

For (beginning with the) *Waking Up Radio* of October 25<sup>th</sup>, 2015 Through: On-going... “Peter Kropotkin On 'The State' and 'The Economy'... Excerpts from: *Kropotkin's Revolutionary Pamphlets*, edited by Roger N. Baldwin – (Dft 29)

---

Excerpts from:

- “Modern Science and Anarchism”: pages 2 – 7
  - ““Law and Authority” ”: pages 7 – 15
  - “Revolutionary Government”: pages 15 – 21
  - “An Appeal to the Young”: pages 21 – 26
  - “Anarchism”: pages 26 – 32
- 

*How Kropotkin Would Define the Authentic 'Economy' of a Free Global Humanity:* “Political economy... ought to occupy with respect to human societies a place in science similar to that held by physiology in relation to plants and animals. It must become the physiology of society. It should aim at studying the needs of society and the various means, both hitherto used and available under the present state of scientific knowledge, for their satisfaction. It should try to analyze how far the present means are expedient and satisfactory, economic or wasteful; and then... concern itself with the discovery of means for the satisfaction of these needs with the smallest possible waste of labor and with the greatest benefit to mankind in general...” (From “Modern Science and Anarchism”)

[October 17, 2015... Sisters and Brothers: Now this is just common sense isn't it? I am certain that as we begin planning our new global social arrangement... premised on non-coercion and the limitless development of our gifts... we will find that most of what we come up with... is just common sense. Beginning with the October 25, 2015 show we will be incorporating Peter Kropotkin into our discussions – his views on 'the state' and 'the economy' – in order to expand our thinking as we start envisioning... the world we want. I'll type and upload in increments... please keep downloading the newest version (pdf) as the draft number changes. As always I welcome your feedback... and hope one day to be included in your discussions. Much love to you... you who are taking on this challenge.]

---

[Before continuing with our excerpted sections from “Modern Science and Anarchism”... lest we allow our 'power'-designed conditioning in how to think about 'science' lead us from Kropotkin's sense... let's put it in the context of the thoughts he's shared with us in earlier shows. We know from them and our reading elsewhere of him that he does not believe this “study of the needs and means of society” he's discussing to be the province of some special category of 'thinker'... far from it. In our August 2, 2015 show we quoted these words of Kropotkin (from *Fields, Factories, and Workshops* [written around 1889]):

We maintain that in the interests of both science and industry, as well as of society as a whole, every human being, without distinction of birth, ought to receive such an education as would enable him, or her, to combine a thorough knowledge of science with a thorough knowledge of handicraft. We fully recognize the necessity of specialization of knowledge, but we maintain that specialization must follow general education, and that general education must be given in science and handicraft alike. To the division of society into brain workers and manual workers we oppose the combination of both kinds of activities; and instead of 'technical education', which means the maintenance of the present division between brain work and manual work, we advocate the *education integrale*, or complete education, which means the disappearance of that pernicious distinction. [By 'handicraft' Kropotkin is referring to the work of physically reproducing our lives... proposing the following as method for both broad areas of knowledge: “Through the eyes and the hand to the brain' – this is the true principle of economy of time in teaching...”(Petr Kropotkin, *Fields, Factories and Workshops Tomorrow*, written around 1889; this edition is edited by Colin Ward)] –

In this same July 26, 2015 show we quoted Paul Goodman saying that once we are free: “Each person becomes increasingly aware of the whole operation and works at it in his own way according to his capacities...”

And we learned from Erich Fromm (in our August 9, 2015 show) that Peter Kropotkin summed up his idea of Socialism in the statement that the fullest development of individuality “will combine with the highest development of voluntary association in all its aspects, in all possible degrees, and for all possible purposes; an association that is always changing, that bears in itself the elements of its own duration, that takes on the forms which best correspond at any given moment to the manifold strivings of all.”

With that said as preface... let's continue now with excerpts of the essay of Peter Kropotkin that we opened with: “Modern Science and Anarchism”]:

---

(Peter Kropotkin, from “Modern Science and Anarchism”, *Kropotkin's Revolutionary Pamphlets*, edited by Roger N. Baldwin:)

Political economy... ought to occupy with respect to human societies a place in science similar to that held by physiology in relation to plants and animals. It must become the physiology of society. It should aim at studying the needs of society and the various means, both hitherto used and available under the present state of scientific knowledge, for their satisfaction. It should try to analyze how far the present means are expedient and satisfactory, economic or wasteful; and then... concern itself with the discovery of means for the satisfaction of these needs with the smallest possible waste of labor and with the greatest benefit to mankind in general....

Pursuing the same method, anarchism arrives at its own conclusions concerning the different forms of society, especially the State. It could not rest content with current metaphysical assertions like the following:

“The State is the affirmation of the idea of the highest justice in society;” or “The state is the instigation and the instrument of progress;” or, “Without the State, society is impossible.” Anarchism has approached the study of the State exactly in the manner the naturalist approaches the study of social life among bees and ants, or among the migratory birds which hatch their young on the shores of sub-arctic lakes. It would be useless to repeat here the conclusions to which this study has brought us with reference to the history of the different political forms (and to their desirable or probable evolution in the future). If I were to do so, I should have to repeat what has been written by anarchists from the time of Godwin, and what may be found with all necessary explanations, in a whole series of books and pamphlets.

I will say only that the State is a form of social life which has developed in our European civilization, under the influence of a series of causes, only since the end of the sixteenth century. Before the sixteenth century the State, in its Russian form, did not exist – or, more exactly, it existed only in the minds of the historians who trace the genealogy of Russian autocracy to Rurik and that of France to the Merovingian kings.

Furthermore, the State (state-justice, state-church, state-army) and capitalism are, in our opinion, inseparable concepts. In history these institutions developed side by side, mutually supporting and re-enforcing each other. They are bound together, not by a mere coincidence of contemporaneous development, but by the bond of cause and effect, effect and cause. Thus the State appears to us as a society for the mutual insurance of the landlord, the warrior, the judge, and the priest, constituted in order to enable every one of them to assert his respective authority over the people and to exploit the poor.

Such was the origin of the State; such was its history; and such is its present essence.

Consequently, to imagine that capitalism may be abolished while the State is maintained, and with the aid of the State – while the latter was founded for forwarding the development of capitalism and was always growing in power and solidity, in proportion as the power of capitalism grew up – to cherish such an illusion is as unreasonable, in our opinion, as it was to expect the emancipation of labor from the church, or from Caesarism or imperialism. Certainly, in the first half of the nineteenth century, there have been many socialists who had such dreams; but to live in the same dreamland now that we enter in the twentieth century, is really too childish.

A new form of economic organization will necessarily require a new form of political structure. And, whether the change be accomplished suddenly, by a revolution, or slowly, by the way of a gradual evolution, the two changes, political and economic, must go on abreast, hand in hand.

Each step towards economic freedom, each victory one over capitalism will be at the same time a step towards political liberty – towards liberation from the yoke of the State by means of free agreement, territorial, professional, and functional. And each step made towards taking from the State any one of its powers and attributes will be helping the masses to win a victory over capitalism.

---

### *The Means of Action*

It is obvious that, since anarchism differs so widely in its method of investigation and in its fundamental principles, both from the academic sociologists and from its social-democratic fraternity, it must of necessity equally differ from them all in its means of action.

Understanding law, right, and the State as we do, we cannot see any guarantee of progress, still less an approach to the required social changes, in the submission of the individual to the State. We are therefore no longer able to say, as do the superficial interpreters of social phenomena when they require the State management of industries, that modern capitalism has come into being through “the anarchy of exploitation,” through “the theory of non-interference, which – we are told – the States have carried out by practicing the formula of “let them do as they like” (*laissez faire, laissez passer*). We know that this is not true. While giving the capitalist any degree of free scope to amass his wealth at the expense of the helpless laborers, the government has *nowhere* and *never* during the whole nineteenth century afforded the laborers the opportunity “to do as they pleased.” The terrible revolutionary, that is, Jacobinist, convention treated strikes as a coalition and legislated: “For strikes, for forming a State within a State – death!” In 1813 people were hanged in England for going out on strike, and in 1831 they were deported to Australia for forming the Great Trades' Union (Union of all Trades) of Robert Owen. In the sixties people were still condemned to hard labor for participating in strikes, and even now trade unions are prosecuted for damages for picketing – for having dissuaded laborers from working in times of strike. What is one to say, then, of France, Belgium, Switzerland and especially of Germany and Russia? It is needless also to tell how by means of taxes the State brings laborers to the verge of poverty which puts them body and soul in the power of the factory boss; how the communal lands have been robbed from the people. Or must we remind the reader how even at the present moment, all the States without exception are creating directly all kinds of monopolies – in railroads, tramways, telephones, gasworks, waterworks, electric works, schools, etc. In short, the system of non-interference – *laissez faire* – has never been applied for one single hour by any government.

And therefore if it is permissible for middle-class economists to affirm that the system of “non-interference” is practiced (since they endeavor to prove that poverty is a law of nature), it is simply shameful that socialists should speak thus to the workers. *Freedom to oppose exploitation has so far never and nowhere existed.* Everywhere it had to be taken by force, step by step, at the cost of countless sacrifices. “Non-interference,” and more than non-interference, – direct support, help and protection, – existed *only* in the interests of the exploiters. *Nor could it be otherwise.* The mission of the church has been to hold the people in intellectual slavery. The mission of the State was to hold them, half starved, in economic slavery.

The State was established for the precise purpose of imposing the rule of the landowners, the employers of industry, the warrior class, and the clergy upon the peasants on the land and the artisans in the city. And the rich perfectly well know that if the machinery of the State ceased to protect them, their power over the laboring classes would be gone immediately.

Socialism, we have said – whatever form it may take in its evolution towards communism – must find *its own form* of political organization. Serfdom and absolute monarchy have always marched hand-in-hand. The one rendered the other a necessity. The same is true of capitalist rule, whose political form is representative government, either in a republic or in a monarchy. This is why socialism cannot utilize representative government as a weapon for liberating labor, just as it cannot utilize the church and its theory of divine right, or imperialism and Caesarism, with its theory of hierarchy of functionaries, for the same purpose.

A new form of political organization has to be worked out the moment that socialist principles shall enter into our life. And it is self-evident that this new form will have to be *more popular, more decentralized, and nearer to the folk-mote self-government* than representative government can ever be.

Knowing this, we cannot see a guarantee of progress in a still greater submission of all to the State. We seek progress in the fullest emancipation of the individual from the authority of the State; in the greatest development of individual initiative and in the limitation of all the governmental functions, but surely not in their extension. The march forward in political institutions appears to us to consist in abolishing in the first place the State authority which has fixed itself upon society and which now tries to extend its functions more and more; and in the second place, in allowing the broadest possible development for the principle of free agreement, and in acknowledging the independence of all possible associations formed for definite ends, embracing in their

federations the whole of society. The life of society itself we understand, not as something complete and rigid, but as something never perfect – something ever striving for new forms, and ever changing these forms in accordance with the needs of time. This is what *life* is in nature.

Such a conception of human progress and of what we think desirable in the future (what, in our opinion, can increase the sum of happiness) leads us inevitably to our own special tactics in the struggle. It induces us to strive for the greatest possible development of personal initiative in every individual and group, and to secure unity of action, not through discipline, but through the unity of aims and the mutual confidence which never fail to develop when a great number of persons have consciously embraced some common idea.

Then we assert and endeavor to prove that it devolves upon every new economic form of social life to develop *its own* new form of political relations. It has been so in the past, and so it undoubtedly will be in the future. New forms are already germinating all round.

Feudal right and autocracy, or at least the almost unlimited power of a czar or a king, have moved hand in hand in history. They depended on each other in this development. Exactly in the same way the rule of the capitalists has evolved its own characteristic political order – representative government – both in strictly centralized monarchies and in republics.

Socialism, whatever may be the form in which it will appear, and in whatever degree it may approach to its unavoidable goal, – communism, – will also have to choose *its own* form of political structure. Of the old form it *cannot make use*, no more than it could avail itself of the hierarchy of the church or of autocracy. The State bureaucracy and centralization are as irreconcilable with socialism as was autocracy with capitalist rule. One way or another, socialism must become *more popular*, more communalistic, and less dependent upon indirect government through elected representatives. It must become more self-governing.

Besides, when we closely observe the modern life of France, Spain, England and the United States, we notice in these countries the evident tendency to form into groups of entirely independent communes, towns and villages, which would combine by means of free federation, in order to satisfy innumerable needs and attain certain immediate ends. In actual life this tendency manifests itself in thousands of attempts at organization outside the State, fully independent of it; as well as in attempts to take hold of various functions which had been previously usurped by the State and which, of course, it has never properly performed. And then as a great social phenomenon of universal import, this tendency found expression in the Paris Commune of 1871 and in a whole series of similar uprisings in France and Spain; while in the domain of thought – of ideas spreading through society – this view has already acquired the force of an extremely important factor of future history. The future revolutions in France and Spain will be *communalist* – not centralist.

On the strength of all this, we are convinced that to work in favor of a centralized state-capitalism and to see in it a *desideratum*, means to work *against* the tendency of progress already manifest. We see in such work as this a gross misunderstanding of the historic mission of socialism itself – a great historical mistake, and we make war upon it. To assure the laborers that they will be able to establish socialism, or even to take the first steps on the road to socialism, by retaining the entire government machinery, and changing only the persons who manage it; not to promote but even to retard the day on which the working people's minds shall be bent upon discovering their own new forms of political life, – this is in our eyes a colossal historical blunder which borders upon crime.

Finally, since we represent a revolutionary party, we try to study the history of the origin and development of past revolutions. We endeavor, first of all, to free the histories of revolutions written up till now from the partisan, and for the most part false, governmental coloring that has been given them. In the histories hitherto written we do not yet see *the people*; nor do we see how revolutions began. The stereotyped phrases about the desperate condition of people previous to revolutions fail to explain whence amid this desperation came the hope of something better – whence came the revolutionary spirit. And therefore after reading these histories, we put them aside, and going back to first sources, try to learn from them what caused the people to rise and what was its true part in revolutions, what advantages it obtained from a revolution, what ideas it launched into circulation, what faults of tactics it committed.

Thus, we understand the Great French Revolution not at all as it is pictured by Louis Blanc, who presents it chiefly as a great political movement directed by the Jacobin Club. We see in it first of all a chaotic *popular* movement, chiefly of the peasant folk (“Every village had its Robespierre,” as the Abbe Gregoire, who *knew* the people's revolt, remarked to the historian Schlosser). This movement aimed chiefly at the destruction of every vestige of *feudal rights* and of redemptions that had been imposed for the abolition of some of them, as well as at the recovery of the lands which had been seized from the village communes by vultures of various kinds. And in so far the peasant movement was successful.

Then, upon this foundation of revolutionary tumult, of increased pulsation of life and of disorganization of all the powers of the State, we find on the one hand developing among the town laborers a tendency toward a vaguely understood socialist equality and the admirable forms of voluntary popular organization for a variety of functions, economic and political, that they worked out in the “sections” of the great cities and small municipalities; and on the other hand the middle classes working hard and successfully in order to establish their own authority upon the ruins of that of royalty and nobility. To this end the middle classes fought stubbornly and desperately that they might create a powerful, all-inclusive, centralized government, which would preserve and assure to them their right of property (gained partly by plunder before and during the Revolution) and afford them the full opportunity of exploiting the poor without any legal restrictions. We study the development and the struggle of these two powers and try to find out why the latter gained the upper hand over the former. And we see how in the State centralization which was created by the revolutionary Jacobinists, Napoleon found an excellent soil for establishing his empire. From this centralized authority which kills all local life, France is suffering even to this very day, and the first attempt to throw off its yoke – an attempt which opened a new era in history – was made by the proletariat of Paris only in 1871.

Without entering here upon an analysis of other revolutionary movements, it is sufficient to say that we understand the social revolution, not at all as a Jacobinist dictatorship – not at all as a reform of the social institutions by means of laws issued by a convention or a senate or a dictator. Such revolutions have never occurred, and a movement which should take this form would be doomed to inevitable death. We understand the revolution as a widespread popular movement, during which in every town and village within the region of the revolt, the masses will have to take upon themselves the task of rebuilding society – will have to take up themselves *the work of construction upon communistic bases*, without awaiting any orders and directions from above. That is, first of all they will have to organize, one way or another, the means of supplying food to everyone and of providing dwellings for all, and then produce whatever will be found necessary for feeding, clothing, and sheltering everybody.

