



POL.NCI8 Anarchist Thinkers: Mikhail Bakunin and Emma Goldman

EDEXCEL 9PL0 · Calculators not allowed · about 75 minutes

Total Marks

Name: _____ Date: ____ / ____ / ____

Answer ALL questions. For levels-marked questions write well-structured developed responses using accurate knowledge of Bakunin and Goldman. Spend about 75 minutes in total; write full sentences for questions worth 6 marks or more.

- 1** Define the term 'anarchism' as used in the study of political ideas, referring to its general aim in the context of Bakunin and Goldman.

(Total for Question 1 is 1 mark)

- 2** State two features of Mikhail Bakunin's collectivist anarchism in the context of nineteenth century revolutionary thought.

(Total for Question 2 is 2 marks)

- 3** Identify the decade in which Mikhail Bakunin was most active in European revolutionary movements.

(Total for Question 3 is 1 mark)

- 4** Explain Bakunin's argument that a transitional 'dictatorship of the proletariat' would return to tyranny, referring to his criticism of Marxist strategy.

(Total for Question 4 is 3 marks)

- 5** State two actions or positions by Bakunin that demonstrate his rejection of Marxist organisational methods within the socialist movement.

(Total for Question 5 is 2 marks)

- 6** Identify one key focus area for Emma Goldman when applying anarchist principles to social life in the early 20th century.

(Total for Question 6 is 1 mark)

- 7** State two ways Emma Goldman extended anarchist critique beyond the state to other social institutions.

(Total for Question 7 is 2 marks)

8 Explain Emma Goldman's critique of organised religion in the context of her anarcho-communist thought.

(Total for Question 8 is 3 marks)

9 Explain two substantive differences between Bakunin's collectivist anarchism and Emma Goldman's anarcho-communism, in terms of property and organisation.

(Total for Question 9 is 5 marks)

10 Analyse two reasons why Bakunin distrusted Marxist revolutionary strategy, focusing on his arguments about power and organisation within post-revolutionary society.

(Total for Question 10 is 10 marks)

11 Explain how Bakunin's preference for immediate insurrection contrasts with gradualist or parliamentary routes to change, using one implied consequence for post-revolutionary social organisation.

(Total for Question 11 is 6 marks)

12 Evaluate the extent to which Mikhail Bakunin and Emma Goldman agree on how revolution should occur.

(Total for Question 12 is 24 marks)

Mark scheme · POL.NCI8 Anarchist Thinkers: Mikhail Bakunin and Emma Goldman

Question 1

- **B1** a concise definition, eg 'a political idea that rejects the legitimacy of the state and seeks society organised without hierarchical coercive authority'
- **Answer: Anarchism is a political idea rejecting the legitimacy of the state and other hierarchical coercive authorities, aiming for a society organised without imposed rulers and often based on voluntary cooperation and mutual aid.**

Question 2

- **B1** one correct feature, eg emphasis on collective ownership of means of production
- **B1** a second correct feature, eg immediate abolition of state and capitalism via revolutionary action
- **Answer: Any two of: collective ownership of the means of production; immediate revolutionary destruction of the state and capitalism; organisation through federations of voluntary associations; distrust of hierarchical political parties and centralised authority.**

Question 3

- **B1** 1840s or 1870s as acceptable century-spanning decades; full credit for the 1860s-1870s revolutionary activity focus, eg 1870s cao
- **Answer: 1870s (Bakunin was especially active in revolutionary organisation and anarchist advocacy through the 1860s and 1870s, with significant involvement in the 1870s).**

Question 4

- **B1** identifies Bakunin's view that any state power, even temporarily held by revolutionaries, tends to become entrenched
- **B1** explains the mechanism, eg centralised authority and party control can create a new ruling class
- **B1** links to consequence, eg the revolution's aim of human liberation would be betrayed by new authoritarian elites
- **Answer: Bakunin argued that a transitional state such as the 'dictatorship of the proletariat' would entrench centralised power and create new elites, because those who hold coercive authority tend to preserve it; centralised party control and hierarchical structures would therefore reproduce domination rather than abolish it, betraying the revolution's aim of genuine freedom.**

