



I'm not robot



Continue

Conquest of bread

One of the current objections to communism and socialism in general is that the idea is so old, and yet it could never be realized. Schemes of ideal states persecuted the thinker of ancient Greece; later, the first Christians joined communist groups; A century later, during the reformist movement, there were large communist brotherhoods. Then the same ideals were revived during the great English and French revolutions; and finally, most recently, in 1848, a revolution inspired largely by socialist ideals took place in France. And yet, you see - we are told - how far your schemes are still being implemented. Don't you think there is any fundamental misconceiving in your understanding of human nature and its needs? At first glance, this objection seems very serious. However, the moment we view human history more closely, it loses its power. We see firstly that hundreds of millions of men have succeeded in supporting each other, in their rural communities, over many hundreds of years, one of the main elements of socialism of joint ownership of the main tool of production, land, and recognition of the same in accordance with the labor opportunities of different families; and we learn that if communal ownership of land was destroyed in Western Europe, it was not from within, but from without, but on the part of governments that created a land monopoly in favor of the nob and the middle classes. We learn, in addition to the fact that the mediæval bridge managed to keep in their environment for several centuries in a row a certain socialized organization of production and trade; that these centuries were periods of rapid intellectual, industrial and artistic progress; and that the decline of these communal institutions came mainly from the malnutrition of the men uniting the village with the city, a peasant with a citizen, to jointly oppose the growth of military states that destroyed free cities. The history of mankind, as it is clear, does not offer, then, an argument against communism. It seems, on the contrary, as a sequence of efforts to implement some communist organization, whose efforts were crowned with partial success of a certain duration; and all that we are authorized to conclude is that humanity has not yet been given the proper form to combine, on communist principles, agriculture with a suddenly developed industry and rapidly growing international trade. The latter appears especially as an alarming element, as it is no longer just individuals, or cities enriched by distant commerce and exports; but whole nations are rich in the price of those nations that fall behind in their industrial development. These conditions, which began to appear by the end of the eighteenth century, took, however, their full swing only in the nineteenth century, after the Napoleonic wars came to an end. And modern communism had to accept them Account. It is now known that the French Revolution, in addition to its political significance, was an attempt by the French people, in 1793 and 1794, in three different directions, more or less like socialism. It was, first, equalized wealth, with the help of income tax and the execution of duties, both heavily progressive and by direct confiscation of land for the purpose of its subdit, and with the help of a hard war taxes were levied only on the rich. The second attempt was to introduce a broad national system of rationally set prices for all commodities, for which had to take into account the real cost of products and moderate trade profits. The Convention worked this scheme, and almost completed its work when the reaction took over. And the third was a kind of municipal communism about the consumption of some essentials bought by municipalities and sold by them at cost. It was during this remarkable movement that modern socialism was never properly studied — furierism with L'Ange, in Lyon, and authoritarian communism with Buonorotti, Babeuf and their comrades. And immediately after the Great Revolution, three great theoretical founders of modern socialism - Fourier, St. Simon and Robert Owen, as well as Godwin (genderless socialism) - came forward; while secret communist societies, ealed from Buonorotti and Babeuf, gave their stamp to militant communism over the next fifty years. To be correct, it must be said that modern socialism is not yet a hundred years old, and that, for the first half of these hundred years, only two nations that stood at the beginning of the industrial movement, that is, Britain and France, participated in its processing. Both were bleeding at the time from the terrible wounds inflicted on them by fifteen years of the Napoleonic wars, and both shrouded in the great European response that came from the East. In fact, it was only after the July 1830 revolution in France and the reformist movement of 1830-1832 in England that this terrible reaction shuddered that discussion of socialism became possible over the next sixteen to eighteen years. And it was in those years that the aspirations of Fourier, St. Simon and Robert Owen, worked out by their followers, took some form, and the various schools of socialism that exist nowadays were identified. In the UK, Robert Owen and his followers simultaneously work out their schemes of communist villages, agricultural and industrial; were started huge cooperative associations to create with their dividends more communist colonies; and the Great Consolidated Trade Union was founded , the profillifier of the Labour Parties of our day and the International Association of Workers. In France, a businessman-considant issued his remarkable manifesto containing, beautifully developed, all theoretical considerations for capitalism, now described as scientific socialism. Gordichon developed his idea of anarchism, and reciprocity, without state intervention. Louis Blanc published his Organization for Labor, which became later under the Lassadell program, in Germany. Vidal in France and Lorenz Stein in Germany further developed, in two wonderful works published in 1846 and 1847, respectively, theoretical concepts of Varanta; and finally, Vidal, and especially — the latter in a very difficult work, as in the series of Reports — elaborated in detail the system of collectivism, which he wanted the Assembly of 1848 to vote in the form of laws. However, there is one feature common to all socialist schemes, a period that needs to be noted. The three great founders of socialism, who wrote at the dawn of the nineteenth century, were so entranced by the broad horizons he discovered before them that they looked at it as a new revelation, and on themselves as the founders of a new religion. Socialism was supposed to be a religion, and they had to regulate his campaign as the heads of the new church. Furthermore, writing during the period of reaction that followed the French Revolution, and seeing more of its failures than its successes, they did not trust the masses, and they did not turn to them for bringing about the changes they thought was necessary. They put their faith, on the contrary, in some great ruler. He will understand the new revelation; he would be convinced of his desirability by successful experiments of his phalansteries or associations; and he will achieve peacefully with the help of his own power a revolution that will bring to mankind welfare and happiness. A military genius, Napoleon, has just ruled Europe.... Why shouldn't a social genius go ahead and carry Europe with him and pass the new gospel to life?... This faith was rooted very deeply, and it stood for a long time in the way of socialism; traces of him ever seen among us, to this day. Only in 1840-1848, when the approach of the Revolution was felt everywhere, and the proletarians began to plant on the barricades the flag of socialism, that faith in the people began to enter once again into the hearts of social schemers: faith, on the one hand, in republican democracy, and on the other hand in the free association and organization of powers of the working men themselves. But then came the February 1848 revolution, a middle-class republic, and broken hopes with it. Four months later, only after the proclamation of the republic erupted June uprising of the Paris proleters, and it was crushed with blood. There were wholesale shootings of working men, mass deportations to New Guinea and finally a Napoleonic coup. The Socialists were prosecuted with rage, and the wash was so horrific and so

place, and modern history taught him to admit that without the help of everyone he could do nothing, even though his strong boxes are full of gold. In fact, along with this current of individualism, we find in all modern history a tendency, on the one hand, to preserve all that remains of the partial communism of antiquity, and on the other hand – to establish the communist principle in thousands of events of modern life. As soon as the communes of the tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries managed to emancipate themselves from their lords, church or laity, their communal labor and communal consumption began to spread rapidly and develop. The town - not private persons - cargo ships and equipped expeditions, and the benefits arising from foreign trade, did not accrue to individuals, but shared by all. The towns also bought provisions for their citizens. Traces of these institutions lingered in the nineteenth century, and people honorably cherish the memory of them in their legends. Everything that's gone. But the rural town is still trying to preserve the last traces of this communism, and it succeeds – except when the state throws its heavy sword in balance. Meanwhile, new organizations, based on the same principle – each person according to his needs – will be fit a thousand different forms; for without a certain exodus of communism, the present societies could not exist. Despite the narrowly selfish twist given to the male mind by the commercial system, the tendency toward communism is constantly emerging, and affects our activities in a variety of ways. Bridges, for which charged for the old days, now become public property and free for all; So are the high roads except the East, where the toll is still demanding from the traveler for every mile of his journey. Museums, free libraries, free schools, free food for children; parks and gardens are open to all; streets paved and lit, free for all; water supplied to each house without measure or accumulation – all such arrangements are based on the principle: Take what you need. Tram and rail tracks have already introduced monthly and annual season tickets, without limiting the number of trips taken; and two nations, Hungary and Russia, have introduced on their railways a zone system that allows the owner to travel five hundred thousand miles at the same price. This is just a short step from this to a single charge, such as dominated by the postal service. In all these innovations and thousands of others, the trend is not to measure individual consumption. One person wants to drive a thousand miles, another 500. These are personal demands. There is no sufficient reason why one has to pay twice as much as the other because its need is twice as much. These are the signs that are emerging even now in our individualist societies. Moreover, there is a tendency, although it remains weak, to take into account the needs of the individual, regardless of its past or possible services to the community. We are beginning to think of society as a whole, every part of which is so closely linked to others that the service provided to one is a service provided to all. When you go to a public library – not really the National Library of Paris, but, say, the British Museum or the Berlin Library – the librarian doesn't ask what services you provided to society before you give you the book, or the fifty books you need, and it comes to your aid if you don't know how to manage the catalogue. With the help of single credentials – and very often prefer to contribute to the work – the scientific society opens its museums, its gardens, its library, its laboratories, as well as its annual conversions to each of its members, whether darwin or a simple lover. In St. Petersburg, if you are pursuing an invention, you go to a special laboratory or workshop, where you are given a place, a carpenter machine, then all the necessary tools and scientific tools, provided that only you know how to use them; and you are allowed to work there as long as you like. There are tutors; if others are in your idea, join colleagues skilled in different crafts, or work alone if you prefer. Inventing a flying machine, or inventing nothing, is your own business. You pursue the idea - that's enough. In the same way, those who man the lifeboat do not ask for authority from the crew of the sinking ship; they launch their boat, risk their lives in violent waves, and sometimes soak, all to save people they don't even know. And what do you need to know? They are people, and they need our help – it is enough that establishes their right – to salvation! Thus, we find a tendency, prominently communist, that comes from all sides, and in different supports, in the heart of theoretically individualist societies. Suppose that one of our great cities, so selfish in normal times, attended a well-inflicted disaster – a siege, for example, the same selfish city would decide that the first needs to be met were children and the elderly. Without asking what services they provide or are likely to provide to society, it will feed them first. Then the combatants will care, regardless of the courage or intelligence shown by each, and thousands of men and women will be outstripped each in unselfish devotion to the wounded. This trend exists and is felt once everyone's most urgent needs are met, and proportionately as the productive strength of the race increases. It becomes an active force whenever a great idea comes to displace the average contusions of everyday life. How then can we doubt that when production tools are placed in the service of all, when business is conducted on communist principles, when labor, restoring its place of honor in society, produces much more than everyone needs – how can you doubt, but that this force (already so powerful) will increase its sphere of action until it becomes the ruling principle of social life? Following these guidelines and considering the further practical side of the expropriation we will talk about in the following chapters, we are convinced that our first commitment, when the revolution breaks the power supported by the present system, will be to realize communism without delay. But ours is neither the communism of Fourier and Falanterien, nor the German socialist states. This anarchist communism - communism without government - communism Free. This is a synthesis of two ideals that haunt humanity for centuries – Economic and Political Freedom. II Taking Anarchy for our ideal of political organization, we only give an expression of another notable trend of human progress. Whenever European societies evolved to a certain point, they shuddered at the yoke of power and replaced a system based roughly more or less on the principles of individual freedom. And history shows us that these periods of partial or general revolution, when governments were overthrown, were also periods of sudden progress in both the economic and intellectual spheres. Now it is the infrastructure of communes whose monuments produced by the free work of guilds have never been surpassed; now it is the peasant rise that led to the Reformation and surpassed the papacy; and then again it is a society free for the short space that was created on the other side of the Atlantic by malcontents from the Old World. In addition, if we are witnessing the current development of civilized peoples, we see, most unmistakably, a movement more and more marked to limit the scope of government action, and to allow more and more freedom for the individual. This evolution takes place before our eyes, albeit burdening the ruins and debris of old institutions and old superstitions. Like all evolutions, he is waiting for a revolution to overthrow old obstacles that block the way that he can find free space in a regenerative society. After trying for a long time to solve an insoluble problem – the problem of building a government that limits the individual to obedience without himself, without resorting to be a servant of society, men finally try to free themselves any form of government and meet their need for an organization under a free contract between individuals and groups pursuing the same goal. The independence of each small territorial unit becomes an urgent need; mutual consent replaces the law, and regulates individual interests everywhere in view of the common facility. All that once looked at the function of the Government is day after day in question. Things are arranged more easily and satisfactorily without state intervention. And as we study the progress made in this direction, we must conclude that the tendency of the human race is to reduce government intervention to zero; actually abolish the state, the personification of injustice, oppression and monopoly. We can already catch glimpses of a world in which the bonds that bind personality are no longer laws, but social habits are the result of each of us feeling the need to seek support, to co-care, to the sympathies of our neighbors. Undoubtedly, the idea of a society without a state will generate at least as many objections as the political economy of society without private capital. We have all been brought up since childhood to view the state as a kind of Providence; all our education, the Roman history we learned in school, the Byzantine code we studied later under the name of Roman law, and the various sciences taught at universities, will teach us to believe in the Government and in the virtues of the state. To support this superstition, entire philosophy systems were developed and trained; all policy is based on this principle; and every politician, whatever its colors, goes forth and says to the people: Give me power, and I both can and will free you from the advertisements that put so much pressure on you. From the coil to the grave, all our actions are guided by this principle. Open any book on sociology or jurisprudence and you will find there the Government, its organization, its acts, filling such a great place that we have come to believe that there is nothing outside the Government and the world of statesmen. The press teaches us equally in all conceivable ways. Entire columns are devoted to parliamentary debates and political intrigues. The nation's vast every life is barely mentioned in several lines when dealing with economic actors, law or in diversifying facts relating to police cases. And when you read these newspapers, you hardly think of countless creatures – all mankind, so to say – who grow up and die, who knows the sorrow, who works and consumes, thinks and creates beyond a few aggravating personalities who have been so magnified that humanity is hidden by its shadows, enlarged by our ignorance. And yet, as soon as we move on from printed matter, to life itself, once we cast a glance at society, we are struck by the infinite part played by the Government. Balzac has already noticed how millions of peasants spend all their lives, knowing nothing about the state, to keep the heavy taxes they are forced to pay. Every day, millions of transactions are made without government interference, and the largest of them – commerce and exchanges – are carried out in such a way that the Government could not be challenged if one of the contracting parties intended not to fulfill its agreement. If you talk to someone who understands commerce, it will tell you that an everyday business transacted by merchants would be completely impossible if it wasn't based on mutual certainty. The habit of keeping your word, the desire not to lose your credit, is enough to maintain that relative honesty. A man who feels no slightest remorse at poisoning his clients with bizarre drugs covered in pompous labels believes he is honored to keep his engagements. Now, if this relative morality has developed in the current circumstances, when enrichment is the sole incentive and sole purpose, can we doubt its rapid progress when appropriation of the fruits of the work of others will no longer be the foundation of society? Another striking fact that particularly characterizes our generation still speaks more in favor of our ideas. This is a constant expansion of the sphere of entrepreneurship through private initiative, as well as the bizarre development of free groups of all kinds. We will discuss this more in the section on the Free Agreement. It is enough to mention that the facts are so numerous and so familiar that they are the essence of the second half of the nineteenth century, although political and socialist writers ignore them, always preferring to talk to us about the functions of government. These organizations, free and infinitely diverse, are such a natural result of our civilization; they expand so quickly and group themselves with such ease; they are so necessary as a result of the constant growth of the needs of a civilized person; and finally, they are so beneficial to replace government intervention that we must recognize in them the factor of growing importance in the lives of societies. If they do not yet spread throughout the manifestations of life, it is that they find an irresistible obstacle in worker poverty, in the castes of present society, in private capital appropriation, and in the state. Abolish these obstacles and you will see them covering a huge area of activity of a civilized person. The history of the last fifty years is living proof that representative government is impotent to perform the functions we sought to assign to it. In the coming days of the nineteenth century, it will be quoted as witnessing the failure of parliamentarism. But this impotence becomes apparent to all; the shortcomings of parliamentarism and its inherent vices of representative principle are self-evident, and few thinkers who have done critically examine them (J. S. Mill and Leverdays) but give a literary form to popular dissatisfaction. In fact, it's not hard to see the absurdity of naming a few men and telling them: Make laws governing all of our areas of activity, even though none of you know anything about them! We are beginning to see that the government by majority means abandoning all the country's affairs for the tide waiters who make up the majority in the House and in election commissions; for those in short who do not have their own opinion. But humanity is looking for and is already finding new questions. The International Postal Union, rail unions and established societies give us examples of solutions based on a free deal instead of the law. On a day when groups are scattered far and widely want to organize themselves for some facility or other, they no longer elect international parliament Jacks of all trades. No, where it is impossible to meet directly or come to an agreement on correspondence, delegates, versed in the matter under consideration, are sent for treatment, with instruction: Reach agreement on such or such an issue, and then return not with the law in their pockets, but with the offer of an agreement that we may or may not accept. This method of large industrial companies, assimilate societies, and associations of every description that already cover Europe and the United States. And this should be the method of emancipation society. By bringing expropriation, society cannot continue to organize itself on the principle of parliamentary representation. A society based on serfdom, in accordance with absolute monarchy; society, based on the system of remuneration and exploitation of the masses by capitalists, finds its political expression in parliamentarism. But a free society, restoring possession of a common heritage, should seek, in free groups and free federations of groups, a new organization, in harmony with the new economic phase of history. Each economic phase has a political phase corresponding to it, and it would be impossible to touch the property without finding a new regime of political life at the same time. Chapter 4: Expropriation I This is stated in Rothschild, that after seeing his fortune threatened by the revolution of 1848, he struck such an execution: I am quite willing to admit, he said, that my fortune was accumulated at the expense of others, but if it were divided into a morrow among the millions of Europe, everyone's share would only be five shillings. Very well, then I commit to providing each of his five shillings if he asks me for it. Dedicated due publicity to his promise, our millionaire continued in the usual way quietly strolled through the streets of Frankfort. Three or four passers-by asked for five shillings he paid off with a sardonic smile. His execution succeeded, and the millionaire's family still owns his wealth. This is in many ways the same fashion as among the middle classes is the reason they say: Um, Expropriation! I know what it means. You take all the firmware and put them in a heap, and everyone is free to help themselves and fight for the best. But such tokens do not matter, as does the flickant. What we want is not a redistribution of pervarok, although it must be said that even in this case, trembling folk will see an advantage in it. Nor do we want to share the wealth of the Rothschilds. What we want is to organize that every person born in the world will be provided with the opportunity in the first case of studying some useful professions, and become qualified in it; further that he would be free to work on his trade without asking to leave the owner or owner, and not passing the landlord or capitalist the lion's share of what he was producing. As for the wealth held by the Rothschilds or Vanderbilts, this will serve us to organize our communal production system. The day when a worker can cultivate land without giving half of what he produces, the day when machines needed to prepare soil for rich harvests are at the free disposal of cultivators, the day when a worker at a factory produces for the community rather than a monopolist - that day will see workers dressed and fed - and there will be no more Rothschilds or other exploiters. No one will then have to sell their workforce for wages, which represents only a fraction of what it produces. So far, so good, our critics say, but you will have Rothschilds coming from the outside. How do you to prevent a person from accumulating millions in China and then settle among you? How are you going to prevent such surround yourself with shortages and salaries-slaves – from exploiting them and enrichment at their own expense? You can't bring revolution around the world at the same time. Well, then you're going to set up individual homes at your borders to look for everyone entering your country and confiscate the money they bring with them? Anarchist police officers shooting at travelers would be a wonderful sight! But at the root of this argument there is a big mistake. Those who promoted it never stopped to ask when the fortunes of the rich come. However, it would be a little thought to show them that these fates have their beginnings in poverty poor. When there are no more disadvantaged, there will no longer be any wealth to use them. Let's take a moment in the Middle Ages when great fortunes began to figuring out. Feudal baron captures on a fertile valley. But as long as the fertile valley is empty of our folk baron is not rich. His land brings him none; he can also own property on the moon. What does our baron do to enrich himself? He looks at the peasants - the poor peasants! If every farmer had a plot of land free from rent and taxes, if he had additional tools and stock necessary for Work, who would plough the land baron? Everyone will look after their own. But there are thousands of disadvantaged people destroyed by wars, or drought, or superstition. They have neither a horse nor a plough. (Iron was expensive in the Middle Ages, and shadders even more.) All these destitute creatures are trying to better their condition. One day they are seen on the road in the confining of our baron's estate to a message board indicating certain signs adapted to their understanding that a worker willing to settle on this estate will receive tools and materials to build his cottage and sow his fields, and some of the land to rent for free for a certain number of years. The number of years is represented by so many crosses on the scoreboard, and the peasant understands the meaning of these crosses. So poor ingestions swarmed over the baron's lands, making roads draining swamps, building villages. Nine years later, he begins to tax them. Five years later, it increases rents. Then he doubles it. The farmer accepts these new conditions because he cannot find the best elsewhere; and in a small way, through the laws made by the barons, the poverty of the peasant becomes the source of the landlord's wealth. And this is not only the owner of the estate, which is prey on him. A number of usurpers waved through villages, multiplying as the curse of peasants grows. That's how things went in the Middle