They may not be – they are sure not to be the *majority* of the nation. But if they are a respectably numerous minority of cities and villages scattered over the country, starting life on their own new socialist lines, they will be able to win the right to pursue their own course. In all probability they will draw towards them a notable portion of the land, as was the case in France in 1793 – 94.

As to representative government, whether self-appointed or elected – be it “the dictatorship of the proletariat,” or an elected “temporary government,” or again a Jacobinist “convention,” – we place in it no hopes whatever. We know beforehand that it will be able to do nothing to accomplish the revolution so long as the people themselves do not accomplish the change by working out on the spot the necessary new institutions. We say so, not because we have a personal dislike of governments, but because nowhere and never in history do we find that people carried into government by a revolutionary wave, have proved equal to the occasion.

In the task of reconstructing society on new principles, separate men, however intelligent and devoted they may be, are sure to fail. The collective spirit of the masses is necessary for this purpose. Isolated men can sometimes find the legal expression to sum up the destruction of old social forms – when the destruction is already proceeding. At the utmost, they may widen, perhaps, the sphere of the reconstructive work, extending what is being done in a part of the country, over a larger part of the territory. But to impose the reconstruction by law is absolutely impossible, as was proved, among other examples, by the whole history of the French Revolution. Many thousands of the *laws* passed by the revolutionary convention had not even been put into force when reaction came and flung those laws into the waste-paper basket.

During a revolution new forms of life will always germinate on the ruins of the old forms, but no government will ever be able to find their expression *so long as these forms will not have taken a definite shape during the work itself of reconstruction* which must be going on in thousands of spots at the same time. It is impossible to legislate for *the future*. All we can do is to guess vaguely its essential tendencies and clear the road for it.

Looking upon the problems of the revolution in this light, anarchism obviously cannot take a sympathetic attitude toward the program which aims at “the conquest of power in present society.” We know that by peaceful, parliamentary means in the present State such a conquest as this is impossible. The middle class will not give up its power without a struggle. It will resist. And in proportion as the socialists become a power in the present bourgeois society and State, their socialism must die out. Otherwise the middle classes, which are much more powerful both intellectually and numerically than is admitted in the socialist press, will not recognize them as their rulers. And we know also that were a revolution to give France or England or Germany a socialist government, the respective governments would be absolutely powerless without the activity of the people themselves, and that, necessarily, they would soon begin to act fatally as a bridle upon the revolution.

Finally our studies of the preparatory stages of all revolutions bring us to the conclusion that not a single revolution has originated in parliaments or in any other representative assembly. *All began with the people*. And no revolution has appeared in full armor –

born, like Minerva out of the head of Jupiter, in a day. They all had their periods of incubation during which the asses were very slowly becoming imbued with the revolutionary spirit, grew bolder, commenced *to hope*, and step by step emerged from their former indifference and resignation. And the awakening of the revolutionary spirit always took place in such a manner that at first single individuals, deeply moved by the existing state of things, protested against it, one by one. Many perished, “uselessly” the arm-chair critic would say. But the indifference of society was shaken by these progenitors. The dullest and most narrow-minded people were compelled to reflect, “Why should men, young, sincere, and full of strength, sacrifice their lives in this way?” It was impossible to remain indifferent; it was necessary to take a stand, for or against; thought was awakening. Then little by little small groups came to be imbued with the same spirit of revolt. They also rebelled – sometimes in the hope of local success – in strikes or in small revolts against some official whom they disliked, or in order to get food for their hungry children, but frequently also without any hope of success: simply because the conditions grew unbearable. Not one, or two, or tens, but hundreds of similar revolts have preceded and must precede every revolution. Without these no revolution was ever wrought.

Without the menace contained in such revolts not a single concession was ever made by the ruling classes. Even the famous “peaceful” abolition of serfdom in Russia, of which Tolstoy, often speaks of as a peaceful conquest, was forced upon the government by a series of peasant uprisings, beginning with the early fifties, spreading from year to year, and gaining in importance so as to attain proportions hitherto unknown, until 1857. Alexander Herzen’s words, “Better to abolish serfdom from above than to wait until the abolition comes from below,” – repeated by Alexander II before the serf-owners of Moscow – were not mere phrases but expressed the real state of affairs. This was all the more true as to the eve of every revolution. Hundreds of partial revolts preceded every one of them. And it may be stated as a general rule that the character of every revolution is determined by the character and the aim of the uprisings by which it is preceded.

To wait therefore for a *social* revolution to come as a birthday present, without a whole series of protests on the part of the individual conscience, and without hundreds of preliminary revolts by which the very nature of the revolution is determined, is to say the least, absurd. But to assure the working people that they will gain all the benefits of a socialist revolution by confining themselves to electoral agitation, and to attack vehemently every act of individual revolt and all minor preliminary mass-revolts – means to become as great an obstacle to the development of the revolutionary spirit and to all progress as was and is the Christian Church.

### *Conclusion*

Without entering into further discussion of the principles of anarchism and the anarchist program of action, enough has been said, I think, to show the place of anarchism among the modern sociological sciences.

Anarchism is an attempt to apply to the study of human institutions the generalizations gained by means of the natural-scientific inductive method; and an attempt to foresee the future steps of mankind on the road to liberty, equality, and fraternity, with a view to realizing the greatest sum of happiness for every unit of human society.

It is the inevitable result of that natural-scientific, intellectual movement which began at the close of the eighteenth century, was hampered for half a century by the reaction that set in throughout Europe after the French Revolution, and has been appearing again in full vigor ever since the end of the fifties. Its roots lie in the natural-scientific philosophy of the century mentioned. Its complete scientific basis, however, it could receive only after that awakening of naturalism which brought into being the natural-scientific study of human social institutions.

In anarchism there is no room for those pseudo-scientific laws with which the German metaphysicians of the first thirty years of the nineteenth century had to content themselves. Anarchism does not recognize any method other than the natural-scientific, and it applies this method to all the so-called humanitarian sciences. Availing itself of this method as well as of all researches which have recently been called forth by it, anarchism endeavors to reconstruct all the sciences dealing with man and to revise every current idea of right and justice on the bases which have served for the revision of all natural sciences. Its object is to form a scientific concept of the universe embracing the whole of nature and including man.

This world-concept determines the position anarchism has taken in practical life. In the struggle between the individual and the State, anarchism, like its predecessors of the eighteenth century, takes the side of the individual as against the State, of society as against the authority which oppresses it. And availing itself of the historical data collected by modern science, it has shown that the State – whose sphere of authority there is now a tendency among its admirers to increase, and a tendency to limit in actual life – is in reality a superstructure – as harmful as it is unnecessary, and for us Europeans of a comparatively recent origin. A superstructure in the interests of capitalism – agrarian, industrial, and financial – which in ancient history caused the decay of politically free Rome and Greece, and which caused the death of all other despotic centers of civilization of the east and of Egypt.

The power which was created for the purpose of welding together the interests of the landlord, the judge, the warrior, and the priest, and has been opposed throughout history to every attempt of mankind to create for themselves a more assured and freer mode of life, – this power cannot become an instrument for emancipation, any more than imperialism or the church can become the instrument for a social revolution.

In the economic field anarchism has come to the conclusion that the root of modern evil lies not in the fact that the capitalist appropriates the profits or the surplus-value, but in the very possibility of these profits, which accrue only because millions of people have literally nothing to subsist upon without selling their labor-power at a price which makes profits and the creation of “surplus values” possible.

Anarchism understands therefore that in political economy attention must be directed first of all to so-called “consumption,” and that the first concern of the revolution must be to reorganize that so as to provide food, clothing and shelter for all. “Production,” on the other hand, must be so adapted as to satisfy this primary, fundamental need of society. Therefore anarchism cannot see in the next coming revolution a mere exchange of monetary symbols for labor-checks, or an exchange of present capitalism for state-capitalism. It sees in it the first step on the road to no-government communism.

Whether or not anarchism is right in its conclusions will be shown by a scientific criticism of its bases and by the practical life of the future. But in one thing it is absolutely right: in that it has included the study of social institutions in the sphere of natural-scientific investigations; has forever parted company with metaphysics; and makes use of the method by which modern natural science and modern materialist philosophy were developed. Owing to this, the very mistakes which anarchism may have made in its researches can be detected the more readily. But its conclusions can be verified only by the same natural-scientific, inductive method by which every science and every scientific concept of the universe is created.

(Peter Kropotkin, from “Modern Science and Anarchism”, *Kropotkin's Revolutionary Pamphlets*, edited by Roger N. Baldwin)

---

What follows is from “Law and Authority” by Peter Kropotkin:

Part 1:

“When ignorance reigns in society and disorder in the minds of men, laws are multiplied, legislation is expected to do everything, and each fresh law being a fresh miscalculation, men are continually led to demand from it what can proceed only from themselves, from their own education and their own morality.” It is no revolutionist who says this, not even a reformer. It is the jurist, Dalloy, author of the collection of French law known as *Repertoire de la Legislation*. And yet, though these lines were written by a man who was himself a maker and admirer of law, they perfectly represent the abnormal condition of our society.

In existing States a fresh law is looked upon as a remedy for evil. Instead of themselves altering what is bad, people begin by demanding a *law* to alter it. If the road between two villages is impassable, the peasant says: – “There should be a law about parish roads.” If a park-keeper takes advantage of the want of spirit in those who follow him with servile observance and insults one of them, the insulted man says, “There should be a law to enjoin more politeness upon park-keepers.” If there is stagnation in agriculture or commerce, the husbandman, cattle-breeder, or corn speculator argues, “It is protective legislation that we require.” Down to the old clothesman there is not one who does not demand a law to protect his own little trade. If the employer lowers wages or increases the hours of labor, the politician in embryo exclaims, “We must have a law to put all that to rights.” In short, a law everywhere and for everything! A law about fashion, a law about mad dogs, a law about virtue, a law to put a stop to all the vices and all the evils which result from human indolence and cowardice.

We are so perverted by an education which from infancy seeks to kill in us the spirit of revolt, and to develop that of submission to authority; we are so perverted by this existence under the ferrule [a metal encircling band] of a law, which regulates every event in life – our birth, our education, our development, our love, our friendship – that, if this state of things continues, we shall lose all initiative, all habit of thinking for ourselves. Our society seems no longer able to understand that it is possible to exist otherwise than under the reign of law, elaborated by a representative government and administered by a handful of rulers. And even when it has gone so far as to emancipate itself from the thralldom, its first care has been to reconstitute it immediately. “The Year 1 of Liberty” has never lasted more than a day, for after proclaiming it men put themselves the very next morning under the yoke of law and authority.

Indeed, for some thousands of years, those who govern us have done nothing but ring the changes upon “Respect for law, obedience to authority.” This is the moral atmosphere in which parents bring up their children, and school only serves to confirm the impression. Cleverly assorted scraps of spurious science are inculcated upon the children to prove necessity of law; obedience to the law is made a religion; moral goodness and the law of the masters are fused into one and the same divinity. The historical hero of the schoolroom is the man who obeys the law, and defends it against rebels.

Later when we enter upon public life, society and literature, impressing us day by day and hour by hour as the water-drop hollows the stone, continue to inculcate the same prejudice. Books of history, of political science, of social economy, are stuffed with this respect for law. Even the physical sciences have been pressed into the service by introducing artificial modes of expression, borrowed from theology and arbitrary power, into knowledge which is purely the result of observation. Thus our intelligence is successfully befogged, and always to maintain our respect for law. The same work is done by newspapers. They have not an article which does not preach respect for law, even where the third page proves every day the imbecility of that law, and shows how it is dragged through every variety of mud and filth by those charged with its administration. Servility before the law has become a virtue, and I doubt if there was ever even a revolutionist who did not begin in his youth as the defender of law against what are generally called “abuses,” although these last are inevitable consequences of the law itself.

Art pipes in unison with would-be science. The hero of the sculptor, the painter, the musician, shields Law beneath his buckler, and with flashing eyes and distended nostrils stands ever ready to strike down the man who would lay hands upon her. Temples are raised to her; revolutionists themselves hesitate to touch the high priests consecrated to her service, and when revolution is about to sweep away some ancient institution, it is still by law that it endeavors to sanctify the deed.

The confused mass of rules of conduct called law, which has been bequeathed to us by slavery, serfdom, feudalism, and royalty, has taken the place of those stone monsters, before whom human victims used to be immolated...

This new worship has been established with especial success since the rise to supreme power of the middle class – since the great French Revolution. Under the ancient regime, men spoke little of laws; unless, indeed, it were, with Montesquieu, Rousseau and Voltaire, to oppose them to royal caprice. Obedience to the good pleasure of the king and his lackeys was compulsory on pain of hanging or imprisonment. But during and after the revolutions, when the lawyers rose to power, they did their best to strengthen the principle upon which their ascendancy depended. The middle class at once accepted it as a dyke to dam up the popular torrent. The priestly crew hastened to sanctify it, to save their bark from foundering amid the breakers. Finally the people received it as an improvement upon the arbitrary authority and violence of the past

To understand this, we must transport ourselves in imagination into the eighteenth century. Our hearts must have ached at the story of the atrocities committed by the all-powerful nobles of that time upon the men and women of the people before we can understand what must have been the magic influence upon the peasant's mind of the words, “Equality before the law, obedience to the law without distinction of birth or fortune.” He who until then had been treated more cruelly than a beast, he who had never had any rights, he who had never obtained justice against the most revolting actions on the part of a noble, unless in revenge he killed him and was hanged – he saw himself recognized by this maxim, at least in theory, at least with regard to his personal rights, as the equal of his lord. Whatever this law might be, it promised to affect lord and peasant alike it proclaimed the equality of rich and poor before the judge. The promise was a lie, and to-day we know it; but at that period it was an advance, a homage to justice, as hypocrisy is a homage rendered to truth. This is the reason that when the saviors of the menaced middle class (the Robespierres and the Dantons) took their stand upon the writings of the Rousseaus and the Voltaires, and proclaimed “respect for law, the same for every man,” the people accepted the compromise; for their revolutionary impetus had already spent its force in the contest with a foe whose ranks drew closer day by day; they bowed their neck beneath the yoke of law to save themselves from the arbitrary power of their lords.

The middle class has ever since continued to make the most of this maxim, which with another principle, that of representative government, sums up the whole philosophy of the bourgeois age, the nineteenth century. It has preached this doctrine in its schools, it has propagated it in its writings, it has moulded its art and science to the same purpose, it has thrust its beliefs into every hole and corner – like a pious Englishwoman, who slips tracts under the door – and it has done all this so successfully that today we behold the issue in the detestable fact that men who long for freedom begin the attempt to obtain it by entreating their masters to be kind enough to protect them by modifying the laws which these masters themselves have created!

But times and tempers are changed. Rebels are everywhere to be found who no longer wish to obey the law without knowing whence it comes, what are its uses, and whither arises the obligation to submit to it, and the reverence with which it is encompassed. The rebels of our day are criticizing the very foundations of society which have hitherto been held sacred, and first and foremost amongst them that fetish, law.



The critics analyze the sources of law, and find there either a god, product of the terrors of the savage, and stupid, paltry and malicious as the priests who vouch for its supernatural origin, or else, bloodshed, conquest by fire and sword. They study the characteristics of law, and instead of perpetual growth corresponding to that of the human race, they find its distinctive trait to be immobility, a tendency to crystallize what should be modified and developed day by day. They ask how law has been maintained, and in its service they see the atrocities of Byzantinism, the cruelties of the Inquisition, the tortures of the middle ages, living flesh torn by the lash of the executioner, chains, clubs, axes, the gloomy dungeons of prisons, agony, curses and tears. In our own days they see, as before, the axe, the cord, the rifle, the prison; on the one hand, the brutalized prisoner, reduced to the condition of a caged beast by the debasement of his whole moral being, and on the other, the judge, stripped of every feeling which does honor to human nature, living like a visionary in a world of legal fictions, revelling in the infliction of imprisonment and death, without even suspecting, in the cold malignity of his madness, the abyss of degradation into which he has himself fallen before the eyes of those whom he condemns.

