ARIANE MIÉVILLE- BETWEEN ANARCHISM AND SYNDICALISM

Title: Between anarchism and syndicalism
Author: Ariane Miéville
Subtitle: Syndicalism, anarchism and anarcho-syndicalism debated at the 1907 Amsterdam Anarchist Congress
Pubdate: 1994
Note: Auto DeepL translation. Missing text styling like italics

Syndicalism, anarchism and anarcho-syndicalism debated at the 1907 Amsterdam Anarchist Congress

The following text was published as an introduction to a reprint of the proceedings of the Amsterdam International Anarchist Congress (1907). Previously, it had been the subject of a dissertation defended in 1994.

The 1907 Anarchist Congress is best known for the debate on syndicalism between Errico Malatesta and Pierre Monatte. Malatesta's view is that syndicalism is reformist, even conservative, while Monatte's is revolutionary. When we chose the subject of our research, it was this debate that interested us. The problem as posed seemed to condemn anarchists and revolutionary syndicalists to irreconcilable and eternal scholastic quarrels. Our ambition in examining the congress text was to move beyond this sterile dispute. We believe we have succeeded, in part, by showing that the two main actors at the meeting missed a new fact that did not fit into their representation of reality: the emergence of anarcho-syndicalism.

The method we have endeavored to follow in this study is that of comprehensive sociology (Max Weber). Our aim was to put the actors' reasoning into context. We tried to put ourselves in their shoes, asking each time: why does this or that person say what they say? This approach is of course aided by historical hindsight. When we know what happened next (the 1914-1918 war...), there's something pathetic about the statements made by certain players.

Historical research is rarely innocent. The questions we ask of the past are often those that preoccupy us, and in them we hope to find recipes for action. This is entirely legitimate,

but it's important to avoid simplifications and approximations. Some may find that what was happening at the time bears a striking resemblance to current situations. But let's not get ahead of ourselves. Similar things at first glance are not always comparable, and it's only when situations have been sufficiently described that we can know whether an analogy is relevant or not. On reading the report, however, it's easy to spot a number of errors that recur periodically.

It's striking, for example, that the congress participants don't seem to learn from the situation in which they find themselves. The debate between Monatte and Malatesta is presented as a confrontation between two doctrines, between two revolutionary strategies. Their arguments are not based on an in-depth analysis of reality, but on their own conception of the revolution to come. This approach is common in the socialist tradition. Karl Marx's historical materialism, for example, operates no differently. But this way of apprehending the present, or even the past, has one flaw: it leaves out elements that do not fit into the doctrine, hence the sterility of the debates that follow.

The past also enables us to build an identity and legitimacy. This concern, which is ours today, was already shared by the promoters of the 1907 anarchist congress. Despite their differences, they saw themselves as the legitimate heirs of a common history, that of revolutionary opposition to the parliamentary evolution of social democracy. In Amsterdam in 1907, they came face-to-face for the first time... only to discover the extent of their differences.

It was a movement in which several schools converged. We find revolutionaries at odds with the Second International, rejected by the social democrats in the anarchist camp, and anarchists from the split of the First International. These anarchists are themselves divided. After the demise of the anti-authoritarian International in 1877, the movement continued its own evolution. Seeing revolution as imminent, it adopted “propaganda by deed” to provoke events. The failure of this strategy led to a division between an individualist current, which refused to sacrifice the present to a hypothetical future and chose to live out its revolt on a daily basis, and an organizational current, which attempted to put in place a coherent revolutionary strategy.

In 1907, anarchism still appeared as a favorable referent within the labor movement. The congress was therefore a congress of affirmation: affirmation of the existence of the anarchist movement as such and, for the militants, affirmation of the anarchist legitimacy of their own practice: “our anarchism is as good as yours” declared Pierre Monatte, for example.

As is often the case, the myth of unity is a powerful argument. Then, as now, anarchists are divided both organizationally and doctrinally, but they represent an oppositional movement that captures the imagination and which, despite its disparate evolutions, is perceived as unitary. That's why we'll see that those who try to build a particular identity for themselves, implying a division either of the anarchist movement or of the workers' movement, fail to make themselves heard.

Before beginning to read the minutes, it is important to be aware that the elements reported at the congress do not give an exhaustive panorama of the libertarian movement of the time. There are some major absentees. The Argentine anarchist movement, very powerful at the time, was represented by an Italian delegate, who expressed himself very little. As for the Spanish anarchists, their representative, Fernando Tarrida del Marmol, was unable to join the congress. We'll never know if his presence would have altered the content of the debates, but it's clear that a good knowledge of Hispanic anarchism(1) is an indispensable complement to a general view of the subject at hand.

* * *

To enter into the debates that took place at the 1907 Amsterdam Anarchist Congress, we need to go back in time. Following the indications given in the minutes, we will briefly present the events that formed the continuity of this congress. First, we shall follow and verify the chronology proposed by the document's author, who is probably Amédée Dunois(2).

Born in 1878 into a small provincial bourgeoisie, Dunois holds a law degree and a bachelor's degree in literature. He was a talented journalist who began his career at Les Temps nouveaux, where he replaced Paul Delesalle in the “Mouvement social” column(3).

The story he presents is part of an evolution made up of both continuity and rupture. Continuity is the persistence of “anarchists, or more precisely [of] a certain number of them” in wanting “to be spiritually attached to the great family of universal socialism”(4). The break with the socialist, or rather social-democratic, movement was linked to the anarchists' anti-statism, which crystallized in their rejection of electoral and parliamentary activity.

Long-standing differences

The introduction to the report situates the divorce “between anarchists and social democrats” in France, at the Le Havre congress in September 1880. The movement then spread to other countries. In fact, that's not exactly how it happened. In France, the

breakthrough came in May 1881, at a regional congress of the socialist movement(5). But the differences between anarchists and the rest of the socialist movement on the subject of electoral participation go back much further. Jean Maitron traces their origins to Switzerland in 1870, even before the split of the First International. The “Bakuninists” were already rejecting “any participation by the working class in bourgeois politics...”, while the “Marxists” were advocating “political intervention and workers' candidacies”(6) as a means of agitation.

Arguably, this is a question of principle. Opposition to the State, the rejection of constituted powers being the basis of anarchism, elected leaders are no more legitimate, in the eyes of anarchists, than those who achieve power by other means. From this point of view, anyone who votes for a parliamentary or government candidate is simply abdicating his or her personal sovereignty. Libertarian abstentionism also reflects the revolutionary conviction that it is not possible to change the structure of the capitalist system through political reform; on the contrary, political reform can consolidate the existing order.

Both anarchists and “authoritarian” socialists are anti-capitalist. They share common goals, such as the elimination of the exploitation of man by man, the disappearance of social classes and the state... Their main differences concern means, not ends. Based on the principle that the means used must not contradict the ends pursued, libertarians reject the idea of conquering political power and its instrument: the centralized political party. For them, a hierarchical organization, whether a party or a workers' state, cannot give rise to a free and egalitarian society.

In 1871, in the turmoil that followed the crushing of the Paris Commune, Michel Bakunin explained the differences between the two tendencies that divided socialism as follows: “Both parties want equally to create a new social order, based solely on the organization of collective labor, (...) equal economic conditions for all, and (...) the collective appropriation of the instruments of labor. Only the [state] communists imagine that they can achieve this through the development and organization of the political power of the working classes, and mainly of the urban proletariat, with the help of bourgeois radicalism, while the revolutionary socialists, enemies of all alliances and equivocal alliances, think, on the contrary, that they can achieve this goal only through the development and organization of the power - not political, but social, and therefore anti-political - of the working masses, both urban and rural, including all men of good will from the upper classes who, breaking with their past, would frankly like to join them (...). ..).

This is the contradiction, which has already become historical, that exists between the communism scientifically developed by the German school (...) and the Proudhonism

widely developed and pushed to its final consequences..."(7).

In the First International, the split between “authoritarian” and “libertarian” socialists occurred at the Hague Congress in 1872. One article of the statutes, article 7a, adopted by the “Marxist” majority, states that “in its struggle against the collective power of the possessing classes, the proletariat can only act as a class by constituting itself as a distinct political party” and that “the conquest of political power becomes the great duty of the proletariat”(8). On this occasion, James Guillaume and Michel Bakounine, leading figures of the minority opposed to this article, were expelled from the International.

Following this rupture, and until 1877, the Fédération Jurassienne continued to organize international congresses for the libertarian branch of the AIT(9). It was in Switzerland, within this Federation, that around 1876, under the impetus of Kropotkin, a new concept emerged: that of anarchist communism.

Anarchist communists

To differentiate themselves from the “Marxist” communists within the International, Bakunin's followers declared themselves revolutionary socialists or collectivists. For them, the latter term meant that the worker should be entitled to the full product of his labor: “to each according to his work”. The new concept, on the other hand, envisages a different way of distributing the product of labor: the communist mode, i.e. “to each according to his needs”. Pierre Kropotkin, and many other anarchist thinkers of the time (Elisée Reclus, Jean Grave...), theorized this as “taking from the heap”. They imagined that if humanity were rid of private property and the State, it would be able, thanks to scientific and technical development, to satisfy all needs. Money would be abolished, and everyone would be able to make use of the goods produced by everyone else. At the same time as Bakunin's followers were adopting this communist principle, Marx's followers, along with Jules Guesde, were asserting their collectivist credentials. Between the two schools, the names are reversed.

So, through the Fédération jurassienne, the former revolutionary socialists became communist-anarchists. From then on, they constituted the main, but not only, current of the libertarian movement. An earlier school, that of Proudhonian mutuellism, survived, particularly in the United States, where, with Benjamin R. Tucker, it evolved into individualist anarchism. The collectivist approach is still dominant in Spain. The communist principle is based on an optimistic conception of socio-economic evolution. Another presupposition, which in some ways complemented it, was to play a fundamental role in subsequent developments: the belief in the imminence of revolution. At the time,

anarchists believed that all it would take was a spark to ignite the fuse. As one of them later put it: “those who, at a distant rumor in the middle of the night, ran to their window, thinking it was the people revolting, can tell what our hope was”(10).

The revolutionary hopes of the anarchists should not be confused with those of the Marxists of the time. For the latter, it was economic evolution, supposedly leading to the proletarianization of the middle classes, that would inevitably lead to revolution, to the final confrontation between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Marxist model is evolutionary and deterministic. The communist outcome is the end of a history already written, the consequence of the development of the productive forces. Anarchist communists rely on the spontaneity and spirit of revolt of the masses. The wear and tear of the liberal economy, its crises, and the misery and unemployment they engender, are all favourable loopholes whose potential must be seized at every moment. Kropotkin justifies this concept. Contrary to the Darwinist model of the time, Kropotkin claims that it is mutual support within a species, rather than the struggle for life, that guarantees its survival and prosperity. The capitalist system of generalized competition is the result of a temporary derangement of the human species, and a logical return of the pendulum should return mankind to the “natural” society of solidarity and equality.

Propaganda by deed

Strengthened by the conviction that happiness was within reach, the companions adopted a new strategy, that of “propaganda by deed”. This was inaugurated on April 5, 1877 with the Benevento expedition to Italy. Errico Malatesta and some thirty armed men burned down the archives of two small villages and distributed the money found in the tax collector's office to the people. The adventure ended a few days later, when the protagonists were arrested, without resistance, in the cold.

The companions' starting point was the idea that workers and peasants, exhausted by their hard work, would be more easily convinced by concrete demonstrations than by oral or written propaganda. This equipment should also be seen in the Italian context of the time. Between 1873 and 1877, insurrectionary attempts and popular uprisings broke out in several regions of Italy. Despite its pitiful failure, the Benevento affair had a great impact. The trial of the participants even ended in acquittal. But propaganda by deed was to evolve in the direction of political attack.

In July 1881, a revolutionary socialist congress was held in London. This meeting, organized by the anarchists, adopted propaganda by deed as its preferred means of action. Member organizations were advised to take action “on the field of illegality, which is the

only road to revolution...”(11). This congress was important in more ways than one. At a time when anarchism was presenting itself as a political force distinct from other socialist schools, divergent interpretations were emerging within its ranks. While Kropotkin and Malatesta had come to the congress with the aim of rebuilding the International Workingmen's Association, i.e. reorganizing revolutionary forces, a majority, scalded by the abuses previously committed by the London General Council, opted for the complete autonomy of groups and individuals. This marked the emergence of an anti-organizational current that would later flourish, especially among individualist anarchists(12).

The historical introduction to the minutes of the 1907 Amsterdam congress makes no mention of the individual attacks that contributed so much to the notoriety of anarchists at the turn of the century. How can we forget the attacks by Ravachol in 1892, or the assassination of President Carnot by Caserio in 1894, that of King Humbert I of Italy by Bresci in 1900, and that of American President McKinley by Czolgocz in 1901...? To name just a few of the best-known cases. This omission is probably not accidental. There may be events on which Dunois, if he is indeed the author of this introduction, prefers not to insist. However, no one at the 1907 congress condemned the attacks - on the contrary. Max Baginski(13) from the USA even praised Czolgosz. “Czolgosz's act was truly an act of class struggle. In killing Mac-Kinley, Czolgosz struck a blow against American capitalism, that barbaric plutocracy that truly feeds on human flesh (...). Mac-Kinley's execution earned the anarchists long persecutions; our ideas, however, did not suffer, far from it"(14).

For Pierre Monatte, terrorism was simply out of date. By 1907, syndicalism had to some extent replaced terrorist attacks: “...syndicalism was born; the revolutionary spirit was revived, renewed by its contact, and the bourgeoisie, for the first time since the anarchist dynamite had killed its grandiose voice, the bourgeoisie trembled!”(15) Emma Goldman(16), in a motion countersigned by Baginsky, which she presented at the end of the congress, proposed a new approach. The individual act of revolt is a right. It must above all be understood, from a “socio-psychological” point of view, as a consequence of the system, and not “praised or condemned”. On the other hand, in certain circumstances, it is useful. This motion was unanimously approved by the congress. Here's the gist of it:

> “The International Anarchist Congress declares itself in favor of the right to revolt on the part of the individual as well as on the part of the entire mass. The congress is of the opinion that acts of revolt, especially when directed against representatives of the state and plutocracy, must be considered from a psychological point of view. (...) As a rule of thumb, it could be said that only the noblest, most sensitive and most delicate mind is subject to deep impressions manifested by internal and external revolt. Taken from this

> point of view, acts of revolt can be characterized as the socio-psychological consequences of an unbearable system; and as such, these acts, with their causes and motives, are to be understood, rather than praised or condemned. During revolutionary periods, as in Russia, the act of revolt (...) serves a double purpose: it undermines the very basis of tyranny and arouses the enthusiasm of the timid... "(17)

Can we say, as Daniel Guérin is a little quick to do, that following the adoption of propaganda by deed, anarchism will isolate itself from the workers' movement, wither away, lose itself in sectarianism?(18) Our feeling is that anarchist attacks are a little like the tree that hides the forest. If we look too closely at them, we neglect the fundamental movements at the origin of the modern workers' movement, in which anarchists play both a concrete and theoretical role. In the United States, for example, the Chicago Congress of 1881, which saw the birth of the Revolutionary Socialist Party, ratified the London decisions and called on workers' organizations to take up arms in defense of any infringement of their rights(19). In the period that followed, anarchists were to have a major influence on the American labor movement.

In France, even before the epidemic of attacks, the most prominent militants tried to rectify the situation and redirect their comrades towards mass action. In August 1888, during the Paris earthworkers' strike, Joseph Tortelier, accompanied by Louise Michel and Charles Malato, was already publicly arguing that only a general strike could lead to social revolution(20). In March 1891, Kroptkine wrote in La Révolte: "Revolutions are not made by heroic acts (...). Revolution, above all, is a popular movement (...). This was (...) the mistake made by the anarchists in 1881. When the Russian revolutionaries killed the Tsar (...), the European anarchists imagined that a handful of ardent revolutionaries, armed with a few bombs, would be enough to bring about social revolution... An edifice based on centuries of history cannot be destroyed with a few kilos of explosives"(21).

A serious study of the real effects of anarchist attacks would require a comparative study for each of the countries concerned. As this is not the subject of our research, we won't go into it. What must be said is that, since propaganda by deed did not have the desired effect, it will be abandoned in favor of other means of action; all the more so since the repression that accompanies it profoundly destructures the groups.

As far as France is concerned, the terrorist outbreak of 1892-1894 led to a split between the "societal" or "orthodox" current of anarchism, which advocated action within the trade unions, and the individualists who defended the beauty of personal sacrifice, or even the enjoyment of the bomber(22). In this respect, it's worth mentioning that American individualist anarchists, led by B.R. Tucker, rejected the principle of violent organization

from the outset. On the other side of the Atlantic, propaganda by deed was favored by anarchist communists.

Anarchists and the congresses of the Second International

Let's return to the introduction. The author of the document recalls the participation of anarchists in the first four congresses of the Second International: Paris (1889), Brussels (1891), Zurich (1893) and London (1896). We'll take a closer look at these last two congresses, which marked the break between the two orientations of the workers' movement, and which were also the scene of the first “libertarian and communist”(23) international meetings since the 1881 London congress. Libertarian and communist” meetings, not anarchist meetings.

Chroniclers of the time, like most historians after them, speak of the expulsion of anarchists from socialist congresses. As we delved deeper into the matter, we realized that not all opponents of the electoralist and parliamentary evolution of the socialist movement at the time could be defined as anarchists, far from it. To illustrate the problem, we decided to follow the itinerary of one of the protagonists, the Dutchman Christian Cornelissen. In our view, this man constitutes a common thread between Zürich (1893) and Amsterdam (1907), as he took part in all these meetings(24). To call him an anarchist would be highly imprecise, at least as far as 1893 is concerned.

Christian Cornelissen

In the brochure(25) written by Cornelissen for the Zürich congress, we see that the man who had just produced the first Dutch translation of the Communist Manifesto(26) was at least as much a Marxist as a libertarian; witness the numerous quotations from Marx on which he relies to defend his point of view. In his view, the main division within the international socialist movement was between a purely parliamentary current and non-parliamentary socialist groups. Among the latter, he ranks his party: the Democratic Socialist Workers' Party of Holland, which considers “legislative elections (...) only as a means of agitation, and the action of workers' elected representatives in parliaments only as a means of propaganda”. (27)

Opposing the German Social Democrats' credo that political power must necessarily precede the appropriation of the means of production by the working class, Cornelissen, relying on the Marxist principle that infrastructure determines superstructure, asserts on the contrary that “the working class cannot conquer political power until it has socialized the means of production” (28).

Reading his brochure, we can see that before the Zurich congress, Cornelissen hoped to rally to his point of view all those organizations that favored economic action by the working class, i.e. workers' organizations such as the Bourses du Travail in France... or even the Société du Grütli in Switzerland. Yet he feared that the parliamentary socialists might succeed in “excluding a fraction of their opponents from the congress, under the fallacious pretext of ‘anarchism’”(29). In this case, the parliamentary socialists would be responsible for the split in the labor movement and the “second (dissident) congress”(30) that was sure to follow.

Zürich 1893 and London 1896

As we know, these two international socialist congresses marked the definitive split between parliamentary socialists and “anarchist” socialists. It is worth recalling the circumstances of this split.

