

## **Between anarchism and syndicalism**

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

**By Ariane Miéville**  
arianemieville@bluewin.ch

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 sees syndicalism as reformist or even conservative, while Monatte sees it as 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 you 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 minutes, however, it's easy to spot a number of errors that recur periodically.

It's striking, for example, that the participants in the congress 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 found themselves face-to-face for the first time... only to discover the extent of their differences.

It's a movement in which several schools converge. 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 workers' 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 then they represent an oppositional movement that captures the imagination and which, despite its disparate evolutions, is felt to be 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's important to realize 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 whether 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 will follow and verify the chronology proposed by the document's author, who is probably Amédée Dunois(2).

Born in 1878 into the provincial petit bourgeoisie, Dunois holds a law degree and a bachelor's degree in literature. A talented journalist, he began his career at *Les Temps nouveaux*, where he replaced Paul Delesalle in the "Mouvement social" column(3).

The history 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 is linked to the anarchists' anti-statism, which crystallizes in their rejection of electoral and parliamentary activity.

### **Long-standing differences**

The introduction to the report situates the divorce "between anarchists and democrat-socialists" in France, at the Le Havre congress in September 1880. The movement then spread to all 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 its origins to Switzerland in 1870, even before the split in 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.

Anarchists and "authoritarian" socialists are anti-capitalists. They share common goals, such as the abolition 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 employed 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 dividing socialism as follows: "Both parties equally desire the creation of 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 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, which exists between the communism scientifically developed by the German school (...) and the Proudhonism widely developed and pushed to its last consequences..."(7).

In the First International, the split between "authoritarian" and "libertarian" socialists occurred at the Hague Congress in 1872. An 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 break-up, and until 1877, the Fédération Jurassienne continued to organize the international congresses of 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 entire 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, with Jules Guesde, were asserting their collectivist credentials. Between the two schools, the names were reversed.

So, through the Fédération jurassienne, the former revolutionary socialists became the communist-anarchists. From then on, they constituted the main, but not only, current of the libertarian movement. An earlier school, that of Proudhonian mutualism, survived, particularly in the United States, where, with Benjamin R. Tucker, it evolved into individualist anarchism. The collectivist conception is still dominant in Spain.

The communist principle is based on an optimistic conception of socio-economic evolution. Another presupposition, which in some ways complements it, will play a fundamental role in subsequent evolution: 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 say 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, which was supposed to lead to the proletarianization of the middle classes, that would inevitably lead to revolution, to the final confrontation between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The

Marxism is evolutionist 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 rifts of opportunity, the potential of which 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 through facts**

Armed with the conviction that happiness was within their grasp, the companions adopted a new strategy: "propaganda by deed". This was inaugurated on April 5, 1877 with the Benevento expedition in Italy. Errico Malatesta and some thirty armed men burned the archives of two small villages and distributed the money found in the tax collector's office to the people. The adventure ends a few days later, with the unresisting arrest of the protagonists, who are sweating 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 dismal failure, the Benevento affair had a major 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. Adhering organizations were advised to take action

"on the terrain of illegality, which is the only path 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 it. 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 Czolgoz in 1901...? To name just a few of the best-known cases. This omission is probably not accidental. There may well be events on which Dunois, if he were to

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 United States even praised Czolgosz. "Czolgosz's act was truly one 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 lengthy persecution; our ideas, however, did not suffer, far from it"(14).

For Pierre Monatte, terrorism was simply no longer relevant. 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 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 the 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 the entire mass.

Congress believes that acts of revolt, especially when directed against representatives of the state and the plutocracy, must be considered from a psychological point of view.

(...) As a rule, 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 and stray into sectarianism?(18) Our feeling is that anarchist attacks are 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.

On the other hand, in France, even before the epidemic of attacks, the most prominent militants were trying to rectify the situation and redirect their fellow workers 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, Kropotkin 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 all it would take from then on was a handful of people (...).

ardent revolutionaries, armed with a few bombs, to make a 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 be embarking on it.

As propaganda by deed did not have the desired effect, it was abandoned in favor of other means of action, all the more so as the repression that accompanied it profoundly destructured 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 issue, we realized that not all opponents of the electoralist and parliamentary evolution of the socialist movement at the time could be defined as anarchists. To illustrate the problem, we decided to follow the itinerary of one of the protagonists, the Dutchman Christian Cornélissen. 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 describe him as an anarchist would be highly imprecise, at least as far as 1893 is concerned.

### **Christian Cornélissen**

In the brochure(25) written by Cornélissen 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 does not consider "the elections

legislative action (...) only as a means of agitation, and the action of elected workers in parliaments only as a means of propaganda"(27).

Opposing the credo of the German Social Democrats that the seizure of 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).

A perusal of his brochure shows that, prior to the Zurich congress, Cornélissen had 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 would succeed in "excluding a fraction of their opponents from the congress, under the fallacious pretext of 'anarchism'"(29). In that case, the parliamentary socialists would be responsible for the split in the labor movement and the

A "second (dissident) congress"(30) 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 Zürich, 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 are admitted to the Congress"(31).

In order 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) with a view to 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 this 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 Socialist Congress in Brussels 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 were to take place elsewhere.

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, according to him, would "only



to replace the present slavery by another slavery by demanding 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'll deliberately use the term "anti-parliamentary" rather than "anarchist" or "anti-authoritarian" to designate socialists opposed to the parliamentary social-democratic current that was to 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 players refer to themselves, which are often the most neutral possible, and the polemical terms used by their opponents. 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 Cornélissen uses to designate his camp(36). It also featured in the title of the main parallel meeting to the London congress: "Meeting anarchiste et antiparlementaire".

This term has the merit of encompassing all those who favor direct, grassroots action, without necessarily claiming libertarian ideology; i.e. 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 or press accounts only partially reflect the exchange of ideas that takes 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, Cornélissen 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:

"For him, "it was literally a conversion: 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 Cornélissen 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 might reveal how Cornélissen directly influenced Pelloutier, and how the subsequent coherence and influence of French revolutionary syndicalism owes much to the Dutch labor movement(40).

At the London Congress (1896), the problem thought to have been resolved in Zürich 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", the leaders of social democracy might have exclaimed!

Officially, all workers' union chambers were 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 notorious 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. According to Hamon, it was they who organized the "syndicalo-anarchist" delegation in Paris. Hamon insists on the collaboration of Malatesta, who, living in London, was in touch with English trade union circles. He also notes Cornélissen's help in Holland(41). For this occasion, Cornélissen 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 anti-parliamentarians is also evidenced by the fact that an "anarchist committee" initially set up to prepare the congress was disbanded and replaced by an "anarchist committee".

"anarchist socialist and antiparliamentary 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 argumentation 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 were trying 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 workers' 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 words of Marx: Workers of the world, unite!"(46)

The anti-parliamentarians' attempt was unsuccessful. In the end, the Social Democrats prevailed. But to expel the anarchists once and for all, they had to admit that at the next Socialist Congress, only the anarchists would be admitted.

They were "purely corporate organizations", recognizing "the need for legislative and parliamentary action"(47). They thus accepted responsibility for the division of the labor movement, which would alienate from them, for a time at least, a number of non-"orthodox" socialists, as well as trade unionists 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. Many anarchist and anti-parliamentary speakers follow: Elisée Reclus, Christian Cornélissen, 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 anti-parliamentary socialists from Holland, 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 constitution of large estates were a necessary precondition for the spread of socialist ideas in the countryside, the latter rejected this deterministic conception (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 hold on to them all too dear. 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 will not be resolved any time soon.

### **Paris 1900 - the forbidden congress**

This dilemma of "class struggle" versus "propaganda" is again apparent in the contributions written for the 1900 International Revolutionary Workers' Congress. This 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 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 do not believe that these two congresses were convened practically at the same time.

same date by chance. Moreover, according to Jean Maitron, "the 1900 congress, which described itself as anti-parliamentary, was intended as a response 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 a common adversary, divergences were about to surface.

The topics to be discussed in Paris were numerous. 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 anarchist attitude in the event of war; anti-militarist propaganda, and so on.

In addition to many French members, 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 Zurich and London meetings, not all participants were anarchists. Non-libertarians were not numerous, but some 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, on one occasion or another, some libertarians tried 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 any grouping"(64). In our opinion, there is no evidence that the boundary between "libertarian" and

The definition of "anarchist" is based on whether or not organization is accepted. But the existence of both terms, and the analysis thus carried out by POSR, show that the main divergences revolve around the theme of organization.