They see a race of law-makers legislating without knowing what their laws are about; today voting a law on the sanitation of towns, without the faintest notion of hygiene, tomorrow making regulations for the armament of troops, without so much as understanding a gun; making laws about teaching and education without ever having given a lesson of any sort, or even an honest education to their own children; legislating at random in all directions, but never forgetting the penalties to be meted out to ragamuffins, the prison and the galleys, which are to be the portion of men a thousand times less immoral than these legislators themselves.

Finally, they see the jailor on the way to lose all human feeling, the detective trained as a bloodhound, the police spy despising himself; "informing," metamorphosed into a virtue; corruption, erected into a system; all the vices, all the evil qualities of mankind countenanced and cultivated to insure the triumph of law.

All this we see, and, therefore, instead of inately repeating the old formula, "Respect the law," we say, "Despise law and all its attributes!" In place of the cowardly phrase, "Obey the law," our cry is "Revolt against all laws!"

Only compare the misdeeds accomplished in the name of each law with the good it has been able to effect, and weigh carefully both good and evil, and you will see if we are right.

---

## Part II:

Relatively speaking, law is a product of modern times. For ages and ages mankind lived without any written law, even that graven in symbols upon the entrance stones of a temple. During that period, human relations were simply regulated by customs, habits and usages, made sacred by constant repetition, and acquired by each person in childhood, exactly as he learned how to obtain his food by hunting, cattle-raising, or agriculture.

All human societies have passed through this primitive phase, and to this day a large proportion of mankind have no written law. Every tribe has its own manners and customs; customary law, as the jurists say. It has social habits, and that suffices to maintain cordial relations between the inhabitants of the village; the members of the tribe or community. Even amongst ourselves – the 'civilized' nations – when we leave large towns, and go into the country, we see that there the mutual relations of the inhabitants are still regulated according to ancient and generally accepted customs, and not according to the written law of the legislators. The peasants of Russia, Italy and Spain, and even of a large part of France and England, have no conception of written law. It only meddles with their lives to regulate their relations with the State. As to relations between themselves, though these are sometimes very complex, they are simply regulated according to ancient custom. Formerly, this was the case with mankind in general.

Two distinctly marked currents of custom are revealed by analysis of the usages of primitive people.

As man does not live in a solitary state, habits and feelings develop within him which are useful for the preservation of society and the propagation of the race. Without social feelings and usages, life in common would have been absolutely impossible. It is not law which has established them; they are anterior to all law. Neither is it religion which has ordained them; they are anterior to all religions. They are found amongst all animals living in society. They are spontaneously developed by the very nature of things, like those habits in animals which men call instinct. They spring from a process of evolution, which is useful, and, indeed, necessary, to keep society together in the struggle it is forced to maintain for existence.... Many travelers have depicted the manners of absolutely independent tribes, where laws and chiefs are unknown, but where the members of the tribe have given up stabbing one another in

every dispute, because the habit of living in society has ended by developing certain feelings of fraternity and oneness of interest, and they prefer appealing to a third person to settle their differences. The hospitality of primitive peoples, respect for human life, the sense of reciprocal obligation, compassion for the weak, courage, extending even to the sacrifice of self for others which is first learnt for the sake of children and friends, and later for that of members of the same community – all these qualities are developed in man anterior to all law, independently of all religion, as in the case of the social animals. Such feelings and practices are the inevitable results of social life. Without being, as say priests and metaphysicians, inherent in man, such qualities are the consequence of life in common.

But side by side with these customs, necessary to the life of societies and the preservation of the race, other desires, other passions, and therefore other habits and customs, are evolved in human association. The desire to dominate others and impose one's own will upon them; the desire to seize upon the products of the labor of a neighboring tribe; the desire to surround oneself with comforts without producing anything, while slaves provide their master with the means of procuring every sort of pleasure and luxury – these selfish, personal desires give rise to another current of habits and customs. The priest and the warrior, the charlatan who makes a profit out of superstition...

But as society became more and more divided into two hostile classes, one seeking to establish its domination, the other struggling to escape, the strife began. Now the conqueror was in a hurry to secure the results of his actions in a permanent form, he tried to place them beyond question, to make them holy and venerable by every means in his power. Law made its appearance under the sanction of the priest, and the warrior's club was placed at its service. Its office was to render immutable such customs as were to the advantage of the dominant minority. Military authority undertook to ensure obedience. This new function was a fresh guarantee to the power of the warrior; now he had not only mere brute force at his service; he was the defender of law.

If law, however, presented nothing but a collection of prescriptions serviceable to rulers, it would find some difficulty in insuring acceptance and obedience. Well, the legislators confounded in one code the two currents of custom of which we have just been speaking, the maxims which represent principles of morality and social union wrought out as a result of life in common, and the mandates which are meant to ensure external existence to inequality. Customs, absolutely essential to the very being of society, are, in the code, cleverly intermingled with usages imposed by the ruling caste, and both claim equal respect from the crowd. "Do not kill," says the code, and hastens to add, "And pay tithes to the priest." "Do not steal," says the code, and immediately after, "He who refuses to pay taxes, shall have his hand struck off."

Such was law; and it has maintained its two-fold character to this day. Its origin is the desire of the ruling class to give permanence to customs imposed by themselves for their own advantage. Its character is the skilful commingling of customs useful to society, customs which have no need of law to insure respect, with other customs useful only to rulers, injurious to the mass of the people, and maintained only by the fear of punishment.

Like individual capital, which was born of fraud and violence, and developed under the auspices of authority, law has no title to the respect of men. Born of violence and superstition, and established in the interests of consumer, priest and rich exploiter, it must be utterly destroyed on the day when the people desire to break their chains.

We shall be still better convinced of this when, later, we shall have analyzed the ulterior development of laws under the auspices of religion, authority and the existing parliamentary system.

---

### Part III:

We have seen how law originated in established usage and custom, and how from the beginning it has represented a skilful mixture of social habits, necessary to the preservation of the human race, with other customs imposed by those who used popular superstition as well as the right of the strongest for their own advantage. This double character of law has determined its own later development during the growth of political organization. While in the course of ages the nucleus of social custom inscribed in law has been subjected to but slight and gradual modifications, the other portion has been largely developed in directions indicated by the interests of the dominant classes, and to the injury of the classes they oppress.

From time to time these dominant classes have allowed a law to be extorted from them which presented, or appeared to present, some guarantee for the disinherited. But then such laws have but repealed a previous law, made for the advantage of the ruling caste. "The best laws," says Buckle, "were those which repealed the preceding ones." But what terrible efforts have been needed, what rivers of blood have been spilt, every time there has been a question of the repeal of one of those fundamental enactments

...serving to hold the people in fetters. Before she could abolish the last vestiges of serfdom and feudal rights, and break up the power of the royal court, France was forced to pass through four years of revolution and twenty years of war. Decades of conflict are needful to repeal the least of the iniquitous laws, bequeathed us by the past, and even then they scarcely disappear except in periods of revolution.

The history of the genesis of capital has already been told by socialists many times. They have described how it was born of war and pillage, of slavery and serfdom, of modern fraud and exploitation. They have shown how it is nourished by the blood of the worker, and how little by little it has conquered the whole world. The same story, concerning the genesis and development of law has yet to be told. As usual the popular intelligence has stolen a march upon men of books. It has already put together the philosophy of this history, and is busy laying down its essential landmarks.

Law, in its quality of guarantee of the results of pillage, slavery and exploitation, has followed the same phases of development as capital. Twin brother and sister, they have advanced hand in hand, sustaining one another with the suffering of mankind. In every country in Europe their history is approximately the same. It has differed only in detail; the main facts are alike; and to glance at the development of law in France or Germany is to know its essential traits and its phases of development in most of the European nations.

In the first instance, law was a national pact or contract. It is true that this contract was not always freely accepted. Even in the early days the rich and strong were imposing their will upon the rest. But at all events they encountered an obstacle to their encroachments in the mass of the people, who often made them feel their power in return.

But as the church on one side and the nobles on the other succeeded in enthraling the people, the right of law-making escaped from the hands of the nation and passed into those of the privileged orders. Fortified by the wealth accumulating in her coffers, the church extended her authority. She tampered more and more with private life, and under pretext of saving souls, seized upon the labor of her serfs, she gathered taxes from every class, she increased her jurisdiction, she multiplied penalties, and enriched herself in proportion to the number of offenses committed, for the produce of every fine poured into her coffers. Laws had no longer any connection with the interest of the nation. "They might have been supposed to emanate rather from a council of religious fanatics than from legislators," observes an historian of French Law.

At the same time, as the baron likewise extended his authority over laborers in the fields and artisans in the towns, he, too, became legislator and judge. The few relics of national law dating from the tenth century are merely agreements regulating service, statute-labor, and tribute due from serfs and vassals to their lord. The legislators of that period were a handful of brigands organized for the plunder of a people daily becoming more peaceful as they applied themselves to agricultural pursuits. These robbers exploited the feelings for justice inherent in the people, they posed as the administrators of that justice, made a source of revenue for themselves out of its fundamental principles and concocted laws to maintain their own domination.

Later on, these laws collected and classified by jurists formed the foundation of our modern codes. And are we to talk about respecting these codes, the legacy of baron and priest?

The first revolution, the revolt of the townships, was successful in abolishing only a portion of these laws; the charters of enfranchised towns are, for the most part, a mere compromise between baronial and episcopal legislation, and the new relations created within the free borough itself. Yet what a difference between these laws and the laws we have now! The town did not take upon itself to imprison and execute citizens for reasons of State: it was content to expel anyone who plotted with the enemies of the city, and to raze his house to the ground. It confined itself to imposing fines for so-called "crimes and misdemeanors" and in the townships of the twelfth century may even be discerned the just principle today forgotten which holds the whole community responsible for the misdoing of each of its members. The societies of that time looked upon crime as an accident or misfortune; a conception common the Russian peasantry at this moment. Therefore they did not admit of the principle of personal vengeance as preached by the Bible, but considered that the blame for each misdeed reverted to the whole society. It needed all the influence of the Byzantine church, which imported into the West the refined cruelties of Eastern despotism, to introduce into the manners of Gauls and Germans the penalty of death, and the horrible tortures afterwards inflicted on those regarded as criminals. Just in the same way, it needed all the influence of the Roman code, the product of the corruption of imperial Rome, to introduce the notions as to absolute property in land, which have overthrown the communistic customs of primitive people.

As we know, the free townships were not able to hold their own. Torn by internal dissensions between rich and poor, burgher and serf, they fell an easy prey to royalty. And as royalty acquired fresh strength, the right of legislation passed more and more into the hands of a clique of courtiers. Appeal to the nation was made only to sanction the taxes demanded by the king. Parliament summoned at intervals of two centuries, according to the good pleasure or caprice of the court, "Councils Extraordinary,"

assemblies of notables, ministers, scarce heeding the “grievances of the king's subjects – these are the legislators of France. Later still, when all power is concentrated in a single man, who can say “I am the State,” edicts are concocted in the “secret counsels of the prince,” according to the whim of a minister, or of an imbecile king; and subjects must obey on pain of death. All judicial guarantees are abolished; the nation is the serf of royalty, and a handful of courtiers. And at this period the most horrible penalties startle our gaze – the wheel, the stake, flaying alive, tortures of every description, invented by the sick fancy of monks and madmen, seeking delight in the sufferings of executed criminals.

The great Revolution began the demolition of this framework of law, bequeathed to us by feudalism and royalty. But after having demolished some portions of the ancient edifice, the Revolution delivered over the power of law-making to the bourgeoisie, who, in their turn, began to raise a fresh framework of laws intended to maintain and perpetuate middle-class domination among the masses. Their parliament makes laws right and left, and mountains of law accumulate with frightful rapidity. But what *are* all these laws at bottom?

The major portion have but one object – to protect private property, i.e., wealth acquired by the exploitation of man by man. Their aim is to open out to capital fresh fields for exploitation, and to sanction the new forms which that exploitation continually assumes, as capital swallows up another branch of human activity, railways, telegraphs, electric light, chemical industries, the expression of man's thought in literature and science, etc. The object of the rest of these laws is fundamentally the same. They exist to keep up the machinery of government which serves to secure to capital the exploitation and monopoly of the wealth produced. Magistrature, police, army, public instruction, finance, all serve one God – capital; all have but one object – to facilitate the exploitation of the worker by the capitalist. Analyze all the laws passed and you will find nothing but this.

The protection of the person, which is put forward as the true mission of law, occupies an imperceptible space among them, for, in existing society, assaults upon the person directly dictated by hatred and brutality tend to disappear. Nowadays, if anyone is murdered, it is generally for the sake of robbing him; rarely because of personal vengeance. But if this class of crimes and misdemeanors is continually diminishing, we certainly do not owe the change to legislation. It is due to the growth of humanitarianism in our societies, to our increasingly social habits rather than to the prescriptions of our laws. Repeal tomorrow every law dealing with the protection of the person, and tomorrow stop all proceedings for assault, and the number of attempts dictated by personal vengeance and by brutality would not be augmented by one single instance.

It will perhaps be objected that during the last fifty years, a good many liberal laws have been enacted. But if these laws are analyzed, it will be discovered that this liberal legislation consists in the repeal of the laws bequeathed to us by the barbarism of preceding centuries. Every liberal law, every radical program, may be summed up in these words, – abolition of laws grown irksome to the middle-class itself, and return and extension to all citizens of liberties enjoyed by the townships of the twelfth century. The abolition of capital punishment, trial by jury for all “crimes” (there was a more liberal jury in the twelfth century), the election of magistrates, the right of bringing public officials to trial, the abolition of standing armies, free instruction, etc., everything that is pointed out as an invention of modern liberalism, is but a return to the freedom which existed before church and king had laid hands upon every manifestation of human life.

Thus the protection of exploitation directly by laws on property, and indirectly by the maintenance of the State is both the spirit and the substance of our modern codes, and the one function of our costly legislative machinery. But it is time we gave up being satisfied with mere phrases, and learned to appreciate their real significance. The law, which on its first appearance presented itself as a compendium of customs useful for the preservation of society, is now perceived to be nothing but an instrument for the maintenance of exploitation and the domination of the toiling masses by rich idlers. At the present day its civilizing mission is *nil*; it has but one object, – to bolster up exploitation.

This is what is told us by history as to the development of law. Is it in virtue of this history that we are called upon to respect it? Certainly not. It has no more title to respect than capital, the fruit of pillage. And the first duty of the revolution will be to make a bonfire of all existing laws as it will of all titles to property.

---

Part IV:

The millions of laws which exist for the regulation of humanity appear upon investigation to be divided into three principal categories: protection of property, protection of persons, protection of government. And by analyzing each of these three categories, we arrive at the same logical and necessary conclusion: the uselessness and hurtfulness of law.

Socialists know what is meant by protection of property. Laws on property are not made to guarantee either to the individual or to society the enjoyment of the produce of their own labor. On the contrary, they are made to rob the producer of a part of what he has created, and to secure to certain other people that portion of the produce which they have stolen either from the producer or from society as a whole. When, for example, the law establishes Mr. So-and-So's right to a house, it is not establishing his right to a cottage he has built for himself, or to a house he has erected with the help of some of his friends. In that case no one would have disputed his right. On the contrary, the law is establishing his right to a house which is *not* the product of his labor; first of all because he has had it built for him by others to whom he has not paid the full value of their work, and next because that house represents a social value which he could not have produced for himself. The law is establishing his right to what belongs to everybody in general and to nobody in particular. The same house built in the midst of Siberia would not have the value it possesses in a large town, and, as we know, that value arises from the labor of something like fifty generations of men who have built the town, beautified it, supplied it with water and gas, find promenades, colleges, theatres, shops, railways and roads leading in all directions. Thus, by recognizing the right of Mr. So-and-So to a particular house in Paris, London or Rouen, the law is unjustly appropriating to him a certain portion of the produce of the labor of mankind in general. And it is precisely because this appropriation and all other forms of property bearing the same character are a crying injustice, that a whole arsenal of laws and a whole army of soldiers, policemen and judges are needed to maintain it against the good sense and just feeling inherent in humanity.