In Zurich, the problem arose during the first debate on the conditions for admission to the congress. The organizing committee passed a resolution to the effect that “all professional workers‘ unions and socialist parties and associations which recognize the need for workers’ organization and political action shall be admitted to the Congress”(31). To sanction the expulsion of the “anarchists”, an amendment proposed by the German Bebel and accepted by the majority specified that “by political action, it is understood that the workers' parties employ all their efforts to use political rights and the legislative machinery (legislature, direct legislation) in view of the interests of the proletariat and the conquest of public powers”(32).

As Cornelissen feared, with this resolution, the congress was not only sidelining patent anarchists; independent socialists opposed to parliamentarianism were also directly targeted. But what of the socialists who fell between the two camps, either because for them parliamentary action was just one tactic among others, or because after having practiced it, they rejected it?

In the latter case was F. Domela Nieuwenhuis, the main Dutch socialist leader, who nevertheless took an active part in the debates. As he had already done at the Brussels Socialist Congress in 1891, he defended, unsuccessfully, the general strike and the military strike in the event of war. That said, for the anarchists and some of the independent socialists, most of the discussions from then on took place off-site. Several meetings were held at Zurich's Plattengarten, with up to 500 participants. They discussed topics on the agenda of the official congress, such as the organization of May Day, the general strike and the economic struggle to “prepare the revolution”(33).

A certain Werner from Berlin already presented the credo of the anti-parliamentary socialists of the next two decades. His speech begins with a libertarian critique of social democracy, which, in his view, would “only 9 replace the present slavery with another slavery by calling for the centralization of product consumption”(34). Then the same Werner makes a concrete proposal for action: “we only want professional unions to watch over our interests, and we'll form these unions ourselves...”(35). The difficulty lies in linking these two premises.

For the time being, we will deliberately use the term “anti-parliamentary” rather than “anarchist” or “anti-authoritarian” to designate socialists opposed to the parliamentary social-democratic current that would impose its hegemony within the Second International.

In the political arena, especially where revolutionary or simply oppositional organizations are concerned, the use of an appropriate and precise designation is always problematic. There are the terms by which the actors designate themselves, which are often the most neutral possible, and the polemical terms their opponents use to designate them. In this case, the social democrats and the “bourgeois” press systematically speak of anarchists, whereas the term “anti-parliamentarians” used by the protagonists is more precise. It's the term Cornelissen uses to designate his camp(36). It was also used in the title of the main parallel meeting to the London congress: “Meeting anarchiste et antiparlementaire” (“Anarchist and anti-parliamentary meeting”).

The term has the merit of encompassing all those who favor direct, grassroots action, without necessarily claiming libertarian ideology; in other words, anarchists, whether or not they are syndicalists, certain revolutionary socialists and future revolutionary syndicalists. We'll come back later to the divergences that emerged within this “anti-parliamentary” conglomerate. Official reports and press accounts only partially reflect the exchange of ideas that took place at workers' congresses. In any such assembly, it's often behind the scenes that the most important discussions take place. Direct contact between individuals is important when analyzing the evolution of socialist ideas. In his memoirs, Cornelissen recounts the walks he took in the Zurich region at the time, in the company of Domela Nieuwenhuis and Jean Allemane(37). He tells us how struck he was by his French colleague's hostility to the congress' deliberations as a whole: “it was literally a conversion for him: a shift, if not outright to anarchy, at least to the left wing of the ‘independent socialists’”(38).

We also know that it was at the Zurich workers' congress that Christian Cornelissen befriended Fernand Pelloutier. The personal links between two men who were to hold similar responsibilities in the labor movement of their respective countries are worth

noting(39). Further study would perhaps reveal how Cornelissen directly influenced Pelloutier, and how the coherence and subsequent influence of French revolutionary syndicalism is indebted to the Dutch labor movement(40).

At the London Congress (1896), the problem thought to have been solved in Zurich became even more acute, so much so that a good half of the meeting was devoted to it. When you throw the anarchists out, they come in through the windows", might have been the cry of the leaders of social democracy!

Officially, all the workers' union chambers had been invited. Only socialist parties and organizations were required to recognize the need for "political action". For some years now, however, anarchists had been advocating entry into the unions. Some of the best-known leaders of the libertarian movement came to the congress with union mandates. Malatesta, for example, had mandates from a French union, Italian groups and Spanish unions. Of the forty-three French union representatives, twenty were well-known anarchists. So the dilemma was this: expelling the anarchists meant closing the door to workers' representatives. We know that this situation was not simply the result of circumstances. Through concerted action, a group of militants had decided to do everything in their power to change the course of the socialist movement.

The idea of leading the fight against social democracy in London came from Fernand Pelloutier and Augustin Hamon in France. If we are to believe the latter, it was they who organized the "syndicalo-anarchist" delegation in Paris. Hamon insists on the collaboration of Malatesta, who, living in London, was in contact with English trade union circles. He also notes Cornelissen's help in Holland(41). For this occasion, Cornelissen drew up a text entitled: Le communisme révolutionnaire. Projet pour une entente et pour l'action commune des Socialistes révolutionnaires et des Communistes anarchistes(42). The prior agreement between libertarians and antiparliamentarians is also evidenced by the fact that an "anarchist committee" initially set up to prepare the congress was dissolved and replaced by an "anarchist socialist and antiparlementary committee"(43).

In the run-up to the congress, anarchists and their friends endeavored to demonstrate that the Social Democrats were sectarians, guilty of dividing the labor movement. In one of his articles, Domela Nieuwenhuis declared that if the anarchists were excluded, we would have to "admit that it would no longer be a socialist congress, but only a parliamentary congress, a reformist congress of the social democrats, a congress of a sect..."(44).

The theme of the unity of the workers' movement is a constant in the arguments of the "anarchists". An article by Malatesta and Augustin Hamon published in English in Labour

Leader, the weekly of the Independent Labour Party (45), and in French in Parti ouvrier, the organ of the Allemanists, is worth quoting at some length, as it sums up the message they wanted to get across.

“It is in the interest of all the enemies of capitalist society that the workers should be united in the struggle (...). This struggle is necessarily economic in nature. It is not that we do not recognize the importance of political questions (...) [but] any attempt to impose a single political opinion on the labor movement would lead to the disintegration of the movement and prevent the progress of economic organization”. And the article concludes: “If the social democrats wish to persist in their attempt to enlist and thus sow division among the workers, may they understand and make triumph the great word of Marx: Workers of the world, unite!”(46)

The anti-parliamentarians' attempt was not crowned with success. In the end, the Social Democrats prevailed. But to expel the anarchists once and for all, they had to admit to the next Socialist Congress only “purely corporate organizations” that recognized “the necessity of legislative and parliamentary action”(47). They thus accepted responsibility for the division of the workers' movement, which would alienate from them, for a time at least, a number of non-“orthodox” socialists, as well as syndicalists who were not directly under their influence(48). Let's turn now to the anarchist and anti-parliamentary meetings held in parallel with the socialist congress. On Tuesday July 28, a large meeting was organized. According to Hamon(49) the attendance was so large (several thousand people) that the meeting had to be divided in two. The first speaker was not exactly an anarchist, being Keir Hardie(50), president of the ILP.

Although a supporter of political action, Keir Hardie came to welcome the anarchist delegates. In favor of solidarity between all those who believe in socialism, he told the assembly that “the crime of anarchists is to be the minority”. Next up was ILP secretary, trade unionist Tom Mann (51). He is even warmer, and admits that tactically, he doesn't differ much from the anarchists. Numerous anarchist and anti-parliamentary speakers followed: Elisée Reclus, Christian Cornelissen, Louise Michel, Kropotkine, Tortelier, Malatesta, Domela Nieuwenhuis...

In the days that followed, the German, Swiss and Italian anarchist socialists who had been expelled from the congress, joined by English, French and Dutch anti-parliamentary socialists, organized three days of debates and conferences. There was much discussion of the priority to be given to struggle and economic organization, i.e. trade union organization. Pelloutier emphasized the progress made by the idea of a general strike, and

the propensity of union members to reject parliamentarianism... in other words, the themes of revolutionary syndicalism, promoted at the time by the anarchists.

On another subject, the agrarian question, a rather curious debate pitted English socialists against several anarchist speakers. While the former declared that the proletarianization of peasants and the creation of large estates were a necessary precondition for the spread of socialist ideas in the countryside, the latter rejected this deterministic view (52). Among them, Malatesta makes a remark that deserves to be quoted, in view of the subsequent debates to which we shall turn. Here's the gist of it: “Marxists have abandoned Marx's theories, and anarchists keep them too preciously. The theories are outdated in many respects. Why wait for the proletarianization of the peasantry, which may never happen? Economic conditions (...) can change; they are at the mercy of a discovery, an invention. Centralization (...) can give way to the individualization of industry, if a new driving force is found. So we mustn't wait for the peasants to be dispossessed before (...) showing them the nuisance of the State...”. Does adherence to socialist ideas depend on class allegiance and the evolution of production relations, or is it born of man's aspiration to freedom, which propaganda can awaken? A fundamental debate that would not be resolved any time soon.

Paris 1900 - the forbidden congress

This dilemma of “class struggle” versus “propaganda” was once again apparent in the contributions written for the 1900 International Revolutionary Workers' Congress. The congress, scheduled for September 19, 20, 21 and 22, 1900, was banned under France's so-called “scélérates” laws(53), but the reports written for the occasion can be consulted(54). In the presentation of these texts, the connection with the London Congress is asserted. It is stated that, following the incidents of 1896, “revolutionary groups in various countries had recognized the need to separate themselves from social democracy, whose intolerance wanted to impose the need for legislative and parliamentary action on all groupings, including trade unions” (55). We are told that the first call for this meeting was signed by F. Domela Nieuwenhuis, Fernand Pelloutier and Emile Pouget (56) and that it was addressed “to workers' groups, revolutionary socialists and anarchist communists” (57). We are also told that the congress was prepared “well before the parliamentary socialists had decided to hold theirs in Paris” (58). This remark deserves a moment's reflection. We don't believe that the two congresses were convened at virtually the same date by chance.

In fact, according to Jean Maitron, “the 1900 congress, which described itself as anti-parliamentary, was intended to respond to the international socialist congress which was to meet in Paris in September 1900” (59). An unacknowledged coincidence, but a deliberate

one. It perhaps reveals a partly unconscious desire to prolong the cohesion that, until now, opposition to the "domesticated socialists" had given to the revolutionary camp. With the removal of the common adversary, divergences were about to surface.

There were many issues that should have been discussed in Paris. Here's an overview: organization of ongoing relations between revolutionary communist groups in the same country and in different countries; propaganda in the trade unions; publications and propaganda by placard and pamphlet for distribution; avant-garde theater; protest elections; publication of an international organ; the agrarian question; the workless; libertarian education; cooperativism and neo-cooperativism; the women's question; the general strike; the attitude of anarchists in the event of war; anti-militarist propaganda, and so on. In addition to many French participants, delegates came from North America, Argentina, England, Germany, Italy, Switzerland, Spain, Belgium, Holland, Bohemia and Russia. Others sent in written adhesions from Bulgaria, Romania, Greece, Portugal, Brazil, the Sandwich Islands and Uruguay. Well-known anarchists such as Kropotkin, Elisée Reclus, Tcherkesoff, Domela Nieuwenhuis, Max Nettlau, Jean Grave and Emma Goldman also took part.

As with the Zürich and London meetings, not all the planned participants were anarchists. Non-libertarians were not numerous, but French members of the Parti ouvrier socialiste révolutionnaire (POSR - allemanist) had announced themselves. The contribution they left, entitled "Libertarian tactics, revolutionary tactics", has the merit of presenting the differences they perceive and clarifying certain definitions. For the Allemanists, libertarians and revolutionaries pursue the same goals: "the overthrow of capitalist society and its replacement by a new era (...) a social state without government (...). Both accept the principle of the general strike..."(60). The differences concern the means. For the Allemanists, "the libertarian, in general, believes and hopes only in individual movement and the evolution of brains (...) only the idea (...) governs [libertarians]" (61). The POSR is more "practical", proposing "the conquest of public powers as a means of propaganda"(62).

Agreement on this point seems very difficult, even if libertarians did try their hand at propaganda through electoral candidacy (63). What's interesting to note is the persistence of the dialogue. This stems from the convergence that existed at the time between Allemanists and libertarians in the trade unions. One last clarification, about the term libertarian. Allemanists believe that "libertarians called themselves libertarians to separate themselves from anarchists opposed to all groupings"(64). In our opinion, there is no evidence that the boundary between "libertarian" and "anarchist" is based on whether or

not the organization is understood. But the existence of both terms and the analysis thus made by the POSR show that the main divergences revolve around the theme of organization. As Jean Maitron has pointed out, in the run-up to the 1900 congress in France, “the first attempt since 1895 to establish permanent links between companions at both national and international level”(65). The initiative came from Cornelissen and the Etudiants Socialistes Révolutionnaires Internationalistes (ESRI)(66). Their concern: 13 to remedy the inorganized state of the anarchist movement by setting up a “correspondence bureau” and an “international libertarian communist federation”(67).

Cornelissen's report to the congress “on the need to establish a lasting understanding between anarchist and revolutionary communist groups”(68) was an appeal, almost a supplication, for the movement to get organized. “What we would like, in a word, is something that would enable us to put ourselves in touch with each other..."(69) Cornelissen, who recently moved to Paris(70), gives a picture of the libertarian movement that is hardly optimistic. “The events of recent years, both in France and in other countries, have shown that revolutionaries are dispersed, that their forces are fragmented (...) in recent times (...) we have been unable to undertake anything serious"(71). No doubt he was referring to the period of the attacks when he added that “if the revolutionaries of France, and in particular those of Paris, had been more united (...) many mistakes could have been avoided”(72).

He was very critical of the anarchist press. Regretting what propaganda newspapers are, he claims that “vis-à-vis the editors of these newspapers or magazines, [the] groups are as powerless as vis-à-vis the capitalist press”(73). Aware that he would not be able to convince all the participants, or even probably the majority, Cornelissen spoke of organizing a meeting after the congress, with those who would agree to “create regular relations between the groups”(74). He also asked those opposed to the project not to stand in the way of its realization.

This was a wise precaution, as the enemies of organization, or rather the partisans of natural and spontaneous organization, held sway in Parisian libertarian circles. Jean Grave(75), for example, vehemently contested the criticism of the libertarian press and the proposals for organizing the movement put forward by ESRI and Cornelissen. Grave's arguments are not lacking in flavor, and deserve a closer look. “The ESRIs think they are putting anarchist newspapers on trial, noting that they are in the hands of those who make them, and that the party has no recourse against them (...). In making this criticism, our comrades in the student group are showing themselves to be ignorant of what a newspaper can and must be if it is to do a good job, and they are forgetting only one thing: that while

there is a current of ideas calling itself anarchism, a current which does indeed have some clearly defined general lines as to its aim, on the other hand there are many different ways of conceiving its realization; and the divergence is such that we more than once call each other reactionary. And these divergences will always remain (...) and, far from wishing to see them lessened, we must, on the contrary, hope that they will each evolve in their own direction. (...) Unity of view is unattainable; then, it would be disastrous, because it would be immobility" (76). Grave was opposed to the correspondence bureau project, as it was "pointless to create a cog that could be a hindrance" (77). Groups should simply correspond with each other according to their desires and needs. The existence of this institution would only flatter "the inertia of individuals, who are only too inclined to rely on those who promise to replace them"(78).

On a syndicalist theme such as the general strike, it is interesting to compare Grave's opinion with that expressed by other militants. The report on the general strike by delegates from the Union du Bronze echoed the main arguments put forward a few years earlier by Fernand Pelloutier. For these militants, the general strike meant revolution, because "the epic times of the barricades are over (...) it is now almost impossible to fight the armed force with the same 14 weapons it has at its disposal"(79). On the other hand, by saying that a minority of workers was sufficient to call a general strike, they were implicitly responding to the Social Democrats' argument that, if all workers were prepared to strike, it would be pointless(80). According to the Bronze delegates, it would be enough for a minority of conscious workers in key sectors (railroads in the first instance) to stop work for the resulting disorganization to turn the strike into a revolution...

Jean Grave is not at all opposed to the general strike, but does not see it as a panacea. General strike propaganda is just as important as anti-militarist propaganda, tax refusal or resistance to certain laws. We can also try to dispute the State's monopoly on children's education, by creating libertarian schools, or join forces to organize an economic agreement aimed at "procuring the facilities of life"(81). Grave also differentiated himself from the syndicalists on the theme of revolution. He declares that "catastrophic transformations (...) are only a matter of faith in providence"(82) and says "we want the Revolution, all right. But the Revolution has no virtue in itself; it will only accomplish what those who take part in it know how to do (...). Moreover, the Revolution cannot be brought about in one fell swoop; it must be brought about by a state of mind, by an evolution of ideas that prepare it"(83).

Within the anti-parliamentary camp, anarchist propaganda and ideas were now to come face to face with the practical, concrete proposals of the emerging revolutionary

syndicalism, and not just with the “Marxist” conception of the inevitable evolution of economic mechanisms.

The context

We have followed the itinerary of the international anarchist movement through the various stages suggested by the minutes of the 1907 congress. Before presenting the meeting, it is worth mentioning two elements that characterize this period: the development of revolutionary syndicalism in France, and the Russian revolution of 1905.

The early 20th century was a period of economic expansion. Between the crises of 1900 and 1907, improved economic conditions generally favored a modest but very real rise in workers' living standards.

In France, the multiplication and, above all, the success of strikes led to changes in syndicalist theories.

Until the end of the 19th century, partial strikes were “the object of systematic defiance on the part of syndicalist leaders”(84). They were rejected because their results, when not negative, were so modest as to discourage workers and distance them from the goal of social transformation. There was a belief in the “iron law” of wages, according to which real wage improvements were impossible under capitalist conditions. As soon as the facts contradicted the theory, a revision became necessary.

French revolutionary syndicalists

From 1902, when Victor Griffuelhes became secretary of the CGT, a whole team of revolutionaries were at the head of the French trade union movement.

Victor Griffuelhes (1874-1922) was a shoemaker. Originally from the Cantal region of France, he left school at the age of fourteen to become an apprentice in Bordeaux. In 1893, he moved to Paris, where he worked for the luxury bootmakers of the Faubourg Saint-Honoré. Griffuelhes took an active part in the general union of shoemakers in the Seine, and around 1896 joined the Blanquist party. In 1899, he became secretary of the Union des syndicats de la Seine, and in 1900, secretary of the Fédération nationale des cuirs et peaux. Griffuelhes' growing reputation in the trade union movement meant he was often approached by the Blanquist leadership. In 1900, he stood as a socialist candidate in the municipal elections for the Xth arrondissement of Paris. Yet he was convinced that union action was the only effective way to liberate the working class. In 1908, in a pamphlet entitled L'Action syndicaliste, he declared:

“I joined the union to fight against the bosses who were directly responsible for my enslavement, and against the State, the natural defender of the bosses because it benefits from them”. In November 1901, he was elected General Secretary of the CGT. In 1902, under his mandate (which lasted until 1909), the CGT merged with the Fédération des bourses du travail, in which anarchists predominated. At the time, Griffuelhes was the very embodiment of French revolutionary syndicalism(85). According to Jacques Julliard, Griffuelhes and his colleague Merrheim “were neither theorists nor organizers: they were strike leaders (86)”.