Ages. And by the day it's not the same yet? If there were vacant land that a farmer could cultivate if he wanted to, would he pay £50 to some duke's sbr[2] for selling him scrap conscientiously? Will he burden himself with rent, which absorbed a third of the products? Would he agree - under the méfayer system - to give half of his crop to the landowner? But he doesn't have anything. So he will accept any conditions if only he can keep the body and soul together while he processes the soil and enriches the landlord. So in the nineteenth century, just as in the Middle Ages, the poverty of a peasant is a source of wealth for the sedate owner. Second landlord owns his wealth poverty peasants, and the wealth of the capitalist comes from the same source. Take the case of a middle-class citizen who somehow finds himself in possession of £20,000. He could certainly spend his money at a rate of £2,000 a year, just bagatelle these days of fantastic, pointless luxury. But then he would have nothing left at the end of ten years. Thus, being a practical person, he prefers to keep his fortune intact, and win for himself little annual income as well. It is very easy in our society, for good reason, that towns and villages swarm with workers who don't have where to live for a month, or even two weeks. So our decent citizen starts a factory. Banks has rushed to lend him a further £20,000, especially if he has a reputation for business ability; and with that the amount it can command labour from five hundred hands. If all the men and women in the countryside had their daily bread confident and their daily needs already met, who would work for our capitalist on a salary of half a crown a day, while the goods one produces a day sell on the market for a crown or more? Unhappily , we also know it well – the poor neighborhoods of our towns and neighboring villages are full of needy paddles, whose children are wobbling with bread. So, before the factory is well finished, workers rushed to offer themselves. Where a hundred need three hundred besieged doors, and since its factory the owner, if it only has average business capacity, will clear £40 a year from every mill-hand he employs. Thus, he is able to lay a little wealth; and if he chooses a lucrative trade and has business talent, he will soon increase his income by doubling the number of men he exploits. So, he becomes a person of importance. He can afford to give dinners to other persons - local tycoons, public, legal and political plumbers. With his money, he can marry money, and he can choose places for his children, and later perhaps get something good from the Government – a contract for the army or for the police. His gold breeds gold; before the last war, or even rumors of war, or speculation on the Stock Exchange, gives him his great opportunity. The nine-tenths of the great abundance made in the United States is (as Henry George has shown in this Social Problems) the result of a knavery on a large scale, with the help of the state. In Europe, nine-tenths of the wealth made in our monarchies and republics are of the same origin. There are no two ways to become a millionaire. This is the secret of wealth; Find the starving and disadvantaged, pay them half the crown, and get them to produce five shillings worth a day, accumulate wealth by these means and then increase it to some happy hit made with the help of the state. Do we need to talk about the small fortunes attributed by economists to foreorching and throes when we know that simply salvation itself brings nothing, as long as the rescued pence is not used to exploit the famists? Take, for example, a shoemaker. Grant that his job is well paid, that he has many customs, and that with the dint of strict throes he humbles lie between eighteen pence and two shillings a day, perhaps two pounds a month. Grant that our shoemaker never gets sick, that he is not half starving himself, despite his passion for the economy; that he should not marry or that he has no children; that he may not die of consumption; Suppose whatever you want and whatever you want! Well, at the age of fifty he won't scrape together £800; and he will not have enough to live on in old age when he is past work. Undoubtedly, this is not how great fortunes are made. But suppose our shoemaker once he has laid a few throes their savings bank, and that savings bank lends them to a capitalist who is only going to employ the workforce, that is to exploit the poor. Then our shoemaker takes a apprentice, the child of some poor moron who will think to himself lucky if five years later his son learned to trade and is able to make a living. Meanwhile, our shoemaker won't lose to him, and if the trade is brisk, he soon takes a second and then a third student. For and he will take two or three working men - poor paddles, grateful to receive half a crown a day for work that costs five shillings, and if our shoemaker is lucky, that is, if he is interested enough and implies enough, his working men and apprentices will bring him almost one pound a day , again and again the product of his own work. Then he can increase his business. It will gradually become rich, and no longer has the need to skimp on the obligations of life. He will leave a small fortune to his son. This is what people call economic and have pathetic, moderate habits. At the bottom it's nothing but grinding the faces of the poor. Commerce seems an exception to this rule. Such a person, they tell us, buys tea in China, brings it to France, and realizes a profit of thirty percent on its original output. He didn't exploit anyone. Still, the case is similar. If our merchant wore bales on his back, well, well! In the early medieval times, this is how foreign trade was conducted, and therefore no one reached such bizarre heights of wealth as in our day. Very little and very hard earned were gold coins, which the medieval merchant received from a long and dangerous voyage. It was less a love of money than the easity of travel and adventure that inspired his undertakings. Nowadays, the method is simpler. A merchant who has some capital doesn't have to shuffle off his desk to become rich. He telegraphs to an agent who tells him to buy a hundred tons of tea; he sends the ship, and a few weeks later, three months later, if it's a sailing ship, the vessel brings him his cargo. He doesn't even risk the war, because his tea and his vessel are insured, and if he spends four thousand pounds, he will receive more than five thousand; that is, if he did not try to speculate in some new goods, in which case he risks either doubling his fortune or losing it altogether. Now, how could he find people willing to cross the sea, travel to China and back, endure hardship and Slavic work and risk their lives for miserable pitching? How could he find dockworkers willing to load and unload their ships for hunger wages? As? Because they are needed and starved. Go to seaports, visit shop chefs and taverns on the waterfronts, and look at these men who have come to hire themselves, crowding around the dock gates that have besieg since early dawn, hoping they will be allowed to work on vessels. on these sailors happy to be hired for long voyage, after weeks and months of waiting. All their lives they have long gone to sea on ships and they will sail in others yet until they have died on the waves. Enter your homes, look at your wives and children in rags, the living does not know how to return the father, and you will have an answer to the question. Multiply examples, select them where you will be, consider the origins of all abundance, large or small, whether it comes from commerce, finance, manufacturing or land. Everywhere you find that wealth of rich sources from poverty is poor. That's why anarchist society doesn't need to be afraid of the emergence of Rothschild, who would settle among him. If every member of the community knows that after a few hours of productive work, he will be entitled to all the pleasures that civilization buys, and to those deeper sources of pleasure that art and science offer to all who seek them, he will not sell his powers for starvation wages. No one will volunteer to enrich your Rothschild. Its golden guineas will only be so many pieces of metal – useful for different purposes, but incapable of breeding more. Responding to the aforementioned objection, we simultaneously pointed out the scope of expropriation. It should apply to anything that allows any person – whether a financier, mill-owner or landlord – to appropriate the product of other washcloths. Our formula is simple and comprehensive. We don't want to rob any of his coats, but we want to give the workers all those things that cause them to fall easy prey to the exploiter, and we will do everything we can to ensure that no one is enough of an augusta so that no man is forced to sell the power of his right hand to get a bare living wage for himself and his infants. This is what we mean when we talk about Expropriation; it will be our duty during the Revolution, the arrival of which we are looking at, not two hundred years ago, but soon, very soon. III Ideas of anarchism in general and Expropriation, in particular, find far more sympathy than we are apt to imagine among men of an independent nature, and those for whom non-work is not a higher ideal. All the same, our friends often warn us, beware that you do not go too far! Humanity cannot be changed in a day, so take your time with your expropriation and anarchy schemes, or you will be in danger of achieving a non-permanent outcome. Now what we fear about Expropriation is exactly the opposite. We are afraid not to go far enough, to conduct expropriation on too small a scale to be lasting. We would not have a revolutionary impulse arrested in the middle of a career to exhaust ourselves in half the measures that would not have hurt anyone, and, producing tremendous confusion in society, and stopping their customary activities, would not have vital power – simply spreading general dissatisfaction and inevitably preparing the way for Reaction. There are, in fact, established relations in the modern state, which is almost impossible to change, if one attacks them only in detail. In our economic organization there are wheels in wheels – the technique is so complex and interdependent that no part can be changed without breaking in general. It becomes clear once an attempt is made to expropriate anything. Suppose that in a particular country there is a limited form of expropriation. For example, that, as has been proposed more than once, only the property of large landlords is socialized, while factories have remained untouched; or that, in a certain city, the property of the house takes over the Commune, but everything else remains privately owned; or that in a certain production center plants pla utilities, but the land does not interfere. The same result would be followed on a case-by-case basis – the terrible smooching of the industrial system, without the means of its reorganization into new lines. Industry and finance would be at an impasse, but a return to the first principles of fairness would not have been achieved and society would find itself powerless to build a harmonious whole. If agriculture could break free from large landowners, while the industry would still remain slavery capitalist, merchant and banker, nothing would have been achieved. The farmer suffers day to day not only in paying rent to the landlord; he is depressed in all hands by the existing conditions. It is exploited by a tradesman who forces him to pay half the crown for a shovel, which, measured by a tile of labor spent on it, is not worth more than sixty years. It is taxed by a state that cannot promise without its formidable hierarchy of officials, and considers it necessary to maintain an expensive army because traffickers of all nations are perpetually fighting for markets, and any day a little quarrel stemming from the exploitation of some part of Asia or Africa could lead to war. Then the farmer again suffers from the depopulation of suburban places: young people attract to large production towns the lure of high wages, which is temporarily paid by manufacturers of luxury goods, or monuments of a more excitable life. Artificial protection of industry, industrial exploitation of foreign countries, prevalence of exchange jobs, difficulty improving soil and production machines – all these departments are united nowadays to work against agriculture, which is burdened not only with rent, but a whole range of conditions in society based on exploitation. Thus, even if the expropriation of land was fulfilled, and each of them was free to cultivate the soil and process it for the better, without paying rent, agriculture, even though it should enjoy – that in any case can not be taken for granted – instant prosperity, will soon fall back into the slough in which it finds itself on the day. The whole point of should be started again, with increased difficulties. The same goes for industry. Take the reverse: instead of turning agricultural workers into peasant owners, make over the factories of those who work in them. Abolish master producers, but leave your land to the landlord, banker your money, merchant his exchange, support a swarm of non-working workers who live on the move of workers, thousands and one intermediary, a state with its countless officials, and the industry will come to a standstill. Not finding buyers in a lot of peasants who would remain poor; not possessing raw materials, and unable to export their products, partly because of stoppage trading, and especially since industries have spread around the world, manufacturers would feel unable to fight and thousands of workers would be thrown out on the streets. These starving crowds would be ready and willing to submit to the first schemer who came to exploit them; they would even agree to return to old slavery, if only under the promise of work. Or finally, suppose you'll displace landowners, and hand over mills and factories to a worker without laying down a swarm of intermediaries who deplete the product of our producers, and speculate on corn and flour, meat and food, in our major trade centers. Then, once the exchange is arrested, big cities are left without bread, while others find no buyers according to their luxury articles, a terrible counterrevolution will take place – a counterrevolution that knocks on those killed, sweeping towns and villages with shots and projectiles; there would be registrations, panic, flight, usually all horrors of guillotine, as it was in France in 1815, 1848 and 1871. Everything is interdependent in a civilized society; it is impossible to reform any without changing as a whole. Therefore, on the day when we strike on private property, under any of its forms, territorial or industrial, we will be obliged to attack them all. The very success of the revolution will require this. Also, we couldn't, if you like, confine our to partial expropriation. Once the principle of Divine Property Law is shaken, no number of theorists will prevent its overthrow, then slaves of labor, there are slaves of the machine. If a big city, Paris, for example, confine itself to taking possession of residential buildings or factories, it would also have to refuse bankers to charge the Commune a £2,000,000 in interest on former loans. A large city would be obliged to put itself in touch with rural areas, and its influence would inevitably urge villagers to break free from the landowner. It would take to communism the railways so that citizens could get food and work, and finally prevent supply waste, and guard against the trust of corn speculators like the commune of 1793 fell prey, it would be forced to place in the hands of the city work on the harvesting of its warehouses goods, as well as the placement of products. However, some socialists still seek to establish distinction. Of course, they say, soil, mines, mills and producers should be expropriated, these are manufacturing tools, and that's right, we should consider them public property. But consumption articles – food, clothing and living quarters – should remain privately owned. Popular common sense got the better of this subtle distinction. We are not savages who can live in the forest, without any other shelter than branches. A civilized man needs a roof, a room, a hearth and a bed. It is true that the bed, room and house are a home of non-production for the non-producer. But for a room worker, properly heated and illuminated is the same manufacturing tool as a tool or machine. This is a place where nerves and sinus gather strength for the work of the muzz. The rest of the worker - daily repair of the machine. The same argument applies even more obviously to food. The so-called economists were talking about are unlikely to deny that coal burned in a car is as necessary for extraction as the raw material itself. How can you exclude food, without which the human machine could not do the work on the list of indispensable things for the manufacturer? Could this be a relic of religious metaphysics? A multi-person feast is indeed a luxury item, but a worker's food is as much a part of production as fuel burned by a steamer. It's the same with clothes. If the economists drawing this difference between manufacturing and consumption articles dressed up in New Guinea fashion, we could understand their objections. But men who couldn't write the word shirtless on their backs are unable to draw such a hard and fast line between shirt and pen. And while the bullies of their dams should certainly rank as luxuries, however, there are a certain amount of lingerie, cotton and woolly things that are a necessity of life for the manufacturer. The shirt and shoes in which he goes to his job, his cap and jacket, which he slips on after the end of the day, are as necessary for him as a hammer to the anawad. Whether we like it or not, this is what the people mean by revolution. Once they have forced the government, they will strive primarily to provide themselves with decent housing and enough food and clothing – free from capitalist rent. And the people will be right. The methods of the people will be much more in line with science than that of economists who draw so many differences between production tools and consumption articles. The people understand that this is exactly the point where the Revolution should begin; and they lay the foundations the only economic science worthy of the name is science, which can be called Studying the Needs of Mankind, and economic means to meet them. Chapter 5: Food I If the coming revolution is a social revolution, it will be different from all former uprisings not only for its purpose, but also by its methods. New tools are needed to reach the new end. The three great popular movements we've seen in France over the past hundred years are largely different from each other, but they have one thing in common. In each case, people want to abolish the old regime, and have spent the blood of their hearts on the case. Then, after they rubbed the brunt of the battle, they fell into obscenity again. A government made up of men more or less honest was formed and pledged to organize - the Republic in 1793, Labour in 1848 and the Free Commune in 1871. Through Jacobin ideas, this Government has taken itself primarily on political issues such as reorganization of the technique of government, purification of administration, separation of church and state, civil liberty and such issues. It is true that working clubs followed members of the new Government, and often superseded their ideas to them. But even in these clubs, whether leaders belonged to the middle or to the working classes, there were always middle-class ideas that prevailed. They discussed various political issues at great length, but forgot to discuss the bread issue. In such times, there will be great ideas, ideas that have moved the world; words have been spoken that still stir our hearts, at intervals of a century. But people starved to death in the slums. Since the beginning of the revolution, the industry inevitably came to a halt – the circulation of products was checked, and the capital concealed itself. The master – the employer – had nothing to fear at such times, he swung on his dividends, if indeed did not speculate on the unhappiness around; but the wage-migrant was reduced to live from hand to mouth. You want to knock on the door. Famine was abroad on earth - the kind of famine that was hardly seen under the old regime. Girondins starve us! There was a cry in the quarters of the workers in 1793, and on this girondinists were guillotine, and full powers were given to Gori and the commune. The commune was really concerned about the bread issue, and made a heroic effort to feed Paris. In Lyon, Fuche and Collot d'Rbois created urban grains, but the sums spent on filling them were grief-deficiency. City councils made great efforts to purchase corn; bakers who made flour were hanged – and still people lacked bread. Then they turned on the royalist silencers and laid the blame on their doors. They are a guillotine of a dozen or fifteen a day – servants and duchesses are the same, especially servants, because the Duchess went to Koblenz. But if only they had guillotined a hundred dukes every day, it would be equally hopeless. I just want to grow up. Because wages-migrant can not live without their wages, and wages were not forthcoming. What difference could it make to a thousand corpses more or less? Then people started tying up. So much for your wobbly revolution! You are more unhappy than ever before, whispered a reactionary worker in his ears. And in a small way, the rich gained courage, came out of their hiding and flaunted their luxury in the face of starving crowds. They dressed up like fragrant FOPs and said to the workers, Come, enough of this nonsense! What did you gain from the uprising? Sick with his heart, his patience at the end, the revolutionary had to finally confess to himself that the cause had been lost once again. He retreated into his navel and waited for the worst. Then the reaction proudly asserted itself, and made a political stroke. The revolution is dead, there is nothing left but to trample his corpse under his feet. White terror began. Blood flowed like water, the guillotine never idle, the prisons were overcrowded, while the pageant rank and fashion resumed its old course, and continued as much fun as ever. This picture is typical of all our revolutions. In 1848, Paris workers placed three months of starvation in the service of the republic, and then, reaching the limit of their powers, make one last desperate effort – an effort that drowned in blood. In 1871 commune died due to lack of combatants. It has taken steps to divide the Church and the state, but it has neglected, unfortunately, until late to take steps to provide the people with bread. And now it happened in Paris that élégantes and fine gentlemen can push the Confederates, and bid them to go sell their lives for a pathetic pittance, and leave their best to feast on their ease in trendy restaurants. Finally, the commune saw its mistake, and opened communal kitchens. But it was too late. His days were already numbered, and Versailles's troops were on shafts. Bread, this is the bread that the Revolution needs! Let others spend their time issuing pompous proclamations, decorating themselves generously with official gold lace, and in a conversation about political freedom!... Whether it's ours to see, from the first day of the Revolution to the last, in all the provinces vying for freedom, that there is not a single man who lacks bread, no woman forced to stand with a weeded crowd outside the roast-door that a rude rough loaf can be thrown at her in charity, nor a single child pinned down by the coercion of food. It was always the idea of the middle class to rank about great principles - a big lie as well! The idea of the people will provide bread to all. And while middle-class citizens, as well as working people infected with middle-class ideas, admire their own rhetoric in Talking Shops, and practical people engage in endless discussions about forms we, Utopian dreamers should consider the issue of daily bread. We have a tamerite to declare that everyone has the right to bread, that bread is enough at all, and that with this guard sword of Bread for all, the Revolution will prevail. Al that we utopias are well known. So, utopian we are that we go the length of believing that the Revolution can and should provide shelter, food and clothing for all - an idea that will greatly disappoint middle-class citizens, regardless of their party colour, for they are quite alive to the fact that it is not easy to hold the upper hand of a nation whose hunger suits. Nevertheless, we support our dispute: bread must be found for the people of the Revolution, and the bread issue should take precedence over all other issues. If it is settled in the interests of the people, the revolution will be on the right track; for when addressing the issue of bread, we must accept the principle of equality, which will force ourselves to exclude any other decision. It is certain that the coming revolution - as in connection with the revolution of 1848 - will break us in the midst of a major industrial crisis. Things have been seen for half a century, and can only go from bad to worse. Everything is usually this way - new countries included in, lists of international trade and the struggle for ownership of world markets, wars, taxes all the more. National debts, moron insecurity and huge colonial undertones in every corner of the globe. There are currently millions of unemployed workers in Europe. It will be even worse when the revolution exploded on us and spread like a fire laid on a train of gunpowd. The number outside the works will be doubled once the barricades are erected in Europe and the US. What do I need to do to provide these crowds with bread? We don't know if people who call themselves practical people have ever asked themselves this question in all their nudity. But we know that they want to support the wage system, and so we should expect national seminars and community work to falter as a means of providing food to the unemployed. Because national workshops were opened in 1789 and 1793, because Napoleon III managed to accommodate the Paris proletariat for eighteen years, giving them public works - which cost Paris up to the day of its £80,000,000 debt - and its municipal tax of three or four pounds; [3] Because this wonderful method of taming the beast was customary in Rome, and even in Egypt four thousand years ago; and last, because despots, kings and emperors have always used the channel to throw a piece of food to people to get time to snatch the whip – it is natural that practical men should magnify this method of perpetuation of the payment system. What it takes to lay down our brains when we have a method revered by time Pharaohs at our disposal? However, if the revolution is so misguided as to begin along the way, it will be lost. In 1848, when on February 27, national workshops were opened, the unemployed in Paris numbered only 800; two weeks later, they have already grown to 49,000. Soon there would be 100,000 of them, not counting those crowded out of the provinces. However, at the time trade and producers in France used only twice as much hands as a day. And we know that in times of revolution, the exchange and industry suffer the most from the general upheaval. To realize this, we should only think for a moment about the number of workers whose labor depends directly or indirectly on export trade, or the number of hands employed in the production of luxury, consumers of which are a minority of the middle