As Jean Maitron points 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 Cornélissen and the Etudiants socialistes révolutionnaires internationalistes ( ESRI)(66) group. Their concern:

remedy the anarchist movement's state of inorganization by setting up a We also set up a "correspondence office" and an "International Libertarian Communist Federation"(67).

Cornélissen's report to the congress "on the need to establish a lasting understanding between anarchist and revolutionary communist groups"(68) is an appeal, almost a plea, 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) Cornélissen, who has recently moved to Paris(70), paints 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 is very harsh on 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, and probably not even the majority, Cornélissen 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.

A wise precaution, since the enemies of organization - or rather, the partisans of natural, 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 Cornélissen. Grave's arguments are not lacking in flavor, and deserve a closer look. "The ESRI[s] 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 needs and desires. The existence of such an institution would only flatter "the inertia of individuals, who are only too inclined to leave the work to be done to those who promise to replace them"(78).

On a syndicalist theme like the general strike, it's interesting to compare Grave's opinion with that expressed by other militants. The report on the general strike by the delegates of the Union du Bronze takes up the main arguments elaborated a few years earlier by Fernand Pelloutier. For these militants, the general strike meant revolution, as "the epic days of the barricades are over (...) it is now almost impossible to fight armed force with the

the same weapons 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 first and foremost) 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 he doesn't 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 is not a one-off event; it has to 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 will now 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.

## **Background**

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's 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 strike action led to a change in syndicalist theories.

Until the end of the 19th century, partial strikes were "the object of systematic mistrust on the part of trade union 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 was 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 Seine cobbler's union, 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 tried to articulate the new strike practice with the revolutionary aspirations of the anarchists.

A native of the Aveyron region, 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: "On every page of the paper, you could feel the

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, then forty, was to make his mark on the life of the trade union confederation.

The key concept he develops is that of "direct action"; an idea that covers 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. By 1890, Pouget had already achieved a synthesis between the idea of the revolutionary general strike and the reformist strike. The latter "is the preparation for it, and it is only after a series of ever-widening conflicts that the workers will reach the final strike"(89). To complete the picture, we need to mention two influential anarchist syndicalists. Firstly, Georges Yvetot (1868-1942) was a typographer. He became an anarchist under the influence of Pelloutier, to whom he was very close, and when Pelloutier 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 craftsman. 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 was also the editor of the minutes of the 1907 anarchist congress we are studying(91).

### **Towards a general strike**

At the CGT congress in Bourges in 1904, a young militant, Dubéros, representing the hairdressers, proposed launching 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 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, brochures, 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 with 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.

It's true that 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 an increase 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 get a rest

weekly from May 1, but we'd hoped for more. In the minds of French 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. Little did they know that May 1st 1906 was the high point and that, despite the many strikes that followed, the movement had begun its decline.

We have already seen the extent of the anarchist influence on the French trade union movement during the period under review. But if there was any influence, it was reciprocal: anarchist militants themselves modified their ideas through contact with trade union life. A decisive moment in this evolution came at the 1906 Amiens congress, when Pouget and his comrades officially renounced their identity as anarchists and adopted that of simple syndicalists.

### **The Amiens Charter**

The Charte d'Amiens, which remains the benchmark for French trade unionism to this day, is the result of a circumstantial compromise; an implicit agreement between the revolutionary syndicalism that formed the majority at this congress and the moderate, reformist wing of the trade 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 (...) increasing the well-being of workers 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: "At the first reading, with Pouget holding the pen, I got upset about the passage 'les partis et les sectes' ('parties and sects'); the *sectes* were aimed at anarcho-syndicalists and, I don't know why, didn't appeal to me. 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 that. I don't need to tell you that all my comrades burst out laughing. "

What a curious document, and one that shows the evolution - conscious for some, unconscious for others - that 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 by the crude lie he tells us above, a lie that provokes bursts of laughter from his comrades!"(96)

### **The Russian Revolution of 1905**

We won't go into the events that began with the massacre of demonstrators who had come to deliver a petition to the Czar on Sunday, January 7, 1905, in St. Petersburg, and ended with the Moscow uprising in December of the same year, which was also bloodily crushed. The most important thing to remember about these events is that

the revolutionary general strike, hitherto an abstract idea, became a concrete reality. Events in Russia were punctuated by hitherto unknown strike movements, taking 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. The movement also spread to the countryside, forcing the government to undertake agrarian reform (97).

We saw earlier how the idea of conquering political power led the Social Democrats to adopt an electoralist 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 for the congress, we're told, was born "almost simultaneously, in the minds of our Belgian and Dutch companions. Right from its foundation (1905), the Dutch Federation of Libertarian Communists 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 that "non-federated groups far outnumber federated groups"(101).

The problem was this: 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. The latter was highly reformist, and saw its membership grow rapidly. However, the

militants of the Dutch Federation of Libertarian Communists were precisely those who worked to stimulate the NAS through their propaganda and theoretical work.

Members of the groupement communiste libertaire de Belgique (GCL) are also supporters of organization, "although 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 publishes 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 comment is in order here. The initiative began with young groups of anarchist-communist orientation, committed to organization and syndicalism. Initially, it involved federations which, although they carried some weight, 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 the groups are traditionally larger.

Cornélissen expressed himself on this point in an appeal 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 giving us the 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).

This expectation is particularly evident in France. "We are counting on anarchist communist groups, revolutionary union members, delegates from communist colonies, libertarian newspapers and magazines, etc., also coming from all sides of *France* (emphasis added) in considerable numbers" (111), he adds.

### **The aim of the congress: to create an international**

This objective is reflected in the very title of the propaganda bulletin, published by the Belgian H. Fuss, and entitled *Bulletin de l'internationale libertaire*. 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 have the authority 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 points out to the Belgians that they are 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, the Amsterdam congress will have a 'workers' character'. (...) The Amsterdam International Anarchist Congress will not bring together delegates of a class, but militants of an idea" (115).

Dunois' remarks seem to have had an echo, as the title "Anarchist Congress" 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, there was first mention of an "international anarchist congress".

Cornélissen, in his article for the *Almanach illustré de la Révolution*, speaks of a "In 1907, the aim was 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 propaganda. "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 in 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's using them. We saw above that the name "anarchist" was given to both communist-anarchists, followers of Bakunin and Kropotkin, and revolutionary socialists who didn't necessarily identify with the term.

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

Cornélissen once again provides us with a key. In an article written in 1905, he explains why members of Holland's new Federation of Libertarian Communists have given up 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

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).

Italian 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 didn't make it particularly easy to understand. Here's what they had to say:

"The qualifier 'libertarian', added at this congress, must not give rise to any equivocation. It is now an established 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 unionists in the NAS to meet other libertarian workers.

The terms "anarchist" and "libertarian", although 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 or hugs better than libertarian. Quite the opposite, for Holland at any rate. Would the anarchist congress live up to the expectations of Dutch libertarians? We'll try to find out now.

## **Congress**

First of all, a few words 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, the difference in the scale of the public meetings organized by the two groups speaks for itself, despite de Marmande's optimism.

Yet it would be wrong to conclude that, in 1907, the anarchist was an endangered species. The various reports on the state of the movement, presented at the congress, testify rather to an expanding movement, and almost all make reference 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 on the anarchist movement in other countries.

The report on French-speaking Switzerland by Jean Wintch 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). By 1907, the movement appeared much more active. Wintch 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 ends with an account of the Vaud strikes of March 1907. A "memorable" and spontaneous movement, but one which caught the anarchists off guard. 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 have an anarchist group attached to them" (129).

After a brief history of their movement, the Americans Max Baginsky and Emma Goldman focus on the propaganda work carried out, through various publications, in 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 trade-unionism (...) to walk in the ways of revolutionary syndicalism" (130).

In Germany, Rudolf Lange described a movement in full expansion, after stagnating 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 hopes that the decision the Social Democrats take at their next congress will give "the first impetus to a syndicalism modelled on that of the Confédération générale du travail in France" (131).

Rudolf Rocker (1873-1958) introduces 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 s h o r t - l i v e d .

Threatened with arrest after organizing a meeting of 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 many years.

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, editor of newspapers and brochures, Rocker was very active (132).

Let's turn now to the Jewish workers living 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 have recently set up their own organization, the Union of Direct Actionists, which brings together eight small unions.

Pierre Mougitch of Belgrade reports on the difficulties faced by Serbian anarchists, noting that they were "trying to implant revolutionary syndicalist ideas in the unions founded by the social democrats" (135).