Alphonse Merrheim (1871-1925) played a pivotal role in the development of French syndicalism. He was to play a key role in the transition from the revolutionary syndicalism of the turn of the century to the much more reasonable syndicalism that followed, from 1909 onwards. Born into a working-class family, he left school at the age of ten to work in a soap factory. He later became a copper boilermaker. After a brief spell with Guesde's Parti Ouvrier Français (POF), then with the Allemanists, he became a trade unionist. He alternated between being secretary of the metal and copper federations, working to unite all metalworkers in a single federation. Although very close to Griffuelhes, he differed greatly from him, being a moderate. Merrheim was as opposed to collaboration with the Socialist Party as he was to revolutionary verbalism. Gifted with a great capacity for work, he studied the mechanisms of strikes, publishing monographs in Le Mouvement Socialiste in 1905 and 1906. At the time of writing, he was beginning to take an interest in the study of economic mechanisms. His aim: “to adapt trade unionism to the struggle against modern big business”. His “realistic” approach contrasts with that of other members of the revolutionary syndicalist school(87).

Emile Pouget, a talented journalist with a long history as an anarchist and syndicalist, was the man who attempted to articulate the new strike practice with the revolutionary aspirations of the anarchists.

Originally from Aveyron, Emile Pouget left high school at the age of fifteen to earn his living in Paris. A salesman in a novelty store, he founded the first Paris textile union in 1879, at the age of nineteen. By this time, he was already active in anarchist circles. In 1883, Pouget took part, alongside Louise Michel, in a demonstration of unemployed workers organized by the Chambre syndicale des menuisiers. The demonstration ended with the looting of three bakeries. Pouget was arrested. He was sentenced to eight years in prison for looting and anti-militarism. The police found six hundred copies of a pamphlet entitled A l'armée in his home. Released three years later under the amnesty of 1886, he made his living by selling books. This occupation gave him time to spare, and in 1889 he

founded Le Père Peinard, an anarchist periodical he wrote in a colorful language that spared no one and nothing. Here's what Colette Chambelland had to say about it: “Throughout the journal's pages, you could feel the style of a great proletarian pamphleteer (...) Pouget's anarchism was essentially working-class. It contained all the themes of anarchist propaganda: against the government, against politics and deputies (the aquarium's “bouffe-galette”), against the army, against the bosses. He advocated the general strike..."(88). In 1894, Le Père Peinard was banned and Pouget fled to England. Back in Paris, he first published La Sociale between 1895 and 1896, then Le Père Peinard again until April 1900. From December 1, 1900 until 1908, he was editor-in-chief of La Voix du Peuple, the CGT weekly. By renouncing his vocation as a libertarian journalist to devote himself to syndicalist propaganda, Pouget, who was forty years old at the time, was to make his mark on the life of the trade union confederation.

The key concept he developed was that of “direct action”, an idea that encompassed the general strike, of course, but also partial strikes, sabotage, boycotts... For Pouget, daily workers' resistance constitutes “revolutionary gymnastics” that enable the exploited individual to escape his or her condition of “human zero”, and prepare for complete emancipation. Back in 1890, Pouget had already achieved a synthesis between the idea of a revolutionary general strike and the reformist strike. The latter “is the preparation for the former, and it is only after a series of conflicts that become more and more widespread that the workers will reach the final strike”(89). To complete the picture, we need to mention two influential anarchist syndicalists. The first was Georges Yvetot (1868-1942), a typographer. He became an anarchist under the influence of Pelloutier, to whom he was very close, and when the latter died in 1901, he took over the post of secretary of the Fédération des Bourses du travail. He held this post until the war. In 1902, following the merger with the CGT, Yvetot became the second-largest union in France. Yvetot was a Proudhonian anarchist, and remained so when he became a trade unionist. In December 1902, together with other anarchists, he founded an antimilitarist league which, after a congress in Amsterdam in June 1904, became a section of the International Antimilitarist Association. His very active propaganda in this field earned him numerous arrests and convictions(90).

Last but not least, Paul Delesalle (1870-1948). A precision fitter-mechanic, Delesalle was a highly skilled worker. He built, for example, the Lumière brothers' chronophotographic camera. At an early age, he turned to anarchism. His involvement in the Paris anarchist movement is documented from 1891 onwards. In 1893, he joined the Chambre syndicale des ouvriers en instruments de précision. From 1895 to 1906, he was a contributor to Jean Grave's Temps nouveaux, where he wrote the “Mouvement social” column. In 1897, he

became assistant secretary of the Fédération des Bourses du Travail, at the same time as assistant secretary of the CGT. In 1901, at the CGT congress, he took part in a commission whose conclusions prefigured the Amiens Charter, since it "invited the congress to decide that trade union action should preserve its own life (...) outside any political influence, leaving to individuals the imprescriptible right to engage in the kind of struggle that suits them in the political sphere". From 1904 to 1906, he was very active in the campaign for the eight-hour week, which culminated in the general strike of May 1, 1906, discussed below. Delesalle set out to demonstrate that the struggle for eight hours was above all a revolutionary struggle, "a springboard to intensify propaganda for a time". In 1908, he opened a bookshop and a small publishing house in Paris. Now a businessman, he decided to leave the CGT. From then on, he devoted himself to publishing and distributing unionist pamphlets, as well as literary works. He himself wrote a number of pamphlets on trade unionism, including: La Confédération générale du Travail (1907), Les Bourses du Travail et la CGT (1909), etc. He also edited the minutes of the 1907 anarchist congress we are studying(91).

Towards the general strike

At the CGT congress in Bourges in 1904, a young militant, Dubéros, representing the hairdressers, proposed to launch a vast movement so that by May 1, 1906, workers would stop working more than eight hours a day. This grassroots proposal surprised Griffuelhes, and was opposed by reformists such as Keufer du Livre, who "suggested a step-by-step action, not excluding recourse to legislative means"(92). On the other hand, it won the support of Pouget, who had long been waiting for an initiative of this kind, and succeeded in convincing the majority. This proposal had the merit of combining the idea of the eight-hour week with that of May 1st as an annual day of demands and that of a general strike.

From then on, the CGT embarked on a vast propaganda campaign: posters, leaflets, flyers... No expense was spared, and each issue of La Voix du Peuple returned to the subject. Demand strike or revolution? The CGT leaves it open to doubt. For its leaders, May 1st 1906 could only be seen as a step towards a revolutionary movement, but some workers, unionized or not, were ready to believe that the time for emancipation had come. But the general strike disappointed these hopes. First an unforeseen event, the Courrières disaster on March 10, 1906, in which over 1,200 miners perished, sparked off a strike and violent incidents that ended in arrests and a negotiated compromise at the end of April, just as the other unions were about to take up the struggle. On the eve of May 1st, the government bans all demonstrations, as expected, but Clemenceau springs a surprise by accusing union leaders of plotting with the far right. Griffuelhes and CGT treasurer Lévy

were arrested, as was Bonapartist Durand de Beauregard(93). Clearly, this was an affair fabricated to create confusion, but it must have had an effect at the time.

Certainly, there was a strike on May 1, 1906, as well as on the following days. Over 200,000 people took part in Paris, mainly in the building trades, and there were demonstrations and clashes despite (or because of) the ban and the presence of 50,000 troops in the Paris region. In the provinces, workers in the ports and military arsenals stopped work. The movement was strong in the glassworks of the North, in some large factories, and among miners in the Massif Central... but neither railway workers (except in the Hérault) nor postal workers mobilized. Demonstrations were held in major cities, and sometimes, as in Brest, Bordeaux and Toulon, the black flags of anarchists mingled with the red flags of socialists and trade unionists.

“The CGT had suggested two different methods: either start an unlimited strike on May 1 to force the bosses to accept the eight-hour week; or, from May 2, stop work every day at the end of the eighth hour. Earthworkers and bricklayers followed the second method, while jewelers and bookmakers employed the first. Sometimes they demand eight hours without any reduction in pay; sometimes they ask for a raise at the same time. The Book industry limited its ambition to nine hours; but the metalworkers demanded the English week as well"(94). Some of these demands were met, certainly not the eight hours, but reductions in working hours or wage increases in certain sectors such as the Book, Jewellery and Building industries... Hairdressers were granted a weekly 18-hour rest day from May 1, but we had hoped for more. In the minds of France's revolutionary syndicalists, we'll do better next time. And it was on the back of this half-success that some of them went to the anarchist congress in Amsterdam. What they didn't know was that May 1st 1906 was the high point and that, despite the many strikes that followed, the movement had begun its decline.

We have seen how important the anarchist imprint is in the French trade union movement, for the period under consideration. But if there was any influence, it was reciprocal: anarchist militants themselves modified their ideas through contact with trade union life. This evolution reached a decisive moment at the 1906 Amiens Congress, when Pouget and his comrades officially renounced their identity as anarchists and adopted that of simple syndicalists.

The Charte d'Amiens

The Charte d'Amiens, which remains the standard reference for French syndicalism to this day, was the result of a circumstantial compromise, an implicit agreement between the

revolutionary syndicalism in the majority at this congress and the moderate, reformist wing of the union movement. On this occasion, both tendencies agreed to condemn the third current led by the Guedist Victor Renard, who wanted relations to be established between the CGT and the reunified SFIO socialist party.

The charter certainly enshrines revolutionary syndicalist theory, articulating “the work of daily demands (...) the increase of workers' well-being through the achievement of immediate improvements...” with the idea of “integral emancipation” (95), but above all, by decreeing that unions had “no concern with parties and sects”, it constitutes for Pouget and his comrades a break with their original anarchism. Based on the testimony of Paul Delessale, Jean Maitron sums up the state of mind of the anarchist militants who took part in drafting this charter.

Paul Delesalle: “When I first read it, with Pouget holding the pen, I got upset about the passage on ‘parties and sects’. The sects were aimed at anarcho-syndicalists and, I don't know why, I didn't like them. I had a spat with Griffuelhes on the subject, and I can still hear Pouget repeating: “What's it to you?” After a moment, “la secte des égaux” (the sect of equals) crossed my mind, I was defeated and, not wanting to appear so, I said to Pouget: “That's fine, I'll say you're alluding to the communists of 1797 and that'll be all there is to it. I don't need to tell you that all my comrades burst out laughing. What a curious document, and one which shows the evolution - conscious for some, unconscious for others - which had taken place in people's minds at that time, which also clearly shows the attractive power of the new doctrine, since an honest militant like Delessale could calm his anarchist conscience with the crude lie he relates above, a lie which provoked bursts of laughter from his comrades! “(96)

The Russian Revolution of 1905

We are not here to analyze the events that began with the massacre of demonstrators who had come to hand over a petition to the Tzar on Sunday January 7, 1905, in St. Petersburg, and ended in December of the same year with the Moscow uprising, which was also crushed in bloodshed. What we need to remember about these events is that 19 the revolutionary general strike, which until then had been an abstract idea, became a concrete reality. The events in Russia were punctuated by hitherto unknown strike movements, which took on both economic and political meanings. More than a million strikers forced the Czar to renounce the autocratic principle, giving Russia its first constitution. But the strikers also won, in some cases, a shorter working day and higher wages. In addition, the movement spread to the countryside, forcing the authorities to undertake agrarian reform (97). We have already seen how the idea of winning political power led the Social

Democrats to adopt an electoral strategy. Obtaining universal suffrage, and then winning a majority of the electorate, seemed to them the only realistic way to achieve socialism. The events of 1905 changed the face of the problem. Marxists such as Rosa Luxemburg, Lenin and Trotsky, each in their own way, saw the general strike as a preparatory stage for insurrection (98), the conquest of power by the socialists. This theme was debated at the VIIth Socialist Congress in Stuttgart in August 1907, where the general strike was seen as a political weapon to be used in the event of war. After 1905, it became clear that, theoretically at least, the revolutionary field was no longer the monopoly of anarchists.

Preparing for the congress

The desire to establish lasting relations between anarchists in different countries, which had manifested itself around the failed congress of 1900, was also at the root of the Amsterdam congress. The available sources show that we are not dealing with a structured movement that periodically decides to meet, but with an initiative that starts with a few groups and then spreads.

The idea of the congress, we are told, was born “almost simultaneously, in the minds of Belgian and Dutch companions. Right from its foundation (1905), the Federation of Libertarian Communists of Holland had expressed the wish to see international relations established between anarchists. The young Belgian libertarian communist grouping, for its part, was thinking of fulfilling this wish” (99).

For the Dutch, we're dealing with a dozen groups. They have in common a fortnightly periodical, De Vrije Communist (the libertarian communist, from The Hague). Since the Federation was founded, they have met twice in general assemblies, in Utrecht on September 23, 1906, and in Haarlem on April 28, 1907. Federation members are “partisans of collective action”. They declared themselves to be “anarchists, communists and syndicalists” (100), but represented only a minority of Dutch anarchists. A speaker at the congress, G. Rijnders, declared in this connection “that non-federated groups far outnumber federated groups”(101).

The problem was as follows: F. Domela Nieuwenhuis, the most popular of the Dutch anarchists(102), had become quite individualistic. He was in favor of free, independent groups, cooperating only on concrete objectives, and opposed to a national anarchist organization. On the other hand, the first Dutch workers' central (NAS), with its revolutionary syndicalist leanings, had suffered a major setback(103) in 1903, and its membership had dwindled (10,526 members in 1902, down to 3,250 in 1906). From 1906 onwards, the NAS also had to contend with a new, competing trade union center, founded

by the socialist unions linked to the Dutch Social Democratic Party. This highly reformist organization saw its membership grow rapidly. But the 20 militants of the Federation of Libertarian Communists of Holland were precisely those who were stimulating the NAS with their propaganda and theoretical work. The members of the Groupement Communiste Libertaire de Belgique (GCL) also supported organization, “although they are convinced that any organization in itself possesses only a relative emancipatory force” (104). The GCL itself is made up of several sections, and “each section meets at least once a month. The GCL holds general assemblies at least once a year” (105). Also formed in 1905, it published a weekly organ, L'Emancipateur (106).

Pressure from individualist anarchists(107) seems less strong in Belgium than in Holland. Syndicalism is not mentioned by the Belgians; the GCL's declared objective being communist-anarchist propaganda. However, the report presented to the congress mentions that Henri Fuss, from Liège, publishes l'Action directe, a syndicalist-revolutionary propaganda organ. It was the same Henri Fuss who took responsibility for publishing the free propaganda bulletin for the congress.

In addition to the Belgians and Dutch, the first groups to sign up to the project (108) were the German Anarchist Federation, the Bohemian Anarchist Federation and the London Federation of Jeddish (Yiddish)-speaking Anarchists.

A general remark is in order here. The initiative originated with young, communist anarchist groups, committed to organization and syndicalism. Initially, it involved federations that had a certain weight, but were relatively “peripheral” and had limited outside influence, if only for linguistic reasons (109). In any case, the initiative did not come from anarchist leaders. Nor did it come from the countries of southern Europe, where groups are traditionally larger.

Cornelissen expressed himself on this point, in an appeal published in the Almanach de la Révolution: “I am sure I speak for the comrades who are helping to organize the congress if I declare that we could not be happier than to see in 1907, in Amsterdam, the southern countries once again setting us a good example of revolutionary and libertarian élan, and to meet as many French, Swiss, Spanish and Italian comrades as Germans, English, Belgians, Dutch or Czechs” (110).

Expectations were particularly high in France. “We are counting on anarchist communist groups, revolutionary union members, delegates from communist colonies, libertarian newspapers and magazines, etc., to come from all sides of France (emphasis added) in considerable numbers” (111).

The aim of the congress: to create an international

The very title of the propaganda bulletin published by Belgian H. Fuss, entitled Bulletin de l'internationale libertaire, reflects this objective. Its first editorial, addressed “to the anarchists”, asserts that “the Libertarian International will be created within a few months”, even though “only the Amsterdam Congress will be qualified to build it and give it the forms and allure that suit it” (112). This way of proclaiming the results of a meeting before it took place was widely appreciated. The Parisian individualists, writing in L'Anarchie, were quick to point out the contradiction and mock the enthusiasm of the Belgians, declaring: “The Amsterdam Congress has become the Eternal Father. (...) His magic wand will be the majority. Only he can codify libertarianism. When will the next exclusions take place?” (113). On a more serious note, Amédée Dunois warned the Belgians that they were anticipating the results of the congress, and also criticized them for wanting “to set themselves the object of organizing from scratch (and from above, which is a bit governmental!) a new International...”. (114).

The name of the congress

In the same article, Dunois raises another problem, that of the name the organizers want to give the congress: “International Libertarian and Communist Workers' Congress”. For Dunois, “this title is long (...) vague; wanting to embrace too much, it embraces poorly”. What's more, “the adjective libertarian lacks not only bravery but clarity and force”. He also expresses “a more serious objection. - Is it true that the Amsterdam anarchist congress will be a workers' congress? Not in the least. Congressmen of all classes will come to Amsterdam (...). The questions to be debated there will not be special to workers (...). Thus neither by its composition nor by its object will the Amsterdam congress have a 'workers' character'. (...) The Amsterdam International Anarchist Congress will not bring together delegates of a class, but militants of an idea” (115).

Dunois's remarks seem to have had an echo, since it was the title “Anarchist Congress” that was finally adopted. But first, let's look at the chronology of the name changes. In Bulletin de l'internationale libertaire no. 2, November 1906, the first reference is to an “international anarchist congress”.

Cornelissen, in his article for the Almanach illustré de la Révolution, spoke of an “international revolutionary and libertarian workers' congress” (116), i.e. the title of the 1900 congress with the added word “libertarian”; this testifies to his desire to place this international meeting in the continuity of those in which he had previously participated. “In 1907, the aim will be to continue the work begun in 1900, i.e. to discuss reports from

all corners of the world (...) and to seek together the best means of revolutionary and libertarian propaganda"(117).

The name “Congrès ouvrier libertaire et communiste international” appeared in the supplement to bulletin no. 3, February 1907, and it was not until bulletin no. 4, May 1907, that the title “Congrès Anarchiste International” was finally adopted.

Anarchist or libertarian?

Words are not neutral, and they don't have the same meaning depending on who uses them. We saw above that the name “anarchist” was given to communist-anarchists, followers of Bakunin and Kropotkin, as well as to revolutionary socialists who didn't necessarily identify with the term.

We now find that some anarchists scoff at the International project put forward by libertarian groups, while some anarchist federations respond favorably to it. Let's try to understand what's at stake here.

Once again, Cornelissen gives us a key. In an article written in 1905, he explains why the members of the new Federation of Libertarian Communists of Holland have renounced calling themselves anarchists. “Dutch revolutionaries, for the most part would gladly accept this title; in the country, they are referred to as 'anarchists' by all their opponents. And 22 just as the 'beggars' once gladly accepted the epithet hurled at them by their enemies, none of us would object to the title of anarchist (...). But in Holland we have 'anarchists' of all shades: mystical, Tolstoyan and Christian anarchists; individualist anarchists; so many different fractions which have very little analogy with the aspirations and propaganda tactics of communist revolutionaries”. It was therefore to “further clarify the character of the new movement [that] the promoters of the entente called themselves Libertarian Communists” (118). Throughout his article, he stresses the need to organize the workers' movement in a revolutionary perspective, and castigates the individualist spirit as a factor of disorganization, first of the unions and then of the libertarian and revolutionary movement in Holland (119).

talian libertarian youth also felt the need to relate the title given to the congress to the rejection of individualism, but for them, the use of the term libertarian did not particularly facilitate understanding. Here's what she had to say:

“The term ‘libertarian’, added to this congress, must not give rise to any ambiguity. It is now a fact that the great majority of anarchists are communists (commonly referred to in Italy as socialist-anarchists) and that only a very small number of individuals still profess

an anarchism that is entirely their own and original, (...) that accepts the abstruse definitions of Nietzsche and Stirner without understanding them, and that (...) proclaims its own dogma infallible...". (120) By choosing the adjective libertarian to designate their own federation, the Dutch companions wanted to differentiate themselves from other anarchists. That's why they wanted to organize an international libertarian congress. No doubt they also wanted the congress to be a workers' congress, to encourage the unionists of the NAS to meet other libertarian workers.