class. The revolution in Europe means an inevitable shutdown of at least half of factories and factories. This means that millions of workers and their families have been thrown out on the streets. And our practical people seek to prevent this truly dire situation through national relief work; that is, using new industries created on the spot to give jobs to the unemployed! Obviously, as Proudhon has already pointed out, that the slightest attack on property will bring to his train a complete disorganization of the system based on private enterprise and the workforce on wages. Society itself will be forced to take production into its hands, in its fullness, and reorganize it to meet the needs of the entire people. But this cannot be achieved in a day or a month; to reorganize the production system must take some time, and during this time millions of men will be deprived of their livelihoods. What to do then? There is only one really practical solution to the problem - to safely face the great task that awaits us, and instead of trying to patch up the situation, which we ourselves have made untenable, to start reorganizing production on a new basis. So the really practical course of action we think will be that people should immediately take possession of all the food of rebel areas, keeping a strict accounting of all this so that no one can be wasted, and that with these accumulated resources everyone may be able to tide over the crisis. During this time, an agreement had to be concluded with the factory workers, the necessary raw materials provided to them and livelihoods guaranteed to them while they worked to meet the needs of the agricultural population. For we must not forget that while France weaves silks and atlases to deck the wives of German financiers, the Empress of Russia, and the Queen of Sandwich Islands, and while Paris fashions fine trinkets and play games for rich people around the world, two-thirds of French peasantry do not have proper fixtures to give them the light, or references needed for modern agriculture. Finally, unproductive land, which is many, should be converted to a better advantage, poor soils enriched, and rich soils that still, under the present system, give neither a quarter nor a tenth of what they can produce, succumb to an intense culture and are treated with the same care as a market garden or flower plot. It is impossible to imagine any other practical solution to the problem; and whether we like it or not, this power of circumstance will lead him to death. III The greatest characteristic of capitalism is the payroll system, which in short size before: — A person, or a group of men, with the necessary capital, starts some industrial enterprise; it undertakes to supply the plant or products with raw materials, organize production, pay the employed fixed wages, and finally pocket excess costs or profits, under the pretext of giving themselves for management of the concern, to run the risks that it can attract, and to fluctuate the price of the market value of the product. To preserve this system, those who now monopolize capital would be willing to make certain concessions; share, for example, part of the profits with workers, or rather to set a sliding scale, which would oblige them to raise wages when prices were high; briefly, they will agree to certain sacrifices provided they are still allowed to direct the industry and take their first fruit. Collectivism, as we know, does not abolish wages, although it makes significant changes to the existing order of things. It only substitutes the state, i.e. Representative Government, national or local, with a separate employer of labor. Under collectivism, it is representatives of the nation, or county, and their deputies and officials who should have control over the industry. They reserve the right to use surplus; production is in the interests of all. In addition, collectivism draws a very subtle but very far-reaching distinction between a worker's work and someone who has learned craft. Noncapital work in the eyes of a collectivist is simple work, while the work of artisan, mechanics, engineer, human science, etc., is what Marx calls a complex workforce, and is entitled to higher wages. But workers and artisans, weavers and people of science, all wages-servants of the state — all officials, as recently said, gilded tablets. The coming revolution cannot give humanity more service than to make the wage payment system, in all its forms an impossibility, and to grant communism, which is a denial of wage slavery, the only possible solution. For even to admit that a collectivist modification of the present system is possible if introduced gradually during the period of prosperity and peace — although for my part I question its practicality even under such conditions — it would become impossible during the Revolution, when the need to feed the hungry millions with the first call to arms. A political revolution can be achieved without shaking the foundations of industry, but a revolution when the people put their hands on property inevitably paralyzes exchange and manufacturing. Millions of public money will not be enough to wage millions of non-exists. You can't insist too much on this point; the reorganization of the industry on a new basis (and we will now show how huge this problem is) cannot be achieved within days, nor, on the other hand, people will submit to semi-starved for years to oblige theorists who support the wage system. To influx during a period of stress, they will require what they have always demanded in such cases — the communion of supplies — the recoil of soldering. It will be useless to preach patience. People will no longer be patient and unless food is put into general they will rob bakeries. If the people are strong enough to carry everything in front of them, they will be whipped to give collectivism a fair margin for experimentation. To this end, the order must be maintained at any cost — order, discipline, obedience! And as capitalists will soon realize that when the people are brought down by those who call themselves revolutionaries, the Revolution itself will become hated in the eyes of the masses; they will certainly call their support to the champions of order — although they are collectivists. In this line of behavior, capitalists will see a means of further crushing collectivists one by one. If order is established in this way, the consequences are easy to predict. Not content with knocking down looters, the faction of the order will be looking for ringleaders crowds. They will re-establish the lawful courts and restore the hanger. The most ardent revolutionaries will be sent to scaffolding. It will be 1793 again. Let's not forget how the reaction won in the last century. At first, hebertists, crazy, were guillotine - those with the memory of struggle, fresh on it, still called anarchists. The Dattonists soon followed them; and when the robespiers' party guillote these revolutionaries, they, in turn, had to mount scaffolding; After that, people sick of bloodshed and seeing the revolution, losers, threw a sponge and let the reactionaries do all the worst. If order is restored, we say, the Social Democrats will hang anarchists; Fabians will hang the Social Democrats, and in turn will be hanged reactionaries; and the Revolution shall come to an end. But everything confirms us in the belief that the energy of the people will carry them far enough, and that when the Revolution takes place, the idea of anarchist communism will take ground. It's not an artificial idea. People themselves have inhaled it into our ear, and the number of communists is constantly growing as the impossibility of any other is becoming more evident. And if the push of the people is strong enough, things will take a very different turn. Instead of robbing baker's shops one day, and starving the next, the people of rebel cities will take possession of warehouses, cattle markets — in fact, all the supply stores and all the food that needed to be had. The good intentions of citizens, men and women both, will shape themselves into groups of volunteers and turn to the task of making a rough overall inventory of content, each store and warehouse. In twenty-four hours, the rebel city or district will know what Paris has not yet figured out, despite its statistical committees, and that it never learned during the siege — the number of provisions it contains. Forty-eight hours, millions of copies will be printed with tables giving a sufficiently accurate accounting of available food, the places where it is stored, and means of distribution. In every block of houses, on every street, in every city ward, gangs of volunteers will be organized. These commissariat volunteers will work in unison and keep in touch with each other. If only the bayonets of Jacobin do not stand on the streets; if only independent scientific theorists do not insert themselves into the dark advice! Or rather let them then eat their muddy theories as much as they like, provided they have neither authority nor power! And that amazing spirit of the organization inherent in the people, above all in every social class of the French nation,[4] but which they were so rarely allowed to carry out, would initiate, even in a vast city like Paris, and at the height of the revolution, a huge guild of free workers ready to equip everyone and all the food needed. Give people a free hand, and in ten days meals will be carried out with remarkable regularity. Only those who have never seen people at work can doubt this, only those who have passed their lives are buried among the documents. Talk about the organizational genius of the Great misunderstanding, the people, those who saw him in Paris in the days of the barricades, or in London during the great Dockers strike, when half a million starving people had to feed, and they will tell you how much it surpasses the official ineptness of Bumble. And even assuming we had to endure a certain amount of discomf and confusion overnight or a month, no doubt that wouldn't matter much. For a mass of people, this will still be an improvement in their former condition; and, moreover, in times of revolution, you can dine quite contentedly on a little bread and cheese, despite the fact that they are eagerly discussing events. In any case, a system that is brought up spontaneously, under the stress of immediate need, will be infinitely better for anything that is come up between four walls of hidden theorists sitting on any number of committees. IV People of major cities will be pushed out by force take possession of all provisions, starting with barists, and gradually extending communism to other things to meet the needs of all citizens. The sooner this is done, the better, the sooner it is done, the less suffering there will be and less strife. But on what basis should society be organized for everyone to share and share equally? It's a question that greets us from the beginning. We answer that there are no two ways of this. There is only one way in which communism can be established fairly, only one way that satisfies our instincts for justice and at the same time practical, namely a system already adopted by europe's agrarian communists. Take, for example, the peasant commune, no matter where, even in France, where there are Jacobins, did everything possible to destroy all communal use. If the commune owns forests and cops, then as long as there is plenty of wood for everyone, everyone can take as much as they want, without other albeit obstacles, than the public opinion of its neighbors. As for trees- trees, which are always scarce, then prove them carefully. It's the same with communal pastures; while it is enough and spare, there is no limit to what can consume the cattle of each estate, nor the number of animals grazing on pastures. Grazing sites are not divided, and do not come out of the stern, if there is no shortage. All Swiss communes, and many of those in France and Germany too, wherever there is communal pasture land, practice this system. And in Eastern European countries, where there are large forests and no shortage of land, you find villagers chopping down trees the way they need to and process as much soil as they require, without any thought about limiting each person's share of wood or land. But the wood will be divided, and the land scattered, to every household according to its needs, as soon as it becomes small, as is already the case in Russia. In short, the system is as follows: no congestion, no limit to what the community has in abundance, but equal exchange and separation of those goods that are scarce or apt for a short run. Of the three hundred and fifty million who inhabit Europe, two hundred million still adhere to this system of natural communism. It should be noted that the same system prevails in large cities when distributing one product at least, which is in abundance, water supplied to each house. As long as there is no fear of supply running short, no water company is thinking about checking water consumption in every home. Take what you like! But during major droughts, if there is any fear of supplying failure, water companies know that all they have to do is report this fact, through short advertisements in the papers, and citizens will reduce water consumption and prevent it from running into waste. But if there was really little water, what would have been done? should have been a system of rations. Such a measure is so natural, so inherent in common sense, that Paris twice asked to put on rations during two sieges it suffered in 1871. Do you need to go into detail, prepare tables showing how the distribution of rations can work, to prove that it is fair and fairer, infinitely fairer and fairer than the current state of affairs? All these tables and details will not serve to convince those in the middle classes, nor, unfortunately, workers tainted by middle-class prejudice who regard the people as a crowd of savages willing to fall and devour each other, directly the Government stops directing matters. But those who have never seen the people decide and act on their own initiative could doubt for a moment that if the masses were masters of the situation, they would distribute rations to everyone and everyone in the strictest conformity of justice and justice. If you gave a statement, in any gathering of people, in the opinion that delicacies - gaming and such - should be reserved for fastidious gourmet aristocratic slackers, and black bread given to patients in hospitals, you would fatter it. But let's say, at one gathering, preach on street corners and in market places that the most perfidious delicacies should be kept for the sick and the weak — especially for the sick. Let's say that if there are only five partridge braces in the whole city, and only one case of sherry wine, then they should go to sick people and convalescents. They say that after the sick come children. For them, the milk of cows and goats should be reserved, if not enough at all. For children and aged the last piece of meat, and for a strong person dry bread if the community is reduced to that limb. Let's say in a word that if this or that article consumption works short, and should be involved, for those most in need most, should give. Say this and see if you don't meet a universal agreement. A person who is fully fed does not understand this, but people understand this, always understood it; and even a child of luxury, if he is thrown outside and comes into contact with the masses, even he will learn to understand. Theorists - for whom soldier uniforms and a barack mess table are the last word of civilization - would have no doubt to start a regime of National Cuisines and Spartan Broth. They would point to the benefits, thereby gained, savings in fuel and food if such huge kitchens were created, where everyone could come for their rations of soup and bread and vegetables. We do not question these benefits. We are well aware that important economies have already been achieved in this direction — such as when a hand shell, or a quern, and a baker's oven attached to each house were abandoned. We see perfectly well that it would be more economical to cook broth immediately for a hundred families, not one hundred separate fires. We know apart from the fact that there are a thousand ways to make potatoes, but that cooked in one huge pot for a hundred families they would be just as good at. We know, in fact, that diversity in cooking is a matter of seasoning introduced by every cook or housewife, cooking together a hundred-weight potatoes wouldn't stop every cook or housewife from dressing up and serving them any way she's happy with. And we know that a stock made from meat can be turned into a hundred different soups into all a hundred different flavors. But while we are fully aware of all these facts, we still argue that no one has the right to force a housewife to pick up her potatoes from a communal kitchen ready if she prefers to cook them herself in her own pot over her own heat. And, above all, we should wish everyone to freely take his food with his family, either with his friends or even in a restaurant if it seemed good to him. Naturally, large public kitchens will spring to take up space in restaurants where people have been poisoned nowadays. Already, the Paris housewife gets stock for her soup from a butcher and turns it into any soup she likes, and London housewives know they can have a joint roast, or an apple or rhubarb tart baked into a baker for a small amount, thus thrifty time and fuel. And when the communal kitchen — the usual baking of the future — is installed, and people can get their food cooked without the risk of being deceived or poisoned, the custom will surely become a common outlet in the communal kitchen for fundamental parts of the meal, leaving the finishing touches to be added, as should offer an individual taste. But to make a rigid and quick rule of this, to make it a duty to take home our food ready cooked, which would be as authoritative for our modern minds as the idea of a monastery or barrack — painful ideas born in brains warped by tyranny or superstition. Who will be eligible for commune food? will undoubtedly be the first question we will have to ask ourselves. Each town will answer for itself, and we are convinced that the answers will all be dictated by a sense of justice. Until labor is reorganized, as long as the disturbed period lasts, and while it is impossible to distinguish between invetative crossers and genuine workers thrown out of work, available food should be common to all without exception. Those who were enemies of the new order will accelerate with their own consent to deprive the commune of their presence. But it seems to us that the masses of the people, who have always been majestic, and have nothing vindictive in their luck, will be willing to share their bread with all who remain with them, conquered and conquered. It will not be a loss for a revolution to be inspired by such an idea, and, when the work is set in agony again, yesterday's antagonists will stand shoulder to shoulder in the same way Society, where work is free, will have nothing to fear from displaced persons. But the provisions will work briefly in a month! Our critics immediately exclaim. Much better, they say we are. This will prove that for the first time on the record people had enough to eat. As for the issue of obtaining fresh supplies, we will discuss the means in our next section. V What means could the city in a state of revolution be able to supply food? We will answer this question, but it is obvious that the means to which they resort will depend on both the nature of the revolution in the provinces and in neighboring countries. If the whole nation, or, better yet, if the whole of Europe had simultaneously achieved the Social Revolution and begun with a thorough communism, our procedure would have been simplified; but if only a few communities in Europe try, other means will have to choose. Circumstances will dictate measures. Thus, we were led before continuing on, to look at the state of Europe, and without pretending to prophesy, we can try to predict what course the Revolution will take, or at least what will be its essential features. Of course, it would be highly desirable for the whole of Europe to go up at once, that expropriation should be common, and that communist principles should inspire everyone and sune. Such a universal rise would do much to simplify the challenge of our century. But all the signs will lead us to believe that this is not going to happen. We have no doubt that the Revolution will engulf Europe. If one of the four major continental capitals - Paris, Vienna, Brussels or Berlin - rises into revolution and abolishes its government, it is almost certain that three others will follow his example within weeks. It is, moreover, very likely that the peninsulas and even London and St Petersburg will not long follow suit. But whether the revolution will everywhere exhibit the same characteristics is questionable. While it is more than likely that expropriation will be unmissable on a larger or smaller scale, and that this policy, carried out by any of the great nations of Europe, will affect everything else; however, the beginnings of the Revolution revealed great local differences, and its course will change in different countries. In 1789-1793 French peasantry took four years to finally get rid of the redemption of feudal rights, and bourgeois overthrow royalty. So let's remember this and be prepared for the revolution to evolve somewhat gradually. Let's not describe it here and there her steps have to move less quickly. Whether this will take an avowedly socialist nature across all European nations, at any rate at the beginning, is questionable. Germany, as it is remembered, is still reals its dream of the United Empire. His advanced parties see the vision of the Jacobin Republic, both in 1848 and labour organizations according to Louis Blanc; while people, on the other hand, want, above all, a free commune, whether it's a communist commune or not. There is every reason to believe that when the coming revolution takes place, Germany will go further than France went in 1793. The revolution of the eighteenth century in France was an advance on the English Revolution of Seventeenth, abolishing, as it was one blow, the power of the throne and the landed aristocracy, the influence of which still survives in England. But, if Germany goes further and learns bigger things than France in 1793, there can be no doubt that the ideas that will contribute to the birth of its Revolution will be what happened in 1848, since the ideas that will inspire the revolution in Russia will be those of 1789, somewhat altered by intellectual movements of our own century. Without, however, giving this prediction greater significance than they deserve, we can safely conclude so much: The revolution will take on a different character in each of the different European nations; the point achieved in the socialization of wealth will not be everywhere the same. So, will it be necessary, as it is sometimes assumed, that nations at the forefront of the movement must adapt their pace to those who lag behind? Should we wait for the communist revolution to mature in all civilized countries? Clearly not! Even if it were a thing to be desired it is not possible. History does not wait for the stragglers. Furthermore, we do not believe that in any one country the revolution will be achieved under attack, in twinkling eyes, as some socialists dream. It is very likely that if one of france's five or six major cities - Paris, Lyon, Marseille, Lille, Saint-Etienne, Bordeaux - had proclaimed a commune, others would have followed her example, and that many, smaller cities would have done the same. Probably also various mining areas and industrial centers would rush to get rid of owners and craftsmen, and form themselves into free groups. But many places in the country have not advanced to this point. Side by side with the revolutionary communes, such places would remain in affable attitude, and would go to live for individualists. Undisturbed by bailiff visits or tax collector, farmers would not be hostile to the revolutionaries, and thus, when they profit from the new state of affairs, they postpone the settlement of accounts with local operators: But with the practical enthusiasm that always characterizes agrarian uprisings (witness the passionate man of 1792) they would have thrown in the task of cultivating land , which, freed from taxes and mortgages, would become much more expensive for them. As for abroad, the revolution will break in everyone, where, but revolution in various aspects, in one country of state socialism, in another Federation; everywhere more or less socialism, do not comply with any particular rule. VI Let's go back to our city in an uprising, and consider how its can provide food for themselves. How should the necessary provisions be obtained if the nation as a whole has not accepted communism? This is an issue that needs to be addressed. Take, for example, one of the great French cities - take the capital itself, for that matter. Paris consumes thousands of tons of grain each year, 350,000 heads of oxen, 200,000 calves, 300,000 pigs and more than two million sheep, in addition to a large number of games. This huge city devours, besides, 18 million pounds of butter, 172 million eggs and other products in a similar proportion. Imports flour and grain from the United States and from Russia, Hungary, Italy, Egypt and India; live stock from Germany, Italy, Spain - even Ruman and Russia; and as for food, there is no country in the world that would not lie under the contribution. Now, let's see how Paris or any other major city can be retailed with homegrown products whose supplies could be readily and willingly expelled from the provinces. For those who put trust in the credibility of the question will appear quite simple. They would start with the creation of a heavily centralized Government, equipped with all the equipment of coercion - the police, the army, the guillotine. This government will make a statement on all products contained in France. This would divide the country into supply areas, and then order that on such a day a certain amount of some food was sent to such a place, and delivered to such a station to be there received on this day by the specified official and stored in separate warehouses. We now state with full conviction, not just that such a decision is undesirable, but that it can never any opportunity be put into life. It's wildly utopian! Pen in hand, you can dream of such a dream in the study, but in contact with reality it comes to nothing; for, like all such theories, it leaves out the spirit of independence which is in man. The attempt would lead to a general uprising, to three or four Vendées, to villages rising against cities, the whole country in the arms of challenging the city for its arrogance in trying to impose such a system on the country. We already had too many Jacobin utopias! Let's see if any other form of organization is going to fit the case. In 1793 provinces starved large cities, and killed the revolution. And yet it is known that grain production in France during 1792-1793 has not decreased; indeed the evidence goes to show that it has increased. But taking possession of the estates, reaping their harvest, farmers did not pay with their grain for paper money. They kept their products waiting for the price hike or the introduction of gold. The harshest measures of the National Convention were without much convention, and even the fear of death failed to break the ring, or force its members to sell their For history says that the commissariat of the Convention did not scour the guillotine of those who kept their grain from the market, and miserably executed those who speculated on food. Nevertheless, corn was not forthcoming, and the townspeople suffered from hunger. But what did the man offer in exchange for his hard work? Appointees, paper scraps are reduced daily in value, promises of payment that could not be kept. A forty-pound note would not have purchased a pair of boots, and the villager, very naturally, was not alarmed by barter's annual squirrel for a piece of paper, by which he couldn't even buy a shirt. As long as worthless paper money — whether assigned or labor notes — is offered by a peasant producer, it will always be the same. The country will withhold its products, and cities will suffer want, even if the re-cast peasants of guillotine still do. We must offer the peasant in exchange for his mutilatingly not worthless paper money, but manufactured articles from which he stands in immediate need. He lacks the proper reference to till the ground, clothes to protect him properly from the unclean weather, lamps and oil to replace his pathetic mince or tallow dip, shovels, rakes, ploughs. All these things, under the current conditions, the peasant is forced to eat without, not because he does not feel the need for them, but because in his life the struggle and privatization of a thousand useful things are beyond his reach; because he doesn't have the money to buy them. Let the city apply itself, without waste time, to the manufacture of everything a peasant needs, instead of fashioning gewgas for the wives of wealthy citizens. Let paris sewing machines be set to work on clothes for the folk country: clothes and clothes for Sunday too, instead of expensive evening dresses. Let the factories and sheds come out agricultural references, shovels, rakes and such, instead of waiting until the British send them to France, in exchange for French wines! Let cities not send more inspectors to villages, wear red, blue or rainbow scarves to convey to peasant orders to take its products to this place or that, but let them send friendly embassies to the folk country and trade them in fraternal way; Bring us your products, and take from our shops and shops all the articles you make you want. Then the provisions will pour in from all sides. The farmer only surpassed what he needed for his own use and would send the rest to the cities, feeling for the first time in history that these men were his comrades - his brothers, not his exploiters. We are probably told that this will take a complete transformation of the industry. Well, yes, this applies to certain departments; but there are other branches that could be quickly modified in such a way as to combine the peasant with clothes, watches, furniture and implements for which cities make it pay such exorbitant prices at present. Weavers, tailors, shoemakers, tins, closet builders and many other trading and crafts could easily direct their energies to produce useful and necessary articles, as well as refrain from producing simple placement. All it takes is that the public mind must be carefully convinced of