Nicolas Rogdæf talks about the recent development (over the past five years) of the anarchist movement in Russia. The first is the syndicalist current: comrades in this current have founded workless unions whose aim is to force the government to provide work, using 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 labor movement or the class struggle" (136).

The Italian situation presented by Errico Malatesta was 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 put together an impressive agenda, and not all the topics on the agenda could be dealt with, either 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 touched upon, 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 anti-militarism: a subject on which we shall now say a few words.

### **Antimilitarism: the Domela Nieuwenhuis incident**

The congress begins on Monday August 26. Even before the agenda had been finalized, 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 on the following Friday in the congress of the International Antimilitarist Association to be held in Amsterdam (of which Domela is 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 opponent of the anarchist congress and had fought it with all his might" (142).

We've already talked about the differences that divide Dutch anarchists. Coming from a man who was then sixty years old, his intervention at the start of the congress was not a 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 its participation in the anti-militarist meeting before discussing it.

However, 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 Cornélissen'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 deep differences between socialists" (146). The same could no doubt be said of the anarchist motion approved without discussion in Amsterdam. The motion was generally opposed 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 **w i t h** insurrection. They declare their belief that anarchists

will set an 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 his willingness to support the organizers of the anarchist congress, while maintaining the unity of the movement. This conciliatory attitude would also be his approach to the problem of organization, which we shall now address.

On the morning of Tuesday August 27, the agenda had included a discussion 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, objections could come from two opposing directions: 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 organization debate**

Dunois begins by recalling 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, then, 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 anarchists for trying to build up 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' 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 individualist H. Croiset from Amsterdam. His presentation gave 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 boring to analyze here all the nuances of the opinions expressed on the subject. However, it is worth mentioning Malatesta's closing speech, 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 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 came, and I could discover no fundamental dissension in what was said. And such must have been the impression of all the delegates, 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 now, Luigi Fabbri drew 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 any price 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

neutralize 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 region. 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, 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 a f o r e m e n t i o n e d 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 Arabi Pacha's insurrection.

In 1885, he went into exile in Argentina, where he lived until 1889. In this country, 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.

As soon as he returned to Europe, he showed himself to be an ardent supporter of anarchist organization. The periodical he began publishing in Nice in September 1889 bore an 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 struck up a friendship with him, d e s p i t e 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 else. 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", believes 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 takes advantage of the means that science places within man's reach (...) it can take advantage of the progress of philosophical thought (...) but it cannot be confused, on pain of absurdity, either with science or with a philosophical system"(167).

Malatesta believed 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 differences 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 didn't come 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 "Most of the evils that afflict mankind stem from poor 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 ignored the advantages that cooperation and solidarity could bring to all"(173), leading to the present state "where a few men inherit the earth 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 "a special class (...) which, provided with the material means of repression (...) uses (...) the force it possesses, to arrogate privileges to itself and to subjugate, if it can, to its supremacy even the class of owners"(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,

in exchange for the legal and material protection it would receive from him. 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. In Malatesta's words, the strategy to be adopted by anarchists is as follows: "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, "the victorious insurrection is the most effective fact for popular emancipation, because (...) the distance between the law (always retarded) and the level of civism reached by the mass of the population can be crossed in one 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, 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 the 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 for themselves all the improvements and freedoms they desire (...) always propagating our integral program...". (181)

This ambitious strategy, based on voluntarism, activism, the power of ideas and the aspiration to freedom, could use all active anarchists, even the most extravagant (182).

Malatesta, who for more than twenty years had remained in the movement, despite his differences with Kropotkin, despite the hostility that had met his

association projects, undoubtedly understood the impatience of his young supporters. But he also knew that there were many undecideds, militants who were not very favorable to the organization but who were not totally opposed to it either. This was the case, for example, with Emma Goldman, Max Baginsky and Pierre Ramus, who opposed the creation of an international office during the congress. Malatesta tried to reassure them. The Anarchist International is "merely a moral bond, an affirmation of the desire for common solidarity and struggle". The bureau that had been appointed was 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 syndicalism.

### **The trade union debate**

The presentation of the discussion on the theme of "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 who 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 Cornélissen 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're dealing with a young activist, here to replace well-known personalities who were unable to attend. Monatte is not one of the organizers of the congress; he is the CGT "representative" invited to the congress. Cornélissen had to fall back on him, for want of anything better (188).

In his speech, Monatte outlines 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 is quick to point out the influence of militants like Pelloutier, Delesalle and Pouget, who symbolize the evolution of anarchists towards the workers' movement, militants who helped form the doctrine of revolutionary syndicalism, and who 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 anarchists, they must 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 claims to "let the facts speak for themselves". Does his personal experience as a trade unionist bear this 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 reformist Fédération nationale des mineurs, which was not part of the CGT, and on the other, the Union générale des mineurs, which was. 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 most powerful. It was headed by Emile Basly, deputy mayor of Lens, a socialist with millerandist leanings who was very opposed to the CGT. Over the years, Basly transformed the "old union" into an electoral committee serving 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 Pas-de-Calais, 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 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 is the most consistent, but also the most difficult to understand.

Malatesta began his speech by making it clear that he supported 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 labor movement than of syndicalism. The labor movement is "a fact", while syndicalism is "a doctrine".

Malatesta was in favor of 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, republican-royalist 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's conception of the revolutionary movement is dualistic. For him, the workers' movement was certainly the revolutionary subject, but it had to have a driving force at its heart to pull 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 go into 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 our 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 demonstrate this, let's compare Malatesta's words with those of revolutionary socialist syndicalists of the same period.

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 we find a more active revolutionary force?" (211)

For Malatesta, the revolutionary syndicalist conception of class struggle is simplistic. For him, what makes the capitalist system specific 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

it's enough for workers to take in hand the defense of their own interests, and at the same time defend 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 not be able 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, in the 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)

Paradoxically, however, 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 "the ever-growing proletariat of the laborless, who count for nothing in 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 makes 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 was not opposed to the very principle of permanent union staff. "An anarchist who is a permanent, stipendiary functionary of a union is a lost man 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 with him for the rest of 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 seems hardly practicable. It's a bit like asking anarchists to walk through mud without getting their feet dirty. How can you have any credibility in a union if you leave the responsibilities and the conduct of negotiations to other political currents?

Malatesta's point of view can be explained in two ways. Firstly, he was not a true trade unionist. Did he ever work as a salaried employee? 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's 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). That's why Malatesta calls for us to prepare for "this inevitable insurrection" (226).

It should be noted in passing that the conception 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'est-ce 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 in 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, would have ignored him. Was it worth arguing with the revolutionary syndicalists over a minor difference of opinion on 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 companions devoted most of their energy to union activity, who would take on "the special and delicate measures to which the great mass is most often unfit"(229). In other words, Malatesta and his followers needed determined, organized militants "to take revolutionary initiative when the time came"(230).

For it to have any chance of success, Malatesta's strategic conception presupposed the existence, on the one hand, of a pre-revolutionary situation, and on the other, of "an anarchist organization based on a theory and practice common to all militants"(231). 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  
In the future revolution, the "masses" will be the *infantry*, as it w e r e .

the revolutionary army [and] anarchist groups, specializing in technical tasks (...) *artillery*"(232), something other than artillery firing haphazardly in all directions was still needed.

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 ideas and Malatesta's insurrectionist ones converged on the notions of unity and neutrality of the labor 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 was heard that went somewhat unnoticed. This voice suggests 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, Cornélissen said he had "no disapproval whatsoever of Monatte's speech"(233), but he did have reservations about syndicalism. For him, it was not revolutionary in itself. Cornélissen was particularly critical of the principle of direct action. Direct action can be used for revolutionary purposes, in which case anarchists must support it, but it can also be used for other purposes.

"for conservative, even reactionary purposes"(234).

Cornélissen's syndicalist conception has an ethical content that seems absent from both revolutionary syndicalist doctrine and Malatesta's theories. In both these conceptions, the action of 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 workers' moral uplift and emancipation, can only gain from workers uniting and fighting for their interests."(236)

For revolutionary syndicalists, direct action leads the proletariat in a quasi-mechanical movement towards revolution. For Malatesta, it emancipates the workers by making them take charge of their own lives, making them more likely to join the anarchist "party" and thus join the numbers when it comes to bringing down the government, expropriating landlords and opposing any reorganization of authority.