The terms "anarchist" and "libertarian", though often synonymous, do not, in this case, cover the same realities. The term anarchist appears to be broader, since it can be applied to individualists, opponents of the organization and its supporters alike. By using it, by convening an anarchist congress, we were casting a wider net, claiming the legitimacy and heritage of the entire movement.

Returning to Dunois's remark, we're willing to admit that the adjective anarchist can be considered more subversive, more prestigious, more revolutionary... but certainly not that it embraces well or embraces better than libertarian. Quite the opposite, for Holland at any rate. Would the anarchist congress live up to the expectations of Dutch libertarians? That's what we'll now try to find out.

The congress

A few words first about the international meeting held the day before the congress, on Sunday August 25, in a public garden. Here, in front of a thousand people, several speakers took the floor. Two of them spoke about the recently concluded "Stuttgart Social Democratic Congress". The Austrian Pierre Ramus (121) showed that "only the anarchists had remained faithful to the cause of revolution" (122), and the Frenchman René de Marmande (123) asserted that the Stuttgart congress was a "bankruptcy", and that "only revolutionary syndicalists and anarchists hold in their hands the force that will create the future" (124). An optimistic statement, given the small crowds who came to listen to the anarchists. In Stuttgart, a public meeting was attended by 60,000 people!

We don't know whether, once again, the anarchists had deliberately set out to measure themselves against their rivals in the Second International. But in any case, despite de Marmande's optimism, the difference in the order of magnitude of the public meetings organized by one side and the other speaks for itself. Yet it would be wrong to conclude that, in 1907, the anarchist is an endangered species. The various reports on the state of the movement, presented at the congress, bear witness to an expanding movement, and almost all refer to syndicalism.

Let's take a look. We've already mentioned the Belgian and Dutch groups. Let's take a look at some of the reports presented on the anarchist movement in other countries. The report on French-speaking Switzerland by Jean Wintsch of Lausanne, read by Amédée Dunois, can be compared with that of the Lausanne revolutionary group published in 1900 by the literary supplement Les Temps Nouveaux. It explained that at the end of the last century, communist-anarchists were no more than a few “old internationalists, lost in the mass of chauvinists” (125). In 1907, the movement appeared to be much more active. Wintsch states that “the Fédération communiste-anarchiste de la Suisse romande has 200 members, almost all of them proletarians (...). Their main activity is therefore spent within the unions [which] have for the last two or three years been following the path of revolutionary syndicalism” (126). The report concludes with an account of the Vaud strikes of March 1907. A “memorable” and spontaneous movement, but one which caught the anarchists unprepared. They found themselves unable to give it “a more accentuated character of social war” (127).

K. Vohryzek from Bohemia points out that “after the French and Spanish movements, our Czech anarchist movement is perhaps the most powerful in Europe” (128). Czech anarchists call themselves “syndicalists”, but for them syndicalism is “only a means of action, not an end”. They see it as “an instrument of anarchist propaganda”. The weavers' and miners' unions in northern Bohemia are under their influence, and “most of these unions double as an anarchist group” (129). After a brief history of their movement, the Americans Max Baginsky and Emma Goldman focus above all on the propaganda work carried out, through various publications, within many émigré communities. Emma Goldman believes that it is partly under the influence of anarchist ideas that “the working class, especially in the West, is tending more and more to abandon the old tradeunionism (...) to follow the path of revolutionary syndicalism” (130).

In Germany, Rudolf Lange presents a movement in full expansion, after a period of stagnation from 1898 to 1904. On the other hand, “revolutionary syndicalism is still in limbo”. Lange pinned his hopes on “localist” unions, i.e. those that did not belong to national craft federations. He hoped that the decision the Social Democrats would take at their next congress would give “the first impetus to a syndicalism modelled on that of the Confédération générale du travail in France” (131). Rudolf Rocker (1873-1958) presents the Jewish anarchist movement in London's East End. First, let's see who Rocker was. He was a German, born into a Catholic family, who learned Yiddish to defend the poorest of the poor, Jewish immigrant workers in England. Born in Mainz, Rocker learned the bookbinding trade. In 1890, he joined the Social Democratic Party, but was soon expelled. In 1891, his journeyman's tour took him to Brussels, where he attended the International

Socialist Congress. It was here that he first became involved with anarchism. Impressed by Domela Nieuwenhuis, he decided to bring back to Germany clandestine pamphlets entrusted to him by German anarchists. His return home was short-lived.

Threatened with arrest following a meeting he had organized for the unemployed, Rocker went into exile in Paris in December 1892. There, he joined the Club des Socialistes Indépendants, a group made up mainly of German exiles. It was here that he befriended Max Baginsky, who passed through Paris before emigrating to the United States, and Jean Wilquet (1866-1940), who like him was originally from Mainz. These three participants in the 1907 congress had known each other for a long time. In 1894, faced with the French police, Rocker went into exile in London, then a haven for many anarchists. There he met Malatesta, Louise Michel... but above all he became involved with the Jewish anarchist movement. It was his companion Milly Witkop who introduced him to this milieu, of which he was to become, somewhat unwillingly, the leader. In Paris, where he visited whenever he could, Rocker immersed himself in revolutionary syndicalist ideas. In London, he put them into practice among Jewish workers. By turns orator, journalist, newspaper and pamphlet editor, Rocker was very active (132).

Let's turn now to Jewish workers in England. Anarchist propaganda began among them in 1886. Originating for the most part from Eastern Russia, their movement developed with the waves of immigrants provoked by the pogroms in Russia. Initially confused with atheism, anarchism developed within their ranks, at the time we're interested in, “the social and revolutionary sides of its doctrine” (133). Rocker cites the influence of the Russian Revolution of 1905. During the events, many companions returned home or financially supported revolutionary action in Russia. Rocker also mentions syndicalism. Between 1904 and 1906, several major strikes launched by Jewish unions were successful. In some cases, the English unions showed solidarity. Of the fourteen Jewish workers' unions in London, eight “are revolutionary, and the influence of the anarchists can be considered preponderant” (134).

Karl Walter presents the English anarchists. They do not constitute a real movement. But there are small, relatively influential groups. Almost all anarchist manual workers belong to trade-unions where, with a few exceptions, they have little influence. In another case, some anarchists, who are also revolutionary syndicalists, refuse to participate in existing trade-unions. They recently set up their own organization, the Union of Direct Actionnists, which brings together eight small unions. Pierre Mougnitch of Belgrade reports on the difficulties faced by Serbian anarchists, noting that they are “trying to implant revolutionary syndicalist ideas in the unions founded by the social democrats” (135).

Nicolas Rogdæf talks about the recent development (in the last five years) of the anarchist movement in Russia. The first is the syndicalist current: the comrades who belong to it have founded workless unions whose aim is to force the government to provide work, and who employ direct action. The second is the anti-syndicalist current: comrades in this current are in favor of organization, but only among anarchists; they don't believe in the workers' movement or the class struggle" (136).

The Italian situation presented by Errico Malatesta is particularly complicated, with comrades divided "into organizers and anti-organizers on the one hand, and syndicalists and anti-syndicalists on the other" (137). Despite this, Malatesta was hopeful, as "the Italian proletariat has always had a taste for revolutionary action" (138). What's more, one of the fractions of the Socialist Party "the one that calls itself syndicalist and anti-statist" should "if it makes sense" (139) join anarchism. The organizers had planned an impressive agenda, and not all the topics on the agenda could be dealt with, due to lack of time or the absence of rapporteurs. This was particularly true of topics such as: modern literature and anarchism; anarchism and religion; anarchism as individual life and activity(140).

Other themes were only broached without the congress being able to reach a decision on the matter, or without being explored in any depth. Such was the case with alcoholism and anarchism; libertarians and the world language (Esperanto); and antimilitarism: a subject on which we shall now say a few words.

Antimilitarism: the Domela Nieuwenhuis incident

The congress opened on Monday August 26. Even before the final agenda was set, an incident occurred. F. Domela Nieuwenhuis requested "that the congress detach from its agenda the part relating to antimilitarism" (141) in order to take part the following Friday in the congress of the International Antimilitarist Association to be held in Amsterdam (of which Domela was general secretary). The minutes tell us that "this proposal aroused considerable emotion, especially among those congressmen who knew that, from the very first day, Domela had set himself up as an adversary of the anarchist congress and had fought it with all his might" (142).

We've already discussed the differences that divide Dutch anarchists. Coming from a man who was then sixty, the intervention made at the start of the congress was no childish provocation. The Dutch organizers of the congress are his adversaries, and his intervention is to be understood in this context. The way in which the anti-militarism congress affair was settled is therefore of interest to us. It sheds light on the central role Malatesta was to play throughout the meeting. Following Domela Nieuwenhuis's intervention, Malatesta

strove to assert the pre-eminence of the anarchist congress, declaring: “Either (...) the [antimilitarist] congress on Friday will bring together only anarchists, and then it will duplicate this one, and I don't see the need for that at all; or non-anarchist elements, even bourgeois and pacifist elements, will also take part in this congress, and then our duty as anarchists is, before we go there, to discuss here among ourselves (...) the question of antimilitarism” (143). Malatesta also succeeded in getting people to admit that the anarchist congress could not prejudge whether or not to take part in the anti-militarist meeting before discussing it.

Yet on the following Friday, Malatesta easily waived the right to an in-depth discussion of antimilitarism, declaring that “all anarchists are in agreement” on the issue (144). And the two congresses met in joint session, despite Cornelissen's reservations that the anarchists should take a stand on the issue after the Stuttgart resolution (145). It has been said that this resolution, “judged by historians to be the most important document in socialist history on the subject of war, proved destined to cover up the profound differences between socialists” (146). The same could undoubtedly be said of the anarchist motion approved without discussion in Amsterdam. This was a very general opposition to “any armed force in the hands of the State: army, gendarmerie, police, magistracy”. All means are used to oppose these institutions: refusal to serve, either individually or collectively, passive and active disobedience, military strikes. And in conclusion, the anarchists “express the hope that all interested peoples will respond to any declaration of war with insurrection. They declare their belief that anarchists will set the example” (147). Ridiculous incantations when we know that, when war comes, anarchists will be completely divided on the attitude to adopt(148).

We wanted to highlight Malatesta's attitude towards Domela Nieuwenhuis and the anti-militarist congress. It testifies to a desire to support the organizers of the anarchist congress while maintaining the unity of the movement. This conciliatory attitude would also apply to the problem of organization, which we shall now address.

On the morning of Tuesday August 27, the agenda included a discussion of the question of syndicalism and anarchism. However, in the absence of English syndicalist John Turner (149), who had been announced as rapporteur on this topic, the congress decided to deal first with the question of organization. Amédée Dunois was asked to present this topic. The aim, as we know, was to form an International. It was therefore necessary to legitimize this project by refuting possible objections. According to Dunois, these could come from two opposing horizons: individualism and syndicalism. To maintain a certain coherence in our presentation, we will deal here only with the conflict between individualism and

organization, as it appears in Dunois' presentation and that of the other speakers. Aspects concerning syndicalism and anarchist organization will be dealt with at a later date.

The debate on organization

Dunois begins by evoking the still recent times when “the majority of anarchists were opposed to any thought of organization” (150). He describes an evolution leading to isolation and individualism. Dunois sees this episode as a kind of deviation from the original anarchist project. Some anarchists, “denying any reality to the class struggle, agreed to see in today's society only antagonisms of opinion...” (151). Dunois was a proponent of class struggle. For him, anarchism stems from the workers' movement, from the First International. It is “one of the modalities of revolutionary socialism. What it denies, therefore, is not organization (...), but government (...). Anarchism is not individualistic; it is federalist, 'associationist', first and foremost. It could be defined as integral federalism” (152). Dunois criticizes the anarchists for trying to build their own ideology, when they would have done better to remain “an abstract protest against the opportunist and authoritarian tendencies of social democracy” (153). In conclusion, he attributes the crisis facing anarchism (especially in France) to a lack of organization. This is why, in his view, the aim of anarchists must be to unite “around a program of practical action” (154), not all those who claim to be anarchists, but all those who are ready to work together.

In the debate that followed Dunois's speech, we didn't discuss his arguments, nor his conception of anarchism, nor the possible program or practicalities of an international anarchist organization, but one particular point, that of voting. One of the participants, the Belgian Georges Thornar, raised a question of principle. He declared himself opposed to any ballot and asked the congress to recognize that he had acted unreasonably the previous day in voting on Domela Nieuwenhuis's proposal... In the end, it was agreed that voting was not a decision-making process, but merely a means of ascertaining the importance of the opinions present. A poll, we would say today.

On Tuesday afternoon, the floor is given to the individualist H. Croiset from Amsterdam. His presentation gives a fairly good idea of the gulf that then divided individualist anarchists and those in favor of organization. Croiset begins his demonstration with a definition of anarchy, not anarchism as Dunois had done. According to him, anarchy is “a social state in which the individual finds the guarantee of his complete freedom (...) in which the individual is allowed to live without restrictions of any kind” (155). Croiset's motto is “moi, moi, moi... et les autres ensuite!” (156). Opposition to all permanent organization, a return to a supposedly ancient purity of ideas - this is Croiset's credo.

Becoming practical, getting organized? It's a “vain ambition” that can only lead anarchists to “reconciliation with authority itself” (157).

The speeches of the following speakers deal with the possibilities of reconciling individual freedom and organization, and it would be tedious to analyze here all the nuances of the opinions expressed on the subject. We must, however, focus on Malatesta's closing remarks, in which he makes a skilful attempt both to impose the principle of organization and to bring everyone together.

Malatesta first claims that the whole debate is just a quarrel about words and that “on the very substance of the question (...) everyone agrees” (158), because in practice the anti-organizers organize, sometimes even better than the others! He also says that “it happens that much more effective authoritarianism is to be found in groups which loudly proclaim the ‘absolute freedom of the individual’, than in those which are ordinarily regarded as authoritarian because they have an office and take decisions” (159), and ends his speech with the need to form an Anarchist International. This would be achieved, at least on paper, the following day.

Malatesta's extremely conciliatory attitude is confirmed by what he wrote about this debate: “There were comrades (mainly Creuze (sic) from Amsterdam) who insisted on the rights of the individual, on free initiative and the dangers of the oppression of the individual by the collectivity, and there were some (mainly Dunois) who insisted on (sic) the idea of solidarity, cooperation, organization. But the differences depended only on the point of view from which each speaker stood, and I was unable to discover any fundamental dissension in what was said. And such must have been the impression of all the congressmen, if we may judge by the favorable reception I received when I pointed out this general agreement” (160).

Well, we're not so sure that Malatesta really believed in the inexistence of fundamental dissension. In any case, there was one participant who could hardly have been convinced by Malatesta's sleight of hand. And this man was very close to him: Luigi Fabbri (161).

In anticipation of the Italian anarchist congress in Rome (June 16-20, 1907) and the one we're dealing with here, Luigi Fabbri had drawn up a report on anarchist organization. In it, he asserted the impossibility of agreement between the supporters of organization, of which he was a member, and the individualists. “...the division that exists on this point among anarchists is much deeper than we think (...). I say this in response to the good friends of agreement at all costs who say: 'We don't have a problem with method! The idea is the same, the goal is the same; we are therefore united without tearing ourselves apart

over a minor disagreement on tactics'. And, on the contrary, I realized long ago that we were tearing ourselves apart precisely because we are too close, and artificially so. Beneath the apparent veneer of a community of three or four ideas - abolition of the state, abolition of private property, revolution, anti-parliamentarianism - there is an enormous difference (...). The difference is such that we cannot take the same road without quarrelling, without 28 neutralizing each other's work, (...) without each renouncing what he believes to be the truth"(162).

Why was Malatesta, who was necessarily aware of existing oppositions, so keen to ensure the unity, or at least the appearance of unity, of the anarchist movement? This is what we shall now try to explain.

Jean Maitron wrote that, at the 1907 congress, Malatesta “appeared as the vigilant guardian of pure anarchist doctrine”(163). Perhaps a majority of participants had this impression. An impression that the dean(164) of the congress undoubtedly wanted to convey. However, it would be wrong to believe that there was a pure anarchist doctrine at the time and that Malatesta was its receptacle. Let's see who Malatesta was and what his ideas were at the time.

Malatesta

Errico Malatesta (1853 - 1932) was born in the Naples area. His parents belonged to the middle class. A precocious rebel, an anti-monarchist letter written to King Victor Emmanuel earned him his first arrest at the age of fourteen. He finished high school in 1869 and began medical studies, which he never completed. The following year, his parents died, and he lived under the guardianship of an aunt who gave him a great deal of freedom. After the events of the Paris Commune, he joined the Neapolitan section of the International, quickly becoming its secretary. In September 1872, in Zurich, he met Bakunin for the first time. With Bakunin, he took part in various meetings to form the Alliance of Socialist Revolutionaries. He also attended the Saint-Imier congress.

This first stay in Switzerland was the start of a series of journeys between Italy, Switzerland and Spain... to propagate and support the theses of the anti-authoritarian International, and to find support for an insurrectionary movement in Italy, which Malatesta considered imminent. After the aforementioned attempt in Benevento, the first period of exile began for the former medical student(165). In Egypt, Syria, France, Switzerland, Romania, Belgium... everywhere in Europe he was expelled. He finally found asylum in London in 1881, but he didn't stay there for long. Whenever the oppressed rose up in revolt, whenever an insurrection seemed imminent, he came to the rescue. In the

summer of 1882, for example, he was in Egypt where, with other Italian comrades, he tried to take part in Arabï Pacha's insurrection.

In 1885, he left for Argentina, where he lived until 1889. In Argentina, he carried out intense propaganda work among Italian immigrants, in particular through the publication of the periodical Questione Sociale. He also took part in the formation of the first Argentine workers' organizations.

On his return to Europe, he became an ardent supporter of anarchist organization. The periodical he began publishing in Nice in September 1889 bore the evocative title L'Associazione. “For Malatesta, the immediate objective was the formation of an anarchist-revolutionary socialist party. He believed that a libertarian-revolutionary International uniting revolutionary anarchist elements of all tendencies would be useful and possible"(166). But Malatesta was expelled from France and his project, which ran counter to the anti-organizing spirit of French anarchists, went almost unnoticed.

Malatesta was opposed to the spontaneism inspired by Kropotkin's theories, which dominated much of the movement at the time. He had first met Kropotkin in Switzerland in 1879. He later met up with him again in London and became friends, despite a major theoretical difference between them. Both were anarchist communists, but Kropotkin's hopes lay above all in Science, while Malatesta's lay in activism, in willpower above all. In an article written in 1925, Malatesta summed up his differences with Kropotkin. Here are a few excerpts: “Kropotkin, trying to ‘give Anarchy its place in modern science’, thinks that ‘Anarchy is a conception of the universe, based on the mechanical interpretation of phenomena, which embraces the whole of nature, including the life of society. This is philosophy (...) it is neither science nor Anarchism (...). Anarchy (...) is a human aspiration which is not founded on any natural necessity, real or supposed, and which may or may not be achieved by the will of man. It benefits from the means that science places within man's reach (...) it can benefit from the progress of philosophical thought (...) but it cannot be confused, on pain of absurdity, either with science or with a philosophical system"(167).