Half our laws, – the civil code in each country, – serves no other purpose than to maintain this appropriation, this monopoly for the benefit of certain individuals against the whole of mankind. Three-fourths of the causes decided by the tribunals are nothing but quarrels between monopolists – two robbers disputing over their booty. And a great many of our criminal laws have the same object in view, their end being to keep the workman in a subordinate position towards his employer, and thus afford security for exploitation.

As for guaranteeing the product of his labor to the producer, there are no laws which even attempt such a thing. It is so simple and natural, so much a part of the manners and customs of mankind, that law has not given it so much as a thought. Open brigandage, sword in hand, is no feature of our age. Neither does one workman ever come and dispute the produce of his labor with another. If they have a misunderstanding they settle it by calling in a third person, without having recourse to law. The only person who exacts from another what that other has produced, is the proprietor, who comes in and deducts the lion's share. As for humanity in general, it everywhere respects the right of each to what he has created, without the interposition of any special laws.

As all the laws about property which make up thick volumes of codes and are the delight of our lawyers have no other object than to protect the unjust appropriation of human labor by certain monopolists, there is no reason for their existence, and, on the day of the revolution, social revolutionists are thoroughly determined to put an end to them. Indeed, a bonfire might be made with perfect justice of all laws bearing upon the so-called "rights of property," all title-deeds, all registers, in a word, of all that is in any way connected with an institution which will soon be looked upon as a blot in the history of humanity, as humiliating as the slavery and serfdom of past ages.

The remarks just made upon laws concerning property are quite as applicable to the second category of laws; those for the maintenance of government, i.e., constitutional law.

It again is a complete arsenal of laws, decrees, ordinances, orders in council, and what not, all serving to protect the diverse forms of representative government, delegated or usurped, beneath which humanity is writhing. We know very well – anarchists have often enough pointed out in their perpetual criticism of the various forms of government – that the mission of all governments, monarchical, constitutional, or republican, is to protect and maintain by force the privileges of the classes in possession, the aristocracy, clergy and traders. A good third of our laws – and each country possesses some tens of thousands of them – the fundamental laws on taxes, excise duties, the organization of ministerial departments and their offices, of the army, the police, the church, etc., have no other end than to maintain, patch up, and develop the administrative machine. And this machine in its turn serves almost entirely to protect the privileges of the possessing classes. Analyze all these laws, observe them in action day by day, and you will discover that not one is worth preserving.

About such laws there can be no two opinions. Not only anarchists, but more or less revolutionary radicals also, are agreed that the only use to be made of laws concerning the organization of government is to fling them into the fire.

The third category of law still remains to be considered; that relating to the protection of the person and the detection and prevention of "crime." This is the most important because most prejudices attach to it; because, if law enjoys a certain amount of consideration, it is in consequence of the belief that this species of law is absolutely indispensable to the maintenance of security in our societies. These are laws developed from the nucleus of customs useful to human communities, which have been turned to

account by rulers to sanctify their own domination. The authority of the chiefs of tribes, of rich families in towns, and of the king, depended upon their judicial functions, and even down to the present day, whenever the necessity of government is spoken of, its function as supreme judge is the thing implied. "Without a government men would tear one another to pieces," argues the village orator. "The ultimate end of all government is to secure twelve honest jurymen to every accused person," said Burke.

Well, in spite of all the prejudices existing on this subject, it is quite time that anarchists should boldly declare this category of laws as useless and injurious as the preceding ones.

First of all, as to so-called "crimes" – assaults upon persons – it is well known that two-thirds, and often as many as three-fourths, of such "crimes" are instigated by the desire to obtain possession of someone's wealth. This immense class of so-called "crimes and misdemeanors" will disappear on the day on which private property ceases to exist. "But," it will be said, "there will always be brutes who will attempt the lives of their fellow citizens, who will lay their hands to a knife in every quarrel, and revenge the slightest offense by murder, if there are no laws to restrain and punishments to withhold them." This refrain is repeated every time the right of society to *punish* is called in question.

Yet there is one fact concerning this head which at the present time is thoroughly established; the severity of punishment does not diminish the amount of crime. Hang, and, if you like, quarter murderers, and the number of murders will not decrease by one. On the other hand, abolish the penalty of death, and there will not be one murder more; there will be fewer. Statistics prove it. But if the harvest is good, and bread cheap, and the weather fine, the number of murders immediately decreases. This again is proved by statistics. The amount of crime always augments and diminishes in proportion to the price of provisions and the state of the weather. Not that all murderers are actuated by hunger. That is not the case. But when the harvest is good, and provisions are at an obtainable price, and when the sun shines, men, lighter-hearted and less miserable than usual, do not give way to gloomy passions, do not from trivial motives plunge a knife into the bosom of a fellow creature.

Moreover, it is also a well known fact that the fear of punishment has never stopped a single murderer. He who kills his neighbor from revenge or misery does not reason much about consequences; and there have been few murderers who were not firmly convinced that they should escape prosecution.

Without speaking of a society in which a man will receive a better education, in which the development of all his faculties, and the possibility of exercising them, will procure him so many enjoyments that he will not seek to poison them by remorse – even in our society, even with those sad products of misery whom we see today in the public houses of great cities – on the day when no punishment is inflicted upon murderers, the number of murders will not be augmented by a single case. And it is extremely probable that it will be, on the contrary, diminished by all those cases which are due at present to habitual criminals, who have been brutalized in prisons.

We are continually being told of the benefits conferred by law, and the beneficial effect of penalties, but have the speakers ever attempted to strike a balance between the benefits attributed to laws and penalties, and the degrading effect of these penalties upon humanity? Only calculate all the evil passions awakened in mankind by the atrocious punishments formerly inflicted in our streets! Man is the cruelest animal upon earth. And who has pampered and developed the cruel instincts unknown, even among monkeys, if it is not the king, the judge, and the priests, armed with law, who caused flesh to be torn off in strips, boiling pitch to be poured into wounds, limbs to be dislocated, bones to be crushed, men to be sawn asunder to maintain their authority? Only estimate the torrent of depravity let loose in human society by the "informing" which is countenanced by judges, and paid in hard cash by governments, under pretext of assisting in the discovery of "crime." Only go into the jails and study what man becomes when he is deprived of freedom and shut up with other depraved beings, steeped in the vice and corruption which oozes from the very walls of our existing prison. Only remember that the more these prisons are reformed, the more detestable they become. Our model modern penitentiaries are a hundred-fold more abominable than the dungeons of the middle ages. Finally, consider what corruption, what depravity of mind is kept up among men by the idea of obedience, the very essence of law; of chastisement; of authority having the right to punish, to judge irrespective of our conscience, and the esteem of our friends; of the necessity for executioners, jailers, and informers – in a word, by all the attributes of law and authority. Consider all this, and you will assuredly agree with us in saying that a law inflicting penalties is an abomination which should cease to exist.

Peoples without political organization, and therefore less depraved than ourselves, have perfectly understood that the man who is called "criminal" is simply unfortunate; that the remedy is not to flog him, to chain him up, or to kill him on the scaffold or in prison, but to help him by the most brotherly care, by treatment based on equality, by the usages of life among honest men. In the next revolution we hope that this cry will go forth:

“Burn the guillotines; demolish the prisons; drive away the judges, policemen and informers – the impurest race upon the face of the earth; treat as a brother the man who has been led by passion to do ill to his fellow; above all, take from the ignoble products of middle-class idleness the possibility of displaying their vices in attractive colors; and be sure that but few crimes will mar our society.”

The main supports of crime are idleness, law and authority; laws about property, laws about government, laws about penalties and misdemeanors; and authority, which takes upon itself to manufacture these laws and to apply them.

No more laws! No more judges! Liberty, equality, and practical human sympathy are the only effectual barriers we can oppose to the anti-social instincts of certain among us.

(Peter Kropotkin, from “Law and Authority”, *Kropotkin's Revolutionary Pamphlets*, edited by Roger N. Baldwin)

---

What follows is from “Revolutionary Government” by Peter Kropotkin:

Parliament:

That the governments existing at present ought to be abolished, so that liberty, equality, and fraternity should no longer be empty words but become living realities, and that all forms of government as yet tried have only been so many forms of oppression and ought to be replaced by a new form of grouping, will be agreed by all who have a brain and temperament ever so little revolutionary. One does not need to be much of an innovator to arrive at this conclusion. The vices of the governments of today and the impossibility of reforming them are too evident to be hidden from the eyes of any reasonable observer. And as for overturning governments, it is well known that at certain epochs that can be done without much difficulty. There are times when governments crumble to pieces almost of themselves like houses of cards, before the breath of the people in revolt.

To overturn a government – is for a revolutionary middle-class man everything; for us it is only the beginning of the social revolution. The machine of the State once out of gear, the hierarchy of functionaries disorganized and not knowing in what direction to take a step, the soldiers having lost confidence in their officers – in a word, the whole army of defenders of capital once routed – then it is that the grand work of destruction of all the institutions which serve to perpetuate economic and political slavery will become ours. The possibility of acting freely being attained, what will revolutionists do next?

To this question the anarchists alone give the proper answer: “No Government!” All the others say “A Revolutionary Government!” and they differ only as to the form to be given to that government. Some decide for a government elected by universal suffrage in the State or in the commune; others decide on a revolutionary dictatorship.

A revolutionary government! These are two words which sound very strange in the ears of those who really understand what the social revolution means, and what a government means. The words contradict each other, destroy each other. We have seen, of course, many despotic governments, – it is the essence of all government to take the side of the reaction against revolution, and to have a tendency towards despotism. But such a thing as a revolutionary government has never been seen, and the reason is that the revolution – meaning the demolition by violence [‘violence’ in referring to ‘forms of property’ is a legal term... i.e.: “involving an unlawful exercise or exhibition of force...” – P.S.] of the established forms of property, the destruction of castes, the rapid transformation of received ideas about morality, is precisely the opposite, the very negation of government, this being the synonym of “established order,” of conservatism, of the maintenance of existing institutions, the negation of free initiative and individual action. And yet we continually hear this white blackbird spoken of as if a “revolutionary government” were the simplest thing in the world, as common and as well known to all as royalty, the empire, and the papacy!

That the so-called revolutionists of the middle class should preach this idea is nothing strange. We know well what they understand by revolution. They understand by it a bolstering up of their republic, the taking possession by the so-called republicans of the lucrative employments reserved today for the royalists. It means at the most the divorce of church and state, replaced by the concubinage of the two, the sequestration of the goods of the clergy for benefit of the State, and above all for that of the future administrators of these goods. Perhaps it may mean the referendum, or some other political machinery. But that revolutionary socialists should make themselves the apostles of such an idea can only be explained by supposing one of two things. Either they are imbued with prejudices which they have imbibed without knowing it from literature, and above all from history written to suit middle-class ideas; or else they do not rally desire this revolution which they have always on their lips. They would be content with a simple plastering up of present institutions, provided that they would secure power for themselves, leaving to the future to decide

what they should do to satisfy “the beast” called “the people.” They only go against the governors of the present time in order to take their places. With these people we care not to argue. We will therefore only speak to those who honestly deceive themselves.

Let us begin with the first of the forms of “revolutionary government” which is advocated, – the elected government.

The power of the royalty we will suppose has just been overturned, the army of the defenders of capital is routed; everywhere there is fermentation, discussion of public affairs, everywhere a desire to march onward. New ideas arise, the necessity of important changes is perceived. It is necessary to act, it is necessary to begin without pity [I suggest... we are so further on toward unity of all humanity... that joy will be the sole wages of this work of transformation... – P.S] the work... in order to prepare the ground for the new life. But what do they propose to us to do? To convoke the people to elections, to elect at once a government and confide to it the work which we all of us, and each of us, should undertake of our own initiative.

This is what Paris did after the 18<sup>th</sup> of March, 1871. “I will never forget,” said a friend to us, “those delightful moments of deliverance. I came down from my upper chamber in the Latin Quarter to join that immense open-air club which filled the boulevards from one end of Paris to the other. Everyone talked about public affairs; all mere personal preoccupations were forgotten; no more was thought of buying or selling; all felt ready, body and soul, to advance towards the future. Men of the middle-class, even, carried away by the general enthusiasm, saw with joy a new world opened up. 'If it is necessary to make a social revolution,' they said, 'make it then. Put all things in common; we are ready for it.' All the elements of the revolution were there, it was only necessary to set them to work. When I returned to my lodging at night I said to myself, 'How fine is humanity after all, but no one knew it; it has always been calumniated.' Then came the elections, the members of the commune were named – and then little by little the ardor of devotion and the desire for action were extinguished. Everyone returned to his usual task, saying to himself, 'Now we have an honest government, let it act for us.'” What followed everyone knows.

Instead of acting for themselves, instead of marching forward, instead of advancing in the direction of a new order of things, the people, confiding in their governors, entrusted to them the charge of taking the initiative. This was the first consequence of the inevitable result of elections. Let us see now what these governors did who were invested with the confidence of all.

Never were elections more free than those of March, 1871. The opponents of the commune admit it themselves. Never was the great mass of electors more influenced with the desire to place in power the best men, men of the future, true revolutionists. And so they did. All well-known revolutionists were elected by immense majorities; Jacobins, Blanquists, Internationalists, all three revolutionary divisions were represented in the Council of the Commune. No election could give a better government.

But what was the result of it? Shut up in the City Hall, charged to proceed after the forms established by preceding governments, these ardent revolutionists, these reformers found themselves smitten with incapacity and sterility. With all their good will and their courage they did not even know how to organize the defense of Paris. Of course people now blame the men, the individuals for this; but it was not the men who were the cause of this failure – it was the system.

In fact, universal suffrage, when it is quite free, can only produce, at best, an assembly which represents the average of the opinions which at the time are held by the mass of the people. And this average at the outbreak of the revolution has only a vague idea of the work to be accomplished, without understanding at all how they ought to undertake it. Ah, if the bulk of the nation, of the commune, could only understand before the movement what is necessary to be done as soon as the government is overturned! If this dream of the utopians of the chair could be realized, we never would have had bloody revolutions. The will of the bulk of the nation once expressed, the rest would submit to it with a good grace. But this is not how things are done. The revolution bursts out long before a general understanding has come, and those who have a clear idea of what should be done the next day are only a very small minority. The great mass of the people have as yet only a general idea of the end which they wish realized, without knowing much how to advance towards that end, and without having much confidence in the direction to follow. The practical solution will not be found, will not be made clear until the change will have already begun. It will be the product of the revolution itself, of the people in action, – or else it will be nothing, the brain of a few individuals being absolutely incapable of finding solutions which can only spring from the life of the people.

This is the situation which is reflected in the body elected by universal suffrage, even if it had not the vices inherent in representative governments in general. The few men who represent the revolutionary idea of the epoch find themselves swamped among the representatives of the revolutionary schools of the past, and the existing order of things. These men who would be so necessary among the people, particularly in the days of revolution, to sow broadcast their ideas, to put the mass in movement, to demolish the institutions of the past, find themselves shut up in a hall, vainly discussing how to wrest concessions from the moderates, and how to convert their enemies, while there is really only one way of inducing them to accept the new idea – namely to put it into execution, The government becomes a parliament with all the vices of a middle-class parliament. Far from being a



“revolutionary” government it becomes the greatest obstacle to the revolution, and at last the people find themselves compelled to put it out of the way, to dismiss those that but yesterday they acclaimed as their chosen.

But it is not so easy to do so. The new government which has hastened to organize a new administration in order to extend its domination and make itself obeyed does not understand giving up so easily. Jealous of maintaining its power, it clings to it with all the energy of an institution which has not yet had time to fall into senile decay. It decides to oppose force with force, and there is only one means then to dislodge it, namely, to take up arms, to make another revolution in order to dismiss those in whom the people had placed all their hopes.

There you see the revolution divided against itself! After losing precious time in delays, it now loses its strength in internecine divisions between the friends of the new government and those who see the necessity of dissolving it. And all this happens because it has not been understood that a new life requires new forms; that it is not by clinging to ancient forms that a revolution can be carried out! All this for not having understood the incompatibility of revolution and government, for now having seen that the one is, under whatever forms it presents itself, the negation of the other, and that outside of anarchism there is not such thing as revolution.

It is just the same with regard to that other form of “revolutionary government” so often extolled, – a revolutionary dictatorship.