the need for this transformation, and must come to look at it as an act of justice and progress, and that it should no longer allow itself to deceive that dream, so expensive theorists - the dream of a revolution that is limited to owning the profits of industry - and leaves manufacturing and commerce just as it is now. This is, then, our view of the whole issue. Deceive the peasant no longer with scraps of paper — whether it's the amounts written on them, ever so large; but invite him in exchange for the fact that he, the cultivator of the soil, stands in need. Then the fruits of the earth will pour into the cities. If it is not done, there will be famine in our cities, and reaction and despair will follow in its train. VII All major cities, as we said, buy their grain, their flour and their meat not only from the provinces, but also from abroad. Foreign countries send Paris spices, fish and various daisies, besides huge amounts of corn and meat. But when the revolution comes, we must depend as little as possible on foreign countries. If Russian wheat, Italian or Indian rice, and Spanish or Hungarian wines abound in the markets of western Europe, it is not that the countries that export them have superabundant, or that such products grow there by itself, like dandelions on meadows. In Russia, for example, a farmer works sixteen hours a day, and half starve three to six months each year to export grain by which he pays the landlord and the state. By the day, the police show up in a Russian village as soon as the harvest is going, and sells the last horse to a farmer and the last cow for arrears on taxes and rent at the landlord's expense, unless the victim imprates himself of his own accord by selling grain to exporters. Usually, instead of dealing with its live stock at a disadvantage, it retains only a nine-month supply of grain, and the rest sells. Then, to sustain life until the next harvest, he mixes birch bark and resin with his flour for three months if it was a good year, and for six, if it was bad, while in London they eat biscuits from his wheat. But as soon as the revolution comes, the Russian peasant will keep enough bread for himself and his children; the same will be done by Italian and Hungarian peasants; and Hindu, let us hope, accept these good examples; and America's farmers are unlikely to cover all the grain shortages that Europe will experience. So won't do to count on their contributions wheat and corn meet all needs. Since our entire middle-class civilization is based on exploiting lower races and countries with less developed industrial systems, the revolution will bring good from the start, menacing that civilization, and allowing so-called lower races to break free. But this great benefit will prove to be a steady and noticeable decline in food supplies pouring into major cities in western Europe. It is difficult to predict the course of affairs in the provinces. On the one hand, the soil slave will use the revolution to spread the bowed back. Instead of working fourteen to fifteen hours a day, as he does at present, he will only work half the time, which of course will have the effect of reducing the production of basic consumption items — grain and meat. But, on the other hand, there will be an increase in production once the farmer realizes that he is no longer forced to support the failing rich with his own. New tracts of land will be cleaned, new and improved machines are installed a-go. There has never been land as vigorously cultivated as in 1792, when a farmer took back from the landown the soil he longed for for so long. Mikelet tells us, speaking of the Great Revolution. Soon the intense culture would be within the reach of all. Improved machinery, chemical manure, and all such issues would be shared ownership. But everything usually indicates that from the outset there will be a drop in agricultural output, in France, as elsewhere. In any case, it would be the most fashionable to expect such a drop in contributions from the provinces as well as from abroad. And how does it fall to be good? Why, in the name of heaven, setting to work alone! No need to lay down our brains for inflated panaceas when the remedy lies close at hand! Major cities must commit to cultivating soil, as do areas of the country. We must return to what biology calls the integration of functions — after the division of labor that is taken for it as a whole — it is this course that all Nature follows. In addition, philosophy separately, the power of circumstance will bring this result. Let Paris see that at the end of eight months it lacks bread, and Paris will work on growing wheat. What about the land? it won't be wanting, for it's around the big cities, and around Paris especially that the parks and pleasure grounds of the landed genteel need to be found. These thousands of acres are waiting only for the skilled labor of a man to surround Paris with fields infinitely more fertile and productive than the steppes of southern Russia, where the soil has dried up from the sun. There is also no shortage of manpower. What two million Paris citizens should look out for when they will no longer be catering to the luxurious whims and entertainment of Russian princes, Rumansky and the wives of Berlin financiers? With all the mechanical inventions of the century; with all the intelligence and technical skills of the worker, accustomed to engaging in complex equipment; with inventors, chemists, professors of botany, practical needs like gardeners of the Genevilliers market; with all the plant they could use to multiply and improve the machinery, and finally with the organizational spirit of the Parisian people, their sinkhole and energy — with all this at their command, the agriculture of the anarchist commune of Paris would be a very different thing from the rough farming of the Ardenne. Steam, electricity, the warmth of the sun and the breath of the wind, will be pressed to service for a long time. Steam harrow and steam plow quickly do a rough job of cooking, and the soil, thus cleaned and enriched, will need only reasonable care for a man, and a woman even more than a man to be dressed in lush vegetation - not once, but three or four times a year. Thus, studying the art of gardening from experts, and trying experiments in various methods on small areas of soil reserved for purpose, compete with each other to get the best return, finding in exercise, without exhaustion or fatigue, whose health and strength so often flagged in cities - men, women and children will happily turn to the work of fields when it is no longer Slavic irritability , and it became a pleasure, a festival, an update of health and joy. There are no barren lands; land is worth what man is worth - this is the last word of modern agriculture. Ask about the earth, and it will give you bread, provided you ask directly. The area, although it was as small as the seine and Seine and Oise departments, and with a major city like Paris to feed, would be virtually enough to grow on it all food supplies that might otherwise not reach it. The combination of agriculture and industry, man and mechanic in the same personality — this is what will inevitably lead us anarchist communism, if it begins fairly with expropriation. Let the revolution get only that far, and hunger is not the enemy it will have to fear. No, the danger that interests him lies in timidity, prejudice and half-choking. The danger is where Dunton saw it when he cried to France: Laugh, dare, and yet again, dare! Bold thought in the first place, and a brave whoa will not be able to follow. Chapter 6: Housing I Those who have closely watched the growth of certain ideas among workers must have noticed that one significant issue is the housing of the people, namely , discreetly puts on a certain conclusion. It is known that in large cities in France, and in many smaller ones as well, workers gradually come to the conclusion that residential buildings do not make sense of ownership of those whom the state recognizes as its owners. This idea has evolved in the minds of the people, and nothing will ever convince them again that property rights must extend to homes. The house was not built by its owner. It was erected, decorated and furnished by countless workers - in wooden yards, a brick field, a workshop that masculinity for dear life at the minimum wage. The money spent by the owner was not the product of his own work. It was accumulated like all other wealth, paying workers two-thirds or only half of what was associated with them. Moreover , and this is where the enormity of the whole proceedings becomes the most brilliant — the house owes its actual value of profit, which the owner can take out of it. Now this profit is based on the fact that his house is built in a town that owns bridges, embankments and beautiful public buildings, and gives its residents a thousand amenities and amenities unknown in the villages; the city is well paved, lit by gas, in regular communication with other cities, and in itself the center of industry, commerce, science and art; a city that has worked twenty or thirty generations gone to make habitable, healthy and beautiful. A house in parts of Paris can be valued at thousands of pounds, not because thousands of pounds worth of labour has been spent on this particular house, but because it is in Paris; because for centuries artists, artists, thinkers and men learning and letters have contributed to Paris that it is day to day - the center of industry, commerce, politics, art and science; because Paris has a past; because, thanks to literature, the names of its streets are household words both in foreign countries and at home; because it is the fruit of eighteen centuries of work, the work of fifty generations of the entire French nation. Who, then, can assign themselves the smallest plot of land, or the freshest building, without committing gross injustice? Who, then, has the right to sell any bidder the smallest part of the common heritage? From that point on, as we said, the workers are aligned. The idea of vacant dwellings showed its existence very clearly during the Siege of Paris, when the cry was for repenting of the clean and simple terms demanded by landlords. It reappeared during the Commune of 1871, when the Parisians worked, expected the Communal Council to boldly decide to abolish rents. And when the New Revolution comes, this will be the first question the poor will be concerned with. Whether during a revolution or in times of peace, a worker must be anywhere or different; He must have some roof over his head. But no matter how down and smashed your accommodation can be, there's always a landlord who can evict you. True, during the revolution he can't find bailiffs and police sergeants to throw away your rags and chat outside, but who knows what the new government will do to thickest up? Who can say it won't call for the force's help again, and set Will the police pack you up to drive you out of your pigs? We have seen the Commune proclaim the remission of rent only until the first of April [5] After that, the rent had to be paid, although Paris was in a state of chaos and the industry was in a standby state; so the revolutionary had absolutely nothing to depend on except his allowance of fifteen pence a day! Now the worker must be made to clearly see that in refusing to pay rent to the landlord or owner he is not just profiting from the disorganisation of power. He must understand that the abolition of rents is a recognized principle, sanctioned, so to speak, by a popular asent; that being leased is a right proclaimed aloud by the people. Will we wait until this measure, which is in tune with every honest person's sense of justice, be accepted by a few socialists scattered among the elements of the middle class from which the Provisional Government will be drawn up? We have to wait a long time — until the reaction returns, actually! That's why, abandoning uniforms and badges - those outward signs of authority and easement - and remaining people among the people, well-deserved revolutionaries will work side by side with the masses that rent cancellation, expropriation of houses, can become a perfect fact. They will prepare the earth and encourage ideas to grow in this direction; and when the fruit of their workers matures, the people proceed to expropriate the houses, oblivious to the theories that will certainly be on their way — the theory of paying compensation to landlords, and finding the necessary funds first. On a day when the expropriation of houses takes place, on that day exploited workers realized that new times had come, that Labour would no longer have to bear the yoke of the rich and powerful, that equality was openly proclaimed that this revolution was a real fact, not a theatrical make-up, like many others preceding it. If the idea of expropriation is adopted by the people, it will be put into action, despite all the insolvevable obstacles with which we are formidable. Of course, good people in the new uniform, sitting in the formal chairs of the Hôtel de Ville Hotel, are sure to be busy wearing obstacles. They will talk about providing compensation to landlords, preparing statistics, and compiling long reports. Yes, they would be capable of compiling reports long enough to exceed the hopes of a people who, having waited and starved of violent incapacitation, and seeing nothing come from all these official studies, will lose heart and faith in the Revolution and abandon the field for reactionaries. The new bureaucracy will end with the expropriation of hatred in the eyes of all. Here, indeed, is a rock that can shipwreck our hope. But if people turn a deaf ear to the insidious arguments used to blind them, and understand that new life needs new conditions, and if take on the task, the expropriation can be carried out without any great difficulties. But how? How can this be done? you ask us. We will try to answer this question, but with a caveat. We do not intend to re-expropriate the expropriation plans in the most good detail. We know in advance that anything anyone, or group of men, can suggest the day will be far superior to reality when it comes. A person will achieve bigger things and achieve them in better and simpler methods than those dictated to him in advance. Thus, we are satisfied with how expropriation can be carried out without government interference. We do not offer to go out of our way to respond to those who declare that the thing is impossible. We are ciring the answer to the fact that we are not the owners of any particular method of organization. We are only concerned to demonstrate that expropriation can be an effective people's initiative, and cannot be effective by any other means. It seems highly likely that, once the expropriation is fairly started, groups of volunteers will show up in every neighborhood, street and block of houses, and commit to asking about the number of apartments and houses that are empty and of those that are overcrowded, undisclosed slums and houses that are too spacious for their occupants and may well be used to house those strangled in swarms. In a few days, these volunteers would make full lists for the street and district of all apartments, houses, family mansions and villa residences, all rooms and suites of rooms, healthy and unhealthy, small and large, foetid dens and luxury homes. Freely communicating with each other, these volunteers will soon have their statistics completed. False statistics can be produced in boardrooms and offices, but true and accurate statistics should start with the individual and mount from simple to complex. Then, without waiting for any vacation, those citizens will probably go and find their comrades who lived in pathetic garrets and pigs and will tell them simply: This is a real revolution this time, comrades, and there is no mistake in this. Come to such a place tonight; the whole neighborhood will be there; we are going to redistribute residential buildings. If you're tired of your slum-garre, come and choose one of the five-bedroom apartments that should be disposed of, and when you've once moved into you, never fear. People in their hands, and someone who would risk evicting you, will have to answer them. But everyone will want a lovely house or a spacious !, - we say. No, you're wrong. This is not people's way to stagger to the moon. On the contrary, whenever we saw them set about restoring the wrong, we were struck by the good decision and instinct of justice that annive the masses. Did we know they required the impossible? Do you have any ever seen the people of Paris fight among themselves, waiting for their rations of bread or firewood during two sieges? The patience and resignation that prevailed among them were constantly held up for grabs by foreign press correspondents; and yet these patient waiters knew full well that the latter would have to go through the day without food or fire. We do not deny that there are many selfish instincts in isolated people in our societies. We are fully aware of this. But we argue that the very way to revive and nourish these instincts would be to confine ourself to issues such as housing the people to any council or committee, essentially the tender mercy of officialy in any form or form. Then indeed all evil passions will come up, and it becomes the business of who is the most influential person on the board. The slightest inequality causes distortion and retraining. If the slightest advantage is given to any, rises a tremendous shade and cry — and not for no reason. But if the people themselves, organized by streets, neighborhoods and parishes, commit to moving slum dwellers into semi-empty middle-class dwellings, petty inconveniences, then small irregularities will be easy to press down on. Rarely addressed the good instincts of the masses - only as the last measure to save a sinking ship in times of revolution - but never has such an appeal been made in vain; heroism, the

selflessness of the mooper never responded to it. And thus it will be in the coming revolution. But, when all is said and done, there will be some inequalities, some inevitable injustices. There are people in our societies whom no major crisis can lift from the deep rut of selfishness in which they flood. The question, however, is not whether there will be injustices or not, but how to limit their numbers. Now the whole story, the whole experience of the human race, and all social psychology, are united, showing that the best and fairest way is to trust the decisions of those concerned most almost. Only they can consider and allow a hundred and one detail that must necessarily be ignored in any simply official redistribution. Third, this in any case does not need to be done directly equal redistribution of all residential premises. Initially, there will undoubtedly be some inconveniences, but soon things will be right in a society that has accepted expropriation. When both masons and carpenters and all those who care about the house know that their daily bread is provided to them, they will ask for nothing better than to work on their old trades for a few hours a day. They will adapt the beautiful houses that absorbed the time of the entire staff of servants, and in a few months the houses have come down, infinitely healthier and more conveniently arranged than on the day. And for those who are not yet comfortable to accommodate an anarchist will be able to say: Patience, comrades! Palaces are fairer and more sophisticated than any capitalists built for themselves, will come out of the ground of our infamed city. They will belong to those who need them most. Anarchist commune does not build with an eye on income. These monuments, built by its citizens, products of collective spirit, will serve as foresakes for all mankind; they will be yours.1 If the people of the Revolution expropriate houses and proclaim free housing - communicating houses and the right of every family to decent housing - the revolution adopts the communist character from the first, and began with a course from which it will be in any case easy to turn it. He will strike the fatal blow on the individual property. For the expropriation of dwellings contained in the embryo all social revolution. The way it is achieved depends on the nature of everything that follows. Either we start with a good road leading straight to anarchist communism, or we'll be left in the mud of despotic individualism. It is easy to see the numerous objections — the theorists on the one hand, practical on the other — with which we will definitely perform. Since it will be a matter of preserving lawlessness at all costs, our opponents, of course, are protesting in the name of justice. It's not a cry of shame - they explain - that the people of Paris should take possession of all these beautiful houses, while villagers in the country only have huts to live in? But don't let us make a mistake. These justice enthusiasts forget, the failure of the memory to which they are subjected, weeping in shame, which they themselves tacitly defend. They forget that in the same city a worker, with his wife and children, suffices in a nasty garb, while out of the window sees the palace rich. They forget that entire generations freeze in crowded slums, starving of air and sunlight, and that correcting this injustice should be the first task of the Revolution. Don't let these pointless protests deter us. We know that any inequality that may exist between city and country in the early days of the revolution will be transitory and nature to rule itself from day to day; for the village will not be able to improve its dwellings as soon as the peasant ceases to be a beast of the burden of a peasant, a merchant, a creditor of money and a state. To avoid accidental and transient inequality, will we keep our hand off the right of the ancient wrong? So-called practical objections are also not very formidable. We are forbidden to consider the difficult business of some poor guy who, through privatization, became interested in buying a house big enough to keep his family. And we're going to deprive him of earned happiness, turn him into a street! Of course not. If his house is only big enough for his family, by all means let him stay there. Let work in his small garden too; our boys will not hurt him — no, they will reach out to him if necessary. But suppose he allows accommodation, suppose he has empty rooms in his house; then the people will make the guests understand that he no longer needs to pay his former landlord rent. Stay where you are, but rent for free. No more dunes and collectors; Socialism has abolished it all! Or again, suppose the landlord has an assessment of the rooms all to herself, and some poor woman lives next to five children in the same room. In that case, people will see if, with some changes, these empty rooms could not be converted into a suitable home for a poor woman and her five children. Wouldn't it be fairer and fairer than leaving a mother and her five little ones longing in the hard, and the Magnificent Midas sitting casually in an empty mansion? In addition, a good Wonderful would probably rush to do so with his own consent; his wife will be happy to be freed from half of her large, unappointed home when there are no more staff servants to keep him in order. So you're going to turn everything upside down, say defenders of law and order. There will be no end to eviction and removal. Wouldn't it be better to start fresh by turning everyone out the door and redistributing homes for a lot? Thus, our critics; but we strongly believe that if no Government intervenes in this case, if all changes are put to those loose groups that break through to take up work, eviction and removal will be less numerous than those that occur within one year under the present system, due to the rape of landlords. First of all, in all major cities almost enough empty houses and apartments to settle all the inhabitants of the slum. As for the palaces and suites of beautiful apartments, many working people would not live in them if they could. It was impossible to keep up with such houses without a large staff of servants. Their inhabitants soon found themselves forced to look for less luxurious accommodation. We could find that the palaces were not well adapted to self-help in the kitchen. Gradually, people were shaking. There would be no need to drive into Gareth at bayonet point, or install Lazarus at Dives Palace with the help of an armed escort. People will shudder peacefully in existing living quarters with the least possible friction and disruption. Aren't we an example of rural communes redistributing fields and not breaking allotment owners so little that one can only praise intelligence and the good sense of the methods they use. Fewer fields change hands under the control of the Russian commune than where personal property holds its hand, and forever carries its quarrels to the courts of law. And do we believe that residents of a major European city will be less intelligent and less capable of organizing than Russian or Hindu peasants? we must not blink the fact that every revolution means a certain disruption of everyday life, and those who expect this huge rise from the old grooves to be performed without as much as the hotness of dishes on their dinner tables will find themselves false. It is true that governments can change without violating decent citizens at dinner, but the crimes of society towards those who nourished and supported it should not be to reimburse any such political sight of parties. There will undoubtedly be a violation, but it should not be pure destruction; it must be minimized. Again, it is impossible to impose too much stress on this maxim — it will be an appeal to stakeholders, not to councils and committees, that we will be best able to reduce the amount of inconvenience for all. People make a blunder on a blunder when they get picked up by voting some zaytsi-zaytsi candidate who demands the honor of representing them, and undertakes to know everything, do everything and organize everything. But when they take it myself to organize what they know touches them directly, they do it better than all the talking shops combined. Isn't the Paris Commune an instance at the point? And a big kick to the Dockers? and do we not have constant evidence of this fact in every rural commune? Chapter 7: Clothing | When homes have become a common heritage of citizens, and when everyone has their daily food supply, will have to take another step forward. The issue of clothing, of course, will require consideration further, and again the only possible solution would be to take possession, in the name of the people, of all the shops and warehouses where clothes are sold or stored, and throw open doors to all so that everyone can take what it needs. Communication of clothes — everyone's right to take away what he needs from communal stores, or to do it for him from tailors and outfitters — is a necessary cooperative of communal houses and food. Obviously, we won't need to disrespect all citizens with their coats, put all their clothes in a heap and draw a lot for them; as our critics suggest, with equal wit and ingenuity. Let the coat, who keeps it in place — the most, if he has ten coats, it is very incredible that anyone will want to deprive him of them, because most people would prefer a new coat to the one that has already decorated the shoulders of some fatty bourgeois; and enough new clothes and save money without having to turn to second-hand wardrobes. If we were to make up the inventory of all the clothes and clothes accumulated in the shops and shops of major cities, we should probably find that in Paris, Lyon, Bordeaux and Marseille it was enough for the commune to offer clothes to all citizens, both sexes; and if everyone didn't fit at once, utility outfitters would soon have made good those flaws. We how fast our large tailoring and dressing establishments are currently operating, provided they are with a technique specially tailored for production on a large scale. But everyone will want a coat with a play or a velvet robot! our opponents exclaim. Honestly, we don't believe it. Every woman does not do on velvet, nor every man dreams of my sticks. Even now, if we were to ask every woman to choose her dress, we should find some to prefer simple, practical clothes for all the fantastic trimming the fashion world is affecting. Tastes change over time, and fashion in fashion at the time of the Revolution will certainly make for simplicity. Societies, like individuals, have their hours of cowardly but also their heroic moments; and although society cuts a very poor figure, sunk in pursuit of narrow personal interests and ideas of the second bet, it wears a different air when it insinuates great crises. She has her moments of grandeur and enthusiasm. People of generous nature will gain strength, what day we have on hand of the 10's. Selflessness will find out, and noble deeds give rise to their similarities; even selfish people will be ashamed to hang back, and will stretch, despite themselves admiring, if not imitation, generous and brave. The Great Revolution of 1793 is replete with examples of this kind, and it ever in such times of spiritual revival — as a natural for societies concerning individuals — that the spring tide