Question 5

- **B1** one correct action/position, eg opposing centralised political parties and the authority of the First International leadership
- **B1** a second correct action/position, eg advocating spontaneous popular insurrection rather than disciplined party-led seizure of state power
- **Answer: Any two of: opposing the centralised direction of the International Workingmen's Association and its Marx-influenced leadership; arguing for immediate insurrection and direct action by workers rather than disciplined party takeover; warning that a party dictatorship would recreate hierarchy.**

Question 6

- **B1** identifies a correct focus, eg gender equality, sexual freedom, or free love
- **Answer: Gender equality and personal freedom, including advocacy for women's autonomy over sexuality and reproductive choices.**

Question 7

- **B1** one accurate way, eg criticising organised religion as an instrument of social control
- **B1** a second accurate way, eg attacking patriarchal family structures and restrictions on sexual freedom
- **Answer: Any two of: criticising organised religion as a tool of control and repression; opposing patriarchal family structures that limit women's autonomy; defending free speech and personal sexual freedom; campaigning for birth control and reproductive rights.**

Question 8

- **B1** identifies that Goldman saw organised religion as reinforcing obedience and moral conformity
- **B1** explains link to power, eg religion legitimises hierarchy including gender and class hierarchies
- **B1** links to anarcho-communist aim, eg undermining religious authority was part of freeing individuals for voluntary cooperative life
- **Answer: Goldman criticised organised religion for promoting obedience, moral conformity and acceptance of authority, arguing it legitimised social and gender hierarchies; undermining religious authority was therefore integral to freeing individuals from imposed morals and enabling voluntary, cooperative social relations consistent with anarcho-communist ideals.**

Question 9

- **B1** identifies a difference about property, eg Bakunin supported collective ownership of workplaces while Goldman emphasised communal sharing of goods according to needs
- **B1** develops the property point, eg collectivism may allow some form of remuneration linked to labour while anarcho-communism leans toward distribution by need
- **B1** identifies a difference about organisation, eg Bakunin stressed federations of collectivised workplaces and local councils whereas Goldman emphasised voluntary communal living and more fluid communal arrangements
- **B1** develops the organisation point, eg Goldman placed greater emphasis on individual autonomy within communal structures and on social and cultural liberation for women and minorities
- **B1** provides a brief concluding synthesis, eg both aim to abolish the state but differ in emphasis on economic distribution and personal freedom within communal life
- **Answer: Differences include property and distribution: Bakunin's collectivism favours collective ownership of workplaces and may allow reward related to labour, while Goldman's anarcho-communism more strongly favours communal sharing according to need. Organisationally, Bakunin emphasised federations of collectivised workplaces and local councils to coordinate production and revolution, whereas Goldman emphasised voluntary communal living and a stronger focus on personal autonomy, social liberation and cultural change. Both reject the state, but they place different emphasis on economic distribution mechanisms and the role of personal freedom within communal arrangements.**

Question 10

- **Level 1** (1-3): Basic identification of one or two reasons with limited development, eg stating Bakunin opposed party centralism without explanation.
- **Level 2** (4-6): Clear explanation of two reasons with some development, linking Bakunin's concerns about the concentration of power to likely outcomes, but lacking deeper analysis or contextual evidence.
- **Level 3** (7-10): Detailed analysis of two reasons, explicitly linking Bakunin's distrust to mechanisms by which Marxist strategy might produce a new ruling class, and considering historical or theoretical context to support the analysis.
- **Indicative content:**
 - Reason 1: Fear of centralised party power. Bakunin argued that Marx's advocacy of a proletarian party seizing state power would create a centralised authority; party elites would monopolise decision making and coercive instruments, reproducing hierarchy rather than abolishing it.
 - Reason 2: Transitional state would ossify into tyranny. Bakunin believed any temporary dictatorship would tend to become permanent because those in power resist surrendering it; he saw the proposed transitional period as a practical route to a new form of oppression.
 - Mechanism linking reasons: centralised organisations require bureaucracy and command structures that favour leaders over rank-and-file, producing a new ruling class bound to defend its privileges.
 - Contextual point: Bakunin observed tendencies in 19th century revolutionary movements where revolutionary committees or leaderships became detached from mass movements, informing his scepticism of party-led transitions.
 - Analytical nuance: a strong answer notes Bakunin did not merely attack ends but argued Marxist means would corrupt ends, and might evaluate the force of his claim by reference to later historical examples or to the plausibility of popular self-organisation instead of party seizure.