Dictatorship:

The dangers to which the revolution is exposed when it allows itself to be controlled by an elected government are so evident that a whole school of revolutionists entirely renounces the idea of it. They understand that it is impossible for a people in insurrection to give themselves, by means of elections, any government but one that represents the past, and which must be like leaden shoes on the feet of the people, above all when it is necessary to accomplish that immense regeneration, economic, political, and moral, which we understand by the social revolution. They renounce then the idea of “legal” government, at least during that period which is a revolt against legality, and they advocate a “revolutionary dictatorship.”

“The party,” say they, “which will have overturned the government will take the place of it, of course. It will seize upon power and proceed in a revolutionary manner. It will take the measures necessary to secure the success of the insurrection. It will demolish the old institutions; it will organize the defense of the country. As for those who will not recognize its authority, why the guillotine will settle them, whether they belong to the people or the middle class, if they refuse to obey the orders necessary for the advance of the revolution.” The guillotine still in action? See how these budding Robespierres argue, who know nothing of the grand epic of the century but its period of decline, men who have never learned anything about it except from speeches of the hangers-on of the Republic.

For us anarchists the dictatorship of an individual or of a party (at bottom the very same thing) has been finally condemned. We know that revolution and government are incompatible. One must destroy the other no matter what name is given to government, whether dictatorship, royalty, or parliament. [Goering made this same point (when ‘honesty’ was the only currency he had left...): that all governments exist to subject the people “no matter what name is given to [that] government...” – P.S.] We know that what makes the strength and the truth of our party is contained in this formula – “Nothing good or durable can be done except by the free initiative of the people, and every government tends to destroy it.” And so the very best among us, if they should become masters of that formidable machine, the government, would become, in a week, fit only for the gallows, if their ideas had not to pass through the crucible of the popular mind before being put into execution. We know whither every dictatorship leads, even the best intentioned, – namely, to the death of all revolutionary movement. We know also, that this idea of dictatorship is never anything more than a sickly product of governmental fetish-worship [we see here Alice’s insight cast broadly... – P.S.], which, like religious fetish-worship, has always served to perpetuate slavery.

But we do not now address ourselves to anarchists. We speak to those governmental revolutionists who, led astray by the prejudices of their education, honestly deceive themselves, and ask nothing better than to discuss the question. We therefore speak to them from their own point of view.

To begin with one general observation: those who preach dictatorship do not in general perceive that in sustaining this prejudice they only prepare the way for those who later on will cut their throats. There is, however, one word of Robespierre’s which his admirers would do well to remember. He did not deny the dictatorship in principle; but “have good care about it,” he answered abruptly to Mandar when he spoke to him of it, “Brissot would be the Dictator!” Yes, Brissot, the crafty Girondin, deadly enemy of the levelling tendencies of the people, furious defender of property (though he once called it theft), Brissot, who would coolly have consigned to the Abbaye Prison, Hebert, Marat, and all the moderate Jacobins!

Now this was said in 1792! At that time France had already been three years in revolution! In fact, royalty no longer existed; it only awaited its death stroke. The feudal regime was actually abolished. And yet even at this time when the revolution rolled its waves untrammelled, it was still the counter-revolutionist Brissot who had the best chance to be made dictator! And who would it have been previously, in 1789? Mirabeau is the man who would have been acknowledged as the head of the government! The man who made a bargain with the king to sell him his eloquence, – this is the man who would have been thrust into power at this time, if the insurgent people had not imposed its sovereignty, sustained by its pikes, and if it had not proceeded by the accomplished facts of the *Jacquerie* [popular revolt], in making illusory every government constituted at Paris or in the departments.

But governmental prejudice so thoroughly blinds those who speak of dictatorship, that they prefer the dictatorship of a new Brissot or a Napoleon to abandoning the idea of giving another master to men who are breaking the chains of their slavery! [Another name for 'governmental prejudice might be: 'middle-class' (or 'liberal'... or 'bourgeois'...) fear of 'the people'... – P.S.]

The secret societies of the time of the Restoration and of Louis-Philippe contributed powerfully to maintain this prejudice of dictatorship. The middle-class republicans of the time, aided by the workers, made a long series of conspiracies, with the object of overturning royalty and proclaiming the Republic. Not understanding the profound change that would have to be effected in France before even a republican regime could be established, they imagined that by means of a vast conspiracy they would some day overturn royalty, take possession of power and proclaim the Republic. [Then as now... when we commoners lack our own alternative vision... our good hearts bend to those who are certain... and we resist seeing... till the very last moment... that they don't have good intentions for us... – P.S.] For more than thirty years those secret societies never ceased to work with an unlimited devotion and heroic courage and perseverance. If the Republic resulted from the insurrection of 1848, it was thanks to these societies, and thanks to the propaganda by deed made by them for thirty years. Without their noble efforts the Republic would have been impossible.

The end they had in view was to get possession of power themselves and to instal a republican dictatorship. But of course they never succeeded. As ever, from the very nature of things, a conspiracy could not overturn royalty. The conspirators had indeed prepared the way for its fall. They had spread widely the republican idea; their martyrs had made it the ideal of the people. But the final effort which definitely overturned the king of the bourgeoisie was much greater and stronger than any that could come from a secret society; it came from the mass of the people. [Given what we learned from Karl Marx and Immanuel Wallerstein in our '3.7' shows that examine the origins of the centralized... bureaucratic... state... in the aftermath of the Revolution of 1848... Peter Kropotkin's observations suggest an additional pattern... a utilitarian one. It is fitting in the extreme that the first 'brave' acts of the Plato's Tribesmen in their inaugural flight would be to 'make-use-of' 'the people'... in all our diversity... in order to achieve their aims. But... as he says... they are certainly patient... on the other hand... it is an endless quest... this business of seeking 'perfection'... so why not be patient? Let's recall Wallerstein's words on the aftermath of this collaboration between the budding global-statesmen... and the artisans... peasants... and slaves... on whose blood they fed... and cast their boats (from our November 1, 2015 show):

The liberal states thus combined legitimating the political role of the middle classes (and thereby receiving from them legitimation in turn) and internal repression of working-class discontent with an entente cordiale between themselves to ensure their dominance in the geopolitical arena. This seemed to work at first. But it was fragile, as the European revolution of 1848 was to demonstrate. More would have to be done to secure a stable political framework for the capitalist world-economy in the post-1789 situation....

The tide – that is, the European revolution of 1848 – as all such great happenings, was made up of a mixture of movements and objectives. In France, it consisted essentially of the joining together of Europe's 'first great proletarian insurrection' (Tilly, 1971, 228) with the acute discontent of the left liberals who shared John Stuart Mill's view of the conservatization of the July Monarchy....

The uprising of February 1848 illuminated the hopes of a 'social republic,' a vague socialist utopia that would provide jobs to the unemployed and liberation to all those who suffered indignities and inequalities. Everyone put forward their claims: the "artisans," who sought to restore their privileges and their mode of production; the peasants, who sought to reestablish traditional rights of collective usage; the women, who sought the extension of "universal" suffrage to include them; the slaves, who sought abolition. The pendulum was beginning to swing too far, and in June the forces of order under General Cavaignac reined in the unruly dangerous classes. "Pitiful provisional government!" cried Labrousse (1948, 2) "It feared the social revolution as much as it did the counter-revolution."

Cavaignac could repress; he could not re-legitimize the state. Nor could the monarchs return; they had exhausted their credit. Into this void stepped Louis Napoleon, who sought to re-create a liberal, orderly, modern state and who, as Zeldin (1958, 6) puts it so well, “was not elected because he was [the] candidate [of the Party of Order], but... was their candidate because they saw he was bound to win.” But what did Louis Napoleon represent? He represented, first of all, the Napoleonic tradition, which combined the legacy of the French Revolution, a commitment to scientific and industrial progress, and nationalism. During the 1840s, Louis Napoleon had been a sharp critic of the July Monarchy because he felt that, by distancing itself from progressive liberalism, it was “building on sand and would surely tumble.” And, unlike Guizot, he was aware that “with proper safeguards [i.e. with 'adequate management' of us... we-the-people... – P.S.] a democratic regime could be established without threatening the stability of the country.”

---

The liberals acted in 1848 just as they had in 1830. Dismayed by a regime that had become too rigid, too illiberal, they rose up and quickly won the day. Then, dismayed by the possibility that the lower strata would be able to take advantage of the situation and push things too far, they renewed their links with the political groups they had just ousted from power, because 'the enemy, at present, is on the left' (Palmade, 1961, 255). When Louis Napoleon made his coup d'etat on December 2, 1851, the primary objective was to repress the left. The secondary objective was, however, to constrain the ability of conservative forces to act other than through him. One can, if one wants, emphasize the Caesarist – the so-called Bonapartist – element in the regime. If one does, however, one risks missing the degree to which the outcome of the repression, which was both real and effective, was that of a centrist regime, oriented to capitalist expansion, constructing a liberal compromise – one led not by a classical liberal but by an enlightened conservative.” (Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System IV: Centrist Liberalism Triumphant, 1789 – 1914*, p. 77 – 92)

[And... it is suggestive... those decades of collaborators working in secret... to defeat the aristocracy: to what degree did Louis' December 10 Society find originating inspiration in them... those secret societies? (Louis'... however... a flipped reconceptualization... stripped of the independently-minded... only the strictly obedient need apply...) particularly given the tendency of Louis Bonaparte to 'borrow'... i.e. steal and claim for his own the ideas of others... a very 'oblate'-like – in our sense... of 'oblates' being abandoned children – a very 'oblate'-like thing to do: “This society dates from the year 1849...” recall Karl Marx told us... in his *Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*... “on the pretext of founding a benevolent society, the *lumpenproletariat* of Paris had been organized into secret sections, each section being led by Bonapartist agents... The Society of December 10 belonged to him, it was *his* work, his very own idea. Whatever else he appropriates is put into his hands by the force of circumstances; whatever else he does, the circumstance do for him or he is content to copy from the deeds of others. But Bonaparte with official phrases about order, religion, family and property in public, before the citizens, and with the secret society of the Schufterles and Spiegelbergs [a note at the back reads: “characters in Schiller's drama *Die Rauber* (The Robbers), who plunder and murder unimpeded by any moral scruples...”], the society of disorder, prostitution and theft, behind him – that is Bonaparte himself as original author, and the history of the Society of December 10 is his own history....”

...but the more important point is this: what is a healthy 'tribalism'? (this is discussed in our *Waking Up Radio* show of December 6, 2015...) and how do we use it to combat... the destructive notion (destructive of our earlier rich diversity... and that we are recomposing... in forming 'open tribes'... 'associations'...) to combat the destructive notion of 'class' (and I must admit... I find it ironic... that Kropotkin is so generous (in his description) to these dictatorship-lovin' Plato's Tribesmen... now wreaking so much havoc on us... but then... no doubt... he casts his conceptualization wide... to embrace the whole of these diverse societies... for in what follows he shows them to us clearly... these forebears of 'our' current 'power'-guys... the 'prudent' ones who hide...) – P.S.]

But the final effort which definitely overturned the king of the bourgeoisie was much greater and stronger than any that could come from a secret society; it came from the mass of the people.

The result is known. The party which had prepared the way for the fall of royalty found itself thrust aside from the steps of the Government House. Others, too prudent to run the risk of conspiracy, but better known, more moderate also, lying in wait for the opportunity of grasping power, took the place which the conspirators hoped to conquer at the point of the bayonet. Journalists, lawyers, good talkers who worked hard to make a name for themselves while the true republicans forged weapons or expired in jail, took possession of power. Some of them, already well known, were acclaimed by the people; others pushed themselves forward and were accepted because their name represented nothing more than a program of agreement with everybody.

It is useless to tell us that this happened because of a want of practical spirit in the party of action, and that others will be able to do better in future. No, a thousand times no! It is a law as immutable as that which governs the movement of the stars, that the party

of action must be thrown aside, and the intriguers and talkers seize upon power. They are always better known to the great mass that makes the final effort. They get more votes, because with or without voting papers, by acclamation or by the ballot-box, at the bottom it is always a kind of tacit election which is made in such cases by acclamation. They are acclaimed by everybody and above all by the enemies of the revolution, who prefer to put forward nobodies, and thus by acclamation those men are accepted as rulers who are really either enemies of the movement or indifferent to it.

The man who more than any other was the incarnation of this system of conspiracy, the man who by a life spent in prison paid for his devotion to this system, on the eve of his death uttered these words, which of themselves make an entire program – “Neither God nor Master!”

### The Impotence of Revolutionary Governments

To imagine that a government can be overturned by a secret society, and that that secret society can take its place, is an error into which have fallen all the revolutionary organizations which sprang to life in the bosom of the republican middle class since 1820... [But the Plato's Tribesmen are not 'revolutionists'... they are totalitarians... – P.S.] And yet facts abound which prove what an error it is. What devotion, what abnegation, what perseverance was not displayed by the republican secret societies of the Young Italy Party! And yet all this immense work, all those sacrifices by the Youth of Italy, before which even those of the Russian revolutionary youth pale, all the corpses piled up in the casemates of Austrian fortresses, and under the knife and bullets of the executioner – all this only brought into power the crafty, robbing middle class and royalty!

It is inevitable, it cannot be otherwise. For it is not secret societies nor even revolutionary organizations that can give the finishing blow to governments. Their function, their historic mission is to prepare men's minds for the revolution, and then when men's minds are prepared and external circumstances are favorable, the final rush is made, not by the group that initiated the movement, but by the mass of the people altogether outside of the society. On the 31<sup>st</sup> of August Paris was deaf to the appeals of Blanqui. Four days later he proclaimed the fall of the government; but then the Blanquists were no longer the initiators of the movement. It was the people, the millions who dethroned the man of December and proclaimed the humbugs whose names for two years had resounded in their ears. When a revolution is ready to burst out, when the movement is felt in the air, when its success is already certain, then a thousand new men, on whom the organization has never exercised any direct influence, come and join the movement like birds of prey coming to the field of battle to feed on the victims. These help to make the final effort, but it is not in the ranks of the sincere and irreconcilable conspirators, it is among the men on the fence that they look for their leaders. The conspirators who still are possessed with the prejudice of a dictatorship then unconsciously work to put into power their own enemies.

But if all this that we have just said is true with regard to political revolutions or rather outbreaks, it is much more true with regard to the revolution we desire – the social revolution. To allow any government to be established, a strong and recognized 'power', is to paralyze the work of the revolution at once. The good that this government would do is nil, and the evil immense.

What do we understand by revolution? It is not a simple change of governors. It is the taking possession by the people of all social wealth. It is the abolition of all the forces which have so long hampered the development of humanity. But is it by decrees emanating from a government that this immense economic revolution can be accomplished? We have seen in the past century the Polish revolutionary dictator Kosciusko decree the abolition of personal servitude, yet the servitude continued to exist for eighty years after this decree. We have seen the Convention, the omnipotent Convention, the terrible Convention as its admirers call it, decree the equal division per head of all the communal lands taken back from the nobles. Like so many others, this decree remained a dead letter because in order to carry it out it was necessary that the proletarians of the rural districts should make an entirely new revolution, and revolutions are not made by the force of decrees. In order that the taking possession of social wealth should become an accomplished fact it is necessary that the people should have their hands free, that they should shake off the slavery to which they are too much habituated, that they act according to their own will, and march forward without waiting for orders from anyone. And it is this very thing which a dictatorship would prevent however well intentioned it might be, while it would be incapable of advancing in the slightest degree the march of the revolution.

But if government, were it even an ideal revolutionary government, creates no new force and is of no use whatever in the work of demolition which we have to accomplish, still less can we count on it for the work of reorganization which must follow that of demolition. The economic change which will result from the social revolution will be so immense and so profound, it must so change all the relations based today on property and exchange, that it is impossible for one or any individual to elaborate the different social forms which must spring up in the society of the future. This elaboration of new social forms can only be made by the collective work of the masses. To satisfy the immense variety of conditions and needs which will spring up as soon as private

property shall be abolished, it is necessary to have the collective suppleness of mind of the whole people. Any authority external to it will only be an obstacle, and beside that a source of discord and hatred.

But it is full time to give up this illusion, so often proved false and so often dearly paid for, of a revolutionary government. It is time to admit, once for all, this political axiom that a government cannot be revolutionary. People talk of the Convention, but let us not forget that the few measures taken by the Convention, little revolutionary though they were, were only the sanction of action accomplished by the people who at the time trampled under foot all governments. As Victor Hugo had said, Danton pushed forward Robespierre, Marat watched and pushed on Danton, and Marat himself was pushed on by Cimourdain – this personification of the clubs of wild enthusiasts and rebels. Like all the government that preceded it and followed it, the Convention was only a drag on the actions of the people.