of enthusiasm sweeps humanity further. We do not want to exaggerate the part played by such noble passions, and not on them, that we would find our ideal of society. But we don't ask too much if we expect their help in sticking over the first and most difficult moments. We can't hope that our daily lives will be constantly inspired by such exalted enthusiasm, but we can expect their help first, and that's all we need. It is simply to wash away the land clean, sweep away the shards and abandon, accumulated by centuries of slavery and harassment, that a new anarchist society will need this wave of brotherly love. Later it can exist without appealing to the spirit of self-sacrifice, because it will eliminate harassment, and thus create a new world instinct with all feelings of solidarity. In addition, if the nature of the Revolution is as we have drawn here, the free initiative of individuals will find a wide field of action in disrupting the efforts of the egoists. Groups will rise up every street and block to take charge of the garments. They would make stocks of everything the city owned and figure out roughly what resources were at their disposal. It is more than likely that in the issue of clothing citizens will adopt the same principle as in question provisions - that is, they will be free to offer from a shared store all that was to be found in abundance, and do whatever was limited in. Without being able to offer every man a coat of chomobile, and every woman a velvet gown, society probably distinguishes between excess and necessary, and, previously, at least, classy smool and velvet among the superfluous of life, ready to give time to prove whether luxury a day can't become commonplace for everyone to the morrows. While the necessary clothing would be guaranteed to every gothic anarchist city, private activities would be left to provide the sick and weak those things pre-examined as luxury items, and procure for less durable such special articles as not going into the daily consumption of ordinary citizens. But, he urges, this gray homogeneity means the end of all things beautiful in life and art. Of course not, we answer; and we are still the foundations of our opinion that already exists. We propose to show now how anarchist society can satisfy the most artistic tastes of its citizens, preventing them from accumulating the fortunes of millionaires. Chapter 8: Ways and Means | If society, city or territory were to guarantee the responsibilities of living with its residents (and we will see how the concept of compulsory life can be so prevalent to include suites), it will be forced to take possession of what is absolutely essential for production; i.e. land, machinery, factories, vehicles, etc. Capital in the hands of private owners would be expropriated and returned to the community. The great damage done by the bourgeoisie society, as we mentioned, is not only that the capitalists seize a large share of the profits of each industrial and commercial enterprise, thereby allowing them to live without work, but also in the fact that all production has gone in the wrong direction, since it is not carried out due to ensuring the well-being of all. For this reason, we condemn this. In addition, it is impossible to continue mercantile production in the interests of everyone. I would like to expect a capitalist to go outside his province and perform duties that he cannot perform without demanding to be what he is — a private producer who seeks his own enrichment. Capitalist organization, based on the personal interest of each individual trader, unlocked everything that could be expected of it, society - it increased the productive power of work. The capitalist, profiting from a revolution that affected the steam industry, the sudden development of chemistry and technology, and other inventions of our century, made an effort in his own interests to increase labor yields, and to a large extent he succeeded. But attributing him to other duties would be unwarranted. For example, to expect it to use this higher yield of work in the public interest as a whole would be to ask for the charity and charity of it, and the capitalist enterprise cannot be based on charity. Now it remains for society to expand this greater productivity, which certain industries, and apply it to the common good. But it is obvious that to ensure the well-being of all, society must regain possession of all means of production. Economists, like their own, will not be able to remind us of the comparative well-being of a certain category of young reliable workers skilled in certain special industries. It is always this minority who point out us with pride. But is it welfare that is the exclusive right of the few, safe? Fatigue, maybe negligence, improvisation or the greed of their employers, will deprive these privileged men of their jobs, and they will pay for a period of comfort they have enjoyed months and years of poverty or destitution. How many important industries - woven goods, iron, sugar, etc. - without mentioning short-term trading, we have not seen the decline or coming to a standstill in turn due to speculation, or as a consequence of the natural displacement of work, and finally from the consequences of competition at the expense of capitalists themselves! If the main weaving and mechanical industry had to go through such a crisis as they went in 1886, we hardly need to mention small trades, all of which periodically come to a standstill. What do we also say to the price paid for the relative well-being of certain categories of employees? Unfortunately, it is paid for by the ruin of agriculture, shameless exploitation of peasants, misery of the masses. Compared to a weak minority of workers who enjoy some comfort, how many millions of people live hand-to-mouth, without a secure wage, are willing to go anywhere; how many peasants work fourteen hours a day for a poor pittance! Capital depopulates the country, exploits colonies and countries where industries, but are little developed, dooms a huge majority of workers to be left without technical education, to remain mediocre even in their own trade. It's not just a coincidence, it's the need for a capitalist system. In order to reward certain classes of giggles, farmers must become beasts of the burden of society; the country must be deserted for the city; small trades should agglomerate in the deaf suburbs of major cities, and produce a thousand little value things for nothing to bring goods to larger industries within reach of buyers with small salaries. That bad fabric can be sold, clothes are made for underpaid workers by tailors who are satisfied with the salary of hunger! Eastern lands in a backward state are exploited by the West in order that under the capitalist system workers of several privileged industries can get some limited amenities of life. The evils of the present system therefore are not that the excess-value of production goes to capitalist, as Rodbertus and Marx said, thus narrowing the socialist concept and overall view of the capitalist system: excess value in itself is only a consequence of deeper causes. Evil lies in the possibility of an existing excess cost, instead of a simple surplus not consumed by each generation; for the fact that there must be an excess of value means that men, women, and children are starved to sell their labor for a small part of what this work produces, and above all that their work is capable of producing. But this evil will continue as long as the production tools belong to several. As long as men are forced to pay tribute to property owners for the right to process land or put machinery into action, and the property owner is free to produce what rates are fair to bring him the greatest profit, rather than the greatest amount of usable goods - wellbeing can be temporarily guaranteed only very little, and will only be bought by the poverty-stricken part of society. It is not enough to distribute profits realized by trade in equal parts, if thousands of other workers are exploited at the same time. This is a case of producing the greatest amount of goods needed for the welfare of all, with the least possible waste of human energy. This may not be the purpose of a private owner; and that is why society as a whole, taking this view of production as its ideal, will be forced to expropriate anything that increases well-being in the production of wealth. We will have to take possession of land, factories, mines, means of communication, etc., and in addition, we will have to study what products will contribute to general complacent, as well as ways and means of production. II How many hours a day will a person have to work to produce nourished food, a comfortable home and essential clothes for his family? This issue was often adone by the Socialists, and they generally concluded that four to five hours a day would suffice, provided it would be well understood that all men work. At the end of the last century, Benjamin Franklin fixed the limit of five hours; and if the need for comfort is now greater, the production capacity has also reached, and much faster. Speaking of agriculture further, we will see that land can be made to succumb to a person when he cultivates it scientifically, instead of throwing seeds into badly plowed soil, as he mostly does on the day. In large farms in Western America, some of which cover 30 square miles but have poorer soil than the mannered soil of civilized countries, only 10 to 15 English bushels per English acre go out; that is, half the yield of European farms or American farms in the Eastern States. And yet, thanks to machines that allow 2 men to plough 4 English acres a day, 100 men can produce in a year whatever is needed to deliver bread to 10,000 people at their home for a full year. Thus, it would be enough for a man to work in the same conditions for 30 hours, say, 6 half days for five hours each to have bread all year round; to work 30 half days to guarantee the same family of 5 people. We will also prove according to the results obtained in our time that if we had an appeal to intensive agriculture, in less than 6 half a day of work it would be possible to eat bread, meat, vegetables and even luxurious fruits for the whole family. And again, if we study the cost of housing working people built in big cities a day, we can figure out what to get, in a big English city, a separate little house as they are built for workers, from 1,400 to 1,800 half-day jobs of 5 hours would be enough. As a home of this kind lasts at least 50 years, it follows that 28 to 36 half-day jobs a year will provide well-furnished, healthy neighborhoods, with all the comfort you need for the family. While when hiring one apartment at the employer, the employee pays from 75 to 100 days of work per year. Note that these figures represent the maximum that a house costs in England a day by being given a defective organisation by our societies. In Belgium, the working cities were built much cheaper. Taking everything into account, we are justified, confirming that in a well-organized society 30 or 40 half a day of work a year will be enough to guarantee a perfectly comfortable home. There now remains clothes, the exact cost of which is almost impossible to fix, because the profit realized by a swarm of intermediaries can not be approximately. Take the fabric, for example, and draw up all the deductions made by landowners, sheep owners, wool traders, and all their intermediate agents, then railroad companies, millowners, weavers, dealers in ready-made clothes, sellers and commission agents, and you'll get a glimpse of what's paid to the entire swarm of capitalists for each article of clothing. That's why it's absolutely impossible to say how many days of work overpay that you pay £3 or £4 a. a large London store represents. It is certain that with the present technique they no doubt manage to make an incredible amount of goods. A few examples are enough. Thus, in the United States, in 751 cotton mills (for spinning and weaving), 175,000 men and women produce 2,033,000,000 yards of cotton goods, besides a large number of threads. On average, more than 12,000 yards of cotton goods only get 300 days of work 91/2 hours each, say 40 yards of cotton in 10 hours. Recognizing that a family needs 200 yards a year, this would be equivalent to working 50 hours, say 10 half days of 5 hours each. And we should have a thread besides; that is, sew cotton, and weave the threads with a cloth to make woolen fillings mixed with cotton. As for the results obtained by weaving alone, official United States statistics teach us that in 1870, if workers worked 13 to 14 hours a day, they did 10,000 yards of white cotton products a year; thirteen years later (1,886) they weaved 30,000 yards, working only 55 hours each. Even in cotton eddy they received, weaving and printing 32,000 yards of work a year — they say about 12 yards per hour. So that your 200 yards of white and printed cotton merciam 17 hours of work a year would be enough. It should be noted that the raw material reaches these plants in about the same state as from the fields, and that the transformation went through the piece before it is converted into goods completed within those 17 hours. But to buy those 200 yards from a tradesman, a well-paid worker must give at least 10 to 15 days of work for 10 hours each, say, 100 to 150 hours. find as for the English peasant, he will have to urinate for a month, or a little more to get this luxury. By this example, we already see that working 50 half a day a year in a well-organized society, we could dress better than the lower middle classes. But with all this we required only 60 half-day work of 5 hours each to get the fruit of the land, 40 for housing, and 50 for clothing, which only does six months of work as the year consists of 300 working days if we take holidays away. There are still 150 days of work that could be used for other duties of life — wine, sugar, coffee, tea, furniture, transport, etc. It is evident that these calculations are only approximate, but they can also be proven differently. When we consider how many, in so-called civilized nations, produce nothing, how many work on malicious trades, are doomed to disappear, and finally, how many are only useless intermediaries, we see that in each country the number of real producers could have been doubled. And if instead of every 10 men 20 were employed in the production of useful goods, and if society accepted trouble in the human energy economy, then those 20 people would have to work only 5 hours a day without reducing production. And that would be enough to reduce human energy waste in the service of wealthy families, or those administrations that have one official for every ten residents, and use those forces, to improve the nation's productivity, to limit jobs to four or even three hours, provided we have to be satisfied with the current production. By studying all these facts together, we can come, then, with this conclusion: Imagine a society commending several million residents engaged in agriculture and a large variety of industries — Paris, for example, with the Department of seine-e-Oise. Suppose that in this society all children learn to work both with their hands and their brains. Recognize that all adults, saving women who are engaged in raising their children, are tied to work 5 hours a day with twenty to twenty-two to forty-five or fifty years old, and that they follow the professions they have chosen in any one field of human work that are deemed necessary. Such a society could instead guarantee the welfare of all its members; that is, more substantial well-being than what I liked middle classes. And in addition, every worker belonging to this society would have at least 5 hours a day at his disposal, which he could devote to science, art and individual needs that do not fit the category of essentials, but would probably do so later when a person's performance is increased and those facilities would no longer appear luxurious or inaccessible. Chapter 9: The need for luxury | Am Human, however, is not a creature whose exceptional purpose in life is to eat, drink and provide asylum for myself. Once his material wants to be met, other needs, of artistic nature, will push themselves forward more fervently. Life goals vary with each person; and even more civilized society, the more individuality will develop, and the more desires will be varied. Even that day, we see men and women denying themselves compulsory to purchase simple little things, get some special pleasure, or some intellectual or material pleasure. A Christian or ascetic may praise these desires for luxury; but it is these little things that violate the monotony of existence and make it pleasant. Would life be work living, with all its inevitable sorrow, if, in addition to daily work, a person could never get any pleasure according to their individual tastes? If we desire a social revolution, we cannot give bread to all in the first place; transform this amazing society, in which we can see every day how reliable workers hang with guns, want from an employer who will exploit them; women and children wander without shelter at night; whole families are reduced to dry bread; men, women and children who die for the desire to care and even for the desire to eat. It is to put an end to these lawlessnesses that we have respred. But we expect more from the Revolution. We see that an employee forced to painfully fight for a naked existence is reduced to ignorance of these higher allures, the highest within human reach, science and especially scientific discoveries; art, and especially artistic creation. It is in order to get these joys for all that are now reserved for a few; in order to give leisure and the opportunity to develop intellectual opportunities, that social revolution must guarantee daily bread for all. Once bread has been secured, leisure is the highest goal. No doubt nowadays, when hundreds and thousands of people need bread, coal, clothing and shelter, luxury is a crime; to satisfy him, the child worker must go without bread! But in a society in which everyone can eat enough needs that we consider luminants a day, will be more acutely felt. And since all men do not and cannot resemble each other (diversity of tastes and needs is the main guarantee of human progress) it will always be, and it is desirable that there are always men and women whose desire will go beyond ordinary individuals in some particular direction. All no telescope is needed because, even if the training was common, there are people who prefer to study things through a microscope to study the stary heavens. Some love statues, some pictures. A particular person has no other ambition than to own an excellent piano, while another is happy with the accordion. Tastes vary, but artistic needs exist in all. In our present, poor capitalist society, a person who has artistic needs cannot satisfy them unless heir to a great destiny, or with the help of hard work suits himself intellectual capital, which will allow him to take on the liberal profession. Nevertheless, he cherishes hope of once satisfying his tastes more or less, and for that reason he rebukes idealistic communist societies by having the material life of each person as a single purpose. In your communal stores, you may have bread for everyone, he tells us, but you won't have beautiful pictures, optical tools, luxury furniture, art jewelry — in short, many things that minister an infinite variety of human tastes. And thus you suppress the possibility of getting anything but bread and meat that the commune has to offer everyone, and the grey underwear in which all your lady citizens will be dressed. These are objections that all communist systems should consider, and which the founders of new societies created in american deserts have never understood. They believed that if the community could procure enough fabric to dress all their members, a music hall in which the brothers could slice a piece of music, or occasionally perform in a play, that was enough. They forgot that the feeling for art existed in both the agrucultivist and the commoner, and despite the fact that the expression of artistic feeling varies depending on the difference in culture, in the main it remains unchanged. In vain, the community guaranteed the common responsibilities of life, in vain it suppressed all education, which would usually develop individuality, in vain eliminates all reading except the Bible. Some tastes broke out, and caused general dissatisfaction; quarrels arose when someone offered to buy piano or scientific instruments; and the progress elements marked. Society could exist only if it suppressed all individual feelings, all artistic tendency and all development. Will the anarchist commune push to the same direction? Obviously not, if he understands that while he produces everything necessary for material life, he should also strive to satisfy all manifestations of the human mind. II We candidly acknowledge that when we think of the abyss of poverty and suffering that surrounds us when we hear the heartfelt cry of a worker walking the streets begging for work, we are a lot to discuss the issue: How will people act in a society whose members are properly fed to satisfy certain people who are afraid to own a piece China or velvet dress? We have a temptation to answer: Let's make sure the bread starts with, we'll see China and velvet later. But because we must recognize that a person has needs other than food, and since the power of Anarchy is precisely that he understands all human abilities and all passions, and ignores none, we will, in a few words, explain how a person can humble himself to meet all his intellectual and artistic needs. We mentioned that working 4 or 5 hours a day to forty-five to fifty years, a person could easily produce everything necessary to guarantee comfort to society. But the day job of a person accustomed to work does not stack up; hours; it's 10 hours a day for 300 days a year, and lasts a lifetime. Of course, when a man is harnessed into a car, his health is soon undermined and his intelligence has dangled; but when a person has the opportunity of different classes, and especially alternating manuals with intellectual work, he can remain busy without fatigue, and even with pleasure, for 10 or 12 hours a day. Consequently, a person who will do 4 or 5 hours of handmade, necessary for its existence, will have before him 5 or 6 hours, which he will seek to employ according to his tastes. And those 5 or 6 hours a day completely give him the opportunity to procure for himself if he associates with others, whatever he desires except the obligatory guaranteed to all. He writes out first his task in this field, in a factory and so on, which he owes to society as his contribution to general production. And he will use the second half of his day, his week, or his year to meet his artistic or scientific needs, or his hobby. Thousands of societies will find out to ow every taste and every possible fantasies. Some, for example, will give their hours of leisure literature. Then they will form groups, which will include authors, composites, printers, engravings, checkers, all pursuing a common goal - spreading ideas that are dear to them. Nowadays, the author knows that there is a beast of burden, a worker who, for an amount of several shillings a day, he can entrust the printing of his books; but he hardly cares to know what a printing press is. If a composer suffers from lead poisoning, and if a child who sees a car dies of anaemi, are there no other poor scors to replace them? But when there are no more starving, willing to sell their jobs for a pittance, when an exploited worker that day will be educated and have his ideas put in black and white and communicate with others, then authors and scientific men will be forced to combine with each other and with printers to bring out their prose and their poetry. As long as men view fussy and manual labor as a sign of inferiority, it will be strange for them to see an author setting up his own book in type, for isn't he a gymnasium or games by distraction? when the opprobria associated with manual work disappeared when everyone has to work with their hands, there is no one to do it for them, the authors, as well as their fans will soon learn the art of handling compositions-sticks and type; they will know the pleasure of coming together - all fans of the work to be printed - to customize the type, shape it to the pages, take it into its innocent purity from the press. These beautiful machines, tools of torture to a child who visits them from mornе into nightfall, will be a source of pleasure for those who will use them to give voice to the thoughts of their favorite author. Does literature lose it? Will the poet be less poet after working out of the door or helping his hands multiply his work? Will the novelist lose his knowledge of human nature after rubbing shoulders with other men in the woods or in a factory, in paving the road or on a railway line? Can there be two answers to these questions? Perhaps some books will be less voluminous; but then, more will be said on fewer pages. Fewer waste may be published; but the printed questions will be more carefully read and more appreciated. The book will appeal to a larger range of the best educated readers who will be more competent to judge. Moreover, the art of printing, which has progressed so little since gutenberg' time, is still in its insufficient state. It takes two hours to compose text written in ten minutes, but more appropriate methods of multiplication of thought are sought and will be discovered. What a pity that every author should not take their share in printing their works! What progress the printing would have made! We should no longer use moving letters like in the SEVENTEENTH century. III Is it a dream to conceive a society in which - all who have become producers, all educated, which allows them to develop science or art, and all having the leisure to do so - will men combine to publish works of their choice, contributing each of their own contributions to manual work? We have already studied hundreds, literary and other societies; and these societies are nothing but voluntary groups of men interested in certain fields of learning, and related to the purpose of publishing their works. Authors who write for periodicals of these societies are not paid, and periodicals are not sold; they are sent free of charge to all quarters of the globe, to other societies, cultivating the same areas of study. This member of society can insert into his review a one-story note summarizing his observation; another can publish in this great work, the results of long years of study; while others will be limited to consultation with the review as a starting point for further research. No matter: all these authors and readers are associated with the production of works in which they all take it is true that the assimilation society, like the individual author, goes to the printing house, where the printing houses worked. Nowadays, those who belong to the assimilate societies despise manual labor; which is indeed carried out in very bad conditions; but a community that would give generous philosophical and scientific education to all its members would know how to organize manual labor in a way that was the pride of humanity. Its learned societies will become associations of researchers, lovers of science and workers — all this knows manual trade and everyone is interested in science. If, for example, society studies geology, then everything will contribute to the study of earth layers; each member will take their share of research, and ten thousand observers, where we now have only a hundred, will do more in a year than we can do in twenty years. And when their work is published, ten thousand men and women qualified in different trades will be willing to draw maps, gravel designs, fold and print books. They will gladly give their leisure time — in the summer to exploration in winter to the housework. And when their work appears, they will find not only a hundred, but also ten thousand readers interested in their joint work. This is the direction in which progress is already moving. Even today, when England felt the need for a full english dictionary, the birth of Littrе, who would dedicate his life to this work, was not waited for. Volunteers were approached, and a thousand men offered their services, spontaneously and gratuitously, to break up libraries, take notes and do a few years of work that one person could not complete in his lifetime. In all branches of human intelligence, the same spirit breaks down, and we must have a very limited knowledge of humanity, could we not have guessed that the future is announcing itself in the kind of tentative singing co-carrier that gradually takes the place of individual work. For this dictionary to be truly a collective work, it would take many volunteer authors, printers, and printer readers to work together; but something in this direction is already being done in the Socialist press, which offers us examples of manual and intellectual work combined. It happens in our newspapers that the socialist author composites his own article in the leaders. However, such attempts are