Cornélissen demonstrates a far more detailed knowledge of the trade union phenomenon than Monatte or Malatesta. He illustrates his reservations about trade unionism with the example of the Amsterdam and Antwerp diamond manufacturers, who used direct action to

defend their corporatist interests. He refers to English or American trade-unions that 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 Cornélissen, 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 move closer to Cornélissen'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 present 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 trade unionism, 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 in nature, but rather to be recommendations and statements of principle. Reading them, one gets 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 quite obvious in the first motion, drafted by Cornélissen, Vohryzek and Malatesta, where we are told who the author of each paragraph is.

Malatesta endeavors to summarize the theses he defended in his speech by asserting 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 through armed insurrection and violent expropriation"(240).

Like the drafters of other motions, Cornélissen reiterated that anarchists should form the revolutionary element of the unions, insisting that they should only support demonstrations of "direct action" going "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 insists on class struggle, the absence of doctrinaire preoccupations in union organization, and the transformation of the union into a producer group in future society.

However, two new elements that were not debated at the congress appear in the motions.

Speaking of the means to be used to achieve proletarian emancipation, Raphaël 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, Cornélissen 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 in the same category have access"(243).

This single mention of the possibility of union division must be seen in the context of the two "strictly private" meetings held by the revolutionary syndicalists present at the congress, which the document indicates in the appendix.

This is a reprint of an article by Dunois published in *La Voix du Peuple de Lausanne*(244) , which states that "revolutionary syndicalism is making unceasing 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). Cornélissen was in charge of producing this bulletin.

The 1907 congress led to the creation of two separate 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 Cornélissen. There is no mention 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. And 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.

Syndicalism of anarchist obedience manifested itself, but nobody really paid attention to it. The Czech Vohrysek spoke of the miners' and weavers' unions in northern Bohemia, which were under direct anarchist influence. 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 was involved in the creation of the first Argentine labor organizations, and we think it's worth saying a few words about the evolution of the Argentine labor 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, 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

defined as a workers' resistance organization, rather than a trade union. For its militants, the term "trade union" implies an ideological neutrality that 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 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-democrat 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.

Cornélissen's little phrase 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". The *Action-directe* de Liège replied that "anarchists, despite their differences of opinion on syndicalism, have 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 of creating special revolutionary unions where the general unions were subservient to a political party. Syndicalism is therefore not threatened by anarchist unions"(253).

Cornélissen adds that he has already explained to the French syndicalist comrades present at the congress "that they shouldn't think too much about the situation in their own country; that in France, no doubt, the tendencies of the unions are revolutionary (this is by no means a question of anarchism) but that this is not the case in other countries: Austria, Germany, England, the United States. In these other countries, a new revolutionary trade union movement may have to be created to counter 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 Cornélissen's modesty and prudence we sense the weight of the idea of unity of the workers' movement. A man who, since the Zürich congress of 1893, had personally experienced the Second International's sidelining of anti-parliamentarians, found himself obliged to present the libertarian workers' movement as an exception to the unitary rule.

Monatte's ideas, like Malatesta's, are based more on their representation 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 workers, despite his rejection of the notion of the working class, Malatesta cannot envisage a divided workers' movement, as in such a case 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.

Like the militants of the "young union" of miners in Pas-de-Calais, the Dutch libertarian syndicalists did not 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 in 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 were formed, most often under the impetus of anarchist workers. A comparative history of these different movements has yet to be written.

Cornélissen published the *Bulletin international du mouvement syndicaliste* until 1915. This weekly, whose aim was "to inform revolutionary syndicalists about the international trade union movement, provides invaluable information on the activities of all 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 Cornélissen is for the revolutionary syndicalist press"(257).

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

In December 1922, two former members of his 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 many books on the Spanish libertarian movement. José Peirats, *Les anarchistes espagnols - Révolution de 1936 et luttes de toujours*, Toulouse, Repères-Silena, 1989.
2. Based on Pierre Monatte's recollections in *La révolution prolétarienne*, n°347, January 1951, p. 17. If this information is correct, Dunois was not without a sense of humor, as he quotes his own articles quite impersonally in the minutes. This modesty is perhaps due to the fact that he considered this to be a collective work, written by himself, but based on notes he had taken.

- by different people. We know that a certain A. Pratelle had announced himself to take down the congress debates in French and English. See *Bulletin de l'Internationale Libertaire*, Herstal- Liège, n°4, May 1907.
3. Although he wrote for an anarchist periodical, Dunois could not be considered a true libertarian. In 1908, he decided to serve revolutionary syndicalism and contributed to the *Bataille syndicaliste*, but Marxism, which he had discovered in 1905-1906, led him to make a crucial choice: in 1912, he joined the SFIO and became a contributor to *L'Humanité*. Very close to Jaurès, he was by his side on the evening of his assassination. After the war, Dunois joined the supporters of the Third International. At the Tours Congress, he became a member of the Communist Party's steering committee. He also became General Secretary of *L'Humanité*. He left the Communist Party in 1927, joining the SFIO in 1930. A leader of the underground 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. From *Dictionnaire biographique du mouvement ouvrier français*, Tome XII, Paris, Editions ouvrières, 1974, pp. 109- 113.
  4. *Congrès anarchiste tenu à Amsterdam, Août 1907 - Compte-rendu analytique des séances et résumé des rapports sur l'état du mouvement dans le monde entier*, Paris, 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, Tome II*, Paris, PUF, 1974, p. 153, or Jean Maitron, *Le mouvement anarchiste en France, Tome I*, Paris, Maspero, 1975, p. 111.
  6. Jean Maitron, *Le mouvement anarchiste en France*, op. cit., p. 56 ff.
  7. Quoted in James Guillaume, *L'internationale - Documents et souvenirs, vol. 1 (1864-1872)*, Geneva, Grounauer, 1980, part three, chapter X, pp. 160-161.
  8. Resolutions of the General Congress held at The Hague from September 2 to 7, 1872, in Jacques Freymond (ed.), *La première internationale*, Genève, Droz, 1962, Tome 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 detailed analysis of the emergence of anarchist individualism at the London Congress in 1881, see 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 apprenticed as a shoemaker and embraced socialist ideas. In 1890, he became editor-in-chief of Silesia's leading social-democratic newspaper. Sentenced to two and a half years' imprisonment for press offenses, he went into exile on his release in 1893. In New York, he joined the circle of the famous German anarchist Johann Most and became a contributor to Most's newspaper *Freiheit*. Baginski wrote mainly satirical articles. In 1894, he was appointed editor of the *Chicagoer Arbeiter-Zeitung*, a socialist daily that became an anarchist under his influence. From then on, he earned his living as a publicist. From *Itinéraire* n° 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 St. 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 learned 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 in anarchist circles, Most sent her on a lecture tour. From then on, she devoted herself to this form of propaganda, which made her famous. In 1892, following a massacre of striking workers, Alexandre Berkman attempted to kill the director of the firm concerned. He survived, but Berkman spent fourteen years in prison. Emma Goldman was also imprisoned, in 1893, for inciting the unemployed to revolt at a meeting. In 1895, she spent some time in Vienna and learned the trade of nurse-midwife, a profession she practiced from then on in the United States while continuing her militant activities. A convinced feminist, she was a pioneer in the fight for birth control. No. 8 of *Itinéraire* magazine is devoted to her. See also Emma Goldman, *Épopée 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, *History of anarchism in the United States of America - The origins: 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 Gætano Manfredonia's thesis, *L'individualisme anarchiste en France*, op. cit.
23. For the authors of the first convening circular, mentioned on page 8 of *Congrès anarchiste tenu à Amsterdam...*, op. cit. the 1907 meeting would be the fourth international libertarian and communist congress, after Zürich (1893), London (1896) and the banned International Revolutionary Workers' Congress in Paris (1900), to which we'll return later.
24. Present at congresses in Brussels (1891), Zurich (1893) and London (1896), and author of a contribution to the banned Paris congress (1900), Cornélissen (1864-1942) was probably the main organizer of the 1907 Amsterdam congress. At least, this is what Jean-Yves Bériou asserts 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 Duitse 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, 1963. Bert Andréas also points out that in 1891 Cornélissen "had already published, under the pseudonym Clemens, a defense of Marx's theories".
27. Christ. Cornélissen, *Les diverses tendances du Parti ouvrier international...*, op. cit. p. 5. Note here the Dutch socialists' acceptance of electoral and parliamentary participation. It is part of the present evolution of Dutch socialism. From 1888 to 1891, its main leader F. Domela Nieuwenhuis (1846-1919) was a member of parliament. His move towards anarchism was contemporaneous with the Zürich Congress. The definitive break between Dutch parliamentary and anti-parliamentary socialists came the following year (1894) with the formation of a rival social-democratic party on the German model. On this subject, see Rudolf de Jong, "Le mouvement libertaire aux Pays-Bas" in *Le Mouvement social*, n°83, April-August 1973, pp. 167-180.
28. Christ. Cornélissen, *Les diverses tendances du Parti ouvrier international...*, op. cit. p. 9.
29. *Ibid*, p. 21.
30. *Ibid*.
31. *International Socialist Workers' Congress held in Zurich from August 6 to 12, 1893*, op. cit., p. 8.
32. *Ibid*.
33. *Journal de Genève* August 13, 1893, reprinted in *Congrès international ouvrier socialiste held in Zurich...*, *ibid*. p. 585.
34. *Journal de Genève* 12 août 1893, *ibid*. p. 581.
35. *Ibid*.
36. "A careful reading of the agenda for the Zürich Congress is enough to convince us that there are two trends in the international socialist workers' movement, fighting for precedence (...). On the one hand, there is the purely parliamentary trend, aiming to conquer political power, and more specifically a majority in parliament (...); on the other, there is the anti-parliamentary trend, partly exclusively trade-unionist, which, in the first place, aims to organize the workers, and which, although it has not completely abandoned all parliamentary action, nevertheless participates in it only with suspicion...". *Les diverses tendances du Parti ouvrier international...* op. cit. p. 3.
37. Jean Allemane (1843-1935) was the leader of the Parti ouvrier socialiste révolutionnaire (POSR), one of France's leading socialist organizations at the time. In contrast to their orthodox Marxist rivals in Jules Guesde's Parti ouvrier français (POF), they were highly pragmatic, believing that all means were good for advancing the workers' cause. They were as much in favor of electoral agitation as they were of the general strike, the former being a prelude to the latter. For them, the blueprint for the future society could just as easily be attempted by winning a town council as by taking part in the trade union movement.
38. This quotation is taken from an extract from Christian Cornélissen's memoirs, appended to a document by Homme Wedman entitled: *Pour une biographie de Christian Cornélissen*, n.d., available from the International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam (IHS).
39. It was in 1893 that Christian Cornélissen created the NAS (Secrétariat National du Travail), the Dutch equivalent of the Fédération des Bourses du Travail in France, of which Pelloutier was to be General Secretary from 1895 until his death in 1901.