The facts which history teach us are so conclusive in this respect, the impossibility of a revolutionary government and the injurious effect of that which is called by the name are so evident, that it would seem difficult to explain the determination with which a certain school calling itself socialist maintains the idea of a government. But the explanation is very simple. It is that socialists, though they say they are the followers of this school, have an entirely different conception from ours of the revolution which we have to accomplish. For them, as for all the middle-class radicals, the social revolution is rather an affair of the future about which we have not to think much at present. What they dream of in their inmost thoughts, though they don't dare to confess it, is something entirely different. It is the installation of a government like that of Switzerland or the United States, making some attempts at expropriation, in favor of the State, of what they call "public services." It is something after the ideal of Bismarck. It is a compromise made in advance between the socialistic aspirations of the masses and the desires of the middle class [in current terms: Plato's Tribesmen... the global-state-statesmen... those would-be gods bedeviling us... – P.S.] They would, indeed, wish the expropriation to be complete, but they have not the courage to attempt it; so they put it off to the next century, and before the battle they enter into negotiation with the enemy.

[I must admit... I wish Peter had elaborated on that last bit... because given what we've seen... of the advancement of the 'vision' of the Plato's Tribesmen... toward their dream of an inescapable global totalitarianism... his words ring prescient... – P.S.]

(Peter Kropotkin, from "Revolutionary Government", *Kropotkin's Revolutionary Pamphlets*, edited by Roger N. Baldwin)

---

In "An Appeal to the Young" Kropotkin addresses himself to the inherent honesty... and longing for truth... of youth... to that time in our lives – those of us caught in the 'class' system – when... though caught... we're still open... still following our questions... He provides vital information that will not be said else: that their quest for answers... and for an honest world... must be on-going... that a momentous struggle is underway... that their need to know... despite all they will be told... from the status quo... is not only legitimate but full of import... that what their bodies tell them is so: that not only is the wrong they see around them... in fact... wrong... but that human beings under 'class'... have been... and continue to be... striving to establish freedom globally... and that they have it in their power to join with those striving for freedom... and that doing so will convey an authentic... a grand... meaning to all they do. There is no 'higher' purpose... when humanity itself is squeezed into being mere functionaries of a Miniscule Few... lustful of 'power'... and needing to believe they are 'supreme'.

His appeal is comprehensive... tailoring his arguments to reach youth exploring a variety of interests... sections addressed to: doctors... scientists... lawyers... engineers... teachers... and artists. The excerpt shared here is from the last section: "What You Can Do"... followed by a final word... "To Working Class Youths."

What follows is from "An Appeal to the Young" by Peter Kropotkin:

---

What You Can Do:

You stop me at last! "What the devil!" you say. "But if abstract science is a luxury and practice of medicine mere chicane; if law spells injustice, and mechanical invention is but a means of robbery; if the school, at variance with the wisdom of the 'practical man,' is sure to be overcome, and art without the revolutionary idea can only degenerate, what remains for me to do?"}

A vast and most enthralling task, a work in which your actions will be in complete harmony with your conscience, an undertaking capable of rousing the noblest and most vigorous natures.

What work? I will now tell you.

Two courses are open to you. You can either tamper for ever with your conscience and finish one day by saying “Humanity can go to the devil as long as I am enjoying every pleasure to the full and so long as the people are foolish enough to let me do so.” Or else you will join the ranks of the socialists and work with them for the complete transformation of society. Such is the necessary result of the analysis we have made. Such is the logical conclusion at which every intelligent being must arrive provided he judge impartially the things he sees around him, and disregard the sophisms suggested to him by his middle-class education and the interested views of his friends.

Having once reached this conclusion, the question which arises is “what is to be done?” The answer is easy. Quit the environment in which you are placed and in which it is customary to speak of the workers as a lot of brutes; go among the people, and the question will solve itself.

You will find that everywhere in England as in Germany, in Italy as in the United States, wherever there are privileged classes and oppressed, a tremendous movement is on foot among the working-classes, the aim of which is to destroy once and for ever the slavery imposed by capitalists, and to lay the foundations of a new society based on the principles of justice and equality. It no longer suffices for the people to voice their misery in those songs whose melody breaks one's heart, and which the serfs of the eighteenth century sang. He works today fully conscious of what he had done, in spite of every obstacle to his enfranchisement. His thoughts are continually occupied in considering what to do so that life instead of being a mere curse to three-fourths of the human race may be a blessing to all. He attacks the most difficult problems of sociology, and strives to solve them with his sound common sense, his observation, and his sad experience. To come to a common understanding with his fellows in misfortune, he tries to form groups and to organize. He forms societies, sustained with difficulty by slender contributions. He tries to make terms with his fellows beyond the frontier. And he does more than all the loud-mouthed philanthropists to hasten the advent of the day when wars between nations will become impossible. To know what his brothers are doing, to improve his acquaintance with them, to elaborate and propagate his ideas, he sustains, at the cost of what efforts, his working-class press. What a ceaseless struggle! What labor, constantly requiring to be recommenced. Sometimes to fill the gaps made by desertion – the result of lassitude, of corruption, of persecutions; sometimes to reorganize the ranks decimated by fusillades and grapeshot, sometimes to resume studies suddenly cut short by wholesale massacres.

The papers are conducted by men who have had to snatch from society scraps of knowledge by depriving themselves of food and sleep. The agitation is supported with the pennies of the workers saved from the strict necessities of life. And all this is done, shadowed by the continual apprehension of seeing their families plunged into destitution as soon as the master perceives that his worker, his slave, is a socialist.

These are the things you will see if you go among the people. And in this ceaseless struggle how often has the worker, sinking under the weight of difficulties, exclaimed in vain: “Where then are those young men who have been educated at our expense, whom we have clothed and fed while they studied? For whom, with backs bowed down under heavy loads, and with empty stomachs, we have built these houses, these academies, these museums? For whom we, with pallid faces, have printed those fine books we cannot so much as read? Where are they, those professors who claim to possess the science of humanity, and yet in whose eyes mankind is not worth a rare species of caterpillar? Where are those men who preach of liberty and who never rise to defend ours, daily trodden under foot? These writers, these poets, these painters, all this band of hypocrites, in short, who speak of the people with tears in their eyes, and who nevertheless never come among us to help us in our work?”

[The pressing quality of the argument Kropotkin is here making has not gotten any less so... if anything it seem our crisis of empathy (under 'class') is worsening (so hard to know for certain... when we don't have our own means of discussing these things... our intercommunications being filtered... diluted... and massaged...) the consequence of 'power's intentionally separating and stratifying us... shattering our essential unity. But it didn't look that way... in 1968... a time when young people globally had seen through all the false divisions states use to separate us. Sixty-eight serves as a reminder – of hope for us... of caution for 'power' – that the earth works on us all – calls us to freedom – but especially calls to the youth... so recently sprung from her bowers.

His analysis should... however... be updated to reflect our current situation of 'power's depletion of our common planetary resources... These last three paragraphs are definitely discussion-worthy in this regard... useful... I think... to dispel the fog enshrouding our relations... across the false divisions: the fog of 'economics' – that exists to keep us divided – and useful therefore for the light they shed... by implication... on this current moment of resource-shortages... this moment in the historical-existence of the 'global order' called 'class'... called “end-'power'-game.” The illusions... cons... propaganda... the 'global-state-statesmen'

promulgate to maintain their 'control' have depended not just on our atomization and hierarchical ordering... i.e.... our separation from... and misconceptions about... each other – on our not meeting each other and as a result then working together... but also on sufficient planetary resources to maintain the stratification... to placate some with better stuff... and cause resentment toward them in the designated 'lessers'. This requirement of their control – that there be 'lessers' – is most critical for those economic areas on the backs of which the weight of the entire system rests: food... water... clothing... and electronic technology... and 'power's 'historical solution': to attempt to make its stratification of us still more rigid through geographical separation: the hierarchical ordering of 'nations' and regions – is becoming expensive. What might be a useful discussion... given this – useful for our planning purposes – would be to consider the implications of the immense environmental and 'economic' crises facing us: the fact that geographic separation presents problems for 'power' right now due to the increasing costs of everything... not the least of which being the 'cost' of we-the-people... ever striving for better lives (and even striving to own our own lives...) at precisely the time when 'power' can least afford to 'give' this – and then... of course... there's the Internet... – P.S.]

Some complacently enjoy their condition of cowardly indifference, others, the majority, despise the “rabble” and are ever ready to pounce down on it if it dare to attack their privileges.

From time to time, it is true, a young man appears on the scene who dreams of drums and barricades, and who is in search of sensational scenes and situations, but who deserts the cause of the people as soon as he perceives that the road to the barricades is long, that the laurels he counts on winning on the way are mixed with thorns. Generally these men are ambitious adventurers, who after failing in their first attempts, seek to obtain the votes of the people, but who later on will be the first to denounce it, if it dare to try and put into practice the principles they themselves advocated, and who perhaps will even point the cannon at the proletariat if it dare move before they, the leaders, have given the word of command.

Add to this stupid insults, haughty contempt, and cowardly calumny on the part of a great number, and you have all the help that the middle-class youth give the people in their powerful social evolution.

And then you ask, “what shall we do?” when there is everything to be done! When a whole army of young people would find plenty to employ the entire vigor of their youthful energy, the full force of their intelligence and their talents to help the people in the vast enterprise they have undertaken!

What shall we do? Listen.

You lovers of pure science, if you are imbued with the principles of socialism, if you have understood the real meaning of the revolution which is even now knocking at the door, do you not see that all science has to be recast in order to place it in harmony with the new principles? That it is your business to accomplish in this field a revolution far greater than that which was accomplished in every ranch of science during the eighteenth century? Do you not understand that history – which today is a woman's tale about great kings, great statesmen, and great parliaments – that history itself has to be written from the point of view of the people in the long evolution of mankind? That social economy – which today is merely the sanctification of capitalist robbery – has to be worked out afresh in its fundamental principles as well as in its innumerable applications? That anthropology, sociology, ethics...

[And here... to use Peter's own words... here I must stop you... with much love and respect... to suggest that we have all the knowledge we need (and we can wait till our freedom is well-established for the rest...) to begin putting forward our global alternative... – those resource-shortages calling the question... pressing the totalitarian threat to a critical (for our humanity) extent... and there's no need to delay... or to apply our energy to any other thing but moving to establish our freedom today... as we have the means in having the Internet ... and global communications... to do it... – P.S.]

...That anthropology, sociology, ethics, must be completely recast, and that the natural sciences themselves, regarded from another point of view, must undergo a profound modification, alike in regard to the conception of natural phenomena and with respect to the method of expression.

Very well, then, set to work! Place your abilities at the command of the good cause. Especially help us with your clear logic to combat prejudice and to lay by your synthesis the foundation of a better organization. Yet more, teach us to apply in our daily arguments the fearlessness of true scientific investigation, and show us as your predecessors did, how man dare sacrifice even life itself for the triumph of the truth.

You, doctors who have learnt socialism by a bitter experience, never weary of telling us today, tomorrow, in and out of season, that humanity itself hurries onward to decay if man remain in the present conditions of existence and work; that all your medicaments

must be powerless against disease while the majority of mankind vegetate in conditions absolutely contrary to those which science tells us are healthful. Convince the people that it is the causes of disease which must be uprooted, and show us all what is necessary to remove them.

Come with your scalpel and dissect for us with unerring hand this society of ours fast hastening to putrefaction. Tell us what a rational experience should and might be. Insist, as true surgeons, that a gangrenous limb must be amputated when it may poison the whole body.

You who have worked at the application of science to industry, come and tell us frankly what has been the outcome of your discoveries. Convince those who dare not march boldly towards the future what new inventions the knowledge we have already acquired carries in its womb, what industry could do under better conditions, what man might easily produce if he produced always with a view to enhance his own productions.

You poets, painters, sculptors, musicians, if you understand your true mission and the very interests of art itself, come with us. Place your pen, your pencil, your chisel, your ideas at the service of the revolution. Figure forth to us, in your eloquent style, or your impressive pictures, the heroic struggles of the people against their oppressors, fire the hearts of our youth with that glorious revolutionary enthusiasm which inflamed the souls of our ancestors. Tell women what a noble career is that of a husband who devotes his life to the great cause of social emancipation! [and vice versa!... – P.S.] Show the people how hideous is their actual life, and place your hands on the causes of its ugliness. Tell us what a rational life would be, if it did not encounter at every step the follies and the ignominies of our present social order.

Lastly, all of you who possess knowledge, talent, capacity, industry, if you have a spark of sympathy in your nature, come you, and your companions, come and place your services at the disposal of those who most need them. And remember, if you do come, that you come not as masters, but as comrade in the struggle; that you come not to govern but to gain strength for yourselves in a new life which sweeps upwards to the conquest of the future: that you come less to teach than to grasp the aspiration of the many; to divine them, to give them shape, and then to work, without rest and without haste, with all the fire of youth and all the judgment of age, to realize them in actual life. Then and then only, will you lead a complete, a noble, a rational existence. Then you will see that your every effort on this path bears with it fruit in abundance, and this sublime harmony once established between your actions and the dictates of your conscience will give you powers you never dreamt lay dormant in yourselves, the never-ceasing struggle for truth, justice, and equality among the people, whose gratitude you will earn – what nobler career can the youth of all nations desire than this?

It has taken me long to show you of the well-to-do classes that in view of the dilemma which life presents to you, you will be forced, if courageous and sincere, to come and work side by side with the socialists, and champion in their ranks, the cause of the social revolution.

And yet how simple this truth is after all! But when one is speaking to those who have suffered from the effects of bourgeois surroundings, how many sophisms must be combated, how many prejudices overcome, how many interested objections put aside!

---

To Working Class Youths:

It is easy to be brief today in addressing you, the youth of the people. The very pressure of events impels you to become socialists, however little you may have the courage to reason and to act.

To rise from the ranks of the working people, and not devote oneself to bringing about the triumph of socialism, is to misconceive the real interests at stake, to give up the cause and the true historic mission.

Do you remember the time, when still a mere lad, you went down one winter's day to play in your dark court? The cold nipped your shoulders through your thin clothes, and the mud worked into your worn-out shoes. Even then when you saw chubby children richly clad in the distance, looking at you with an air of contempt, you knew right well that these imps were not the equals of yourself and your comrades, either in intelligence, common sense or energy. But later when you were forced to shut yourself up in a filthy factory from seven o'clock in the morning, to remain hours on end close to a whirling machine, and, a machine yourself, you were forced to follow day after day for whole years in succession its movements with relentless throbbing – during all this time they, the others, were going quietly to be taught at fine schools, at academies, at the universities. And now these



same children, less intelligent, but better taught than you, have become your masters, are enjoying all the pleasures of life and all the advantages of civilization. And you? What sort of lot awaits you?

You return to little, dark, damp lodgings where five or six human beings pig together within a few square feet. Where your mother, sick of life, aged by care rather than years, offers you dry bread and potatoes as your only food, washed down by a blackish fluid called in irony "tea." And to distract your thoughts you have ever the same never-ending question, "How shall I be able to pay the baker tomorrow, and the landlord the day after?"

What! must you drag on the same weary existence as your father and mother for thirty and forty years? Must you toil your life long to procure for others all the pleasures of well-being, of knowledge, of art, and keep for yourself only the eternal anxiety as to whether you can get a bit of bread? [...or whether your unique earth-gifts shall live... – P.S.] Will you forever give up all that makes life so beautiful to devote yourself to providing every luxury for a handful of idlers? [...or for... in the case of our new crop of would-be-gods... Plato-worshipping-totalitarians... 'hard-working'... they would argue... to a fault – as Plato is their god... and Bentham their witness... they pledge themselves but to works of 'benevolence'... to 'serving' us... even as they 'thoughtfully' remove from our midst the ones they deem 'superfluous'... – P.S.] Will you wear yourself out with toil and have in return only trouble, if not misery, when hard times – the fearful hard times – come upon you? Is this what you long for in life?