rare, but they indicate in which direction evolution is going. They show the road of freedom. In the future, when a man will have something useful to say-word that goes beyond the thoughts of his century, he will not have to look for an editor who can advance the necessary capital. He will look for collaborators among those who know the printing house and who approve of the idea of his new work. Together, they will publish a new book or journal. Literature and journalism will cease to be a means of making money and living at the cost of others. But are there any who knows literature and journalism from within, and who do not fervently wish that literature could finally break free from those who have previously defended it, and who are now exploiting it, and from the multitude of which, with rare exceptions, pays it in proportion to its mediocrity, or to the ease with which it adapts to the poor taste of more? Letters and science will take their proper place only in the work of human development, when, freed from all mercenary slavery, they will be exclusively cultivated by those who love them, and for those who love them. IV Literature, Science and Art should cultivate free men. Only under this condition will they manage to emancipate themselves from the yoke of the state, the capital, and the bourgeois mediocrity that strangles them. What does a scientist mean today to do research that interests him? Should he seek help from a state that can only be given to one candidate for a hundred, and which no one can get, who supposedly does not promise to hold on to the beaten path? Let us remember how the Institute of France censored Darwin, how St Petersburg's Academy treated Mendeleph with contempt, and how the Royal Society of London refused to publish a Joule paper in which it identified the mechanical equivalent of heat, revealing it unscrupulant. [6] That's why all the great research, all discoveries revolutionizing science, were made outside academies and universities, or by men wealthy enough to remain independent, such as Darwin and Lyell, or men who blew up their health by working in poverty and often in large straits, without losing the end of time in order to want labs, and unable to procure tools or books necessary to continue their research, but perseverance against hope and often dies before they have reached an end, given their legion name. Overall, the system of aid provided by the state is so bad that science has always tried to lure itself out of it. That is why there are thousands of assimilated societies organized and supported by volunteers in Europe and America — some have evolved to such an extent that all the resources of subvention societies, and the wealth of millionaires would not buy their treasures. No government agency is as admies as the Zoological Society of London, which is supported by voluntary contributions. She does not buy animals that are in thousands of people her gardens: they are sent by other societies and collectors around the world. The Bombay Zoological Society will send the elephant as a gift; another time, a hippo or rhino is offered by Egyptian naturalists. And these wonderful gifts pur every day, coming from all quarters of the globe - birds, reptiles, insect collections, etc. These cargoes often include animals that could not be bought for all the gold in the world; thus, a traveler who captured an animal at risk of life, and loves him as he would like a child, will give it to society because he is sure he will be cared for. The entrance fee is paid by visitors and they are countless, enough to maintain this vast institution. What is defective in london's zoological society, and in other societies, is that a member's fee cannot be paid in work: that the keepers and numerous employees of this Great Institution are not recognized as members of the Society, while many have no other incentive to join society than to put the F.Z.S. cabalistic letters (an employee of the zoological society) on their cards. In short, what's needed is a more perfect combination. We can say the same about inventors that we said about scientists. Who doesn't know what suffering almost all the great inventions that have come to light have cost? Sleepless nights, families deprived of bread, want tools and materials for experimentation, this is the story of almost all those who enriched the industry with inventions that are truly the legitimate pride of our civilization. But what should we do to change the conditions that everyone is convinced are bad? Patents have been tried and we know what the results are with. The inventor sells his patent for several shillings, and the man who only lent capital pockets often huge profits as a result of the invention. In addition, patents isolate the inventor. They force him to keep secret his research, which therefore ends in failure; whereas the simplest suggestion coming from the brain is less absorbed into a fundamental idea, sometimes it is enough to insinuate the invention and make it practical. Like all state control, patents are holding back industry progress. Thought fails to be patented, patents are a weeping injustice in theory, and in practice they lead to one of the great obstacles to the rapid development of invention. What is needed to popularize the spirit of invention is, above all, the awakening of thought, the courage of conception that all our education makes us bored; this is the spread of scientific education, which would increase the number of requesters by a hundred times; it is the belief that humanity is going to take a step forward because it is the enthusiasm, the hope of doing good, that has inspired all great inventors. Only social revolution can give this impulse of thought, this courage, this knowledge, this conviction to work for all. Then we will have huge institutions provided with motor energy and tools of all sorts, huge industrial laboratories open to all enquirs where men will be able to work out their dreams, after justifying themselves for their duty to society; where they will spend their five or six hours of leisure time; where they will do their experiments: where they will find other comrades, experts in other industries, as well as coming to study some complex problem, and therefore able to help and enlighten each other. meeting them and experience causing the solution to be found. And yet again, it's not a dream come true. Solanoy Gorodok, in St. Petersburg, has already partially implemented this on technical issues. It is a factory well equipped with tools and free for all; tools and motor motors are supplied free of charge, only metals and wood are charged. Unfortunately, workers go there only at night, when ten hours of labor in the workshop are worn out. Moreover, they carefully hide their inventions from each other, as they are hindered by patents and capitalism, which banes modern society, stumbling-block in the way of intellectual and moral progress. V What about art? On all sides, we hear lamentations about the decadence of art. We are, indeed, far behind the great masters of the Renaissance. Art specifications have recently made great progress; thousands of people, gifted with a certain amount of talent, cultivate each branch, but art seems to fly from civilization! Specifications make way into the head, but the inspiration of frequent studio artists is less than ever. Where, indeed, should it come from? Only a grand idea can inspire art. Art in our ideal sunnium for creation, it should look ahead; but to preserve a few rare, very rare exceptions, a professional artist remains too pholystylen to embrace new horizons. Moreover, this inspiration cannot come out of the books; it must be pulled out of life, and the present society cannot cause it. Raphael and Murillo drew at a time when the quest for a new ideal could adapt to old religious traditions. They drew to decorate large churches that represented the watering work of several generations. Basilica with its mysterious aspect, its grandeur, was connected with the life of the city itself and could inspire a painter. He worked on a popular monument; he spoke with his fellow citizens, and received inspiration in return; He addressed the crowd

in the same way as the neof, pillars, stained glass windows, statues and carved doors. Currently, the artist's greatest honor may seek to see his canvas framed in a gilded tree hung in a museum, a kind of old curiosity shop where you see, as in the Prado, Murillo's ascension next to the beggar Velazquez and the dogs of Philip II. Poor Velázquez and poor Murillo! Poor Greek statues that lived in the Acropolis of their cities, and are now strangled under the red cloth of the lodging Louvre! As the Greek sculptor chisored his marble, he made an effort to save the spirit and heart of the city. All his passions, all his traditions of fame, had to live in creativity again. But day after day, the united city ceased to exist; there is no more communion of ideas. The city is a chance to agglomerate people who do not know each other, who have no common interest, save enrichment at each other's expense. Parental land does not exist... What notch can have in common with an international banker and rag-gatherer? Only cities, territories, nations or groups of peoples, restore their harmonious life, will be able to draw their inspiration from the ideals held together. Then the architect will teach a monument to the city, which will no longer be a temple, prison or fortress; then there will be an artist, a sculptor, a chimera, an ornament; worker knows where to put their canvases, their statues and their decorations; withdraw their execution power from the same vital source and gloriously march all together into the future. But until then, art can only vegetate. The best canvases of contemporary artists are those representing nature, villages, valleys, the sea with its dangers, a mountain of its splendor. But how can an artist express the poetry of work in the fields, if he only contemplated it, imagined if he never delighted her himself? If he only knows it as a passing bird knows the country he is hovering in on his migration? If in the cheerfulness of his early youth he didn't follow the plough at dawn and enjoyed mowing grass with a big scything next to unlikely gamers competing in energy with live young girls filling the ether with their songs? The love of the soil and what grows on it is not acquired by sketching with a brush — it is only in his service; and without loving it, how to draw it. That's why everything the best artists have produced in this direction is still so imperfect, not true to life, almost always just sentimental. It has no power. You must have seen the sunset when returning from work. You must have been a peasant among the villagers to keep the splendor of it in your eye. You must have been at sea with fishermen at all hours of the day or night, fishing alone, struggling with the waves facing the storm, and after the tumultuous work felt the joy of chasing a heavy net, or disappointment at seeing it empty to understand the poetry of fishing. You probably spent time in the factory, knew the fatigue and joys of creative work, forge metals with the bright light of the blast furnace, felt life in the car, understood the power of man and expressed it in the work of art. You should actually, be permeated with popular feelings, to describe them. In addition, the works of future artists who have lived the lives of the people, like the great artists of the past, will not be intended for sale. They would be an inexhaustible part of a living whole that wouldn't be complete without them, any more than they would have been complete without it. Men will go to the artist's own city to look at his work, and the spirit and carefree beauty of such creations will have a beneficial effect on the heart and mind. Art, in order to evolve, must be associated with an industry a thousand intermediate degrees mixed, so to say, as Raskin and the great socialist poet Morris have proven so often and so well. Everything that surrounds a person, on the street, in the interior and exterior of the public should be pure art form. But this will only be able to implement in a society in which everyone enjoys comfort and leisure. Then we will see artistic associations in which everyone can find a place for their capacity, because art can not do without the infinity of purely tame and technical additional works. These art associations will commit to decorating the homes of their members, as did those kind volunteers, young Edinburgh artists, decorating the walls and ceilings of a large hospital for the poor in their city. The painter or sculptor who created the work of personal feeling will offer it to the woman he loves or a friend. Executed for love's sake, will his love-inspired work give way to art that today satisfies the vanity of a phylot by that it cost a lot of money? The same will be done as far as all pleasure is concerned, not included in the responsibilities of life. Anyone who wishes a grand piano will enter the association of musical instrument-makers. And by giving the association part of his half-day leisure time, he will soon own the piano of his dreams. If he passionately admires astronomical research, he will join the Association of Astronomers, with her philosophers, her observers, her calculators, with his artists in astronomical instruments, her scientists and amateurs, and he'll have the telescope he desires, taking his share of related work, for it's a particularly rough work that's needed in an astronomical brickwork observatory, carpentry, founder, mechanic's work, the last touch provided by the artist's precision tool. In short, the five or seven hours a day that everyone will have at their disposal, after consecrating a few hours to produce essentials, will be enough to satisfy all the lust for luxury, however varied. Thousands of unions are committed to supplying them. What is now a privilege of a small minority would be accessible to all. Luxury, throbbing to be a pointless and osteoly manifestation of the bourgeois class, will be an artistic pleasure. Everyone will be happier about it. In a collective work done with a light heart to achieve the desired end, a book, a work of art or a luxury item, everyone will find an incentive, and a necessary relaxation that makes life enjoyable. In the work to end the division between the master and the slave we work for the happiness of both, for the happiness of mankind. Chapter 10: A Pleasant Work I When socialists declare that a society emancipated from Capital will make the job acceptable, and suppress all authoritative and unhealthy irritability, laugh at them. And yet even today we see the impressive progress made in this direction; and wherever this progress is made, employers congratulate themselves on the energy economy gained in this way. It is evident that the factory could be made as healthy and pleasant as the scientific laboratory. And this is no less than that it would be beneficial to do so. In a spacious and well-ventilated factory, the work is better; it is easy to introduce small ameliorations, of which each is a saving of time or manual labor. And if most of the factories we know are foolish and unhealthy, it's because workers have no accounting in the organization of factories, and because the saddest waste of human energy is its hallmark. However, now and again we are already finding some factories so well managed that it would be a real pleasure to work in them if the work, whether well understood, should not have lasted more than four to five hours a day, and if everyone had the opportunity to vary it according to their tastes. Look at this plant, unfortunately, consecrated under the engines of war. It is ideal for sanitary and intellectual organization. It occupies fifty English acres of land, fifteen of which are roofing glass. The sidewalk of the fire brick is as clean as that of the miner, and the glass roof is carefully cleaned by a gang of fathers who do nothing else. In this plant are wrought iron steel vingot or flowering weighing as much as twenty tons; and when you stand thirty feet from a huge furnace whose flame has a temperature of more than a thousand degrees, you will not guess what its presence will retain when its large jaws open to release a steel monster. And only three or four workers are engaged in the monster, which is now here, now there, open the crane, resulting in huge cranes moving water pressure in the pipes. You enter waiting to hear the deafening noise of the stampedes and you find that there are no stamps. Huge stalwart guns and crammed shafts of transatlantic steamships are forged by hydraulic pressure, and instead of forging steel, the worker should once again turn the crane to give it shape, making much more homogeneous metal, without crack or flaw, flowering, whatever their thickness. We expect a horseradish grille, and we find machines that cut blocks of steel thirty feet long with no more noise than it takes to cut cheese. And when we expressed our admiration for the engineer who showed us round, he replied: It's just a matter of economics! This steel aircraft machine has been in use for forty-two years. It wouldn't last ten years if its constituent parts, poorly adjusted, lacked cohesive force, interfered and creaked at every movement of the planet! And blast furnaces? It would be a waste to let the heat run rather than use it. Why fry the founders when the heat lost by radiation is tons of coal? The stampedes that caused the buildings to shake five leagues were also wasteful! It is better to press pressure than by influence, and it is cheaper — loses less. In a factory, light, cleanliness, space allotted to each bench, it's just a simple question of economics. Work is better done when you see and you have an elbow room. This is true; he said: We were very closely Come here. The land is such a road in the vicinity of large cities — landlords are so host! That's even the case in the mines. We know what mines are nowadays from Zola's descriptions and from newspaper reports. But the mine of the future will air well, with temperatures as easily regulated as the library; there will be no horses doomed to die below ground: underground thrust will be carried out using an automatic cable put into motion at the back of the pit. Ventilator devices will always work, and explosions will never happen. It's not a dream come true. Such a mine can already be seen in England; We were dreams of it. Here again, this organization is just a matter of economics. The mine we are talking about, despite its enormous depth (466 yards), has the production of thousands of tons of coal a day, only two hundred miners — five tons a day per worker, while on average two thousand pits in England are hardly three hundred tons per year per person. If necessary, we could multiply examples confirming that Fourier's dream of a material organization was not a utopia. The issue, however, has been so often discussed in socialist newspapers that public opinion could have been educated. Factory, forge and mine can be as healthy and wonderful as the best labs in modern universities, and the better the organization, the more human work will produce. If so, can we doubt that work will become a pleasure and relaxation in a society of equals, in which hands will not be forced to sell themselves into labor, but to accept work under all conditions? Authoritative tasks will disappear, because it is evident that these unhealthy conditions are harmful to society as a whole. Slaves can submit to them, but free men will create new conditions, and their work will be pleasant and infinitely more productive. Exceptions the other day will be the rule to the seas. The same will happen with homework, which until the day society rests on the shoulders of that stupidity of mankind — slaves. If Society, regenerated by the revolution, will make domestic slavery disappear — this is the last form of slavery, perhaps the most reliable, because it is also the oldest. Only this will not come in the way that the Falansters dreamed of, nor in a way often imagined by authoritarian communists. Falansterias are repugnant for millions of people. The most discreet man certainly feels the need to meet his mates in order to work together, which becomes more attractive, the more he feels part of a huge whole. But this is not the case for hours of leisure reserved for rest and intimacy. Falansteria and family hysteria do not take this into account, otherwise they supply this need through artificial groups. Falansteria, which is actually nothing but a huge hotel, can please some, and even everything in a certain period of their lives, but a large mass prefers family life (family of the future, whether it is understandable). They prefer isolated apartments, Normans and Anglo-Saxons even gather as much as they prefer houses of six to eight rooms in which family, or agglomeration of friends, can live separately. Sometimes falansteria is a necessity, but it would be hateful whether it was a common rule. Isolation, alternating with time spent in society, is a normal desire for human nature. That's why one of the greatest tortures in prison is the impossibility of isolation, just as solitary confinement becomes torture one by one when not alternating with hours of public life. As for the considerations of the economy, which are sometimes stressed in favor of phalansterium, they are a small trader. The most important economy, the only reasonable, is to make life enjoyable for everyone, because a person who is happy with his life produces infinitely more than a person who curses his environment. Other socialists reject falanster. But when you ask them how you can organize domestic work, they answer: Everyone can do their job. My wife runs the house; And if it's a bourgeois play on socialism that says, he'll add, with a gracious smile to his wife: It's not true, honey, what would you promise without a servant in socialist society? Would you work like the wife of our good comrade Paul or John's wife carpenter? A servant or wife, a man always counts on a woman to do housework. But the woman also finally claims her share — in the emancipation of mankind. She no longer wants to be a beast of the burden of home. She considers enough work to give many years of her life to her grown children. She doesn't want to be a cook anymore, a mander, a house cleaner! And, thanks to American women taking the lead in getting their claims, there is a general complaint from dear women who will be conscientious to domestic work in the United States. My lady prefers art, politics, literature or gaming tables; As for working girls, there are few, those who agree to submit to apron-slavery, and servants are only with difficulties in the States. So, the solution, very simple, indicates life itself. Appliances undertakes three-quarters of household services. You are black boots and you know how funny this job is. What could be stupider than grate your boot twenty or thirty times with a brush? A tenth of the European population must be forced to sell themselves in exchange for a miserable shelter and insufficient food, and a woman must consider herself a slave, in order for millions of her gender to have to go through this performance every morning. But hairdressers already have machines for cleaning glossy or woolly hair heads. Why shouldn't we apply, then, the same principle to another limb? This has been done, and is now a machine for escording boots generally used in large American and European Its use extends beyond hotels. In large English schools where pupils boarding in teachers' homes, it was easier to have one single institution commit to cleaning a thousand pairs of boots each morning. As for washing! Where we can find a housewife who has no horror of this long and dirty work, which is usually done by hand, solely because the work of a domestic slave has no account. In America, they are doing better. There are already a number of cities in which hot water is transferred to homes as cold water is found in Europe. Under these conditions, the problem was simple, and the woman - Ms. Cochrane - solved it. Her car washes twelve dozen plates or dishes, wipes them and dries them, in less than three minutes. A factory in Illinois manufactures these machines and sells them at a price within reach of the middle-class purse. And why shouldn't small households send their utensils to the establishment as well as their boots? It is even likely that the two functions, cleaning and washing, will be carried out by the same association. Cleaning, rubbing the skin from the hands when washing and pushing laundry; sweeping floors and carpet cleaning, thereby lifting clouds of dust that then cause a lot of trouble to get out of the places where they settled, all this work is still done because the woman remains a slave, but she tends to disappear as she can be infinitely better executed by the machine. Machines of all kinds will be introduced to households, and the distribution of motor power in private homes will enable people to work them without muscle effort. Such machines are worth little to manufacture. If we still pay a lot for them, it's because they're not in general use, and mainly because exorbitant tax is charged on each machine by gentlemen who wish to live in a grand style and who have speculated on land, raw materials, manufacturing, sales, patents and duties. But emancipation from the domestic muad will not be brought only by small machines. Households are coming out of the present state of isolation; they begin to associate with other households to do common things that they did separately. In fact, in the future we will not have a cleaning machine, a plate wash machine, a third for washing laundry and so on, in every house. To the future, on the contrary, belongs to the general heating apparatus, which sends heat to each room of the whole area and saves from lighting fires. This is already the case in several American cities. Large central furnace supplies all houses and all rooms with hot water, which circulates in pipes; and to adjust the temperature, you only need to turn the tap. And if you care about a burning fire in any particular room, you can light a gas specifically supplied for heating purposes from the central reservoir. All the tremendous work of cleaning chimneys and maintaining fires - and the woman knows what time it will take - disappears. Lamps, and even the gas had its day. There are entire cities in which it is enough to press a button for the light to break forward, and, indeed, it is a simple matter of economics and knowledge to give itself the luxury of electric light. And finally, also in America, they talk about forming societies for almost complete suppression of household work. It would only be necessary to create a department for each block of houses. The trolley will come to every door and take the boots to be blacked out, the dishes you need to wash, the laundry washed, the small things to be snouted (if it were worth the time), the carpets that need to be cleaned, and the next morning would have returned things entrusted to him all well cleaned. After a few hours, your hot coffee and your eggs made to pleasantness will appear on your table. It is a fact that between twelve and two hours there are more than twenty million Americans and as many Englishmen who eat roast beef or lamb, boiled pork, potatoes and seasoning vegetables. And at its lowest rate, eight million fires burn within two to three hours to fry this meat and cook these vegetables; eight million women spend their time cooking this meal, which perhaps consists of most ten different dishes. Fifty fires are burning, the American wrote the other day, where enough is enough! Dine at home, at your own table, with children, if you like; but just think for yourself why these fifty women should spend all their morning to cook a few cups of coffee and simple food! Why fifty fires when two people and one single fire are enough to cook all these pieces of meat and all those vegetables? Choose your own beef or lamb to be roasted if you're specifically. Season the vegetables to your liking if you prefer a certain sauce! But there is one kitchen with one fire, and arrange it as beautifully as you are able to. Why has a woman's job never been a by any account? Why in every family do mother and three or four servants have to spend so much time on cooking? Because those who want to emancipate humanity have not included a woman in their dream of emancipation, and consider it under their supreme male dignity to think about those kitchen arrangements that they have traded on the shoulders of this annoying woman. To emancipate a woman should not only open the gates of the university, law courts or parliaments, for her, because the emancipated woman will always throw household labor at another woman. Emancipation of a woman is to free her from the cruel steering of the kitchen and washbasin; it is to organize your family in such a way that it will enable her to raise her children if she is so attuned, while maintaining sufficient leisure time to take up her share of social life. It's going to happen. As we said, everything is already improving. Only let's fully understand that a revolution intoxicated by the beautiful words Freedom, Equality, Solidarity will not be a revolution she