Malatesta thought that Kropotkin's optimism was unrealistic. Creative spontaneity, mutual support, abundance at hand were not, for Malatesta, palpable elements that could be counted on when revolution broke out. For many years, Malatesta would periodically criticize Kropotkin's theses, carefully avoiding any reference to their author, as he wanted to avoid divergences leading to a split. According to Nettlau, there was a tacit agreement between the two men not to weaken the movement by emphasizing their disagreements(168). The split did not occur until 1914, over the war.

During a propaganda tour of the United States in 1899, Malatesta explained his strategy. In Paterson, New Jersey, where he stayed during the summer of 1899, he declared in a lecture “that if revolution broke out in Italy, anarchy might not be able to impose itself, but the anarchists would be faced with a weak government (...) upon which a whole series of obstacles could be imposed: refusal of military service, tax and rent strikes, labor disputes”(169). To overthrow the monarchy, Malatesta envisaged allying himself with the socialists or even the republicans. A program published at the time(170) summarized his ideas.

In this program, Malatesta first expressed his voluntarist credo. According to him, “the greater part of the evils that afflict men derive from bad social organization (...). [However] men, by their will and knowledge, can make them disappear"(171). For Malatesta, the anarchist project is above all an ethical one. Anarchists reject the struggle of all against all, and want to give mankind “a solution by replacing hatred with love, competition with solidarity”(172).

Historically, men “have disregarded the advantages that could result for all from cooperation and solidarity”(173), leading to the present state “where a few men hereditarily own the land and all social wealth”(174). But even more than the possession of material goods, it is the possession of power that poses a problem for humanity. For the anarchist Malatesta, government is not a mere superstructure in the hands of capitalists. It is “a special class (...) which, provided with the material means of repression (...) uses (...) the strength it possesses, to arrogate privileges to itself and, if it can, to subject even the class of owners to its supremacy”(175). For him, it is therefore essential to abolish government, because “if capitalist exploitation were destroyed, and the governmental principle preserved, then government (...) would not fail to re-establish a new capitalism. Unable to satisfy everyone, the government would need an economically powerful class to support it, 30 in exchange for the legal and material protection it would receive from it. Privileges cannot therefore be abolished, and liberty and social equality definitively established, without putting an end (...) to the institution of government itself."(176)

From this certainty flows the strategy he proposes. The first task of anarchists is propaganda. People must be persuaded, because happiness and freedom cannot be imposed. But propaganda is not enough, because the government won't let itself be stripped of its power without reacting. That's why violent confrontation is inevitable. According to Malatesta, this is the strategy that anarchists must adopt: “When we have sufficient strength, we must, taking advantage of favorable circumstances that arise, or provoking them ourselves, make the social revolution: forcibly bring down the

government, forcibly expropriate the landlords, pool the means of subsistence and production, and prevent new rulers from imposing their will and opposing the social reorganization carried out directly by those concerned. “(177)

For Malatesta, “victorious insurrection is the most effective means of popular emancipation, because (...) the distance between the law (which is always lagging behind) and the level of civic-mindedness attained by the mass of the population can be bridged in a single leap. Insurrection determines revolution, i.e. the rapid activity of latent forces accumulated during the preceding evolution [but] everything depends on what the people are capable of wanting"(178). Insurrection is a necessary but not sufficient step towards anarchy. A propitious moment during which anarchists can perhaps, if they have the strength, if they are numerous enough, impose their views. If, after the insurrection, the anarchists fail to convince the majority, they will still have to apply their ideas as far as possible, i.e.: “not to recognize the new government, to keep resistance alive, to ensure that the communes, where our ideas are received with sympathy, reject all government interference and continue to live in their own way” (179). Malatesta added: “We don't know whether anarchy and socialism will triumph in the next revolution; (...) we will have the influence on events that our numbers, our energy, our intelligence and our intransigence will give us; and, even if we are defeated, our work will not have been in vain, since, the more determined we are to achieve the realization of our entire program, the less government and property will exist in the new society” (180).

Both before and after the insurrectionary stage, Malatesta believes that everything can be done to raise people's consciousness. What's needed is for the action to be produced by the will of the protagonists, and also under the direct influence of the anarchists, who must be active, who must rely on the combativeness of the people to get their ideas adopted.

“We must not wait until we can achieve anarchy; and, in the meantime, limit ourselves to pure and simple propaganda. If we do so, we will soon have exhausted our field of action (...). And, even if the transformations of the environment were to raise new popular strata to the possibility of conceiving new ideas, this would take place without our work, even against it, and therefore to the detriment of our ideas. We must seek to ensure that the people, in their totality and in their various fractions, demand, impose and realize themselves, all the improvements, all the freedoms they desire (...) always propagating our integral program...”. (181)

To this ambitious strategy, based on voluntarism, activism, the power of ideas and the aspiration to freedom, all active anarchists, even the most extravagant (182), could be useful. Malatesta, who had remained in the movement for over twenty years, despite his

differences with Kropotkin, despite the hostility his association projects had met with, undoubtedly understood the impatience of his young supporters. But he also knew that there were many undecideds, militants who were not very favorable to organization, but who were not totally opposed either. This was the case, for example, with Emma Goldman, Max Baginsky and Pierre Ramus who, during the congress, opposed the formation of an international bureau. Malatesta tried to reassure them. The Anarchist International is “only a moral link, an affirmation of the desire for solidarity and common struggle”. The bureau that has been appointed is of “only secondary importance”(183).

It now remains to be seen why this unity, which had been achieved, at least officially, on the subject of organization, could not be achieved on the subject of unionism.

The debate on syndicalism

The presentation of the discussion on “syndicalism and anarchism” begins with these words: “Wednesday August 28 - Evening session. The vast Plancius room is literally packed (...) Comrade Pierre Monatte of Paris, member of the committee of the Confédération générale du travail, takes the floor...” (184).

Monatte

Before outlining the main points of the speech he was to deliver to the congress and the large Dutch audience that had come to hear him, let's briefly introduce Pierre Monatte. In 1907, he was twenty-six years old. He had been active in the trade union movement for four or five years. Although of modest origins (he was the son of a blacksmith), Monatte had obtained his baccalaureate. From 1899 to 1902, he worked as a college repetiteur (pion as he called himself) in several towns in northern France. During this period, he was an avid reader of anarchist publications. College life didn't suit him, so in 1902 he moved to Paris, where he was hired by the bookshop of the journal Pages libres. It was there that he met Emile Pouget and Alphonse Merrheim. From then on, Monatte was a very active militant. He helped found the bookshop employees' union, took part in the activities of the Etudiants Socialistes Révolutionnaires Internationalistes (ESRI), and contributed to Les Temps Nouveaux and Le Libertaire. In 1904, he became a printer's proofreader. That same year, Emile Pouget invited him to join the CGT confederal committee, as a representative of the Bourg-en-Bresse labor exchange(185). In 1905, he moved to Lens, where he replaced the imprisoned Benoît Broutchoux as editor of the weekly Action syndicale. He returned to Pas-de-Calais in March 1906, after the Courrières mining disaster. For Monatte, the strike, demonstrations and riots that followed the tragedy must have been a kind of baptism by fire for workers' combativeness. He was even arrested during a

confrontation with the troops and accused of collusion with the Bonapartists (186). These recent events give us an idea of his state of mind at the time of the congress. He himself explained the circumstances that led him to Amsterdam.

“I had wandered around quite a bit in the last few years: 1905, in Pas-de-Calais (...) 1906 for the miners' strike after the Courrières disaster, (...) in Béthune prison for the conspiracy affair; 1907, in Amsterdam, for the international anarchist congress, where Cornelissen had dragged me along for lack of being able to take along otherwise well-known CGT anarchists, like Pouget or Yvetot.” (187)

In other words, we are dealing with a young activist, here to replace well-known personalities who were unable to attend. Monatte was not one of the organizers of the congress; he was the CGT “representative” invited to the congress. Cornelissen had to fall back on him, for want of anything better (188).

In his speech, Monatte outlined revolutionary syndicalism: “the doctrine that makes the union the organ, and the general strike the means, of social transformation” (189). He begins by specifying that revolutionary syndicalism, “unlike the socialism and anarchism that preceded it” (190), asserts itself above all through deeds and not theories, which is why Monatte proposes to “make the facts speak for themselves” (191). He declares that revolutionary syndicalism revives the anti-authoritarian wing of the First International, from which it borrows the idea of federation and the general strike. He recalls the influence of militants such as Pelloutier, Delesalle and Pouget, who are symbols of the anarchists' evolution towards the workers' movement, militants who contributed to the formation of the revolutionary syndicalist doctrine, and helped it adopt the tactics that make it so original, such as boycotts and sabotage.

While insisting on what French syndicalism has in common with anarchism: federalism, autonomy, direct action, anti-parliamentarianism, the revolutionary project... Monatte declares that this is not anarchism. Like the Charte d'Amiens, he asserts that the CGT has no doctrine, that it tolerates all tendencies within its ranks, while remaining autonomous from parties. From the Socialist Party, of course, but also from anarchists. The union must be politically neutral. The principle is “a single union per profession and per town” (192). With the single union, class struggle is no longer hampered “by the squabbles of rival schools or sects” (193). Henceforth, “the working class, now of age, intends at last to be self-sufficient and no longer to rely on anyone else for its own emancipation” (194).

As for the anarchists, they had to abandon “the ivory tower of philosophical speculation” (195) to join the trade union movement and make the French trade union experience

known throughout the world. They had to oppose this neutral syndicalism to syndicalism of opinion, even to Russian anarchist unions. As if to forestall future criticism, Monatte concludes his demonstration by mentioning certain imperfections, such as union functionarism. There are union officials who “no longer hold their positions to fight for their ideas, but because there is an assured livelihood there” (196). Yet unions often cannot do without permanent staff. Monatte relies on critical thinking to correct such shortcomings.

Monatte claimed to “make the facts speak for themselves”. Does his personal experience as a trade unionist bear him out? On one central point at least, the answer is no. Among the miners of Pas-de-Calais, there is not “a single union per profession and per town”. In France, mining unionism has been divided since 1902. On the one hand, there was the majority reformist Fédération nationale des mineurs, which did not belong to the CGT, and on the other, the Union générale des mineurs, which did. In 1906, the two entities agreed in principle to reunite within the CGT. In most regions, the local unions belonged en bloc to one or other of the two organizations, and reunification posed no problem. But in the Pas-de-Calais region, the two rival unions are engaged in a merciless battle.

The “old union”, a member of the Fédération Nationale, was the more powerful. It was headed by Emile Basly, deputy mayor of Lens, a millerandist Socialist who was very opposed to the CGT. Over the years, Basly transformed the “old union” into an electoral committee at the service of his political career.

Opposite him was the “young union”, a member of the Union générale and therefore of the CGT, headed by Benoît Broutchoux (1879-1944), who accompanied Monatte to Amsterdam. Broutchoux experienced the chaotic life of revolutionary proletarians at the turn of the century. First a carter on a farm, then a miner in Montceaux-les-Mines, direct action was not an empty word for him. His revolt against the state and employers landed him in prison on several occasions. At the end of 1902, he went to Lens, where he took part in the formation of the “young union”, a Guedist initiative that rapidly evolved into revolutionary syndicalism. In 1903, Broutchoux became editor of the “young union” periodical Réveil syndical, which later became Action syndicale. From 1906 to 1908, he ran a café in Lens and, having bought a small printing works, he and Georges Dumoulin edited and printed l'Action syndicale, a weekly with a print run of between 3,500 and 5,000 copies, and sometimes as many as 12,000(197). According to Monatte, Broutchoux's anarchism “was not doctrinaire. It was made up of syndicalism, anti-parliamentarianism, free thought, free love, neo-Malthusianism and a lot of gouaille"(198).

During the Courrière strike, the “young union” experienced a real boom, which seriously threatened the “old union”. It “was able to count on a membership of over 1,500” (199), but the battle was not won. The “old union” is certainly not very active, but it has a much larger base, estimated at 6,000 or 7,000 members (200). Like Broutchoux at the Amsterdam congress, we can certainly hope that “the evolution taking shape (...) in working-class circles” (201) will continue in a revolutionary direction. In the Pas-de-Calais region, however, this was not to be. In the summer of 1908, the National Miners' Federation joined the CGT by surprise. For the revolutionary syndicalists in Lens, it was the coup de grâce. The “young union” survived for just over a year, with an increasingly theoretical membership” (202). “On October 2, 1910, Action syndicale, which had returned to pure anarchism, announced that it was merging with Combat, an anarchist newspaper from Arras, to form Le Révolté.” (203)

Monatte makes no mention of the difficulties he may have encountered in Lens. His discourse is ideological. He presents syndicalism not as it is, with all its contradictions and difficulties, but as the revolutionary syndicalist leaders of the CGT would like it to be. It was impossible for him, in 1907, to think, or at least to admit, that an evolution different from that envisaged by the doctrine could occur.

Malatesta's reply

Of all the reactions to Monatte's speech, Malatesta's was the most consistent, but also the most difficult to understand.

Malatesta begins his speech by making it clear that he supports workers' organization and action. But he rejects the idea that “trade unionism is self-sufficient”. For him, trade unionism is not the “necessary and sufficient means of social revolution” (204). Malatesta suggests clarifying the concepts. In his opinion, it would be more accurate to speak of the workers' movement than of trade unionism. The labor movement is “a fact”, while syndicalism is “a doctrine”.

Malatesta advocates the unity and neutrality of the labor movement. On this point, he is absolutely categorical.

“I'm not asking for anarchist unions, which would immediately legitimize social-democratic, royalist republican or other unions and would, at most, be good at dividing the working class more than ever against itself. I don't even want so-called red unions, because I don't want so-called yellow unions. On the contrary, I want unions that are broadly open to all workers without distinction of opinion, unions that are absolutely neutral.” (205)

Malatesta has a dualist conception of the revolutionary movement. For him, the workers' movement is certainly the revolutionary subject, but it must have a driving force at its heart that pulls it in the desired direction. This engine is the anarchists. Anarchists must see the workers' movement as “a fertile ground for revolutionary propaganda” (206). In their revolutionary perspective, “syndicalism [is] an excellent means of action because of the workers‘ forces it places at [the anarchists’] disposal” (207). Unions will also be useful after the revolution. “...anarchists must join workers' unions (...) because this is the only way for us to have at our disposal, when the time comes, groups capable of taking the direction of production into their own hands...” (208).

But although he assigns important objectives to the trade union movement in his revolutionary strategy, Malatesta gives a most depressing description of it: “trade unionism is and will never be anything but a legalistic and conservative movement, with no other attainable goal - and even then! - than the improvement of working conditions” (209). This apparent contradiction is based on Malatesta's conception of class struggle, which is very different from that of revolutionary syndicalists. To illustrate this, let's compare Malatesta's words with those of revolutionary syndicalists of socialist persuasion at the same time.

At an international conference on the relationship between syndicalism and socialism, held in Paris on April 3, 1907, Arturo Labriola declared: “We have neither dogmas nor ready-made ideals to realize. The only reality we recognize is the existence of class struggle” (210). Hubert Lagardelle was to clarify this point of view in the foreword to the proceedings of this conference, directly attacking the anarchists: ”Anarchist socialism, despite its daring revolts, has not had a clear conception of classes and class struggle. In its ignorance of economic matters, it has addressed itself to all men indiscriminately, and has focused its main effort on individual reform through the illusory process of literary, rationalist and scientific education (...). Syndicalism, on the other hand, grasps the working class in its combat formations. It sees it as the only class that can, through the conditions of its life and the affirmations of its conscience, renew the world (...) the class struggle is perfect. None of the traditional values can survive this work of progressive destruction. We are truly faced with a class that uses only its acquisitions and is driven by a formidable will to power. It intends to be the sole architect of its own destiny, with no protector but itself. Where can you find a more active revolutionary force?” (211)

In Malatesta's eyes, the syndicalist revolutionary conception of class struggle is simplistic. For him, what makes the capitalist system unique is not a fundamental contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, but the struggle of all against all, “the universal competition that derives from the regime of private property” (212). He rejects

“the notion that the economic interests of all workers - of the working class - are interdependent, the notion that it is enough for workers to take up the defense of their own interests to defend at the same time the interests of the whole proletariat against the bosses” (213). Malatesta even rejects the concept of the working class. Like the bourgeoisie, the working class has no unity, and is crisscrossed by differences of interest. “There are therefore no classes, in the true sense of the word, since there are no class interests. Within the working “class” itself, as with the bourgeoisie, there is competition and struggle. The economic interests of one category of workers are irreducibly opposed to those of another.” (214) Unable to rely on the convergence of economic interests, “solidarity, in today's society, can only be the result of communion within the same ideal” (215).

The complexity of Malatesta's thinking lies in his insistence on the idealistic content of the revolutionary project, his denial of the notion of a homogeneous class, but his rejection of the principle of working-class struggle. The workers' movement is “a fact”, he says, but a reformist fact in essence. Since it occurs within the system, it cannot transform it. “Syndicalism, I say, even if it's adorned with the adjective revolutionary, can only be a legal movement, a movement that fights against capitalism in the economic and political environment that capitalism and the state impose on it. It therefore has no way out, and will be unable to achieve anything permanent and general, except by ceasing to be trade unionism, and by focusing no longer on improving the conditions of wage earners and winning a few freedoms, but on the expropriation of wealth and the radical destruction of statist organization.” (216) Anarchists must participate in the workers' movement, the trade unions, in order to transform it. “It is the role of anarchists to awaken the unions to the ideal, orienting them little by little towards social revolution...” (217)

But paradoxically, Malatesta, based on his knowledge of the international trade union movement, describes an evolution that goes in the opposite direction. To prove that trade unionism is not revolutionary, he refers to “the great North American unions [which] after showing themselves to be radical revolutionaries when they were still weak (...) became, as they grew in strength and wealth, distinctly conservative organizations”(218). Corporatist organizations hostile to “this ever-growing proletariat of the workless, who do not count for syndicalism [and whom] we anarchists (...) must defend because they are the worst sufferers” (219).

On another point, Malatesta's opinion is quite astonishing. He seized on Monatte's remark about union officials. On this point, he issued a categorical judgment. “General rule: the

anarchist who accepts to be the permanent, salaried functionary of a union is lost for propaganda, lost for anarchism!"(220)

Yet Malatesta is not opposed to the very principle of the union permanent. “An anarchist who is a permanent, stipendiary functionary of a trade union is a man lost as an anarchist. I'm not saying that sometimes he can't do some good; but it's a good that men of less advanced ideas would do in his place and better than him, whereas he to win and keep his job must sacrifice his personal opinions.” (221) This idea would remain his throughout his life. The union is reformist, but within it anarchists must remain pure, must be and remain revolutionaries. That's why certain tasks are forbidden to them. In 1925, for example, he wrote: “If it's really necessary to compromise, to give in, to come to impure contacts with the authorities and the bosses in order to keep the organization alive, or because the union members feel the need to do so, or because that's what they want to do, so be it. But let the others do it, not the anarchists” (222).