40. Pelloutier's presence at the Zurich congress and his links with Cornélissen are curiously not mentioned in Jacques Julliard's biography: *Fernand Pelloutier et les origines du syndicalisme d'action directe*, Paris, Seuil, 1971. See Homme Wedman, in *Die Rezeption der Marxschen Theorie in den Niederlanden - Schriften aus dem Karl-Marx-Haus*, no. 45, Trier, 1992, p. 94.
41. According to Augustin Hamon, in *La Révolution Proletarienne*, n°53, March 1, 1928.
42. La Société Nouvelle de Bruxelles, 1896. Quoted in Homme Wedman, *Pour une biographie de Christian Cornélissen*, op. cit.
43. A. Hamon, *Le socialisme & le congrès de Londres*, Paris, P.-V. Stock, 1897, p. 83.
44. Ibid, p. 84.
45. Founded in 1893, the Independent Labour Party (ILP) was Britain's leading left-wing party. Although formed ten years after the Marxist Social Democratic Federation (SDF), the ILP proved to be more effective than the SDF from the outset, and was in some ways the forerunner of the Labour Party. The ILP's orientation was socialist, collectivist, libertarian and federalist, but not revolutionary. After a bitter defeat in the 1895 elections, the party, which relied on the new direct action unionism embodied by its leaders such as Keir Hardie and Tom Mann, set out to conquer the Trade-Unions in order to rally the working-class base needed for its electoral strategy.
46. Quoted in A. Hamon, *Le socialisme & le congrès de Londres*, op. cit. p. 219-222.
47. *Congrès international socialiste des travailleurs et des chambres syndicales ouvrières, London, July 26 - August 2, 1896*, Geneva, Minkoff Repint, 1980, p. 6 and p. 459.
48. First and foremost, the French revolutionary syndicalists and all the trade union groups in other countries inspired by their doctrine. And, of course, the anarchist-inspired workers' organizations, particularly in Spain and Latin America. But also, to a certain extent, the British Trade-Unions and the entire American labor movement, from the Knights of Labor to the American Federation of Labor and the Industrial Workers of the World...
49. For this section we refer to Augustin Hamon, *Le socialisme & le congrès de Londres*, op. cit. p. 171 ff.
50. Keir Hardie (1856-1915) was undoubtedly one of the best-known socialists of his time in Great Britain. A miner from the age of ten, then a journalist and trade union leader in Lanarkshire, Scotland, he became Secretary of the Scottish Miners' Federation in 1886, a position he held for seven years. His socialism, originally Christian, was not based on any specific theory. He preached non-violent revolution and was totally 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.
51. A miner from the age of ten, then a metalworker, Tom Mann (1856-1941) made a name for himself through the important role he played in the great London dockers' strike of 1889, and subsequently as a tireless advocate of the defense and organization of unskilled workers. Initially a militant of the Social Democratic Federation (SDF), Tom Mann was one of the ILP's leading figures at its founding. Party secretary from 1894 to 1897, he left to become president of the International Dockworkers' Federation. Emigrating to New Zealand and then Australia between 1901 and 1910, he embraced the principles of revolutionary syndicalism. On his return in 1910, he became one of the most influential leaders in the British labor movement, where he endeavored to popularize the principles of the French CGT. In 1920, he was one of the founders of the British Communist Party.
52. Emile Pouget considers the peasant to be almost instinctively anarchistic; for him, government is the gendarme and the taxman. So it's easy to show them the uselessness of the State. On the economic front . As for the collective exploitation of land, he'll come to it little by little through experimentation. German anarchist Gustave Landauer was even more opposed to the Marxist concept of agrarian collectivism. For Landauer, "large farms are a form of state socialism". He wanted to see small landowners form cooperatives with their workers to "prevent the growth of large property and create organizations that could be the nucleus of a socialist society". *Socialism & the London Congress*, op. cit.
53. Between 1893 and 1894, at the height of the bombing era, three laws were passed targeting anarchists. Among other things, they were intended to target those who "by any means whatsoever carry out an act of anarchist propaganda". Quoted in Jean Maitron, *Le mouvement anarchiste en France*, op. cit. p. 252, note 2.
54. *Les Temps Nouveaux - Literary supplement appearing every Saturday*, nos. 23 to 32 published between September 29 and December 1, 1900. These reports exist as a separate issue numbered from page 129 to page 342.
55. Ibid, p. 129.
56. This appeal appeared in *Père Peinard*, n°128, April 16-30, 1899.