Question 11

- **Level 1** (1-2): Limited explanation that notes immediate insurrection is direct revolution without linking to consequences.
- **Level 2** (3-4): Clear explanation of contrast and one implied consequence, eg weaker institutional continuity or risk of disorder.
- **Level 3** (5-6): Detailed explanation showing how immediate insurrection alters the formation of post-revolutionary institutions, for example enabling direct worker self-management but risking instability if federations are not established.
- **Indicative content:**
 - Immediate insurrection aims to dismantle state and capitalist institutions at once, enabling direct worker control and spontaneous federations, whereas gradualist or parliamentary routes rely on legal reforms, elections or transitional institutions.
 - Consequence: immediate insurrection can empower local self-organisation and prevent entrenchment of a bureaucratic transitional state, but it may also produce short-term instability and challenges in coordinating complex economic systems without pre-existing federations.
 - Analytical nuance: a balanced answer might argue that the success of immediate insurrection depends on the level of pre-revolutionary organisation and the ability to create federative structures rapidly, whereas gradualism offers continuity but risks institutional capture by elites.

Question 12

- **Level 1** (1-6): Basic knowledge of Bakunin and Goldman with limited or very general evaluation. Claims are asserted rather than supported with developed analysis or examples.
- **Level 2** (7-12): Clear knowledge of both thinkers and some developed analysis comparing their views on revolution. Evaluation is present but may be one-sided or not fully substantiated with contextual detail.
- **Level 3** (13-18): Detailed, accurate knowledge used to compare Bakunin and Goldman's views on revolutionary method, with sustained analysis and engagement with similarities and differences and supported by relevant examples or reasoned argument.
- **Level 4** (19-24): Sophisticated, wide-ranging and well-supported evaluation that directly addresses the extent of agreement. The response integrates precise knowledge of both thinkers, explores theoretical and practical implications, weighs evidence and counter-arguments, and reaches a clearly justified, balanced judgement.
- **Indicative content:**
 - Areas of strong agreement: both reject gradualist parliamentary routes for delivering genuine freedom if those routes leave intact hierarchical state structures; both emphasise direct action and the need to dismantle the state and capitalist institutions rather than trusting a transitional political elite.
 - Bakunin's position: advocates immediate revolutionary destruction of the state and capitalism, collective ownership organised through federations, and clear distrust of centralised party-led transitions; he focused on the mechanics of revolutionary organisation to prevent a new ruling class.
 - Goldman's position: endorses social revolution and direct action, but places additional emphasis on cultural and personal liberation, including gender and sexual freedom, arguing revolution must transform social relations as well as economic structures; she stresses the importance of individual autonomy within communal arrangements.
 - Areas of difference: Bakunin's writings centre on organisational structures at the point of revolution and on economic collectivism, whereas Goldman gives greater attention to ongoing cultural change, public education, and challenging social institutions like religion and family as part of revolutionary practice.
 - Evaluative points: agreement is substantial on the rejection of Marxist transitional dictatorship and on reliance on popular action rather than party domination, but they differ on emphasis and tactics regarding cultural transformation and the role of individual autonomy within post-revolutionary society.
 - Consideration of effectiveness: a strong answer might assess whether their shared advocacy of immediate popular action is realistic or whether Goldman's cultural programme requires a longer process, and whether Bakunin's stricter organisational prescriptions risk becoming rigid in practice.
 - Judgement: a balanced conclusion could argue Bakunin and Goldman broadly agree on the core principle that revolution must be direct and must abolish the state, but they diverge meaningfully in emphasis and practical priorities, so the extent of agreement is large in principle but qualified in practice.