This strategy would appear to be difficult to put into practice. It's a bit like asking anarchists to walk in the mud without getting their feet dirty. How can you have any credibility in a union if you leave the responsibilities and conduct of negotiations to other political currents? Malatesta's point of view can be explained in two ways. Firstly, he was not a real trade unionist. Did he ever work for a wage-earner? We don't know. His biographers describe him in turn as an apprentice mechanic to an old comrade, a gold digger in Argentina, a sweet-seller on the streets of London, a mechanic or electrician again in his own workshop... But perhaps that's not the point.

Monatte is not wrong when he attributes to him “the old ideas of Blanquism”(223). Malatesta was above all an insurrectionist. His strategy of subverting the labor movement can only be explained in this way. It is in this context that we need to understand his comments on the general strike. The general strike is “an excellent means of opening up social revolution” (224), but it is not a sufficient means. Striking workers will die of hunger after a few days, or they'll have to fight the troops for food, and “it will be insurrection, and victory will go to the strongest” (225). This is why Malatesta calls for “this inevitable insurrection” (226).

It should be noted in passing that the concept of the general strike that Malatesta criticizes is not that of revolutionary syndicalism. In 1892, Pelloutier and Briand had imagined a pacifist general strike. But by 1894, at the Nantes congress, Pelloutier had abandoned this idea. The movement he described in 1895, in his brochure Qu'estce que la grève générale? - was certainly not an insurrection, but an active expropriation movement (227). Revolutionary syndicalists rejected insurrection against central power, which was too easy

to suppress militarily, and imagined a movement that would attack all the nerve centers of society. A multi-faceted mobilization during which workers take ownership of their production tools. This concept did not rule out violent confrontation(228). The anti-militarist propaganda to which some of them devoted themselves (Yvetot, for example) also aimed to neutralize the army.

It's hard to imagine that Malatesta, who was with Pelloutier at the London Congress in 1896, ignored him. Was it worth arguing with the revolutionary syndicalists over a minor difference of opinion concerning the degree of violence required at the moment of revolutionary conflagration?

In our opinion, the problem arose above all on a practical level. For Malatesta, based on the Italian situation, but no doubt also on the Russian events of 1905, the material preparation of the confrontation was urgent. If the best journeymen devoted most of their energy to union activity, who then would take charge of "the special and delicate measures to which the great mass is more often than not unfit"(229). In other words, Malatesta and his followers needed determined and organized militants "to act, in due course, as a revolutionary initiative"(230).

To have any chance of success, Malatesta's strategic conception presupposed the existence of a pre-revolutionary situation, on the one hand, and of "an anarchist organization based on a theory and practice common to all militants"(231), on the other. While the first condition may have been met in different countries, at different times, the second was, as we have seen, a figment of the imagination. One could well imagine, as the Austrian Siegfried Nacht did, that "the masses, in the future revolution, will constitute, as it were, the infantry of the revolutionary army [and the] anarchist groups, specialized in technical tasks (...) the artillery"(232), but one still needed something other than an artillery that fired haphazardly in all directions.

At the same time, Lenin was also thinking in military terms, but he had conceived the idea of a centralized general staff. When the time came, some anarchists would draw the necessary conclusions... and join the Communist Party. But let's stay with 1907, the Amsterdam Congress.

A discordant voice

Despite their open differences, Monatte's revolutionary syndicalist and Malatesta's insurrectionist conceptions converged on the notions of unity and neutrality of the workers' movement. Monatte's view was that syndicalism should evolve in a revolutionary direction

everywhere, as in France, and Malatesta's was that the organized labor movement was an excellent springboard for his revolutionary project.

In Amsterdam, however, a discordant voice, somewhat unnoticed, was heard. This voice suggested that there is no such thing as a single labor movement, or trade unionism, which is either reformist or revolutionary in essence, but rather that we should speak of trade unionism in the plural.

In his brief intervention, Cornelissen said he had “no disapproval whatsoever of Monatte's speech”(233), but he did express reservations about syndicalism. For him, it was not revolutionary in itself. Cornelissen was particularly critical of the principle of direct action. It can be used for revolutionary purposes, in which case anarchists must support it, but it can also be used “for conservative, even reactionary purposes”(234).

There is an ethical content to Cornelissen's syndicalist conception that seems absent from both revolutionary syndicalist doctrine and Malatesta's theories. In both these conceptions, the action of making demands is, as such, in the direction of emancipation. The idea of “revolutionary gymnastics” developed by Pouget can be found in Malatesta's work. Here's what he had to say about it in his 1899 “program”: “Whatever the practical results of the struggle for immediate improvements, their principal utility lies in the struggle itself. (...) If they [the workers] succeed in obtaining what they want, they will live better. They will earn more, they will work less, they will have more time and strength to think about the things that interest them; they will suddenly feel greater desires and needs. If they don't succeed, they will be led to study the causes of their failure and recognize the need for greater union, greater energy; and they will finally understand that to win surely and definitively, capitalism must be destroyed(235). The cause of revolution, the cause of the moral elevation of workers and of their emancipation can only gain from the fact that workers unite and fight for their interests"(236)

For revolutionary syndicalists, direct action leads the proletariat in an almost mechanical movement towards revolution. For Malatesta, it emancipates the workers by making them take charge of their own lives; this makes them likely to join the anarchist “party” and thus make up the numbers when it comes to bringing down the government, expropriating landlords and opposing any reorganization of authority.

Cornelissen's knowledge of the syndicalist phenomenon is far more detailed than that of Monatte or Malatesta. He illustrates his reservations about syndicalism with the example of the Amsterdam and Antwerp diamond merchants, who used direct action to defend their corporatist interests. He refers to English or American trade-unions, which defend the

interests of their members against unskilled or foreign workers. He declares that anarchists cannot approve of “the typos in France and Switzerland [who] refuse to work with women”(237). For Cornelissen, the value of trade unionism is measured not only by its combativeness, but also by its content, and on this content anarchists are entitled to make value judgments.

Malatesta would later come closer to Cornelissen's point of view. In 1922, he wrote: “...trade unions do not lead naturally, by their own intrinsic force, to the emancipation of man (...). I believe that they can produce evil as well as good; that they can be, today, organs of social conservation as well as social transformation, and serve, tomorrow, reaction as well as revolution; depending on whether they limit themselves to their proper role, which is to defend the current interests of their members, or whether they are animated and worked by the anarchist spirit which makes them forget interests in favor of ideals"(238).

To conclude the debate on syndicalism, four motions were drafted by various participants; “despite their obvious contradictions”(239), all four were adopted, each having obtained a majority of votes. The voting method chosen: successive votes on each text, so as not to stifle the minority.

These motions are not intended to be strategic, but rather to be recommendations and declarations of principle. Reading them, you get the feeling that each writer has made a point of mentioning his or her main concerns. It's as if everyone is pulling the wool over everyone else's eyes. This is most evident in the first motion drafted by Cornelissen, Vohryzek and Malatesta, where we are told who the author of each paragraph is.

Malatesta endeavors to summarize the theses he has defended in his intervention by stating that: “anarchists consider the syndicalist movement and the general strike as powerful revolutionary means, but not as substitutes for the Revolution” and that “anarchists believe that the destruction of capitalist and authoritarian society can only be achieved by armed insurrection and violent expropriation”(240). Like the drafters of other motions, Cornelissen reiterated that anarchists should form the revolutionary element of the unions, insisting that they should only support demonstrations of “direct action” “in the direction of the transformation of society”(241).

Dunois' motion, countersigned by Monatte and a few others, took up the main arguments of revolutionary syndicalism. It emphasized class struggle, the absence of doctrinaire preoccupations for union organization, and the transformation of the union into a producer

group in future society. However, two new elements that had not been debated at the congress appeared in the motions.

Speaking of the means to be employed to achieve the emancipation of the proletariat, Raphæl Friedeberg opposes the means advocated by Marxist socialism. This means parliamentarianism, but also the reformist trade union movement, because “these two means can only favor the development of a new bureaucracy”(242). On the other hand, Cornelissen considers the possibility of union pluralism. He does so with great caution, presenting it as an exception to the rule. “...the Congress, while admitting the possible need for the creation of particular revolutionary syndicalist groupings, recommends that comrades support general syndicalist organizations to which all workers of the same category have access."(243)

This single mention of the possibility of union division must be set against the two ‘strictly private’ meetings held by the revolutionary syndicalists present at the congress, which the document tells us about in the appendix.

This is a reprint of an article by Dunois published in La Voix du Peuple de Lausanne(244) in which we read that “revolutionary syndicalism is making incessant progress in all countries”. It is presented as “a new workers' movement (...) which has nothing in common with the old”(245). As Monatte had defined in his report, and in line with revolutionary syndicalist doctrine, this new movement saw itself as the vanguard of a general evolution. The discussion focused on the possibility of reaching agreement “without worrying about the laggards”(246).

The participants in these two meetings decided to create an “International Press Bureau” responsible for collecting workers' newspapers from all countries, analyzing them and transcribing important information into a bulletin “sent to all centers and corporate newspapers affiliated to the Bureau”(247). Cornelissen was commissioned to produce this bulletin.

The 1907 congress thus led to the creation of two distinct bodies. The Bureau de Correspondence de l'Internationale Anarchiste, based in London, whose members were Errico Malatesta, the Germans Rudolf Rocker and Jean Wilquet, the Russian Alexandre Schapiro(248) and the Englishman John Turner. And the International Press Bureau, headed by Cornelissen. No mention was made of this de facto split in the congress debates.

Most of the participants in the two private meetings did not fit into the framework defined by Malatesta. They were not militant anarchists trying to subvert a reformist or “neutral” labor movement. But neither, with the exception of the French, are they part of a central

organization like the CGT. Whatever the case, we have no other trade unionists in this congress who can claim to belong to a revolutionary-oriented trade union center that is both majority and politically neutral. Yet, during the sessions of the Anarchist Congress, these syndicalists barely made their voices heard. There was no public discussion of their union orientations or actual practices. Anarchist syndicalism did make itself felt, but nobody really paid much attention to it. The Czech Vohrysek spoke of the miners' and weavers' unions in northern Bohemia being under the direct influence of anarchists. The situation of the Jewish workers' unions in London, described by Rudolf Rocker, is that of a labor movement dominated by anarchists. The Russian Nicolas Rogdæf spoke of laborless unions founded by anarchists. Aristide Ceccarelli, who represents the Argentine journeymen, reported that at the recent congress of the Argentine Regional Workers' Federation (FORA), a large majority approved “the proposal made to the unions to contribute to the propaganda of anarchist communism”(249).

As we have seen, Malatesta participated in the creation of the first Argentine workers' organizations, and we think it is worth saying a few words about the evolution of the Argentine workers' movement, as it runs completely counter to the principle of union neutrality accepted by both Monatte and Malatesta.

In 1901, the country's workers' organizations grouped together to form the Argentine Workers' Federation. In 1902, the social-democratic elements quickly left this federation to form a short-lived General Workers' Union, thus creating the first division in the Argentine labor movement. In 1904, the Federation took the name FORA and adopted clearly libertarian principles. In 1905, a congress recommended that all its members propagate the “economic and philosophical principles of anarchist communism” among workers. FORA prefers to define itself as a workers' resistance organization, rather than a trade union. For its activists, the term “syndicalism” implies ideological neutrality, which they reject. FORA members are grouped by profession or sector of activity, but FORA's action is not limited to the world of work. In 1907, it instigated a major rent strike. Until the '20s, it remained the main organization of the Argentine labor movement, despite fierce repression(250).

On the other hand, we have representatives of minority unions. Such was the case of Fritz Kater, president of the Free Union of German Trade Unions, who came to the anarchist congress specifically with the aim of “achieving in the near future the union of workers' organizations whose goal is the abolition of wage-labor and the general strike as their means”(251). This was also the position of the Englishman Karl Walter of the Industrial Union of Direct Actionists, an organization at odds with the trade-unions. As for the NAS,

the leading Dutch workers' central, we know that it has become a minority organization, but that it continues to exist alongside the social-democratic trade-union central.

For the majority of revolutionary, libertarian and anarchist syndicalists present at the congress, the unity and neutrality of the trade union movement is a myth that is not borne out by the facts. We are dealing with a movement (252) that exists in reality, but has no legitimacy.

Cornelissen's little phrase about this did not go unnoticed. In L'Humanité of September 26, 1907, Louis Niel of the CGT commented: “So here we are, threatened with anarchist unions alongside the general unions”. In response, Action-directe de Liège reported that “despite their differences of opinion on trade unionism, the anarchists unanimously agreed to reject anarchist unions and advocate the formation of purely economic unions. In the minds of the Amsterdam congressmen, it was only a question, we believe, of creating particular revolutionary unions where the general unions are subservient to any political party. And syndicalism is therefore not threatened by anarchist unions"(253).

Cornelissen added that he had already explained to the French syndicalist comrades present at the congress “that they should not think too much about the situation in their own country; that in France, undoubtedly, the tendencies of the unions are revolutionary (there is no question of anarchism) but that it is not the same in other countries: Austria, Germany, England, the United States. In these other countries, a new trade union movement of a revolutionary character may have to be created against a movement with overly conservative tendencies. And it is for this possible work that the Amsterdam congress has asked for the help of anarchist comrades"(254) Behind Cornelissen's modesty and prudence we sense the full weight of the idea of unity of the workers' movement. A man who, since the Zürich congress of 1893, has personally experienced the Second International's sidelining of anti-parliamentarians, finds himself obliged to present the libertarian workers' movement as an exception to the unitary rule.

Monatte's ideas, like Malatesta's, were based more on their own vision of the future than on a precise analysis of the different realities encountered by militants. Unlike Georges Sorel, the general strike or revolution is not a myth for them. They are concrete projects for which an appropriate strategy must be put in place. If there is a myth, it's that of unity: unity of the working class, unity of the workers' movement, unity of the anarchist movement.

Despite his description of the division that exists among the workers, despite his rejection of the notion of the working class, Malatesta cannot envisage a divided workers'

movement, because if he did, the revolutionary project he was building would cease to be credible.

What lessons could the Dutch libertarian activists of the NAS draw from the debate at the Amsterdam anarchist congress? Certainly not to join the reformist labor movement, the social-democratic trade union, and use it as leverage in a hypothetical revolutionary movement, as Malatesta suggested. No more than the militants of the “young union” of Pas-de-Calais miners, the Dutch libertarian syndicalists would join the majority union. Disregarding the ideas and recommendations put forward at the Anarchist Congress, they maintained their own minority trade union center. From a mere 3,250 members in 1906, it exceeded 50,000 by 1920(255).

In the years between the turn of the century and the First World War, in the United States, Latin America, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Sweden, French-speaking Switzerland... revolutionary unions sprang up, most often under the impetus of anarchist workers. A comparative history of these different movements has yet to be written.

Cornelissen published the Bulletin international du mouvement syndicaliste until 1915. The aim of this weekly was “to inform revolutionary syndicalists about the international trade union movement, and it provides invaluable information on the activities of all the revolutionary syndicalist centers throughout the world (...). It also sometimes publishes extracts from the trade union or revolutionary (particularly anarchist) press"(256).

For its part, the Bureau de l'Internationale Anarchiste published a Bulletin de l'Internationale Anarchiste. Initially published monthly, then irregularly, this periodical died out at number 13, in April 1910. Anarchist groups were reluctant to send in articles, despite vibrant appeals from the Correspondence Bureau. The latter noted that, despite its efforts, its bulletin was not “for the anarchist press what the Bulletin international du mouvement syndicaliste of our comrade Cornelissen is for the revolutionary syndicalist press”(257).

A new anarchist congress, initially planned for 1909, was constantly postponed. Finally, the dates August 28 to September 5, 1914 were set, but the war prevented the meeting from taking place. Internationale Anarchiste had come to an end.

In December 1922, two former members of its Correspondence Bureau, Rocker and Schapiro, joined the secretariat of a new anarcho-syndicalist International Workers' Association, thus publicly renouncing the principle of unity and ideological neutrality of the workers' movement. But in the meantime, the war and the Russian revolution of 1917 had reshuffled the deck.

Notes

1. There are numerous works on the Spanish libertarian movement. For an initial approach, one can read in French: José Peirats, Les anarchistes espagnols - Révolution de 1936 et luttes de toujours, Toulouse, Repères-Silena, 1989.
2. According to the recollections of Pierre Monatte in La révolution prolétarienne, no. 347, January 1951, p. 17. If this information is correct, Dunois did not lack humour because, in the report, he quotes his own articles in a completely impersonal way. This modesty can perhaps be attributed to what he considered to be a collective work, written by him of course, but based on notes taken by various people. We know that a certain A. Pratelle had volunteered to take shorthand notes of the congress debates in French and English. See Bulletin de l'Internationale Libertaire, Herstal-Liège, no. 4, May 1907.
3. Although he wrote for an anarchist periodical, Dunois cannot be considered a true libertarian. In 1908, he decided to serve revolutionary syndicalism and contributed to the Bataille syndicaliste, but Marxism, which he had been introduced to in 1905-1906, would then lead him to a crucial choice: in 1912, he joined the SFIO and became a contributor to L'Humanité. Very close to Jaurès, he was at his side on the evening of his assassination. After the war, Dunois rallied to the supporters of the Third International. The Tours Congress brought him to the executive committee of the Communist Party. He was also secretary general of L'Humanité. He left the CP in 1927, to rejoin the SFIO in 1930. He was the driving force behind the clandestine socialist party and its newspaper in the occupied zone during the Second World War. He was arrested by the Gestapo and died in Bergen-Belsen in February 1945. According to the Dictionnaire biographique du mouvement ouvrier français, Tome XII, Paris, Editions ouvrières, 1974, pp. 109
4. Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam, August 1907 — Summary record of the sessions and summary of reports on the state of the movement throughout the world, Paris, La Publication Sociale, M. Delessale, 1908, p. 5.
5. The regional congress of the Union Fédérative du Centre (Paris region) See Madeleine Rebérioux, , in Jacques Droz (ed.), Histoire générale du socialisme, Volume II, Paris, PUF, 1974, p. 153, or Jean Maitron, Le mouvement anarchiste en France, Volume I, Paris, Maspero, 1975, p. 111.
6. Jean Maitron, Le mouvement anarchiste en France, op. cit., p. 56 et seq.
7. Quoted in James Guillaume, L'internationale — Documents et souvenirs, vol. 1 (1864-1872), Geneva, Grounauer, 1980, third part, chapter X, p. 160-161.