57. *Les Temps Nouveaux - Supplément littéraire... 1900*, op. cit. p. 129.
58. Ibid.
59. Jean Maitron, *Le mouvement anarchiste en France*, op. cit. p. 441. The Paris congress of the Second International took place from September 24 to 27, 1900, starting the day after the revolutionaries' congress should have ended.
60. *Les Temps Nouveaux - Supplément littéraire... 1900*, op. cit. p. 199.
61. Ibid.
62. Ibid, p. 200.
63. This was the case for Sébastien Faure in Lyon in 1901. Detail reported in Gætano Manfredonia, *L'individualisme anarchiste en France*, op. cit. p. 206.
64. *Les Temps Nouveaux - Literary Supplement... 1900*, p. 199.
65. *Le mouvement anarchiste en France*, op. cit. p. 442.
66. Initially made up of socialist students of various persuasions, the ESRI group became clearly anarchist from 1894 onwards. The ESRI played an important role in the maturation and dissemination of revolutionary syndicalist ideas. The students' genuine collaboration with syndicalists such as Paul Delessale and Pierre Monatte, who was their last secretary in 1903, is attested 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 activity consisted in organizing public discussion assemblies and preparing and publishing pamphlets on themes relating to socialism, anarchism and the workers' movement. The ESRI drew up several reports for the 1900 congress.
67. According to Jean Maitron, *Le Mouvement social* n°46, ibid. p. 21.
68. *Les Temps Nouveaux - Supplément littéraire... 1900*, op. cit. p. 177.
69. Ibid, p. 178.
70. Cornélissen moved to Paris in the spring of 1898. His departure from Holland was linked to the evolution of Dutch socialism and, above all, to his differences with F. Domela Nieuwenhuis. Domela Nieuwenhuis. Since 1893, a new parliamentary socialist party had existed in Holland, Troelstra's SDAP. The Socialistenbond (Socialist Federation), headed by Domela Nieuwenhuis, was breaking up. Domela, who was moving towards anarchism, became increasingly suspicious of permanent organizations and left the Socialistenbond at Christmas 1897. Cornélissen, following a love affair with Domela's daughter, had very strained relations with the latter. He refused to replace Domela as head of the Socialistenbond, just as he refused, for reasons of principle, a permanent position at the NAS, the trade union center he had helped to create. Thirty-four years old when he moved to Paris, Cornélissen, who had been a primary school teacher, began an apprenticeship as a decorative painter before establishing himself as a journalist. He maintained links with his homeland, contributing to the trade-unionist *Volksblad* and anarchist periodicals. He was also at the heart of attempts to unite anti-parliamentary socialists and anarchist communists in Holland. Cf. Homme Wedman, *Pour une biographie de Christian Cornélissen*, op. cit.
71. *Les Temps Nouveaux - Supplément littéraire... 1900*, op. cit. p. 177.
72. Ibid.
73. Ibid, p. 178.
74. Ibid, p. 179.
75. Jean Grave (1859-1939) was a typical example of communist-libertarian ideology between 1880 and 1914. He was a friend of Elisée Reclus and Kropotkin, whom he had known since 1883, when he agreed to take charge of the publication of *Le Révolté* in Geneva. From then until the First World War, Jean Grave carried out a constant and colossal work of anarchist propaganda. For thirty-one years, he carried a bi-monthly or weekly anarchist newspaper, often accompanied by a literary supplement. First came *Le Révolté*, which followed him to Paris in 1885 and disappeared in 1887 to make way for *La Révolte*, which itself disappeared in 1894 at the time of the bombings, to be followed in 1895 by *Les Temps nouveaux*. The author of several books and propaganda brochures, Grave published a total of 12 million copies of periodicals, 88 brochures with a total print run of 2,236,000 copies, 240,000 leaflets and books totalling around 12,000 volumes. Figures given by Jean Maitron in "Jean Grave 1854-1939" *Revue d'Histoire économique et sociale*, n°1, 1950, pp. 105-115. Without being a fervent supporter of trade unionism, as we shall see, Grave opened up *Les Temps Nouveaux* to trade unionists, who wrote a column in the paper from 1895 onwards. First Fernand Pelloutier wrote a few articles, then Paul Delessale inaugurated the "Mouvement ouvrier" section, which was later taken over by militants such as Amédée Dunois and Pierre Monatte. Grave, on the other hand, was a fervent opponent of individualism. Here's what he had to say about it: "To assert that

- the individual has only to seek his own well-being, to look after his own development - too bad for those who stand in his way - was to introduce, under the guise of anarchy, the most ferociously bourgeois theory". Jean Grave, *Quarante ans de propagande anarchiste*, Paris, Flammarion, 1973, p. 25.
76. *Les Temps Nouveaux - Supplément littéraire... 1900*, op. cit. pp. 181-183.
  77. Ibid, p. 184.
  78. Ibid.
  79. Ibid, p. 246.
  80. If such a situation were to arise, it would mean, according to the social democrats, that workers could long ago have taken power through the ballot box.
  81. *Les Temps Nouveaux - Supplément littéraire... 1900*, op. cit. p. 186.
  82. Ibid, p. 187.
  83. Ibid, p. 185.
  84. Jacques Julliard, in *Le Mouvement social*, n°65, 1968, p. 57. Article reprinted in *Autonomie ouvrière - Etudes sur le syndicalisme d'action directe*, Paris, Seuil, 1988, pp. 43-68.
  85. For a detailed biography, see *Dictionnaire biographique du mouvement ouvrier français*, Tome XII, op. cit. pp. 331-333.
  86. Underlined by the author, Jacques Julliard, *Le Mouvement social*, n°65, 1968, art. cit. p. 58.
  87. From *Dictionnaire biographique du mouvement ouvrier français*, Tome XIV, op. cit. 1976, pp. 70-73.
  88. In *Dictionnaire biographique du mouvement ouvrier français*, Tome XIV, op. cit. p. 300. Pouget was also the author of several syndicalist pamphlets, including *Grève générale réformiste et grève générale révolutionnaire* (1903) *Boycottage et sabotage, L'Action directe* (1910), *Le Parti du Travail...* and a book written with Emile Pataud: *Comment nous ferons la Révolution* (1909).
  89. *Le Père Peinard* n°45, January 12, 1890, p. 17. Quoted in Christian de Goustine, *Pouget - Les matins noirs du syndicalisme*, Paris, Tête de Feuilles, 1972, p. 85.
  90. From *Dictionnaire biographique du mouvement ouvrier français*, Tome XV, op. cit. pp. 345- 346
  91. Information taken from *Dictionnaire biographique du mouvement ouvrier français*, Tome XI, 1973, pp. 347-349.
  92. According to Georges Lefranc, *Le mouvement syndical sous la troisième république*, Paris, Payot, 1967, p. 127.
  93. Monatte, imprisoned after the events at Courrière, was accused of having received a very large sum of money from Count Durand de Beauregard to foment unrest in Pas-de-Calais.
  94. Georges Lefranc, *Le mouvement syndical...*, op. cit. p. 137.
  95. For detailed analyses and reflections on the Charter and the Amiens Congress, see Georges Lefranc, *ibid.* pp. 138-146. See also Decoopman, Nicole et al, *L'actualité de la Charte d'Amiens*, Paris, PUF, 1987.
  96. Jean Maitron, *Le mouvement anarchiste en France*, Tome 1, op. cit. p. 321. Paul Delessale's words come from a letter to E. Dolléans on May 27, 1938
  97. Adapted from Patrick de Laubier, *1905: mythe et réalité de la grève générale*, Tournai, Editions Universitaires, 1989.
  98. While Rosa Luxemburg and Trotsky recognized the positive role of mass spontaneity in this context, Lenin vigorously rejected it, attributing a major role to professional revolutionaries. However, all three considered that the general strike did not solve the question, essential in their eyes, of conquering power. It is merely a means, a prerequisite. *Ibid.* pp. 31-38.
  99. *Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam...*, op. cit. p. 7.
  100. *Ibid.* p. 23.
  101. *Ibid.* p. 27.
  102. Federation representative I. I. Samson acknowledges in his report that the newspaper owned by Domela Nieuwenhuis, the *Vrije Socialist* (Free Socialist) is "by far the best known of our newspapers", *ibid.*, p. 23.
  103. In January 1903, a railway workers' strike led to a resounding victory. "The successful paralysis of traffic seemed to vindicate anarchist ideas about the general strike. But the government reacted by proposing laws prohibiting strikes in the railroads and other public services. The general strike, launched in April of that year, failed, and the laws were passed. Many activists lost their jobs. According to Rudolf de Jong, *Le Mouvement social* n°83, op. cit. p. 171-172.
  104. According to the "declarations and comments of the G.C.L. of Belgium" published in *Bulletin de l'Internationale Libertaire*, Herstal-Liège, n°1, October 1906.

