L’anarchisme latino-américain, la littérature et les arts, ou comment rendre populaire la culture savante et savante la culture populaire », *Amerika*, n° 6, 2012, <http://journals.openedition.org/amerika/2889>. (La bibliographie de cet article est riche en études sur l’anarchisme en Amérique latine)
- Joël Delhom, « Les anarchistes espagnols dans les conspirations contre la Dictature et la Monarchie (1923-1930) : entre mémoires et histoire », *Cahiers de civilisation espagnole contemporaine*, Hors-série « L’anarchisme espagnol », coord. par Gérard Brey, n° 1, octobre 2012, <http://journals.openedition.org/ccec/3938>.

Cette dernière référence met en lumière les tensions entre anarchistes “purs”, anarchistes syndicalistes et anarcho-syndicalistes.

- “Les syndicats espagnols et le travail industriel des femmes (1872-1913)”, in Eva Tilly (coord.), *Genre et identités en Espagne du Moyen Âge à nos jours. Un plaidoyer pour la sororité*, Paris, Indigo & Côté-femmes éd., 2020, p. 403-426.
- 2019 “Plus de rouge que de noir. L’expérience anarcho-syndicaliste de socialisation de l’industrie du cuir à Barcelone (1936-1938) : du renoncement anarchiste au dirigisme socialiste”, *Actuel Marx* (Paris, PUF), 2019/2, n° 66, p. 64-80.
- “Identidad y socialización anarquistas en las memorias de mujeres: un despertar a la reivindicación de género”, in Marta García Carrión, Sergio Valero Gómez (eds.), *Tejer identidades. Socialización, cultura y política en época contemporánea*, Valencia, Tirant Humanidades, 2018, p. 387-411.
- “Autour de Manuel GONZÁLEZ PRADA (Lima, 5 janvier 1844 – Lima, 22 juillet 1918)”, *Amerika*, n° 17, 2017, <https://journals.openedition.org/amerika/8313>.
- “La voix solitaire de la femme anarchiste argentine à la fin du XIXe s.”, in Mariannick Guennec (dir.), *Entre jouissance et tabous. Les représentations des relations amoureuses et des sexualités dans les Amériques*, Rennes, PUR, 2015, p. 115-123.