Perhaps you will give up. Seeing no way whatever out of your condition, maybe you say to yourself, "Whole generations have undergone the same lot, and I, who can alter nothing in the matter, I must submit also. Let us work on then and endeavor to live as well as we can!"

Very well. In that case life itself will take pains to enlighten you. One day a crisis comes, one of those crises which are no longer mere passing phenomena, as they were formerly, but a crisis which destroys a whole industry, which plunges thousands of workers into misery, which crushes whole families. You struggle against the calamity like the rest. But you will soon see how your wife, your child, your friend, [or our Brothers and Sisters in other lands... delivered into the hands of even more hard-core totalitarian 'statesmen'... dedicated to their 'management'... – P.S.] little by little succumb to privation, fade away under your very eyes. For sheer want of food, for lack of care and medical assistance, they end their days on the pauper's stretcher, whilst the life of the rich flows on joyously amidst the sunny streets of the great city, careless of those who starve and perish. You will then understand how utterly revolting is this society. You will then reflect upon the causes of this crisis, and your examinations will scrutinize to the depths that abomination which puts millions of human beings at the mercy of the brutal greed ['power'-lust... – P.S.] of a handful of useless triflers. Then you will understand that socialists are right when they say that our present society can be, that it must be, reorganized from top to bottom.

To pass from general crises to your particular case. One day when your master tries by a new reduction of wages to squeeze out of you a few more dollars in order to increase his fortune still further you will protest. But he will haughtily answer, "Go and eat grass, if you will not work at the price I offer." Then you will understand that your master not only tries to shear you like a sheep, but that he looks upon you as an inferior kind of animal altogether; that not content with holding you in his relentless grip by means of the wage system, he is further anxious to make you a slave in every respect. Then you will, perhaps, bow down before him, you will give up the feeling of human dignity, and you will end by suffering every possible humiliation. Or the blood will rush to your head, you shudder at the hideous slope on which you are slipping down, you will retort, and, turned out workless on the street, you will understand how right socialists are when they say, "Revolt! Rise against this economic slavery!" Then you will come and take your place in the ranks of the socialists, and you will work with them for the complete destruction of all slavery – economic, social and political.

Every one of you then, honest young people, men and women, peasants, laborers, artisans, and soldiers, you will understand what are your rights and you will come along with us. You will come in order to work with your brothers in the preparation of that revolution which is sweeping away every vestige of slavery, tearing the fetters asunder, breaking with the old worn-out traditions and opening to all mankind a new and wider scope of joyous existence [and then World Wars I and II wiped out our world-scale 'evolution'... for which Kropotkin had given of himself without stint... – P.S.], and which shall at length establish true liberty, real equality, ungrudging fraternity throughout human society. Work with all, work for all – the full enjoyment of the fruits of their labor, the complete development of all their faculties, a rational, human and happy life!

Don't let anyone tell us that we – but a small band – are too weak to attain unto the magnificent end at which we aim. Count and see how many there are who suffer this injustice. We peasants who work for others, and who mumble the straw while our master eats the wheat, we by ourselves are millions of men. We workers who weave silks and velvet in order that we may be clothed in rags, we too, are a great multitude; and when the clang of the factories permits us a moment's repose, we overflow the streets and squares like the sea in a spring tide. We soldiers who are driven along to the word of command, or by blows, we who receive the bullets for

which our officers get crosses and pensions, we, too, poor fools who have hitherto known no better than to shoot our brothers, why we have only to make a right about face towards these plumed and decorated personages who are so good as to command us, to see a ghastly pallor overspread their faces.

Ay, all of us together, we who suffer and are insulted daily, we are a multitude whom no man can number, we are the ocean that can embrace and swallow up all else. When we have but the will to do it, that very moment will justice be done: that very instant the tyrants of the earth shall bite the dust.

(Peter Kropotkin, from "An Appeal to the Young", *Kropotkin's Revolutionary Pamphlets*, edited by Roger N. Baldwin)

---

What follows is from "Anarchism" by Peter Kropotkin:

Anarchism (from the Greek 'an', and 'arkhos', contrary to authority), is the name given to a principle or theory of life and conduct under which society is conceived without government – harmony in such a society being obtained, not by submission to law, or by obedience to any authority, but by free agreements concluded between the various groups, territorial and professional, freely constituted for the sake of production and consumption, as also for the satisfaction of the infinite variety of needs and aspirations of a civilized being.

In a society developed along these lines, the voluntary associations which already now begin to cover all the fields of human activity would take a still greater extension so as to substitute themselves for the State in all its functions. They would represent an interwoven network, composed of an infinite variety of groups and federations of all sizes and degrees, local, regional, national, and international – temporary or more or less permanent – for all possible purposes: production, consumption and exchange, communications, sanitary arrangements, education, mutual protection, defense of the territory, and so on; and, on the other side, for the satisfaction of an ever-increasing number of scientific, artistic, literary and sociable needs.

Moreover, such a society would represent nothing immutable. On the contrary – as is seen in organic life at large – harmony would (it is contended) result from an ever-changing adjustment and readjustment of equilibrium between the multitudes of forces and influences, and this adjustment would be the easier to obtain as none of the forces would enjoy a special protection from the State.

If, it is contended, society were organized on these principles, man would not be limited in the free exercise of his powers in productive work by a capitalist monopoly, maintained by the State; nor would he be limited in the exercise of his will by a fear of punishment, or by obedience towards individuals or metaphysical entities, which both lead to depression of initiative and servility of mind. He would be guided in his actions by his own understanding, which necessarily would bear the impression of a free action and reaction between his own self and the ethical conceptions of his surroundings. Man would thus be enabled to obtain the full development of all his faculties, intellectual, artistic and moral, without being hampered by overwork for the monopolists, or by the servility and inertia of mind of the great number. He would thus be able to reach full *individualization*, which is not possible either under the present system of *individualism*, or under any system of State socialism in the so-called *Volkstaat* (popular State).

The anarchist writers consider, moreover, that their conception is not a Utopia, constructed on the *a priori* method, after a few desiderata have been taken as postulates. It is derived, they maintain, from an *analysis of tendencies* that are at work already, even though state socialism may find a temporary favor with the reformers. The progress of modern technics, which wonderfully simplifies the production of all the necessities of life; the growing spirit of independence, and the rapid spread of free initiative and free understanding in all branches of activity – including those which formerly were considered as the proper attribution of church and State – are steadily reinforcing the no-government tendency.

As to their economical conceptions, the anarchists, in common with all socialists, of whom they constitute the left wing, maintain that the now prevailing system of private ownership in land, and our capitalist production for the sake of profits, represent a monopoly which runs against both the principles of justice and the dictates of utility. They are the main obstacle which prevents the successes of modern technics from being brought into the service of all, so as to produce general well-being. The anarchists consider the wage-system and capitalist production altogether as an obstacle to progress. But they point out also that the State was, and continues to be, the chief instrument for permitting the few to monopolize the land, and the capitalists to appropriate for themselves a quite disproportionate share of the yearly accumulated surplus of production. Consequently, while combating the present monopolization of land, and capitalism altogether, the anarchists combat with the same energy the State as the main support of that system. Not this or that special form, but the State altogether, whether it be a monarchy or even a republic governed by means of the *referendum*. [One of the major analytical advantages – the better vantage – we possess today is our

understanding... thanks to Alice Miller particularly... but also to Jeremy Bentham as well... is our understanding of how 'the state' exists in our training to be obedient – work done by the parent on behalf of 'the system' – the implication of this being... for the argument being made here by Kropotkin... that our accelerated evolution today (thanks to the Internet... the means to further the discussions 'power' has systematically suppressed...) based as it is in our consciously grasping the full extent of the disaster called 'class'... and determining to end it... and together globally embrace our freedom... means this evolution is qualitatively different from any other that went before it – which Kropotkin acknowledges implicitly by using the term 'individualization'... i.e.... the process of our negating 'class' and becoming 'soul-sufficient'... through the mutual development of our earth-given gifts... in cooperative association... – P.S.]

The State organization, having always been, both in ancient and modern history (Macedonian empire... Roman empire, modern European states grown up on the ruins of the autonomous cities), the instrument for establishing monopolies in favor of the ruling minorities, cannot be made to work for the destruction of these monopolies. The anarchists consider, therefore, that to hand over to the State all the main sources of economic life – the land, the mines, the railways, banking, insurance, and so on – as also the management of all the main branches of industry, in addition to all the functions already accumulated in its hands (education, State-supported religions, defense of the territory [it's likely he did not see... as he was living in its inception... the global ambition of the just-solidifying Plato's Tribesmen... their determination to solve 'Plato's Dilemma' of the unsettling effect of 'imperialism'... 'outsiders' coming in and upsetting 'the children' (which we all are until we end the 'class'-system...) – of the Republic... – P.S.], etc.) ...the anarchists consider, therefore, that to hand over to the State all the main sources of economic life would mean to create a new instrument of tyranny. State capitalism would only increase the powers of bureaucracy and capitalism. True progress lies in the direction of decentralization, both *territorial* and *functional*, in the development of the spirit of local and personal initiative, and of free federation from the simple to the compound, *in lieu* of the present hierarchy from the center to the periphery.

In common with most socialists, the anarchists recognize that, like all evolution in nature, the slow evolution of society is followed from time to time by periods of accelerated evolution which are called revolutions; and they think that the era of revolutions is not yet closed. Periods of rapid changes will follow the periods of slow evolution, and these periods must be taken advantage of – not for increasing and widening the powers of the State [which is exactly what happened... the challenge before us... is to... just as Kropotkin says... reincorporate those powers into ourselves... and reproduce our lives *for ourselves*... without any masters... – P.S.], but for reducing them, through the organization in every township or commune of the local groups of producers and consumers, as also the regional, and eventually the international, federations of these groups.

In virtue of the above principles the anarchists refuse to be party to the present-State organization and to support it by infusing fresh blood into it [a *most* important point... and so much more difficult to achieve... we can see today... with our expanded perspective... as we know we are wrestling with a hidden-State – not only with global-state-statesmen-in-hiding... but with that hidden-State within ourselves... requiring the insights and guidance of Alice Miller to begin even contemplating its accomplishment – that 'refusal' – and then... to establish the material... the community... support... that would sustain that refusal – that is the subject of our December 20, 2015 show... – P.S.]. They do not seek to constitute, and invite the workingmen not to constitute, political parties in the parliaments. Accordingly, since the foundation of the International Working Men's Association in 1864 – 1866, they have endeavored to promote their ideas directly amongst the labor organizations and to induce those unions to a direct struggle against capital, without placing their faith in parliamentary legislation.

[Given our vision of hindsight... and thanks to the insights of Alice Miller... Karl Popper... John Boswell... Martin Bernal... Albert O. Hirschman... and our Good Three's (Terence K. Hopkins, Giovanni Arrighi and Immanuel Wallerstein's) provision of *Antisystem Movements*... we can answer the question: "How possible was the implementation of Kropotkin's prescription?..." – P.S.]

### *The Historical Development of Anarchism*

The conception of society just sketched, and the tendency which is its dynamic expression, have always existed in mankind [under 'class'... – P.S.], in opposition to the governing hierarchic conception and tendency – now the one and now the other taking the upper hand at different periods of history. To the former tendency we owe the evolution, by the masses themselves, of those institutions – the clan, the village community, the guild, the free medieval city – by means of which the masses resisted the encroachments of the conquerors and the power-seeking minorities. The same tendency asserted itself with great energy in the great religious movements of medieval times, especially in the early movements of the reform and its forerunners. At the same time it evidently found its expression of some thinkers, since the times of Lao-tze, although, owing to its non-scholastic and popular origin, it obviously found less sympathy among the scholars than the opposed tendency.

As has been pointed out by Prof. Adler in his *Geschichte des Sozialismus und Kommunismus*, Aristippus (b. c. 430 B.C.), one of the founders of the Cyrenaic school, already taught that the wise must not give up their liberty to the State, and in reply to a question by Socrates he said that he did not desire to belong either to the governing or the governed class. Such an attitude, however, seems to have been dictated merely by an Epicurean attitude towards the life of the masses.

The best exponent of anarchist philosophy in ancient Greece was Zeno (342 – 267 or 270 B.C.), from Crete, the founder of the Stoic philosophy, who distinctly opposed his conception of a free community without government to the state-Utopia of Plato. He repudiated the omnipotence of the State, its intervention and regimentation, and proclaimed the sovereignty of the moral law of the individual – remarking already that, while the necessary instinct of self-preservation leads man to egotism [under 'class'... – P.S.], nature has supplied a corrective to it by providing man with another instinct – that of sociability. When men are reasonable enough to follow their natural instincts, they will unite across the frontiers and constitute the Cosmos. They will have no need of law-courts or police, will have no temples and no public worship, and use no money – free gifts taking the place of the exchanges. Unfortunately, the writings of Zeno have not reached us and are only known through fragmentary quotations. However, the fact that his very wording is similar to the wording now in use, shows how deeply is laid the tendency of human nature of which he was the mouth-piece.

In medieval times we find the same views on the State expressed by the illustrious bishop of Alba, Marco Girolamo Vida, in his first dialogue *De dignitate reipublicae* (Ferd. Cavalli, in *Men. Dell' Istituto Vento*, *xiii.*; Dr. E. Mys, *Researches in the History of Economics*). But it is especially in several early Christian movements, beginning with the ninth century in Armenia, and in the preachings of the early Hussites, particularly Chojecki, and the early Anabaptists, especially Hans Denk (d. Keller, *Ein Apostel der Wiedertäufer*), that one finds the same ideas forcibly expressed – special stress being laid of course on their moral aspects.

Rabelais and Fenelon, in their Utopias, have also expressed similar ideas, and they were also current in the eighteenth century amongst the French Encyclopaedists, as may be concluded from several expressions occasionally met with in the writings of Rousseau, from Diderot's *Preface* to the *Voyage* of Bougainville, and so on. However, in all probability such ideas could not be developed then, owing to the rigorous censorship of the Roman Catholic Church.

These ideas found their expression later during the great French Revolution. While the Jacobins did all in their power to centralize everything in the hands of the government, it appears now, from recently published documents, that the masses of the people, in their municipalities and "sections," accomplished a considerable constructive work. They appropriated for themselves the election of the judges, the organization of supplies and equipment for the army, as also for the large cities, work for the unemployed, the management of charities, and so on. They even tried to establish a direct correspondence between the 36,000 communes of France through the intermediary of a special board, outside the National Assembly (cf. Sigismund Lacroix, *Actes de la commune de Paris*).

It was Godwin, in his *Enquiry concerning Political Justice* (2 vols., 1793), who was the first to formulate the political and economic conceptions of anarchism, even though he did not give that name to the ideas developed in his remarkable work. Laws, he wrote, are not a product of the wisdom of our ancestors: they are the product of their passions, their timidity, their jealousies and their ambition. The remedy they offer is worse than the evils they pretend to cure. If and only if all laws and courts were abolished, and the decisions in the arising contests were left to reasonable men chosen for that purpose, real justice would gradually be evolved. As to the State, Godwin frankly claimed its abolition. A society, he wrote, can perfectly well exist without any government: only the communities should be small and perfectly autonomous. Speaking of property, he stated that the rights of every one "to every substance capable of contributing to the benefit of a human being" must be regulated by justice alone: the substance must go "to him who most wants it." His conclusion was communism. Godwin, however, had not the courage to maintain his opinions. He entirely rewrote later on his chapter on property and mitigated his communist views in the second edition of *Political Justice* (8vo, 1796).

Proudhon was the first to use, in 1840 (*Qu'est-ce que la propriété?* first memoir), the name of anarchy with application to the no-government state of society. The name of "anarchists" had been freely applied during the French Revolution by the Girondists to those revolutionaries who did not consider that the task of the Revolution was accomplished with the overthrow of Louis XVI, and insisted upon a series of economical measures being taken (the abolition of feudal rights without redemption, the return to the village communities of the communal lands enclosed since 1669, the limitation of landed property to 120 acres, progressive income-tax, the national organization of exchanges on a just value basis, which already received a beginning of practical realization, and so on).