105. Ibid.
106. Ibid.
107. Their existence is mentioned in one sentence. "Apart from the G.C.L., there is a libertarian colony in Stockel-Bois; two small monthly French-language sheets and two Flemish bi-monthlies. On the other hand, some comrades, while opposed to the organization, have *organized* a library in Verviers." Ibid. There is a rather comical description of the Stockel libertarian colony, promoted by Emile Chapelier, one of the congress participants. Founded in 1905, it was an agricultural colony, but it didn't have a single peasant; all its members were "honest workers". Production "proceeded at a snail's pace (...) [but] working the land proved so off-putting that several settlers discovered a sudden artistic vocation. Instead of wielding spades and rakes, they began to decorate plates with paintbrushes, bought at bargain prices (...). The bourgeoisie and the curious were happy to visit the Communist colony (...). Visitors were welcomed as potential followers. They were served slices of brown bread, cottage cheese, radishes and onions, and, as the principles of the colony were opposed to any kind of commercial activity, after eating and sometimes wrapping a plate decorated with meaningful symbols, each person paid his or her contribution into a specially prepared box. (...) many visitors regarded the experiment as a joke or a fairground attraction (...) [and] limited their contribution to a few buttons they had provided themselves with beforehand". The experiment came to an end when the owner  
 "On learning of the snakes' nest occupying the estate under his control, he ordered the anarchists to leave within the legal time limit. That was the end of it. Jean de Meur, *L'anarchisme ou la contestation permanente*, Essai, Bruxelles, Pierre de Méyère, 1970, pp. 55-57.
108. In other words, the signatories of the first convocation circular. The 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*, n°42, February 16, 1907.
109. With the exception of relations between native Germans and German immigrants, mainly in the USA.
110. *Almanach illustré de la Révolution*, Paris, 1907, pp. 39-41.
111. Ibid.
112. *Bulletin de l'Internationale Libertaire*, n°1, op. cit. The article from which this quotation is taken is unsigned, as are most of the contributions published in this Bulletin. The editor (?) having decided, from the very first issue, to "depersonalize the debates, by doing away with signatures".
113. Continuing to reflect on the subject, an individualist voice adds a few lines on "creation and libertarianism" which, in our opinion, testify well to this current's feelings towards the supporters of the International: "Nothing is lost, nothing is created, said Lavoisier. He's no friend of internationalist bulletineers. In the first article alone of the B.I.L. [Bulletin de l'internationale libertaire], addressed I don't know why to the anarchists, an article of fifty or sixty lines, we read seven or eight times the words créer and création. Now maybe the friends have done it voluntarily: what they create is so little that it's safe to say: nothing is created." *L'Anarchie* n°80, Paris, October 17, 1906.
114. *Les Temps nouveaux*, n°42, February 16, 1907. In this article, Dunois also wonders whether there isn't "a great illusion in believing that congresses are capable of creating something? Their role is to exchange ideas, to confront opinions, facts, hypotheses and hopes, - and to leave it to each individual to conclude and act". An argument, as we can see, quite close to that of *L'Anarchie*, from which everything separates it.
115. Ibid.
116. Op. cit, p. 39.
117. Ibid.
118. "The evolution of anarchism in the Dutch workers' movement" in *Le Mouvement socialiste*, July 15, 1905, pp. 392-400.
119. Commenting on the evolution of certain Dutch anarchists, Cornélissen refers to Stirner's philosophy, advocated in certain circles "as a new gospel even by those (or especially by those) who couldn't read Stirner, his Unique not being translated into Dutch". Ibid. p. 397.
120. La Gioventu Libertaria, *Bulletin de l'internationale libertaire*, no. 3, February 1907.
121. Rudolf Grossmann, known as Pierre Ramus (1878-1942), was one of Austria's leading libertarian propagandists and writers. As a journalist, from 1900 he contributed to the journal *Freiheit*, published in New York by the German anarchist Johann Most. In 1907, he moved to Vienna, where he founded the anarchist organ *Wohlstand für Alle*. He would go on to edit numerous other publications (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 that of non-violence. He approved of the strike

- expropriation, direct action and revolution, but disapproved of the militaristic method of arming this revolution. He also opposed all individual armed violence. See *Dictionnaire biographique du mouvement ouvrier international (Autriche)*, Paris, Editions ouvrières, 1971, pp. 243-244.
122. *Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam...*, op. cit. p. 17.
123. Born in 1875, de Marmande was a viscount. An anarchist journalist, he contributed to *Les Temps Nouveaux* and Gustave Hervé's *La Guerre sociale*. According to the *Dictionnaire biographique du mouvement ouvrier français*, Tome XIV, op. cit. p. 13.
124. *Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam...*, op. cit. p. 17.
125. *Les Temps Nouveaux - Supplément littéraire*, 1900, op. cit. p. 224.
126. *Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam...*, op. cit. p. 24.
127. *Ibid*, p. 25.
128. *Ibid*, p. 22.
129. *Ibid*. Here are a few figures to 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, and 50,000 copies of a brochure had recently been distributed.
130. *Ibid*, p. 27.
131. *Ibid*, p. 30.
132. Building on his London experience, Rocker devoted his life to the development of the international libertarian workers' 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. See *Dictionnaire biographique du mouvement ouvrier international (Allemagne)*, Paris, Editions ouvrières, 1990, pp. 402-403, and the issue devoted to him by the magazine *Itinéraire* (n°4, December 1988).
133. *Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam...*, op. cit. p. 31.
134. Rudolf Rocker also gives figures for anarchist publications in Yiddish. *L'Arbeiter Freund* has a circulation of 2,500, and 40,000 brochures have been put into circulation in four years. The Federation also has the magazine *Germinal*, with a circulation of 2,000.
135. *Ibid*, p. 33.
136. *Ibid*, p. 32.
137. *Ibid*, p. 33.
138. *Ibid*, p. 34.
139. *Ibid*.
140. 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 money. According to Manfredonia, *L'individualisme anarchiste en France*, op. cit. p. 346.
141. *Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam...*, op. cit. p. 19.
142. *Ibid*.
143. *Ibid*, p. 19-20.
144. *Ibid*, p. 98.
145. Following a joint amendment by Vaillant and Jaurès, the congress of the Second International agreed that the working class and its representatives in parliaments had a duty to prevent war by all means. Previously, resolutions of social-democratic congresses had asserted that a general strike in the event of war would hand Europe over to the least civilized country (Russia) and thus delay the advent of socialism.
146. Georges Haupt, in *Congrès socialiste international - Stuttgart 6-24 août 1907*, Tome 17, Genève, Minkoff Repint, 1985, p.10.
147. *Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam...*, op. cit. p. 99.
148. While Kropotkine, Jean Grave, James Guillaume, Cornélissen and others rallied to the Sacred Union. Malatesta, Domela Nieuwenhuis, Emma Goldman, Rocker and others maintained their principled opposition to the war.
149. In the end, John Turner (1864-1940), an English anarchist and trade unionist, did not take part in the congress.
150. *Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam...*, op. cit. p. 35.
151. *Ibid*.
152. *Ibid*, p. 37.
153. *Ibid*, p. 36.
154. *Ibid*, p. 40.
155. *Ibid*, p. 43.
156. *Ibid*.
157. *Ibid*, p. 43-44.



158. Ibid, p. 48.
159. Ibid, p. 50.
160. *Les Temps Nouveaux*, September 28, 1907, p. 2.
161. In the preface to the Spanish edition of Luigi Fabbri's biography of his daughter Malatesta, Luce Fabbri wrote: "When Luigi Fabbri spoke at the international anarchist congress in Amsterdam, Malatesta put his arm on his shoulder and introduced him to his companions with the words 'my son'. This paternity of spirit was not just one of tenderness, but also of intimate intellectual compenetration". In Luis Fabbri, *Malatesta*, Buenos Aires, Editorial Americalee, 1945, p. 7.
162. Luigi Fabbri, *L'organisation anarchiste*, Paris, Volonté anarchiste, 1979, p. 20.
163. Jean Maitron, *Le mouvement anarchiste en France*, Tome 1, op. cit. p. 324.
164. Jean Maitron, *ibid.* considers Malatesta to be the dean of the congress. He was fifty-three at the time, seven years younger than Domela Nieuwenhuis, who admittedly made only a brief appearance at the congress.
165. To earn his living, Malatesta learned the trade of mechanic, then electrician.
166. After Max Nettlau, *Errico Malatesta. El hombre, el revolucionario, el anarquista*, s. 1., Ed. Tierra y Libertad, 1945, p. 18.
167. Malatesta goes on to tear Kropotkin's mechanical determinism to shreds. *Pensiero e Volontà*, July 1, 1925, translated in Errico Malatesta, *Ecrits choisis 1*, Annecy, Groupe 1er Mai, 1978, pp. 46-47.
168. Max Nettlau, *Errico Malatesta*, op. cit., p. 13.
169. Ibid, p. 33.
170. This text was first published in 1899, in various issues of Paterson's *Questione sociale*, and then published in 1903 in pamphlet form in New London (Connecticut). In 1920, the congress of the Italian Anarchist Union asked Malatesta to draw up a program. He proposed this text, which was then republished with a few modifications. We have used the translation published in Errico Malatesta, *Articles politique*, Paris, 10/18, 1979, pp. 63-88, based on the 1903 text.
171. Ibid, p. 64.
172. Ibid, p. 66.
173. Ibid.
174. Ibid, p. 65.
175. Ibid.
176. Ibid, p. 82.
177. Ibid, pp. 71-72.
178. Ibid, p. 85.
179. Ibid, p. 86.
180. Errico Malatesta, "L'Anarchie", *La Brochure mensuelle* n°79-80, Paris, 1929 (reprint "in extenso" of the brochure published in Paris in 1907).
181. *Political articles*, op. cit. p. 75.
182. Malatesta thought that these "perhaps serve, as extravagant people often do, to open up new paths for future thought and action...", *Les Temps nouveaux*, September 28, 1907.
183. Ibid.
184. *Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam...*, op. cit. p. 62.
185. At the time, provincial stock exchanges were willingly represented on national bodies by volunteer members of Parisian unions.
186. See above for events preceding the general strike of May 1, 1906.
187. Emphasis added. See Pierre Monatte, "Il y a cinquante ans - La fondation de la "Vie Ouvrière" in *La Révolution Proletarienne*, nouvelle série, n° 142, October 1959.  
At the time of the congress, Georges Yvetot was in prison.
188. Monatte went on to play a significant role in the French labor movement. Here are a few details of his later career. In 1908, he worked at the CGT confederal printing works. After the failure of *La Révolution*, Emile Pouget's syndicalist daily, Monatte set up his own magazine, *La Vie ouvrière*, with financial help from James Guillaume and others. In 1914, he opposed the Sacred Union. A supporter of the CGT minority against Jouhaux in 1922, he was led, against the advice of the anarchists, to support the CGTU's membership of the Red Trade Union International. In 1923, he became a journalist with *L'Humanité*, then a member of the Communist Party, but was expelled in 1924. He then founded a new review, *La Révolution prolétarienne*. At the end of his life, Monatte did not deny the conception of syndicalism he had expressed in Amsterdam in 1907. His "Discours au congrès anarchiste d'Amsterdam" was published in *La Révolution prolétarienne* n° 347 in