8. Resolutions of the General Congress held in The Hague from 2 to 7 September 1872, in Jacques Freymond (ed.), The First International, Geneva, Droz, 1962, Volume II, p. 373.
9. On this subject, see Marianne Enckell, La Fédération Jurassienne, Saint-Imier, Canevas, 1991.
10. Elie Murmain, , L'Œuvre nouvelle, no. 9-10, Dec. 1903-Jan. 1904. Quoted in Jean Maitron, Le mouvement anarchiste en France, op. cit., p. 152.
11. Quoted in Jean Maitron, ibid., p. 114.
12. For a very subtle analysis of the emergence of anarchist individualism at the London congress in 1881, refer to the thesis of Gætano Manfredonia, L'individualisme anarchiste en France (1880-1914), Paris, Institut d'études politiques, 1984, pp. 39-49.
13. Max Baginski (1864-1943) was born in East Prussia. His father, a shoemaker by trade, was a Social Democrat. He himself trained as a shoemaker and subscribed to socialist ideas. A member of the , in 1890 he was the editor-in-chief of the main Social Democratic newspaper in Silesia. Sentenced to two and a half years in prison for press offences, he went into exile as soon as he was released from prison in 1893. In New York, he joined the circle of the famous German anarchist Johann Most and became one of the contributors to Freiheit, Most's newspaper. Baginski wrote mainly satirical articles for it. In 1894, he was appointed editor of the Chicagoer Arbeiter-Zeitung, a socialist daily newspaper that became anarchist under his influence. From then on, he earned his living as a publicist. According to Itinéraire no. 8, 1990, pp. 28-29.
14. Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam..., op. cit., p. 26.
15. Ibid., p. 69.
16. Emma Goldman (1869-1940) was born in Kovno, Lithuania. In 1882, her family moved to Saint Petersburg, where Emma discovered factory life in a textile company. In 1885, she emigrated to the United States, where she also worked in a factory. She learnt the trade of dressmaker. In 1889, after a failed marriage, she moved to New York. There she met Johann Most and Alexandre Berkman, a young Russian who became her companion. After a few months of frequenting anarchist circles, Most sent her on a lecture tour. From then on she devoted herself to this form of propaganda that would make her famous. In 1892, following a massacre of striking workers, Alexander Berkman attempted to kill the director of the firm concerned. The latter survived, but Berkman spent fourteen years in prison. Emma Goldman also experienced prison, in 1893, for having incited the unemployed to revolt at a meeting. In 1895, she spent some time in Vienna and trained as a nurse and midwife, a profession she then practised in the United States while continuing her activism. A committed feminist, she

was one of the pioneers of the fight for birth control. Issue 8 of the magazine Itinéraire is dedicated to her. See also Emma Goldman, Epopée d'une anarchiste, Paris, Hachette, 1979.

17. Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam..., op. cit., p. 97.
18. Daniel Guérin, L'anarchisme — De la doctrine à l'action, Paris, Gallimard, 1965, p. 86.
19. Ronald Creagh, Histoire de l'anarchisme aux Etats-Unis d'Amérique - Les origines : 1826-1886, Grenoble, La pensée sauvage, 1981, p. 215.
20. See Jean Maitron, Dictionnaire biographique du mouvement ouvrier français, (Article Tortelier), Tome XV, op. cit., 1977, p. 241.
21. Quoted in Jean Maitron, Le mouvement anarchiste en France, op. cit., p. 260.
22. On this point, see the thesis of Gætano Manfredonia, L'individualisme anarchiste en France, op. cit.
23. For the authors of the first circular of convocation, mentioned on page 8 of Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam..., op. cit., the 1907 meeting would be the fourth international libertarian and communist congress after Zurich (1893), London (1896) and the international revolutionary workers' congress of Paris (1900) which was banned and to which we will return.
24. Present at the congresses in Brussels (1891), Zurich (1893) and London (1896), and author of a contribution for the banned congress in Paris (1900), Cornélissen (1864-1942) was probably the main organiser of the Amsterdam congress in 1907. In any case, that is what Jean-Yves Bériou claims in F. Domela Nieuwenhuis, Le socialisme en danger, Paris, Payot, 1975, p. 257.
25. Christ. Cornélissen, Les diverses tendances du Parti ouvrier international – A propos de l'ordre du jour du congrès international ouvrier socialiste de Zürich, Brussels, 1893. Facsimile in Congrès international ouvrier socialiste tenu à Zürich du 6 au 12 août 1893, Geneva, Minkoff Repint, 1977, pp. 513-534.
26. Het Kommunistisch Manifest van Karl Marx en Friedrich Engels. Naar de vierde geautoriseerde Duitsche uitgave bewerkt door C. Cornelissen, ‘s Gravenhage, 1892. According to Bert Andréas, Le Manifeste Communiste de Marx et Engels — Histoire et Bibliographie 1848-1918, Milan, Feltrinelli,
27. Bert Andréas also informs us that in 1891 Cornélissen ‘had already published, under the pseudonym Clemens, a defence of Marx's theories’.
28. Christ. Cornélissen, Les diverses tendances du Parti ouvrier international..., op. cit., p. 5. Note here the acceptance by the Dutch socialists of electoral and parliamentary participation. This is part of the current evolution of Dutch socialism. From 1888 to 1891, its main leader F. Domela Nieuwenhuis (1846-1919) was a member of

parliament. His evolution towards anarchism is contemporary with the Zurich congress. The definitive break between Dutch parliamentary and anti-parliamentary socialists occurred the following year (1894) with the formation of a competing social-democratic party based on the German model. On this subject, see Rudolf de Jong, 'Le mouvement libertaire aux Pays-Bas' in Le Mouvement social, no. 83, April-August 1973, pp. 167-180.

29. Christ. Cornélissen, Les diverses tendances du Parti ouvrier international..., op. cit., p. 9.
30. Ibid., p. 21.
31. Ibid.
32. International Socialist Workers' Congress held in Zurich from 6 to 12 August 1893, op. cit., p. 8.
33. Ibid.
34. Journal de Genève 13 August 1893, reprinted in International Socialist Workers' Congress held in Zurich..., ibid., p. 585.
35. Journal de Genève 12 August 1893, ibid., p. 581.
36. Ibid.
37. 'One need only carefully read the agenda of the Zurich Congress to be convinced that there are two tendencies in the international socialist labour movement fighting for precedence (...). On the one hand, there is the purely parliamentary current, which tends to conquer political power and, more specifically, a majority in parliaments (...); on the other hand, there is the anti-parliamentary current, which is partly exclusively trade unionist, and which, in the first place, tends towards the organisation of workers and which, although it has not completely abandoned all parliamentary action, nevertheless participates in it only with mistrust...'. The various tendencies of the International Workers' Party... op. cit., p. 3.
38. Jean Allemane (1843-1935) was the leader of the Revolutionary Socialist Workers' Party (POSR), one of the main French socialist organisations of the time. Unlike their orthodox Marxist rivals in Jules Guesde's French Workers' Party (POF), they were very pragmatic, believing that all means were good for advancing the workers' cause. They favoured electoral agitation as much as the general strike, the former being a necessary preparation for the latter. For them, the shaping of future society could be attempted as much by winning a local council seat as by participating in the trade union movement.
39. This quote is taken from an extract from the memoirs of Christian Cornélissen, which appears in an appendix to a document signed Homme Wedman entitled: Pour une

biographie de Christian Cornélissen, n.d., available at the International Institute of Social History in Amsterdam (IIHS).

40. It was precisely in 1893 that Christian Cornélissen created the NAS (National Secretariat of Labour), the Dutch equivalent of the Federation of Labour Exchanges in France, of which Pelloutier was to be the general secretary from 1895 until his death in 1901.
41. Pelloutier's presence at the Zurich congress and his links with Cornélissen are strangely not mentioned in the biography written by Jacques Julliard: Fernand Pelloutier et les origines du syndicalisme d'action directe, Paris, Seuil, 1971. On this subject, see Homme Wedman, in Die Rezeption der Marxschen Theorie in den Niederlanden – Schriften aus dem Karl-Marx-Haus, no. 45, Trier, 1992, p. 94.
42. According to Augustin Hamon, in La Révolution Prolétarienne, no. 53, 1 March 1928.
43. La Société Nouvelle de Bruxelles, 1896. Quoted in Homme Wedman, Pour une biographie de Christian Cornélissen, op. cit.
44. A. Hamon, Le socialisme & le congrès de Londres, Paris, P.-V. Stock, 1897, p. 83.
45. Ibid., p. 84.
46. Founded in 1893, the Independent Labour Party (ILP) was the main left-wing party in Great Britain at the time. Although it was formed ten years after the Marxist Social Democratic Federation (SDF), the ILP proved more effective than the SDF from the outset and was in a way the forerunner of the Labour Party. The ILP's orientation was socialist, collectivist, libertarian and federalist, but not revolutionary. After a bitter failure in the 1895 elections, this party, which was based on the new direct action syndicalism embodied by its leaders such as Keir Hardie and Tom Mann, set out to conquer the Trade Unions in order to rally to itself the working class base necessary for its electoral strategy.
47. Quoted in A. Hamon, Le socialisme & le congrès de Londres, op. cit., p. 219-222.
48. International Socialist Congress of Labour and Trade Union Chambers, London, 26 July - 2 August 1896, Geneva, Minkoff Repint, 1980, p. 6 and p. 459.
49. First and foremost, the French revolutionary syndicalists and all the trade union groups in different countries that were inspired by their doctrine. And of course the anarchist-inspired workers' organisations, particularly in Spain and Latin America. But also, to a certain extent, the British Trade Unions and the entire American trade union movement, whether it be the Knights of Labor, the American Federation of Labor or the Industrial Workers of the World...
50. For this entire section, we refer to the work of Augustin Hamon, Le socialisme & le congrès de Londres, op. cit., p. 171 and following.

51. Keir Hardie (1856-1915) was undoubtedly one of the best-known socialists of the time in Great Britain. He was a miner from the age of ten, then a journalist and trade union leader in Lanarkshire in Scotland, and from 1886 for seven years he was secretary of the Scottish Miners' Federation. His socialism, originally Christian, was not based on any specific theory. He preached non-violent revolution and was completely impervious to Marxism. Elected MP for a working-class constituency in London's East End in 1892, he lost his seat in 1895, but regained it in 1900 and held it until his death.
52. A miner at the age of ten, then a metallurgist, Tom Mann (1856-1941) became known for the important role he played in the great London dockers' strike of 1889 and later as a tireless advocate for the defence and organisation of unskilled workers. Initially a militant of the Social Democratic Federation (SDF), Tom Mann was one of the leading figures of the ILP when it was founded. Secretary of the party from 1894 to 1897, he left it to become president of the International Dockworkers' Federation. He emigrated to New Zealand, then to Australia, between 1901 and 1910, and subscribed to the principles of revolutionary syndicalism. On his return in 1910, he became one of the most influential leaders of the British labour movement, in which he endeavoured to popularise the principles of the French CGT. In 1920, he was one of the founders of the British Communist Party.
53. Emile Pouget considered that the peasant had an almost anarchist instinct; for him, the government was the policeman and the tax collector. It was therefore easy to show him the uselessness of the State. On the economic level . As for the collective exploitation of the land, he will come to it gradually through experimentation. The German anarchist Gustave Landauer is even more opposed to the Marxist conception of agrarian collectivism. For Landauer, ‘large farms are a form of state socialism’. He wanted to see smallholders form cooperatives with their workers to ‘prevent the growth of large estates and create organisations that could be the nucleus of a socialist society’. Socialism & the London Congress, op. cit.
54. Between 1893 and 1894, at the height of the period of attacks, three laws targeting anarchists, which became known as the infamous laws, were adopted. Among other things, they were intended to target those who ‘carry out acts of anarchist propaganda by any means’. Quoted in Jean Maitron, Le mouvement anarchiste en France, op. cit., p. 252, note 2.
55. Les Temps Nouveaux — Literary supplement published every Saturday, issues 23 to 32 published between 29 September and 1 December 1900. These reports exist in the form of an Offprint numbered from page 129 to page 342.
56. Ibid., p. 129.

57. This appeal appeared in Père Peinard, no. 128, 16-30 April 1899.
58. Les Temps Nouveaux — Supplément littéraire... 1900, op. cit., p. 129.
59. Ibid.
60. Jean Maitron, Le mouvement anarchiste en France, op. cit., p. 441. The Paris congress of the Second International took place from 24 to 27 September 1900, so it began the day after the revolutionaries' congress should have ended.
61. Les Temps Nouveaux — Supplément littéraire... 1900, op. cit., p. 199.
62. Ibid.
63. Ibid., p. 200.
64. This was the case of Sébastien Faure in Lyon in 1901. Detail reported in Gætano Manfredonia, L'individualisme anarchiste en France, op. cit., p. 206.
65. Les Temps Nouveaux - Supplément littéraire... 1900, p. 199.
66. The Anarchist Movement in France, op. cit., p. 442.
67. Initially made up of socialist students of various tendencies, the ESRI group became clearly anarchist from 1894 onwards. The ESRI played an important role in the maturing and dissemination of revolutionary syndicalist ideas. A genuine collaboration between the students and trade unionists such as Paul Delessale or Pierre Monatte, who was their last secretary in 1903, is attested to by a study by Jean Maitron: ‘Le groupe des Etudiantes Socialistes Révolutionnaires Internationalistes de Paris (1892-1902)’ in Le Mouvement social n°46, 1964. The ESRI's activities consisted of organising public discussion meetings and producing and publishing brochures on topics related to socialism, anarchism and the labour movement. The ESRI wrote several reports for the 1900 congress.
68. According to Jean Maitron, Le Mouvement social no. 46, ibid., p. 21.
69. Les Temps Nouveaux — Supplément littéraire... 1900, op. cit., p. 177.
70. Ibid., p. 178.
71. Cornélissen moved to Paris in the spring of 1898. His departure from Holland is related to the evolution of Dutch socialism and especially to the differences with F. Domela Nieuwenhuis. Since 1893, there had been a new parliamentary socialist party in Holland, Trölstra's SDAP. The Socialistenbond (Socialist Federation), led by Domela Nieuwenhuis, was falling apart. Domela, who was moving towards anarchism, became increasingly distrustful of permanent organisations and left the Socialistenbond at Christmas 1897. Cornélissen, following an affair with Domela's daughter, had a very strained relationship with the latter. He refused to replace him as head of the Socialistenbond, just as he refused, on principle, a permanent position at the NAS, the trade union centre he had helped to create. Thirty-four years old when he moved to

Paris, Cornélissen, who had been a schoolteacher, began an apprenticeship as a painter and decorator before establishing himself as a journalist. He maintained links with his country by contributing to the union-leaning daily Volksblad and to anarchist periodicals. He was also at the centre of attempts to unite anti-parliamentary socialists and anarchist communists in Holland. Cf. Homme Wedman, Pour une biographie de Christian Cornélissen, op. cit.

72. Les Temps Nouveaux — Supplément littéraire... 1900, op. cit., p. 177.
73. Ibid.
74. Ibid., p. 178.
75. Ibid., p. 179.
76. Jean Grave (1859-1939) typifies the communist-libertarian ideology between 1880 and
77. He was a friend of Elisée Reclus and Kropotkine, whom he had known since 1883, when he had agreed to take charge of the publication of Le Révolté in Geneva. From then until the First World War, Jean Grave worked tirelessly and tirelessly on anarchist propaganda. For thirty-one years, he single-handedly published a bi-monthly or weekly anarchist newspaper, often accompanied by a literary supplement. Firstly, Le Révolté, which followed him to Paris in 1885 and which disappeared in 1887 to make way for La Révolte, which itself disappeared in 1894, at the time of the attacks, and which was followed, from 1895, by Les Temps nouveaux. Grave himself was the author of several books and pamphlets of propaganda, and published a total of 12 million copies of periodicals, 88 pamphlets with a total print run of 2,236,000 copies, 240,000 tracts and books for a total of approximately 12,000 volumes. Figures provided by Jean Maitron in ‘Jean Grave 1854-1939’ Revue d'Histoire économique et sociale, no. 1, 1950, pp. 105-115. Without being a very fervent supporter of trade unionism, as we shall see, Grave opened the Temps Nouveaux to trade unionists, who had a column there from 1895. First Fernand Pelloutier wrote a few articles there, then Paul Delessale inaugurated the ‘Labour Movement’ section, which was later taken over by activists such as Amédée Dunois and Pierre Monatte. Grave, on the other hand, was a fervent opponent of individualism. This is what he had to say about it: ‘To assert that the individual only has to seek his own well-being, to concern himself only with his own development - so much the worse for those who stand in his way - was to introduce, under the guise of anarchy, the most ferociously bourgeois of theories’. Jean Grave, Quarante ans de propagande anarchiste, Paris, Flammarion, 1973, p. 25.
78. Les Temps Nouveaux — Supplément littéraire... 1900, op. cit., pp. 181-183.
79. Ibid., p. 184.
80. Ibid.

81. Ibid., p. 246.
82. According to the Social Democrats, if such a situation arose, it would mean that the workers could have taken power at the ballot box a long time ago.
83. Les Temps Nouveaux — Supplément littéraire... 1900, op. cit., p. 186.
84. Ibid., p. 187.
85. Ibid., p. 185.
86. Jacques Julliard, in Le Mouvement social, no. 65, 1968, p. 57. Article reprinted in Autonomie ouvrière — Etudes sur le syndicalisme d'action directe, Paris, Seuil, 1988, pp. 43-68.
87. For a detailed biography, refer to the Dictionnaire biographique du mouvement ouvrier français, Tome XII, op. cit., pp. 331-333.
88. Underlined by the author, Jacques Julliard, Le Mouvement social, no. 65, 1968, art. cit., p. 58.
89. According to the Dictionnaire biographique du mouvement ouvrier français, Tome XIV, op. cit., 1976, pp. 70-73.
90. In Dictionnaire biographique du mouvement ouvrier français, Tome XIV, op. cit., p. 300. Pouget is also the author of several union pamphlets including: Grève générale réformiste et grève générale révolutionnaire (1903) Boycottage et sabotage, L'Action directe (1910), Le Parti du Travail... as well as a book written with Emile Pataud: Comment nous ferons la Révolution (1909).
91. Le Père Peinard No. 45, 12 January 1890, p. 17. Quoted in Christian de Goustine, Pouget — Les matins noirs du syndicalisme, Paris, Tête de Feuilles, 1972, p. 85.
92. According to the Dictionnaire biographique du mouvement ouvrier français, Tome XV, op. cit., pp. 345- 346
93. Information taken from the Dictionnaire biographique du mouvement ouvrier français, Tome XI, 1973, pp. 347-349.
94. According to Georges Lefranc, Le mouvement syndical sous la troisième république, Paris, Payot, 1967, p. 127.
95. Monatte, imprisoned after the Courrière events, was accused of having received a very large sum of money from Count Durand de Beauregard to foment unrest in the Pas-de-Calais.
96. Georges Lefranc, Le mouvement syndical..., op. cit., p. 137.
97. For detailed analyses and reflections on the Charter and the Amiens congress, refer to Georges Lefranc, ibid., pp. 138-146. See also Decoopman, Nicole et al., L'actualité de la Charte d'Amiens, Paris, PUF, 1987.