Now Proudhon advocated a society without government, and used the word anarchy to describe it, Proudhon repudiated, as is known, all schemes of communism, according to which mankind would be driven into communistic monasteries or barracks, as also all the schemes of state or state-sided socialism which were advocated by Louis Blanc and the collectivists.. When he

proclaimed in his first memoir on property that “Property is theft,” he meant only property in its present, Roman-law, sense of “right of use and abuse;” in property-rights, on the other hand, understood in the limited sense of *possession*, he saw the best protection against the encroachments of the State. At the same time he did not want violently to dispossess the present owners of land, dwellings-houses, mines, factories and so on. He preferred to attain the same end by rendering capital incapable of earning interest [a strategy akin to “stem the tide of the functionaries...” or ‘starve the beast’... – P.S.]; and this he proposed to obtain by means of a national bank [and here we see already the heel of Achilles exposed... an opportunity for ‘power’ to seize... or... as we asked in our discussion of ‘agents’... is there a way to nullify ‘power’s tactic of co-optation?... – P.S.], based on the mutual confidence of all those who are engaged in production, who would agree to exchange among themselves their products at cost-value, by means of labor checks representing the hours of labor required to produce every given commodity [we can see that... staying within ‘power’s frame – within its concepts and definitions... its utilitarian mindset of ‘making-use’ – there are no new ideas (can we say ‘Timebanks’?... for instance...) or strategies... and that it is in the total rejection of that mindset... that we achieve our freedom... – P.S.]. Under such a system, which Proudhon described as “Mutuellisme,” all the exchanges of services would be strictly equivalent. Besides, such a bank would be enabled to lend money without interest, levying only something like 1 per cent, or even less, for covering the cost of administration. Every one being thus enabled to borrow the money that would be required to buy a house, nobody would agree to pay any more a yearly rent for the use of it. A general “social liquidation” would thus be rendered easy, without expropriation. The same applied to mines, railways, factories, and so on. [Let’s ponder this for a long moment... – P.S.]

In a society of this type the State would be useless. The chief relations between citizens would be based on free agreement and regulated by mere account keeping. The contests might be settled by arbitration. A penetrating criticism of the State and all possible forms of government and a deep insight into all economic problems, were well-known characteristics of Proudhon’s work.

It is worth noticing that French mutualism had its precursor in England, in William Thompson, who began by mutualism before he became a communist, and in his followers John Gray (*A Lecture on Human Happiness*, 1825; *The Social System*, 1831) and J. F. Bray (*Labour’s Wrongs and Labour’s Remedy*, 1839). It had also its precursor in America. Josiah Warren, who was born in 1798 (cf W. Bailie, *Josiah Warren, the First American Anarchist*, Boston, 1900), and belonged to Owen’s “New Harmony,” considered that the failure of this enterprise was chiefly due to the suppression of individuality and the lack of initiative and responsibility. These defects, he taught, were inherent to every scheme based upon authority and the community of goods. He advocated, therefore, complete individual liberty. In 1827 he opened in Cincinnati a little country store which was the first “Equity Store,” and which the people called “Time Store,” because it was based on labor being exchanged hour for hour in all sorts of produce. “Cost – the limit of price,” and consequently “no interest,” was the motto of his store, and later on of his “Equity Village,” near New York, which was still in existence in 1865. Mr. Keith’s “House of Equity” at Boston, founded in 1855, is also worthy of notice.

While the economic, and especially the mutual-banking, ideas of Proudhon found supporters and even a practical application in the United States, his political conception of anarchy found but little echo in France, where the christian socialism of Lamennais and the Fourierists, and the state socialism of Louis Blanc and the followers of Saint-Simon, were dominating. These ideas found, however, some temporary support among the left-wing Hegelians in Germany, Moses Hess in 1843, and Karl Grun in 1845, who advocated anarchism. Besides, the authoritarian communism of Wilhelm Weitling having given origin to opposition amongst the Swiss workingmen, Wilhelm Marr gave expression to it in the forties.

On the other side, the individualist anarchism found, also in Germany, its fullest expression in Max Stirner (Kaspar Schmidt), whose remarkable works (*Der Einzige und sein Eigentum* and articles contributed to the *Rheinische Zeitung*) remained quite overlooked until they were brought into prominence by John Henry Mackay.

Prof. V. Basch, in a very able introduction to his interesting book, *L’Individualisme anarchiste: Max Stirner* (1904), has shown how the development of the German philosophy from Kant to Hegel, and “the absolute” of Schelling and the Geist of Hegel, necessarily provoked, when the anti-Hegelian revolt began, the preaching of the same “absolute” in the camp of the rebels. This was done by Stirner, who advocated, not only a complete revolt against the State and against the servitude which authoritarian communism would impose upon men, but also the full liberation of the individual from all social and moral bonds – the rehabilitation of the “I,” the supremacy of the individual, complete “a-moralism,” and the “association of the egotists.” The final conclusion of that sort of individual anarchism has been indicated by Prof. Basch. It maintains that the aim of all superior civilization is, not to permit all members of the community to develop in a normal way, but to permit certain better endowed individuals “fully to develop,” even at the cost of the happiness and the very existence of the mass of mankind. It is thus a return towards the most common individualism, advocated by all the would-be superior minorities, to which indeed man owes in his history precisely the State and the rest, which these individualists combat. Their individualism goes to far as to end in a negation of their own starting-point, – to say nothing of the impossibility for the individual to attain a really full development in the conditions

of oppression of the masses by the “beautiful aristocracies.” His development would remain uni-lateral. This is why this direction of thought, notwithstanding its undoubtedly correct and useful advocacy of the full development of each individuality, finds a hearing only in limited artistic and literary circles.

### *Anarchism in the International Working Men's Association*

A general depression in the propaganda of all fractions of socialism followed, as is known, after the defeat of the uprising of the Paris workingmen in June 1848 and the fall of the Republic. All the socialist press was gagged during the reaction period, which lasted fully twenty years. Nevertheless, even anarchist thought began to make some progress, especially Joseph Dejacque (*Les Lazareennes, L'Humanisphere*, and anarchist-communist Utopia, lately discovered and reprinted.) The socialist movement revived only after 1864, when some French workingmen, all “mutualists,” meeting in London during the Universal Exhibition with English followers of Robert Owen, founded the International Working Men's Association. This association developed very rapidly and adopted a policy of direct economic struggle against capitalism, without interfering in the political parliamentary agitation, and this policy was followed until 1871. However, after the Franco-German War, when the International Association was prohibited in France after the uprising of the Commune, the German workingmen, who had received manhood suffrage for elections to the newly constituted imperial parliament, insisted upon modifying the tactics of the International, and began to build up a social-democratic political party. This soon led to a division in the Working Men's Association, and the Latin federations, Spanish, Italian, Belgian and Jurassic (France could not be represented), constituted among themselves a federal union which broke entirely with the Marxist general council of the International. Within these federations developed now what may be described as modern anarchism. After the names of “federalists” and “anti-authoritarians” had been used for some time by these federations the name of “anarchists,” which their adversaries insisted upon applying to them, prevailed, and finally it was re-vindicated.

Bakunin soon became the leading spirit among these Latin federations for the development of the principles of anarchism, which he did in a number of writings, pamphlets and letters. He demanded the complete abolition of the State, which – he wrote – is a product of religion, belongs to a lower state of civilization, represents the negation of liberty, and spoils even that which it undertakes to do for the sake of general well-being. The State was an historically necessary evil, but its complete extinction will be, sooner or later, equally necessary. Repudiating all legislation, even when issuing from universal suffrage, Bakunin claimed for each nation, each region and each commune, full autonomy, so long as it is not a menace to its neighbors, and full independence for the individual, adding that one becomes really free only when, and in proportion as, all others are free. Free federations of the communes would constitute free nations.

As to his economic conceptions, Bakunin described himself, in common with his federalist comrades of the International, a “collectivist anarchist” – not in the sense of Vidal and Pecqueur in the forties, or of their modern social-democratic followers, but to express a state of things in which all necessities for production are owned in common by the labor groups and the free communes, while the ways of retribution of labor, communist or otherwise, would be settled by each group for itself. Social revolution, the near approach of which was foretold at that time by all socialists, would be the means of bringing into life the new conditions.

The Jurassic, the Spanish, and the Italian federations and section of the International Working Men's Association, as groups, were for the next years the chief centers of anarchist thought and propaganda. They refrained from any participation in parliamentary politics, and always kept in close contact with the labor organizations. However, in the second half of the eighties and the early nineties of the nineteenth century, when the influence of the anarchists began to be felt in strikes, in the first of May demonstrations, where they promoted the idea of a general strike for an eight hours' day, and in the anti-militarist propaganda in the army, violent prosecutions were directed against them, especially in the Latin countries (including physical torture in the Barcelona Castle) and the United States (the execution of five Chicago anarchists in 1887). Against these prosecutions the anarchists [I think we can now state with assurance that what we are seeing in this history... is U.S. global-power's agent-provocateur-strategy up and rolling... – P.S.] retaliated by acts of violence which in their turn were followed by more executions from above, and new acts of revenge from below. This created in the general public the [intended... – P.S.] impression that violence is the substance of anarchism, a view repudiated by its supporters, who hold that in reality violence is resorted to by all parties in proportion as their open action is obstructed by repression, and exceptional laws render them outlaws.

Anarchism continued to develop, partly in the direction of Proudhonian “Mutuellisme,” but chiefly as communist-anarchism, to which a third direction, christian-anarchism, was added by Leo Tolstoy, and a fourth, which might be described as literary-anarchism, began amongst some prominent modern writers.

The ideas of Proudhon, especially as regards mutual banking, corresponding with those of Josiah Warren, found a considerable following in the United States, creating quite a school, of which the main writers are Stephen Pearl Andrews, William Greene,

Lysander Spooner (who began to write in 1850, and whose unfinished work, *Natural Law*, was full of promise), and several others, whose names will be found in Dr. Nettlau's *Bibliographie de l'anarchie*.

A prominent position among the individualist anarchists in America has been occupied by Benjamin R. Tucker, whose journal *Liberty* was started in 1881 and whose conceptions are a combination of those of Proudhon with those of Herbert Spencer. Starting from the statement that anarchists are egotists, strictly speaking, and that every group of individuals, be it a secret league of a few persons, or the Congress of the Untied States, has the right to oppress all mankind, provided it has the power to do so, that equal liberty for all and absolute equality ought to be the law, and "mind every one your own business" is the unique moral law of anarchism, Tucker goes on to prove that a general and thorough application of these principles would be beneficial and would offer no danger, because the powers of every individual would be limited by the exercise of the equal rights of all others. He further indicated (following H. Spencer) the difference which exists between the encroachment on somebody's rights and resistance to such an encroachment; between domination and defense: the former being equally condemnable, whether it be encroachment of a criminal upon an individual, or the encroachment of one upon all others, or of all others upon one; while resistance to encroachment is defensible and necessary. For their self-defense, both the citizen and the group have the right to any violence, including capital punishment. Violence is also justified for enforcing the duty of keeping an agreement. Tucker thus follows Spencer, and, like him, opens (in the present writer's opinion) the way for reconstituting under the heading of "defense" all the functions of the State. His criticism of the present State is very searching, and his defense of the rights of the individual very powerful. As regards his economic views, B. R. Tucker follows Proudhon.

The individualistic anarchism of the American Proudhonians finds, however, but little sympathy amongst the working masses. Those who profess it – they are chiefly "intellectuals" – soon realize that the individualization they so highly praise is not attainable by individual efforts, and either abandon the ranks of the anarchists, and are driven into the liberal individualism of the classical economists, or they retire into a sort of Epicurean a-moralism, or super-man-theory, similar to that of Stirner and Nietzsche. The great bulk of the anarchist workingmen prefer the anarchist-communist ideas which have gradually evolved out of the anarchist collectivism of the International Working Men's Association. To this direction belong – to name only the better known exponents of anarchism – Elisee Reclus, Jean Grave, Sebastien Faure, Emile Pouget in France; Enrico Malatesta and Covelli in Italy; R. Mella, A. Lorenzo, and the mostly unknown authors of many excellent manifestos in Spain; John Most amongst the Germans; Spies, Parsons and their followers in the United States, and so on; while Domela Nieuwenhuis occupies an intermediate position in Holland. The chief anarchist papers which have been published since 1880 also belong to that direction; while a number of anarchists of this direction have joined the so-called syndicalist movement – the French name for the non-political labor movement, devoted to direct struggle with capitalism, which has lately become so prominent in Europe.

As one of the anarchist-communist direction, the present writer for many years endeavored to develop the following ideas: to show the intimate, logical connection which exists between the modern philosophy of natural sciences and anarchism; to put anarchism on a scientific basis by the study of the tendencies that are apparent now in society and may indicate its further evolution; and to work out the basis of anarchist ethics. As regards the substance of anarchism itself, it was Kropotkin's aim to prove that communism – at least partial – has more chances of being established than collectivism, especially in communes taking the lead, and that free, or anarchist-communism is the only form of communism that has any chance of being accepted in civilized societies; communism and anarchy are therefore two terms of evolution which complete each other, the one rendering the other possible and acceptable. He has tried, moreover, to indicate how, during a revolutionary period, a large city – if its inhabitants have accepted the idea – could organize itself on the lines of free communism; the city guaranteeing to every inhabitant dwelling, food and clothing to an extent corresponding to the comfort now available to the middle classes only, in exchange for a half-day's, or a five-hours' work [I think we can advance this vision a bit... now that we have the Internet and instantaneous communication... technologies that allow for ultra-small scale 'production' – for those interested – with a minimal expenditure of energy... such as the Earthship... and Blume's small-scale ethanol-fuel distilleries – point being: no coercion of any kind is needed for our future freedom... – P.S.]; and how all those things which would be considered as luxuries might be obtained by every one if he joins for the other half of the day all sorts of free associations pursuing all possible aims – educational, literary, scientific, artistic, sports and so on. In order to prove the first of these assertions he has analyzed the possibilities of agriculture and industrial work, both being combined with brain work. And in order to elucidate the main factors of human evolution, he has analyzed the part played in history by the popular constructive agencies of mutual aid and the historical role of the State.

Without naming himself an anarchist, Leo Tolstoy, like his predecessors in the popular religious movements of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, Chojecki, Denk and many others, took the anarchist position as regards the State and property rights, deducing his conclusions from the general spirit of the teachings of the Christ and from the necessary dictates of reason. With all the might of his talent he made (especially in *The Kingdom of God in Yourselves*) a powerful criticism of the church, the State and law altogether, and especially of the present property laws. He describes the State as the domination of the wicked ones, supported by brutal force. Robbers, he says, are far less dangerous than a well-organized government. He makes a searching criticism of the

prejudices which are current now concerning the benefits conferred upon men by the church, the State and the existing distribution of property, and from the teachings of the Christ he deduces the rule of non-resistance and the absolute condemnation of all wars. His religious arguments are, however, so well combined with arguments borrowed from a dispassionate observation of the present evils, that the anarchist portions of his works appeal to the religious and the non-religious reader alike.

It would be impossible to represent here, in a short sketch, the penetration, on the one hand, of anarchist ideas into modern literature, and the influence, on the other hand, which the libertarian ideas of the best contemporary writers have exercised upon the development of anarchism. One ought to consult the ten big volumes of the *Supplement litteraire* to the paper *La Revolte* and later the *Temps Nouveaux*, which contain reproductions from the works of hundreds of modern authors expressing anarchist ideas, in order to realize how closely anarchism is connected with all the intellectual movement of our own times. J. S. Mill's *Liberty*, Spencer's *Individual versus The State*, Marc Guyac's *Morality Without Obligation or Sanction*, and Fouillee's *Le morale, l'art et la religion*, the works of Multatuli (E. Douves Dekker), Richard Wagner's *Art and Revolution*, the works of Nietzsche, Emerson, W. Lloyd Garrison, Thoreau, Alexander Herzen, Edward Carpenter and so on; and in the domain of fiction, the dramas of Ibsen, the poetry of Walt Whitman, Tolstoy's *War and Peace*, Zola's *Paris* and *Le Travail*, the latest works of Merezhkovsky, and an infinity of works of less known authors, – are full of ideas which show how closely anarchism is inter-woven with the work that is going on in modern thought in the same direction of enfranchisement of man from the bonds of the State as well as from those of capitalism.

(Peter Kropotkin, from “Anarchism”, *Kropotkin's Revolutionary Pamphlets*, edited by Roger N. Baldwin)

---