- January 1951. Information taken mainly from *Dictionnaire biographique du mouvement ouvrier français*, Tome XIV, op. cit. p. 117-123.
189. *Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam...*, op. cit. p. 67.
190. Ibid, p. 62.
191. Ibid.
192. Ibid, p. 67.
193. Ibid, pp. 69-70.
194. Ibid, p. 70.
195. Ibid. p. 69
196. Ibid. p. 70-71.
197. From *Dictionnaire biographique du mouvement ouvrier français*, Tome XI, op. cit. pp. 73-74.
198. Quoted by Jacques Julliard, *Le Mouvement social* n°47, April-June 1964, p. 15.
199. Ibid, p. 21.
200. Ibid, p. 20.
201. *Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam...*, op. cit. p. 87. During his stay in Amsterdam, Broutchoux had entrusted the editorial staff of *Action syndicale* to individualist anarchist elements. On August 18, 1907, in an editorial entitled "La lâcheté ouvrière" ("Workers' cowardice") and signed "Lord Hulot" (Lorulot), he wrote: "The working class, beaten to a pulp by the despots it accepts, only gets what it deserves. (...) By its silence, unconsciousness, fear and cowardice, it has made itself an accomplice of the rulers and capitalists. Quoted in Jacques Julliard, *Le Mouvement social* n°47, op. cit. p. 27. This text, which contradicts the allegations made by Monatte and Broutchoux at the congress, is revealing of the heterogeneity of French anarchism at the time. It was bound to sow discord among the militants of the "young union". On November 10, Dumoulin's team denounced in *Action syndicale* "the miserable attempts of politicians and unscrupulous anarchists" against the union. Quoted by Jacques Julliard, *ibid.*
202. Jacques Julliard, *ibid.* p. 30.
203. Ibid. To avoid having to join Basly's union, or leave the CGT, the miners in the "young union" took refuge in the slate quarry workers' union... On this subject, see also Joël Michel, "Syndicalisme minier et politique dans le Nord-Pas-de-Calais : le cas Basly (1880-1914)" in *Le Mouvement social* n°87, April-June 1974, pp. 9-33.
204. *Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam...*, op. cit. p. 78.
205. Ibid. p. 79.
206. Ibid.
207. Ibid, p. 85. In 1922, Malatesta clarified his thinking: "the labor movement is a means to be used today to raise and educate the masses, and to be used tomorrow for the inevitable revolutionary jolt. But it's a means with its drawbacks and dangers. And we anarchists must do our utmost to neutralize the disadvantages in question (...) and use the movement as best we can for our own ends". *Umanità Nova*, April 6, 1922, in Malatesta, *Ecrits choisis III*, Annecy, Groupe 1er Mai, 1982, p. 11.
208. *Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam...*, op. cit. p. 81.
209. Ibid, p. 80.
210. Hubert Lagardelle et al, *Syndicalisme & socialisme*, Paris, Rivière, 1908, p. 17.
211. Ibid, pp. 4-6.
212. *Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam...*, op. cit. p. 81.
213. Ibid.
214. Ibid.
215. Ibid, p. 82.
216. Malatesta, "Le congrès d'Amsterdam", in *Les Temps nouveaux*, October 5, 1907.
217. *Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam...*, op. cit. p. 82
218. Ibid, p. 80.
219. Ibid.
220. Ibid, p. 82.
221. Malatesta, *Les Temps nouveaux*, October 5, 1907.
222. *Pensiero e Volontà*, April 16 1925, in Malatesta, *Selected Writings III*, op. cit. p. 14.
223. *Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam...*, op. cit. p. 89.
224. Ibid, p. 83.
225. Ibid.
226. Ibid.
227. See Jacques Julliard, *Fernand Pelloutier et les origines du syndicalisme d'action directe*, Paris, Seuil, 1971, p. 88.

228. Here's how Victor Griffuelhes approached the theme of "general strike and violence" in 1908: "The general strike, in its final expression, is not for workers the simple stoppage of their arms; it is the seizure of social wealth developed by corporations, in this case trade 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.
229. As Dunois puts it, in *Congrès anarchiste tenu à Amsterdam...*, op. cit. p. 39.
230. Malatesta, *ibid.* p. 50.
231. According to Massimo Varengo, in *Itinéraire* n° 5-6, June 1989, p. 70.
232. *Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam...*, op. cit. p. 44.
233. *Ibid.*, pp. 76-77.
234. *Ibid.*, p. 77.
235. The fact that Malatesta considers that, in the fight against capitalism, a lost strike is just as useful as a won one testifies to his practical ignorance of trade union struggle. The Dutch unionists of the NAS, who saw their organization virtually disappear after the 1903 strike, could have taught him a thing or two on the subject.
236. Errico Malatesta, *Political articles*, op. cit., p. 77.
237. *Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam...*, op. cit. p. 77.
238. *Umanità Nova*, April 13 1922, in Malatesta, *Selected Writings III*, op. cit., p. 5.
239. *Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam...*, op. cit. p. 96.
240. *Ibid.*, pp. 92-93.
241. *Ibid.*, p. 92.
242. *Ibid.*, p. 94.
243. *Ibid.*, p. 92.
244. *La Voix du Peuple de Lausanne*, n°40, October 5, 1907. Reproduced in *Congrès anarchiste tenu à Amsterdam...*, op. cit. pp. 113-116.
245. *Ibid.*, p. 113.
246. *Ibid.*, p. 114.
247. *Ibid.*, p. 116.
248. Born in Rostov-on-Don in 1882, Alexandre Schapiro was the son of a revolutionary. As a child, he was sent to Turkey to study at the Lycée Français. 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, as he had planned to study medicine, but was soon forced to drop out for lack of money. In 1900, Schapiro joined his father in London and worked for many years in close collaboration with Kropotkin, Cherkezov and Rocker at the Jubilee Street Anarchist Federation. According to Paul Avrich, *Les anarchistes russes*, Paris, Maspero, 1979, p. 160.
249. *Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam...*, op. cit. p. 91.
250. Based on Antonio Lopez, *La FORA en el movimiento obrero*, Buenos Aires, 1987.
251. *Anarchist Congress held in Amsterdam...*, op. cit. p. 114.
252. To speak of anarcho-syndicalism in 1907 is an anachronism in French. As Daniel Colson has shown. See Daniel Colson, *Anarcho-syndicalisme et communisme - Saint-Etienne 1920- 1925*, Université de Saint-Etienne, 1986, p. 20. However, the existence of the concept is attested as early as 1905 for Russia, cf. Paul Avrich, *Les anarchistes russes*, op. cit. pp. 92-93, and as early as 1904 for England, cf. *Itinéraire* n°4, p. 15.
253. Quoted in *Bulletin international du mouvement syndicaliste*, n°7, October 20, 1907.
254. *Ibid.*
255. Cf. Rudolf de Jong, *Le Mouvement social*, n°83, op. cit. pp. 172-172.
256. As described by René Bianco in *Un siècle de presse anarchiste d'expression française*, Thèse pour le doctorat d'Etat, Aix-Marseille, 1987.
257. *Bulletin de l'Internationale anarchiste*, n°11, October 1909.