98. Jean Maitron, Le mouvement anarchiste en France, Volume 1, op. cit., p 321. Paul Delessale's remarks come from a letter to E. Dolléans dated 27 May 1938.
99. According to Patrick de Laubier, 1905: mythe et réalité de la grève générale, Tournai, Editions Universitaires, 1989.
100. While Rosa Luxembourg and Trotsky recognised the positive role of mass spontaneity in this context, it was vigorously rejected by Lenin, who attributed a major role to professional revolutionaries. However, all three considered that the general strike did not resolve the question of the conquest of power, which was essential in their eyes. It was only a means, a preliminary. Ibid., pp. 31-38.
101. Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam..., op. cit., p. 7.
102. Ibid., p. 23.
103. Ibid., p. 27.
104. The representative of the Federation, I. I. Samson, acknowledges in his report that the newspaper belonging to Domela Nieuwenhuis, the Vrije Socialist (the Free Socialist) is ‘by far the best known of our newspapers’, ibid., p. 23.
105. In January 1903, a railway strike ended in a resounding victory. ‘The success of the paralysis of traffic seemed to justify anarchist ideas about the general strike’. But the government reacted by proposing laws prohibiting strikes in the railways and other public services. The general strike, launched in April of the same year, failed and the laws were adopted. Many activists lost their jobs. According to Rudolf de Jong, Le Mouvement social no. 83, op. cit., p. 171-172.
106. According to the ‘declarations and comments of the G.C.L. of Belgium’ published in Bulletin de l'Internationale Libertaire, Herstal-Liège, no. 1, October 1906.
107. Ibid.
108. Ibid.
109. Their existence is mentioned in one sentence. ‘Apart from the G.C.L., there is a libertarian colony in Stockel-Bois; two small French-language monthly magazines and two Flemish bi-monthly magazines. On the other hand, some comrades, while being opponents of the organisation, have organised a library in Verviers.’ Ibid. There is a rather amusing description of the libertarian colony of Stockel, which was promoted by Emile Chapelier, one of the participants in the congress. Founded in 1905, it was an agricultural colony, but it did not have a single peasant; all its members were ‘honest workers’. Production ‘went along in fits and starts (...) [but] working the land proved so off-putting that several settlers discovered a sudden artistic vocation. Rather than wielding spade and rake, they set about decorating plates bought at a discount with a paintbrush (...). Bourgeois and the curious alike enjoyed visiting the communist colony

(...). The visitors were welcomed as many followers as possible. They were served slices of white bread, fromage blanc, radishes, onions and, as the principles opposed any mercantile activity, after eating and sometimes wrapping up a plate decorated with meaningful symbols, each person would pay their contribution in a box prepared for this purpose. (...) many visitors considered the experience to be a joke or a fairground attraction (...) [and] limited their contribution to a few buttons that they had brought with them beforehand. The experiment ended when the owner 'learned what a nest of snakes the estate he owned was occupied by, and he ordered the anarchists to clear out within the legal time limit. That was the end of it.' Jean de Meur, L'anarchisme ou la contestation permanente, Essay, Brussels, Pierre de Méyère, 1970, pp. 55-57.

110. That is to say, the signatories of the first circular of convocation. This circular, dated December 1906 - January 1907, was printed in seven languages: French, English, German, Dutch, Spanish, Italian and Esperanto. According to A. Dunois, Les Temps nouveaux, no. 42, 16 February 1907.
111. With the exception of relations between ethnic Germans and German immigrants, mainly in the United States.
112. Almanach illustré de la Révolution, Paris, 1907, pp. 39-41.
113. Ibid.
114. Bulletin de l'Internationale Libertaire, no. 1, op. cit. The article from which we have taken this quotation is not signed, as is the case with most of the contributions published in this Bulletin. The editor (?) decided, from the very first issue, to 'depersonalise the debates by removing the signatures'.
115. Continuing the reflection on the subject, an individualist voice adds a few lines on 'creation and libertarianism' which, in our opinion, clearly reflect the sentiments of this current towards the supporters of the Internationale: 'nothing is lost, nothing is created, said Lavoisier. He is no friend of internationalist newsletter writers. In the first article of the B.I.L. [Bulletin de l'internationale libertaire] alone, addressed to anarchists for some reason or other, an article of fifty or sixty lines, the words create and creation appear seven or eight times. Now perhaps the chaps did it deliberately: what they create is so insignificant that it can be said without fear of contradiction: nothing is created.' L'Anarchie no. 80, Paris, 17 October 1906.
116. Les Temps nouveaux, no. 42, 16 February 1907. In this article, Dunois also wonders whether there is not 'a great illusion in believing that congresses are capable of creating something? Their role is to exchange ideas, to compare opinions, facts, hypotheses, hopes - and to leave it up to each individual to draw conclusions and act'. An argument, as we can see, quite similar to that of L'Anarchie, from which it is

completely separate. 117. Ibid. 118. Op. cit., p. 39. 119. Ibid. 120. ‘The evolution of anarchism in the Dutch labour movement’ in Le Mouvement socialiste, 15 July 1905, pp. 392-400.

117. With regard to the evolution of certain Dutch anarchists, Cornélissen refers to Stirner's philosophy, which was advocated in certain circles ‘as a new gospel even by those (or especially by those) who could not read Stirner, his Unique not having been translated into Dutch’. Ibid., p. 397.
118. La Gioventu Libertaria, Bulletin de l'internationale libertaire, no. 3, February 1907.
119. Rudolf Grossmann, known as Pierre Ramus (1878-1942), was one of the main Austrian libertarian propagandists and writers. From 1900, he worked as a journalist for the newspaper Freiheit, which the German anarchist Johann Most published in New York. In 1907, he settled in Vienna, where he founded the anarchist organisation Wohlstand für Alle. He was to publish many other works (magazines, brochures, etc.). In 1907, alongside the anarchist congress, he took part in the international anti-militarist congress in Amsterdam, where he presented a long report. His ideology was one of non-violence. He approved of the general strike, expropriation, direct action and revolution, but disapproved of the militaristic method of arming this revolution. He also fought against all individual armed violence. See the Dictionnaire biographique du mouvement ouvrier international (Autriche), Paris, Editions ouvrières, 1971, pp. 243-244.
120. Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam..., op. cit., p. 17.
121. Born in 1875, de Marmande was a viscount. An anarchist journalist, he contributed to Gustave Hervé's Temps Nouveaux and La Guerre sociale. According to the Dictionnaire biographique du mouvement ouvrier français, Tome XIV, op. cit., p. 13.
122. Congrès anarchiste tenu à Amsterdam..., op. cit., p. 17.
123. Les Temps Nouveaux — Supplément littéraire, 1900, op. cit., p. 224.
124. Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam..., op. cit., p. 24.
125. Ibid., p. 25.
126. Ibid., p. 22.
127. Ibid. Here are a few figures that give an idea of the importance of this movement. According to Voryzek, Czech anarchism had eight periodicals in Bohemia. One of them, Churdas, had a circulation of 12,000 copies and 50,000 copies of a brochure had recently been distributed.
128. Ibid., p. 27.
129. Ibid., p. 30.

130. Drawing on his experience in London, Rocker devoted his life to the development of the international libertarian labour movement. He left a relatively large body of work, mainly published in English and Spanish. Nationalism and Culture (1937) is undoubtedly his most important work. Refer to the Dictionnaire biographique du mouvement ouvrier international (Allemagne), Paris, Editions ouvrières, 1990, pp. 402-403 as well as the issue that the magazine Itinéraire (no. 4, December 1988) devoted to him.
131. Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam..., op. cit., p. 31.
132. Ibid., Rudolf Rocker also gives figures for anarchist publications in Yiddish. The Arbeiter Freund has a circulation of 2,500 copies, 40,000 brochures have been circulated in four years. The Federation also has the magazine Germinal, which has a circulation of 2,000 copies.
133. Ibid., p. 33.
134. Ibid., p. 32
135. Ibid., p. 33
136. Ibid., p. 34
137. Ibid.
138. Emile Armand, who had undertaken to present his individualist point of view in Amsterdam, had good reason to be absent. He had just been arrested for counterfeiting. According to Manfredonia, L'individualisme anarchiste en France, op. cit., p. 346.
139. Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam..., op. cit., p. 19.
140. Ibid.
141. Ibid., p. 19-20.
142. Ibid., p. 98.
143. Following a joint amendment by Vaillant and Jaurès, the Second International Congress had agreed that the working class and its parliamentary representatives had a duty to prevent war by any means possible. Previously, the resolutions of the social-democratic congresses stated that a general strike in the event of war would hand Europe over to the least civilised country (Russia) and thus delay the advent of socialism.
144. Georges Haupt, in Congrès socialiste international — Stuttgart 6-24 août 1907, Volume 17, Geneva, Minkoff Repint, 1985, p.10.
145. Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam..., op. cit., p. 99.
146. Whereas Kropotkin, Jean Grave, James Guillaume, Cornélissen and others would rally to the Union sacrée. Malatesta, Domela Nieuwenhuis, Emma Goldman, Rocker and

others would maintain their principled opposition to the war.

147. In the end John Turner (1864-1940), English anarchist and trade unionist, did not participate in the congress.
148. Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam..., op. cit., p. 35.
149. Ibid.
150. Ibid., p. 37.
151. Ibid., p. 36.
152. Ibid., p. 40
153. Ibid., p. 43.
154. Ibid.
155. Ibid., p. 43-44. 49
156. Ibid., p. 48.
157. Ibid., p. 50.
158. Les Temps Nouveaux, 28 September 1907, p. 2.
159. In the preface to the Spanish edition of the biography that Luigi Fabbri dedicated to Malatesta, his daughter Luce Fabbri wrote the following: ‘When Luigi Fabbri spoke at the international anarchist congress in Amsterdam, Malatesta put his arm around him and introduced him to his comrades with the words “my son”. This paternity of spirit was not only one of tenderness, it was also an intimate intellectual interpenetration. In Luis Fabbri, Malatesta, Buenos Aires, Editorial Americalee, 1945, p. 7.
160. Luigi Fabbri, L'organisation anarchiste, Paris, Volonté anarchiste, 1979, p. 20.
161. Jean Maitron, Le mouvement anarchiste en France, Volume 1, op. cit., p. 324.
162. Jean Maitron, ibid., considers Malatesta to be the doyen of the congress. He was fifty-three years old at the time, seven years younger than Domela Nieuwenhuis who, it is true, only made a brief appearance at the congress.
163. To earn a living, Malatesta trained as a mechanic, then as an electrician.
164. According to Max Nettlau, Errico Malatesta. El hombre, el revolucionario, el anarquista, s. l., Ed. Tierra y Libertad, 1945, p. 18.
165. Malatesta continues his presentation by demolishing Kropotkin's mechanical determinism. Pensiero e Volontà, 1 July 1925, translated in Errico Malatesta, Ecrits choisis 1, Annecy, Groupe 1er Mai, 1978, p. 46-47.
166. Max Nettlau, Errico Malatesta, op. cit., p. 13.
167. Ibid., p. 33.
168. This text was first published in 1899, in various issues of Paterson's Questione sociale, then published in 1903 as a pamphlet in New London (Connecticut). When, in 1920,

the congress of the Italian Anarchist Union asked Malatesta to draw up a programme, he proposed this text, which was then republished with some modifications. We have based our translation on the translation published in Errico Malatesta, Articles politique, Paris, 10/18, 1979, pp. 63-88, based on the 1903 text.

169. Ibid., p. 64.
170. Ibid., p. 66.
171. Ibid.
172. Ibid., p. 65.
173. Ibid.
174. Ibid., p. 82.
175. Ibid., p. 71-72.
176. Ibid., p. 85.
177. Ibid., p. 86.
178. Errico Malatesta, 'L'Anarchie', La Brochure mensuelle no. 79-80, Paris, 1929 (reprint of the 1907 brochure, in extenso, Paris).
179. Articles politique, op. cit., p. 75.
180. Malatesta thought that these 'may serve, as the extravagant often do, to open up new paths for future thought and action...', Les Temps nouveaux, 28 September 1907.
181. Ibid.
182. Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam..., op. cit., p. 62.
183. At the time, provincial trade unions were happy to be represented in national bodies by volunteer members of the Parisian unions.
184. See above for the events leading up to the general strike of 1 May 1906.
185. Emphasis added. See Pierre Monatte, 'Fifty years ago - The founding of "Vie Ouvrière" in La Révolution Prolétarienne, new series, no. 142, October 1959. At the time of the congress, Georges Yvetot was in prison.
186. Monatte would go on to play a significant role in the French labour movement. Here are some details of his subsequent career. In 1908, he worked at the CGT confederal printing works. After the failure of La Révolution, the unionist daily newspaper of Emile Pouget, Monatte created his own magazine La Vie ouvrière, with the financial help of James Guillaume among others. In 1914, he opposed the Union sacrée. A supporter of the minority CGT against Jouhaux in 1922, he was led to support, against the advice of the anarchists, the CGTU's membership of the Red International of Trade Unions. In 1923, he became a journalist at L'Humanité, then a member of the Communist Party, but was expelled in 1924. He then founded a new magazine, La

Révolution prolétarienne. At the end of his life, Monatte did not renounce the concept of trade unionism that he had expressed in Amsterdam in 1907. His ‘Speech to the Amsterdam Anarchist Congress’ can be found in La Révolution prolétarienne No. 347 in 50 January 1951. Information mainly from Dictionnaire biographique du mouvement ouvrier français, Tome XIV, op. cit., p. 117-123.

187. Congrès anarchiste tenu à Amsterdam..., op. cit., p. 67.
188. Ibid., p. 62.
189. Ibid.
190. Ibid., p. 67.
191. Ibid., pp. 69-70.
192. Ibid., p. 70.
193. Ibid., p. 69
194. Ibid., pp. 70-71.
195. According to the Dictionnaire biographique du mouvement ouvrier français, Tome XI, op. cit., pp. 73-74.
196. Quoted by Jacques Julliard, , Le Mouvement social no. 47, April-June 1964, p. 15.
197. Ibid., p. 21.
198. Ibid., p. 20.
199. Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam..., op. cit., p. 87. During his stay in Amsterdam, Broutchoux had entrusted the editing of Action syndicale to individualist anarchists. On 18 August 1907, an editorial entitled ‘La lâcheté ouvrière’ (Worker's cowardice) and signed ‘Lord Hulot’ (Lorulot) the following words: ‘The working class, kept in check with guns by the despots it accepts, gets no more than it deserves. (...) Through its silence, its unconsciousness, its fear, its cowardice, it has made itself an accomplice of the leaders and the capitalists’. . Quoted by Jacques Julliard, Le Mouvement social no. 47, op. cit., p. 27. This text, which contradicted the allegations of Monatte and Broutchoux at the congress, is indicative of the heterogeneity of French anarchism at the time. It did not fail to sow discord among the militants of the ‘young union’. On the following 10 November, Dumoulin's team denounced in Action syndicale ‘the miserable attempts of politicians and unscrupulous anarchists’ against the union. Quoted by Jacques Julliard, ibid.
200. Jacques Julliard, ibid., p. 30.
201. Ibid. To avoid having to join Basly's union or leave the CGT, the miners of the ‘young union’ took refuge in the slate workers' union... On the subject, see also Joël Michel,

‘Syndicalisme minier et politique dans le Nord-Pas-de-Calais : le cas Basly (1880-1914)’ in Le Mouvement social no. 87, April-June 1974, pp. 9-33.

202. Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam..., op. cit., p. 78.
203. Ibid., p. 79.
204. Ibid.
205. Ibid., p. 85. In 1922, Malatesta clarified his thinking as follows: ‘the labour movement is a means to be used today to raise and educate the masses, and to be used tomorrow for the inevitable revolutionary upheaval. But it is a means that has its drawbacks and its dangers. And we anarchists must do everything in our power to neutralise these drawbacks (...) and use the movement as best we can for our own ends.’ Umanità Nova, 6 April 1922, in Malatesta, Ecrits choisis III, Annecy, Groupe 1er Mai, 1982, p. 11.
206. Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam..., op. cit., p. 81.
207. Ibid., p. 80.
208. Hubert Lagardelle et al., Syndicalisme & socialisme, Paris, Rivière, 1908, p. 17.
209. Ibid., pp. 4-6.
210. Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam..., op. cit., p. 81.
211. Ibid.
212. Ibid.
213. Ibid., p. 82.
214. Malatesta, ‘The Amsterdam Congress’, in Les Temps nouveaux, 5 October 1907.
215. Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam..., op. cit., p. 82
216. Ibid., p. 80.
217. Ibid.
218. Ibid., p. 82.
219. Malatesta, Les Temps nouveaux, 5 October 1907.
220. Pensiero e Volontà, 16 April 1925, in Malatesta, Ecrits choisis III, op. cit., p. 14.
221. Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam..., op. cit., p. 89.
222. Ibid., p. 83.
223. Ibid.
224. Ibid.
225. See Jacques Julliard, Fernand Pelloutier et les origines du syndicalisme d'action directe, Paris, Seuil, 1971, p. 88. 51

226. This is how Victor Griffuelhes approached the theme of ‘general strike and violence’ in 1908: ‘The general strike, in its ultimate expression, is not for the workers the simple stopping of the arms; it is the taking possession of the social wealth developed by the corporations, in this case the unions, for the benefit of all. This general strike, or revolution, will be violent or peaceful, depending on the resistance to be overcome.‘ In Griffuelhes, L'action syndicaliste, Paris, Bibliothèque socialiste, 1908.
227. According to Dunois’ euphemism, in Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam..., op. cit., p. 39.
228. Malatesta, ibid., p. 50.
229. According to Massimo Varengo, in Itinéraire no. 5-6, June 1989, p. 70.
230. Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam..., op. cit., p. 44.
231. Ibid., pp. 76-77.
232. Ibid., p. 77.
233. The fact that Malatesta considers that, in the struggle against capitalism, a lost strike is as useful as a successful one testifies to his practical ignorance of the trade union struggle. The Dutch trade unionists of the NAS, who saw their organisation practically disappear after the strike of 1903, could have taught him a thing or two about the issue.
234. Errico Malatesta, Articles politique, op. cit., p. 77.
235. Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam..., op. cit., p. 77.
236. Umanità Nova, 13 April 1922, in Malatesta, Ecrits choisis III, op. cit., p. 5.
237. Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam..., op. cit., p. 96.
238. Ibid., p. 92-93.
239. Ibid., p. 92.
240. Ibid., p. 94.
241. Ibid., p. 92.
242. La Voix du Peuple de Lausanne, no. 40, 5 October 1907. Reproduced in Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam..., op. cit., pp. 113-116.
243. Ibid., p. 113.
244. Ibid., p. 114.
245. Ibid., p. 116.
246. Born in Rostov-on-Don in 1882, Alexander Schapiro was the son of a revolutionary. As a child, he was sent to Turkey to study at the French lycée. He thus had the opportunity to practise four languages (Russian, Yiddish, French and Turkish; he would later become equally proficient in English and German); at the age of eleven, he read the works of Kropotkin, Elisée Reclus and Jean Grave. At the age of sixteen, he entered the

Sorbonne to study biology because he was planning to study medicine, but he was soon forced to give up for lack of money. In 1900, Schapiro joined his father in London and worked for many years in close collaboration with Kropotkin, Cherkesov and Rocker in the Jubilee Street Anarchist Federation. According to Paul Avrich, Les anarchistes russes, Paris, Maspero, 1979, p. 160.

247. Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam..., op. cit., p. 91.
248. According to Antonio Lopez, La FORA en el movimiento obrero, Buenos Aires, 1987.
249. Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam..., op. cit., p. 114.
250. To speak of anarcho-syndicalism in 1907 is an anachronism in French. As demonstrated by Daniel Colson. See Daniel Colson, Anarcho-syndicalism and communism - Saint-Etienne 1920 1925, University of Saint-Etienne, 1986, p. 20. However, the existence of the concept is attested from 1905 for Russia, cf. Paul Avrich, The Russian Anarchists, op. cit., pp. 92-93, and from 1904 for England, cf. Itinéraire no. 4, p. 15.
251. Quoted in Bulletin international du mouvement syndicaliste, no. 7, 20 October 1907.
252. Ibid.
253. Cf. Rudolf de Jong, Le Mouvement social, no. 83, op. cit., pp. 172-172.
254. According to the description by René Bianco in Un siècle de presse anarchiste d'expression française, Thesis for the state doctorate, Aix-Marseille, 1987.
255. Bulletin de l'Internationale anarchiste, no. 11, October 1909.