supported slavery at home. Half of humanity subjected to bonfire slavery will still have to rebel against the other half. Chapter 11: The free deal I am used to, as we are by its prejudices and completely unsexual education and training to see government, legislation and magistrates everywhere around, we have come to believe that a man will tear his neighbor to pieces like a wild beast on the day the police tore his eye off; this chaos would come if power were overthrown during the revolution. And with our eyes closed, we pass by thousands and thousands of human groups that form themselves freely, without any interference from the law, and achieve results, endlessly surpassing those achieved under the rule. If you open a daily document, you'll find its pages are entirely devoted to government agreements and the political workforce. The Chinese, reading this will assume that in Europe nothing is done to save at the behest of some master. You won't know anything in them about institutions that grow, grow and develop without a ministerial prescription. Nothing — or hardly anything! Even when there is a rubric — Solar events — it is because they are connected with the police. The family drama, an act of rebellion, will only be mentioned if police showed up at the scene. Three hundred and fifty million Europeans love or hate each other, work or live on their income; but apart from literature, theatre or sport, their lives remain ignored by newspapers unless governments somehow intervene. That's even the case with history. We know the smallest details of the king's life or parliament; all the good and bad speeches uttered by politicians have survived. Speeches that never had the slightest impact on a single member's vote, the old parliamentarian said. Royal visits, good or bad humor by politicians, jokes or intrigues, are all carefully recorded for posterity. But it is difficult for us to mark the city of the Middle Ages, to understand the mechanism of this huge commerce that was fending between Hanseatic cities, or to know how the city of Rouen built its cathedral. If a scientist spends his life studying these issues, his works remain unknown, and parliamentary histories - that is, defective, as they relate to only one side of public life - multiply, circulate, are taught in schools. And we don't even accept the condescendent work done daily by spontaneous groups of men, which amounts to the main gag of our century. Therefore, we propose to point to some of these brightest manifestations, and to prove that men, once their interests are not quite faced, act in a harmonious, harmonious way, and perform collective work of a very complex nature. Obviously, in the present society, based on individual property — that is, looting, and on highly specialism and therefore foolish individualism — facts good necessarily little in quantity; agreements are not always completely free, and often have an average if not an applied purpose. But what concerns us is not to give examples that we could blindly follow, and which, moreover, the present society could not give us. What we have to do is prove that despite the authoritarian individualism that strangles us, it remains in our lives taken as a whole, a big part in which we act only with free consent, and that it would be much easier than we think to dispense with the government. In support of our point of view we have already mentioned the railways and we are going to get back to them. We know that there is a railway system in Europe, 175,000 miles of widows, and that in this network you can currently travel from north to south, from east to west, from Madrid to St Petersburg, and from Calais to Constantinople, nonstop without even changing carriages (when you are travelling by express). What's more: a parcel thrown at the station will find its addressee anywhere, in Turkey or Central Asia, without the greater formality required to send it than writing a destination on paper. This result could have been obtained in two ways. Napoleon, Bismarck, or some powerful, capturing Europe, will be from Paris, Berlin or Rome, draw a railway map and regulate train hours. Russian Tsar Nicholas I dreamed of taking such measures. When he was shown the rough drafts of railways between Moscow and St. Petersburg, he captured the ruler and drew a direct line between these two capitals on the map of Russia, saying: Here's the plan. And the road announcement was built in a straight line, filling deep ravines, building quaint height bridges that had to be abandoned a few years later, costing around £120,000 to £150,000 per English mile. This is one way, but happily everything succeeded in a different way. Railways were built in parts, pieces were connected to each other, and a hundred divers of the companies to which these pieces belonged came to an understanding of the arrival and departure of their trains, and the running of wagons on their rails, from all countries, without unloading the goods as it moves from one network to another. All this was done by free agreement, by exchanging letters and proposals, by congresses on which the delegates met to discuss certain special topics, but not to make laws; after the congress, the delegates returned to their companies not with the law, but with a draft contract that will be adopted or rejected. There were, of course, stubborn men who would not be convinced. But common interest forced them to agree without calling for the help of armies against refractory members. This vast network of railways connected to each other, and the huge traffic to which it generated, is undoubtedly the brightest feature of our century; and this is the result of free consent. If a person had predicted or predicted it fifty years ago, our grandfathers would have He's idiotic or crazy. They would say: Never will you be able to force shareholders of a hundred companies to listen to reason! It's a utopia, a fairy tale. The central government, with an iron director, can alone enforce it. And the most interesting thing about this organization is that there is no European Central Government of railways! Nothing! No minister of railways, no dictator, not even a continental parliament, nor even a directing committee! Everything is done under contract. So we ask believers in the state who pretend that we can never do without a central government, was it just to regulate traffic, we ask them, But how do European railways grow without them? How do they continue to transfer millions of travelers and mountains of luggage across the continent? If the companies owning the railway were able to agree, why would the railway workers who took possession of the railway not agree the same way? And if the St. Petersburg Warsaw Company and parislan Belfort can act coherently without giving themselves the luxury of a joint commander, why in the midst of our societies, made up of free workers groups, do we need a government? If When we make an effort to prove on examples that even on that day, despite the lawless organization of society as a whole, men, provided that their instincts will not be diametrically opposed, agree without interference from the authorities, we do not ignore the objections that will be put forward. These examples have their faulty side because it is impossible to quote a single organization freed from exploitation by the weak by the strong, poor rich. That is why cysts will not be able to tell us with their won logic: You see that state intervention is necessary to put an end to this exploitation! Only they forget the lessons of history; they do not tell us to what extent the state itself has contributed to the existing order, creating proletari and delivering them to exploiters. They also forget to tell us whether exploitation can be put to an end, while the primary reasons - private capital and poverty, two-thirds of which are artificially created by the state - continue to exist. As for full harmony among rail companies, we expect them to say: You don't see rail companies depressing and badly using their employers and their travellers! The state must intervene to protect the public! But have we repeated that as long as there are capitalists, this abuse of power will be perpetuated by the state itself, the benefactor who has given companies that are monopolistic, which they own today. Did it not create concessions, guarantees? She didn't send her soldiers against railway workers on strike? And during the first tests (we see it in Russia), did it not extend the privilege of forbid the press from mentioning rail accidents so as not to de-de-price the shares it guaranteed? Did not contribute to this monopoly anointed Vanderbilt and Polyakoffs, directors of P.L.M., C.P.R., St. Gothard, kings of the times? Therefore, if a tacit agreement comes as an example, then a tacit agreement comes between railway companies, it is in no way as an ideal of economic management, nor even the ideal of a technical organization. This means that if capitalists, with no other purpose than increasing their dividends at the expense of other people, can successfully operate railways without establishing the International Department, working men's societies will be able to do just as well, and even better, without nominating the Ministry of European Railways. Another objection is invoked, which is more serious at first sight. We may be told that the deal we are talking about is not completely free that large companies are laying the law on small ones. They can, for example, quote a certain wealthy company that coerces travelers traveling from Berlin to Bail, pass through Cologne and Frankfurt, instead of passing the Leipzig route; the second carrying loads sixty or a hundred and thirty miles in the volume (over long distances) in favor of influential shareholders; third, which destroys the secondary lines. In the United States, travelers and goods are sometimes forced to travel incredibly contour routes so that dollars flow into Vanderbilt's pocket. Our answer will be the same: as long as capital exists, more capital will depress less. But harassment is not the result of capital alone. It is also thanks to the support provided to them by the state, a monopoly created by the state in their favor that certain large companies oppress small ones. Early Socialists showed how English law did everything in their power to break down small industries, drive a peasant into poverty, and deliver to wealthy industrial employers battalions of men forced to work no matter what salary. Rail legislation did the same. Strategic lines, subsidized lines, companies that received a monopoly of International Mail, were all brought into play to put forward the interests of wealthy financiers. When Rothschild, the lender of all European states, puts capital on the railway, its loyal subjects, ministers, will do all they can to make it earn more. In the United States, in a democracy that authoritarians hold on to us as an ideal, the most scandalous fraud has backed up to everything about railroads. Thus, if a company destroys its competitors with cheap tariffs, it is often given the opportunity to do so because it is reimbursed by the land granted to it by the state for free. Documents recently published regarding the U.S. wheat trade fully showed the part played by the state in exploitation of the weak strong. Here, also, the power of accumulated capital has increased tenfold and a hundred times with state aid. Thus, when we see syndicates of railway companies (a product of free consent) that succeed in protecting their small against the greats, we are surprised by the national power of a free deal that can hold its own against state-backed almighty capital. It is a fact that small companies exist despite the partiality of the state. If in France, land centralisation, we see only five or six large companies, there are more than a hundred and ten in the UK that agree extremely well and which are certainly better organised for the rapid transit of travellers and goods than French and German companies. Moreover, this is not a question. The large capital favored by the state can always, if it is in its favor, crush smaller. For us, this is important: The agreement between hundreds of companies to which Europe's railways belong was created without the intervention of the central government, which lays the law to the societies of divers; she founded with the help of congresses consisting of delegates debating among themselves, and submitting proposals, not laws, to their constituents. This is a new principle that is completely different from the entire government principle, monarchical or republican, absolute or parliamentary. It is an innovation that has been cowardly introduced in the customs of Europe, but has come to remain. III How often have we not read in the works of state-loving socialists: Who then will take up the regulation of the movement of channels in the future society? Should he enter the minds of one of your anarchist comrades to put his barge across the channel and thwart the thousands of boats that will make him succumb to reason? Let's acknowledge the assumption to be somewhat bizarre, but one might say, for example: If a certain commune, or group of communes, want their barges to pass in front of others, they might have to block the canal in order to carry stones, while the wheat needed in another commune would have to stand by. Who, then, would have regulated the traffic barge if it hadn't been for the Government? But real life has again demonstrated that government can be very good at getting around here, as elsewhere. Free deal, free organization, replace this lexica and expensive system, and do better. We know what the channels mean for Holland. They are his highways. We also know how much traffic there is on the channels. What is transported along our hayroads and railways is transported on canal boats in Holland. There you could find a reason to fight to let your boats pass in front of others. There, the government can really interfere with keeping traffic in order. But it's not. The Dutch settled matters in a more practical way, long ago, lighting up a kind of guild, or syndicate shuttles. These were free associations stemming from the very needs of shipping. The right of way for boats was adjusted by a certain registered order; they followed each other one by one. No one was allowed to get ahead of others under pain, being excluded from the guild. No one could station more than a certain number of days along the waterfront and if did not find goods for transportation during this time, so it is worse for him: He had to move away with his empty barge to leave room for the new arrivals. Thus, the obstruction was avoided, even though the competition between the private owners of boats continued to exist. If the latter were suppressed, the deal would only be more cordial. It will not be superfluous to add that shipowners could comply with or not syndicate. That was their business, but most of them chose to join her. Moreover, these syndicates offered such great advantages that they also spread along the Rhine, Wezer, Oder and as far as Berlin. The boats did not wait for the great Bismarck to annex Holland to Germany, and appoint Ober Haupt General Staats Canal Navigations Rath (Supreme Counsel general states channel navigation), with a number of lanes corresponding to the length of the name. They preferred to come to an international understanding. In addition, a number of shipowners whose sailing vessels carry traffic between Germany and Scandinavia, as well as Russia, have also joined these syndicates to regulate traffic in the Baltics and bring some harmony to the chasse croissant of vessels. These associations freely appeared, recruited supporters of volunteers and had no common with governments. This, however, is more than likely here that too much capital is depressingly less. Perhaps the syndicate also tends to become a monopolist, especially where it receives precious patronage of the state that won't prevent it. Let's not forget that these syndicates represent associations whose members have only private interests, and that if at the same time each shipowner was forced - by socializing production, consumption and exchange - to belong to a hundred other associations to meet his needs, everything would have a different aspect. A group of shipowners powerful at sea would feel weak on land, and they would be obliged to diminish their claims to reconcile with railways, factories and other groups. At any rate, without discussing the future, here is another spontaneous association that is costing the Government. Let's quote more examples. As we talk about ships and boats, let's remember one of the most beautiful organizations that brought our century, one of those we can with the right to be proud of - the English Lifeboat Association. It is known that every year on the shores of England sunk more than a thousand ships. At sea, a good ship is rarely afraid of a storm. It is off the coast fraught with danger - stormy seas that destroy her stem-post, squalls that demolish her mast and sail, currents that make her unmanageable, reefs and sandy shores on which she runs aground. Even in the old days, when it was custom among shore dwellers to light fires to attract vessels to reefs as well as seize their cargo, they to save the crew. Seeing the ship in distress, they launched their nutshells and went to the rescue of the sailors caught in the accident, only too often finding the watercress tomb themselves. Each farm along the sea coast has its own legends of heroism, reflected by a woman as well as a man to rescue crews in distress. Undoubtedly, the state and the people of science have done something to reduce the number of victims. Beacons, signals, graphs, meteorological warnings have significantly reduced them, but there remain a thousand ships and several thousand human lives to be saved each year. To that end, several men of goodwill put their shoulders on the wheel. Being good sailors and navigators themselves, they invented a lifeboat that could weather the storm without being torn to pieces or capsules, and they are set to work to interest the public in their venture, raise the necessary funds to build boats, and to place them along the coast wherever they are in use. These people, without being Jacobins, did not appeal to the Government. They understood that in order to bringing their company to a successful issue, they must have cooperative, enthusiasm, local knowledge, and especially the self-sacrifice of sailors. They also understood that finding men who, at first signal, would launch their boat at night, in wave chaos, without suffering themselves to be restrained by darkness or switches, and fighting five, six, ten hours against the tide before reaching the vessel in distress - men willing to risk their lives to save those others, there must be a sense of solidarity, a spirit of sacrifice not to be bought with a gallon. So it was a completely spontaneous movement, cherished with consent and individual initiative. Hundreds of local groups emerged along the shores. The initiators had common sense not to pose as masters. They were looking for a quiver in fishing hamlets and when Lord set £1,000 to a village on the coast to erect a lifeboat station and his offer was accepted, he left the choice of plot to local fishermen and sailors. Models of new boats were not submitted to the Admiralty. We read in the EBA report: As it is important that lifeboats have full confidence in the vessel they are human, the Committee will make a point of building and equipping the boats in accordance with the expressed desire for lifeboats. As a result, every year brings with him new improvements. The work is fully carried out by volunteers organized in committees and local groups; by mutual assistance and consent! - Oh, anarchists! -- Plus, they're not asking for anything repayments, and in a year they can get £40,000 in spontaneous subscriptions. As for the results, here they are: In 1891, the Association owned 293 lifeboats. That same year, 601 sailors who died on the ship and 33 vessels were rescued. It has rescued 32,671 people since it was founded. In 1886, three lifeboats with all their men died at sea, hundreds of new volunteers their names, organized themselves in local groups, and campaigning led to the construction of twenty additional boats. As we continue, we note that every year the Association sends fishermen and sailors excellent barometers, at a price three times less than their sale price. It spreads meteorological knowledge, and warns parties concerned about the sudden changes envisaged by men of science. I repeat that these hundreds of committees and local groups are not organized hierarchically, and consist exclusively of volunteers, rescuers and people interested in the work. The Central Committee, which is more of a center of correspondence, does not interfere with any. It is true that when a vote on the issue of education or local taxation takes place in the county, these committees do not participate in discussions, modesty, which, unfortunately, members of elected bodies do not mimic. But, on the other hand, these daredevils do not allow those who have never faced a storm to legitimize for them about saving lives. At the first distress signal, they rush forward, concert, and go ahead. There are no galleons, but a lot of goodwill. Take another society of the same kind as the Red Cross. The name matters little; let's look at it. Imagine someone saying twenty-five years ago: A state capable, like twenty thousand men a day, and wounding fifty thousand more, is unable to help its victims; as long as war exists a private initiative must intervene and people of goodwill should organize internationally for this humane work! What bullying would not meet a man who would dare to speak this way! To begin with, he would be called utopian, and if it hadn't fallen silent on him, he would have been told: Volunteers would be found wanting exactly where they are most needed, your hospitals would be centralized in a safe place, while what is irreplaceable would want in ambulances. National rivalry will lead to poor soldiers dying without help. The scattershots equaled only the number of speakers. Who haven't heard of us so people can hold on to this strain? Now we know what happened. Red Cross societies organized themselves freely, everywhere, in all countries, in thousands of localities; and when the war of 1870-1 began, volunteers dedicate work. Men and women offered their services. Thousands of hospitals and ambulances have been organized; began to carry ambulances, provisions, linen and medicines for the wounded. English committees sent whole convoys of food, clothing, tools, seeding, kebab animals, even steamships with their attendants to assist in the processing of bars of departments devastated by war! Just consult La Croix Rouge, by Gustave Moignier, and you'll be really impressed by the resinousness of the work done. As for prophets who are always willing to deny other men's courage, good derision, intelligence, and faith be the only ones capable of ruled by the world as a pivot, none of their predictions have been realized. The dedication of the Red Cross volunteers was beyond all praise. They were only too happy to hold the most dangerous positions; and while the state's hired doctors fled with their staff as the Prusses approached, Red Cross volunteers continued their work under fire, enduring the brutality of bismarcks and Napoleon's officers, lavishing their care on the wounded of all nationalities. The Dutch, Italians, Swedes, Belgians, even the Japanese and Chinese agreed remarkably well. They distributed their hospitals and their ambulances according to the needs of the drive. They wished each other especially in the hygiene of their hospitals And there are many French who still speak with deep gratitude about the tender assistance he received from a Dutch or German volunteer in red cross ambulances. But what is this authoritarian? His ideal is the doctor of the regiment, which will pay the state. What does he care about the Red Cross and its hygiene hospitals if nurses are not functionaries? That's when the organization that came up, but yesterday, and which considers its members hundreds of thousands; owns ambulances, hospital trains, develops new treatment processes for wounds and so on, and this is due to the spontaneous initiative of several dedicated men. Perhaps we will be told that the state has something to do with this organization. Yes, the states put their hands on him to capture him. Directing committees are headed by those whom fluids call blood princes. Emperors and queens generously patronizing national committees. But not before this patronage should be the success of the organization. It is up to a thousand local committees of each nation; to the activities of individuals, to the devotion of all those who are trying to help the victims of war. And that commitment would have been much greater if the state hadn't messed with it. In any case, it was not at the behest of the International Directing Committee that the British and Japanese, Swedes and Chinese, were best placed to send aid to the wounded in 1871. It was not at the behest of the international ministry that hospitals had climbed the invaded area and that ambulances had been taken to the battlefield. This was on the initiative of volunteers from each country. Once in place, they did not take each other by the hair, as predicted by the Jacobinkans; all of them are determined to work without the distinction of nationality. We may regret that such great efforts should be made to serve such a bad cause, and ask ourselves as the poet's child: Why inflict wounds if you are to heal them later? By seeking to destroy the power of capital and bourgeois power, we are working to end the mass killings, and we would much rather see Red Cross volunteers put forward their activities to bring (with us) the suppression of war; but we had to remember this huge organization as another produced by free agreement and free of charge assistance. If we would like to multiply examples taken from the art of extermination of men, we must never end. It is enough to quote the numerous societies to which the German army owes its strength, which not only depends on discipline, as generally believed. I mean societies whose purpose is to spread military knowledge. Delegates from 2,452 federal societies attended one of the last congresses of the Military Alliance (Kriegerbund), which included 151,712 members. But there are, in addition to very numerous shootings, war games, strategic games, topographical research societies are seminars in which technical knowledge of the German army is developed, not in regimental schools. It is a formidable network of all sorts of societies, including military and civilians, geographers and gymnasts, athletes and technologists who rise spontaneously, organize, federally discuss and explore the country. It is these voluntary and free associations that make up the true backbone of the German army. Their goal is an example. It's the maintenance of the empire. But what concerns us is that despite the fact that the military organization is the Great Mission of the state, success in this area is more certain, the more left to the free consent of the groups and to the free initiative of individuals. Even in matters relating to war, free agreement is thus challenged; and to further prove our statement, let us mention three hundred thousand British volunteers, the British National Artillery Association and the

Society, now in the course of the organization, for the defence of the shores of England, as well as calls for a commercial fleet, the Corps of Cyclists, as well as new organisations of private cars and steam launches. The state abdicates and challenges in its holy functions individuals. Everywhere, free organization will queue on its domain. And yet, the facts we have quoted, let's catch only the notion that free agreement preserves for us in the future when there is no longer a state. Chapter 12: Objections that I allow us to now consider the basic objections put forward against communism. Most are obviously caused by a simple misunderstanding, but they raise important questions and deserve our attention. It is not for us to respond to the objections raised by authoritarian communism - we hold on to them ourselves. Civilized nations suffered too badly in the long, hard fight to emancipate the individual, repudiate their past work and tolerate a government that would feel in the most intible detail of a citizen's life, even if that government had no other purpose than the good of the community. If an authoritarian socialist society ever manages to self-satu with, it could not last; general dissatisfaction will soon cause him to disperse, or reorganize himself on the principles of freedom. It is an anarchist-communist society going to speak, a society that recognizes absolute freedom of identity that does not recognize any power and does not use coercion to drive people to work. By limiting our research to the economic side of the issue, let's see if such a society, made up of men as they are on the day, neither better nor worse nor more nor less hardworking, will have no chance of successful development. The objection is known. If the existence of everyone is guaranteed, and if the need for earning wages does not make men work, no one will work. Each person will put the burden of their work on the other if he or she is not forced to do it himself. Let's first note the incredible urgency with which this objection is raised, without taking into account the fact that the question is actually just to know, on the one hand, whether you are effectively getting the wage results you are aiming for; and, on the other hand, whether voluntary work is no longer more productive per day than work is stimulated by wages. An issue that will require deep study. But while in the exact sciences men give their opinions on issues infinitely less important and less complex after serious research, carefully collecting and analyzing the facts on this issue they will pronounce the court's decision without appeal, resting satisfied with any particular event, such as wanting the success of communist unification in America. They act as a barrister who does not see in the council for the opposite side of the case representative, or an opinion contrary to his own but simple opponent in the oratoro-annual debate; and if he's lucky to find a repred, otherwise he doesn't care to justify his business. Therefore, studying this important basis of the entire political economy, studying the most favorable conditions for giving society the largest number of useful products with the least waste of human energy, will not move forward. They are limited to repeating common statements, otherwise they pretend not to cast themselves for our assertions. What is most striking about this relevance is that even in the capitalist political economy you will already find a few writers forced by facts to doubt the axiom put forward by the founders of their science that the threat of hunger is the best stimulant for a person's productive work. They are beginning to perceive that a certain collective element is being introduced in production that has been too neglected so far, and which may be more important than personal gain. Lower quality wages, a terrible waste of human energy in modern agricultural and industrial labor, an ever-increasing number of pleasure seekers who per day load their burden on the shoulders of others, the lack of some animation in manufacturing that is becoming increasingly apparent; all this begins to be encouraged by the economists of the classical school. Some of them ask themselves if they are not on the wrong path: if an imaginary evil being, to be tempted solely by the lure of alfalfa or wages really exists. This heresy penetrates even universities; it is in the books of the Orthodox economy. This does not prevent many socialist reformers from remaining partisans of individual remuneration, and to protect the old citadel from wages, despite being delivered over a stone's stone to attackers by its former defenders. They fear that without coercion, the masses will not work. But in our lifetime have we not heard the same fears expressed twice? Anti-abolitionists in America to blacks emancipation, and Russian no idea before the liberation of serfs? Without a whip, blacks won't work, the anti-abolitionist said. Free from the supervision of their master serfs will leave the fields uncultured, said Russian serfs-owners. It was the retention of French nobles in 1789, the retention of the Middle Ages, a refrain as old as the world, and we will hear it every time there is a question of sweeping injustice. And every time the actual facts give him a lie. A freed peasant in 1792 ploughed with wild energy unknown to his ancestors, an emancipated negro works more than his parents, and a Russian peasant, honoring his honeymoon with his emancipation, celebrating Fridays as well as Sundays, took up the job with the same greed as his release was more complete. Where the soil of it is, it works desperately; that's the exact word for it. Anti-abolitionist retention may have value for slaveholders; as for the slaves themselves, they know what it's worth because they know his motive. Moreover, who, in addition to economists, taught us that if the work of wages-migrant but indifferent, then intensive and productive work is received only from a person who sees that his wealth is increased in proportion to his efforts? All hymns sung in honor of private property can be reduced to this axiom. For it is noteworthy that when economists wanting to celebrate the blessings of property show us how unproductive, wetland or standing ground is dressed in rich harvests when cultivated by a peasant owner, they in no way prove their thesis in favor of private property. Recognizing that the only guarantee not to be robbed of the fruits of your work is to own the tools of work — that the truth is that economists only prove that a person really produces the most when he works at liberty, when he has some choices in his professions, when he does not have a sitter to discourage him, and finally, when he sees his work, profiting him and others who work like him - but nothing That's all we can take away from their reasoning, and we support the same thing ourselves. As for the form of ownership of labor tools, they only indirectly mention it in their demonstration, as a guarantee to the cultivator, that it should not be robbed of either the profits of its yield or its improvements. In support of his dissertation in favor of private property against all other forms of ownership, shouldn't economists demonstrate that under the form of communal ownership, land never produces such rich yields as when ownership is private? But it is not; on the contrary. Take, for example, a commune in the canton of Veath, in winter, when all the men of the village go to fall through the forest in the forest that belongs to them all. It was during these festivals that the greatest arduous for work and the most considerable manifestation of human energy worked. Neither hired workforce nor private owner's efforts can bear comparison with him. Or take a Russian village when all its inhabitants mow a field owned by a commune or agricultural it. There you will see what a person can produce when working in common for communal production. Comrades tier with each other in cutting the widest wave; women are best at their way, so as not to distance themselves from mowers. It's a labour festival in which a hundred people do work in a few hours that wouldn't have been over in a few days had they worked separately. What a sad contrast compared to the work of an isolated owner! In fact, we can quote dozens of examples among America's pioneers, in Swiss, German, Russian and in some French villages; or work done in Russia by gangs (arteres) of masons, carpenters, shuttles, fishermen, etc., who take on tasks and share products or rewards with each other, without it passing through the intermediary intermediaries. One could mention the large communal hunts for member tribes, and the infinite number of successful collective enterprises. And in each case, we could show an undeniable advantage of communal work compared to wage-migrant or isolated private owner. Well-being, that is, meeting physical, artistic and moral needs, has always been the most powerful stimulant to work with. And when a hirer produces bare first-danger items with difficulty, a free worker who sees ease and luxury grows for him and for others in proportion to his efforts, expends infinitely much more energy and intelligence, and gets top-notch products in much greater abundance. One feels glued to adversity, the other hopes for ease and luxury in the future. Therein lies all the mystery. Thus, a society aimed at the welfare of all, and at the opportunity of all to enjoy life in all its manifestations, will supply voluntary work that will be infinitely higher and yield far more than the work produced so far under the course of slavery, serfdom or wages. II Nowadays, who can download to others their share of work, indispensable for existence, does this, and admits that this will always be the case. Now the work is indispensable for existence essentially manual. We can be artists or scientists; but none of us can do without things received by management — bread, clothes, roads, ships, light, heat, etc. And, moreover, however high-woeful or, however subtly metaphysical our pleasures are, they all depend on manual labor. And it is this work — the foundations of life — that everyone tries to avoid. We understand perfectly well that this should be the case in our time. Because, do manual work now, means in reality to shut up for ten to twelve hours a day in an unhealthy workshop, and stay glued to the same task for twenty or thirty years, or maybe for the whole of your life. It means being doomed to a fervent wage, to the uncertainty of the moov, to want to work, often to destitution, more often than not to death in hospital, after working forty years to feed, put on, comfort and teach others than himself and his children. This means bearing the stamp of inferiority all his life, because, whatever policy tells us, a manual worker is always considered inferior to a brain worker, and someone who has tormented ten hours in a workshop has no time but even less money to give himself the high benefits of science and art, nor even prepare to appreciate them; it must be covered with crumbs from the table of privileged persons. We understand that under these conditions manual labor is considered a curse of fate. We understand that all men have only one dream — coming out of this, or allowing their children to come out of this lower state; create an independent position for yourself, which means that? — Also live for the work of other men! As long as there will be a class of manual workers and a class of brainworkers, black hands and white hands, it will be this way. What interest, in fact, can this oppressive work have for a worker when he knows that the fate that awaits him from cradle to grave will live in mediocrity, poverty and morde insecurity? So when we see a huge majority of men take on their damning task every morning, we marvel at their persistence, on their zeal for work, by a habit that allows them, like machines to blindly obey this impetus, to lead this life of misery without hope of a smoority; without anticipating ever so hazy that someday they, or at least their children, will be part of a humanity rich in all the treasures of a generous nature, in all the pleasures of knowledge, scientific and artistic creation, reserved for a day for several privileged minions. It is to put an end to this division between manual and brainwork that we want to abolish the wages that we want a social revolution. Then the curse of fate will no longer appear in the work; it will become what it should be — the free exercise of all human faculties. Moreover, it is time to submit to a serious analysis of this legend of the top job, which was supposed to be obtained under the wages. It's enough to visit not the modeling plant and workshop that we find now and again, but the usual conceive huge waste of human energy, which characterizes modern industry. For one factory more or less rationally organized, there are a hundred or more that spend a person's labor, without more substantial motives than perhaps bringing in a few pounds more per employer day. Here you see youngsters between twenty and twenty-five sitting all day on a bench, their chests sunk, feverishly flailing their heads and bodies to tie, at the speed of the conjunciars, two ends of worthless patches of cotton, throwback lace looms. What kind of thanksgiving will these trembling and shaky bodies wish for their country? But they take up so little space in the factory, and each one brings me in sixty a day, the employer will say. In a huge London factory, you could see girls bald in seventeen from carrying trays of matches on their heads from one room to another when the simplest car could wheel wies matches to their desks? But... it costs so little, the work of women who do not have a special trade! What is the use of the machine? When they can't do more, they will be easily replaced... there are so many on the street. On the steps of the mansion on an icy night, you'll find a bare-footed baby asleep with her bundle of papers on her arms... the cost of wages is so little that it may well be employed, every night, to sell papers worth tenepenni, of which the poor boy will receive a penny, or a penny of half a penny. Finally, you can see a strong man trampling, hanging hands; he had been out of work for months. Meanwhile, his daughter pales into overheated pairs of clothes workshops, and the son fills the black pots by hand, or waits for hours on the street corner until a passerby lets him earn a penny. And so it is everywhere, from San Francisco to Moscow, and from Naples to Stockholm. The waste of human energy is a distinctive and prevailing feature of the industry, not to mention trade where it reaches even more colossal proportions. What a sad satire that the name, the political economy given to science wasting energy under the wagemod system! That's not all. If you talk to the director of a well-organized factory, he will naively explain to you that nowadays it is difficult to find a skillful, energetic and energetic worker who works out of his will. If such a man presents himself among the twenty or thirty who call every Monday asking for a job, he will definitely be received, even if we reduce the number of our hands. We recognize him at first glance and he is always accepting, even if we have to get rid of an older and less active worker the next day. And whoever has just received the message of quitting, and all who receive it in the gloom, go to reinforce this vast reserve army of capital - the workforce from work - who are only called upon to loom or bench when there is pressure to work, or to confront strikers. And those other, average employees who abandonment of better class factories? They join an equally formidable army of elderly and indifferent workers, which is constantly circulating between second-class factories — those that barely cover their costs and make their way into the world with cunning and traps laid for the buyer, and especially for the consumer in distant countries. And if you talk to the workers themselves, you will soon learn that the rule in such factories is — never fully do what you are capable of. Shy payment is a shy job! is the advice a person receives from his comrades at the entrance to such a factory. Because employees know that if in a moment of generosity they will give way to the animosity of the employer and agree to intensify the work in order to perform the urgent order, then this nervous work will be demanding in the future usually on the scale of wages. Therefore, in all such factories they prefer never to produce as much as they can. In some industries, manufacturing is limited in a way that maintains high prices and sometimes a Go-canny password, which means: Bad job for bad pay! Wages are serfs; he can't, he shouldn't, produce everything he could produce. And it is time to disbelieve the legend that embodies weidm as the best incentive for productive work. If the industry nowadays brings a hundred times more than it did during the time of our grandfathers, it is due to the sudden awakening of physicochemical sciences by the end of the last century; not to the capitalist organization wagemod, but despite this organization. III Those who have seriously studied the issue do not deny any of the benefits of communism, provided it is well understood that communism will be completely free, i.e. anarchist. They acknowledge that a job paid for by money, even disguised as labor notes, to workers' unions run by the state will maintain wage characteristics and preserve their shortcomings. They agree that the whole system will soon suffer from this, even if society took possession of the tools of production. And they recognize that, thanks to the integral education provided to all children, the time-consuming habits of civilized societies, with agency and change in their professions and monuments of work done equal to the well-being of all, communist society would not want producers who would soon make soil fertility triple and tenfold - and give new impetus to industry. Our opponents agree to this. But the danger, they say, will come from that minority of lochs that won't work, and we won't have regular habits despite the excellent conditions that make the job enjoyable. By the day, the prospect of hunger forces the most refractory to move along with others. Anyone who does not arrive in time is relieved. But black-beaved will be enough to contaminate the entire flock, and two or three sluggish or refractory lead others a beckon and bring the spirit of disarray and rebellion to a workshop that makes it impossible to work; so in the end we'll have to go back to a system of coercion that forces the ringleaders back into the ranks. And isn't the wage system paid in proportion to the work done, the only one that allows you to force a job without hurting an employee's feelings? Because all other means would mean constant interference by the authorities, which would be repugnant to free people. I. This, to ourselves, is a denial rightly stated. It belongs to the category of arguments that try to justify the state, the law on execution of punishments, the judge, and Gaeller. Since there are people, a weak minority who will not submit to social customs - authoritarians say - we must support magistrates, tribunals and prisons, although these institutions are becoming a source of new evil of all kinds. So we can only repeat what we so often say about power in general: To avoid possible evil, you have an appeal to means that in themselves are a greater evil, and become the source of the same abuses you want to correct. For do not forget that it is the inability to live differently than the sale of your work, which created the present capitalist system, the vices of which you begin to recognize. Let's also note that this authoritarian way of reasoning is just an excuse for what is wrong in the current system. Wages have not been theted to address the shortcomings of communism; its origin, as well as public and private property, should be found elsewhere. It is born out of slavery and serfdom imposed by force, and wears only more modern garbage. Thus, the argument for wages is as valuable as those by which they seek to apologize for private property and the state. We are nevertheless going to examine the objections, and see if there is any truth in it. Let's start with, isn't it obvious that if a society founded on the principle of free work were indeed menacingly loched, it could defend itself without an authoritarian organization and lacking recourse to vapes? Take a group of volunteers, uniting for a particular enterprise. With their success at heart, they all work out of their will, saving one of the associates who is often absent from his position. Should they disband the group, elect a president to impose fines, and maybe distribute markers for the work done, as is customary at the Academy? It is evident that neither one nor the other will be done, but that one day a friend who likes his company will be told: Mate, we must work with you; but since you are often absent from your position and you do your job carelessly, we have to part ways. Go and find other comrades who put up with your indifference! This path is so natural that it is practiced every other way, in all industries, in competition with all possible fines, docking systems wages, supervisors, etc.; the worker can enter the factory at the appointed time, but if he does his job badly, if he interferes with his comrades with his lazone or other defects, and they quarrel with him on this account, there is an end; he's forced to leave the workshop. Authoritarians pretend that it is the omnipotent employer and its superintendents that maintain regularity and quality of work in factories. In fact, at a somewhat complex enterprise, where manufactured products pass through many hands before completion, it is the factory, workers as unity, see good quality work. So the best factories in british private industry have few onlookers, far fewer on average than French factories, and fewer than British state-owned factories. A certain standard of public morality is maintained in the same way. Authoritarians say this is due to village guards, judges and police officers, whereas in reality it is supported despite judges, police officers and village guards. Many laws producing crims! was said a long time ago. Not only in industrial stores do things go this way; it happens everywhere, every day, on a scale that only book worms so far have no clue. When a rail company, federated with other companies, fails to meet its obligations when its trains are late and goods lie neglected at stations, other companies threaten to cancel the contract, and that threat is usually put forward. It is generally believed, at any rate, he is taught that commerce only keeps its engagements out of fear of lawsuits. Nothing like this, nine times in ten traders who did not keep their word will not appear before the judge. Where trading is very large, as in London, the only fact is that the lender has driven the lender to sue enough for a huge majority of merchants to refuse to forever have any relationship with the person who forced one of them to go to law. Then, why should the funds used today among fellow workers at the department, traders and railway companies not be used in a society based on voluntary work? Take, for example, an association that stipulates that each participant must fulfill the following contract: We undertake to give you the use of our homes, shops, streets, vehicles, schools, museums, etc., provided that from twenty to forty-fifty years you consecrate four to five hours a day for some work deemed necessary for existence. Choose the production groups you want to join, or organize a new group, provided it commits to manufacturing responsibilities. And as for the rest of your time, combine along with those you like for recreation, art or science, according to your bent taste. Twelve or fifteen hundred hours of work a year, in a group producing food, clothing or homes, or employed in public health, transportation, etc., that's all we ask of you. For work we guarantee you all that these produce or produce. But if not one, of the thousands of groups of our federation, will receive you, whatever their motive; if you are completely incapable of producing anything useful, or if you refuse to do so, then live like an isolated person or as a disabled person. If we are rich enough to give you the responsibilities of life, we will be happy to give them to you. You are human and you have the right to live. But because you want to live in special conditions, and leave the ranks, it is more than likely that you will suffer for it in your daily relationships with other citizens. You will be viewed as the specter of a bourgeois society if some of your friends, discovering talent for you, kindly free you from all moral obligations to society by doing the work you need. Lastly, if it does not please you, go and look for other conditions where in the wider world, otherwise look for supporters and organize with them according to new principles. We prefer our own. This is something that could be done in a communal society in order to avert slugs if they became too numerous. IV We doubt very much that we need to fear this unforeseenness in a society truly based on all the freedom of the individual. In fact, despite the disability premium offered by private equity, a really lazy man, if he doesn't get sick, is comparatively rare. Among workers, they often say that the bourgeois is leaders. There are definitely enough of them, but they too are the exception. On the contrary, in each industrial enterprise you will definitely find one or more bourgeois that work very hard. It is true that most of the bourgeois profits of their privileged position reward themselves with the least unpleasant tasks, and that they work in hygienic conditions of air, food, etc., allowing them to do their thing without unnecessary fatigue. But these are exactly the conditions that we claim for all workers without exception. It should also be said that if, due to their privileged position, rich people often do completely useless or even harmful work in society, nevertheless, ministers, department heads, factory owners, traders, bankers, etc., subject themselves to a few hours a day of work, which they consider more or less tedious, all prefer their hours of leisure for this compulsory job. And if in nine cases out of ten this work is fateful, they do not consider it no less tedious to do so. But precisely because the middle class put forward great energy, even harming (knowingly or not) and defending their privileged position, they managed to defeat the landing entity, and that they continue to rule the masses. If they were non-functioning, they would have ceased long ago. exist, and would disappear like aristocrats. In a society that expects only four to five hours a day of useful, enjoyable and hygienic work, they would do their job perfectly, and they certainly wouldn't put up with the awful in which men molosses nowadays without reforming them. If Huxley had spent only five hours in a London sewer, rest assured that he would have found the means to make them as sanitary as his physiological laboratory. As for the laziness of the vast majority of workers, such nonsense is spoken only by polystymline economists and philanthropists. If you ask an intelligent manufacturer, it will tell you that if working people only put it in their heads to be lazy, all factories would have to be shut down, without a measure of gravity, no spying system would be of no use. You should have seen the terror caused in 1887 among British employers when several agitators began preaching the go-canny theory - for poor pay for poor work; Calm down, do not overwork yourself, but waste everything you can. — They demoralize the worker, want to kill the industry! shouted those who had previously interfered with the immorality of the worker and the poor quality of his work. But if the worker were who he represented, namely the ledier to whom you are constantly threatening dismissal from the workshop — what would the word demoralization declare? Therefore, when we talk about possible failing, we must understand well that this is a small minority issue in society; and before legitimizing for this minority, wouldn't it be reasonable to study its origins? Anyone who watches with a reasonable eye sees well enough that a child who has comforted the lazy at school is often someone who doesn't understand what he's poorly taught. Very often he also suffers from a thébral anoisim caused by poverty and anti-hyenic upbringing. A boy who is lazy in Greek or Latin would work perfectly, he taught in science, especially if he taught handmade environments. A girl who hears know-n-y in mathematics becomes the first mathematician of her class if she accidentally meets someone who can explain to her elements of arithmetic that she did not understand. And the worker, lazy in the workshop, cultivates his garden at dawn, staring at the rising sun, and will be at work again at night when all nature goes on his vacation. Someone said dirt matters in the wrong place. The same definition applies to nine-tenths of those who are called lazy. They are people who have gone a mand in a direction that does not respond either to their temperament or to their abilities. Reading the biography of great men, we are impressed by the number of non-working among them. They were lazy until they found the right way and then laborious to excess. Darwin, Stevenson and many others belonged to this category of non-working. Very often, leder is only a man who has a hard time making a lifetime eighteenth of a pin, or a stote part of the clock, while he feels he has the good energy he would like to spend elsewhere. Often he too is a rebel who cannot submit to securing a lifetime on a work bench to zak up a thousand pleasures for his emulation, knowing himself much less stupid of the two, and knowing his only fault to be that born in a hoe rather than come into the world in lockdown. Finally, many good non-working people do not know the trade by which they are forced to make a living. Seeing an imperfect thing done with their own hands, in vain seeking to do better, and perceiving that they will never succeed because of already acquired work habits, they begin to hate their trade, and, without knowing any other, hate work in general. Thousands of workers and artists who have failed suffer from this cause. On the other hand, someone who has learned to play the piano well, cope well with plans, teeth, brush or file to make it feel like what he's doing beautifully will never seem like a piano, no tooth, no file. He will find pleasure in his work, which does not tire him until he overdrives. Under one name, a failing, a number of results were grouped due to different reasons for which each of them could be a source of good, instead of being a source of evil for society. Like all issues concerning criminality and related to human faculties, the facts were gathered with nothing to do with each other. They say laziness or crime without giving yourself the hassle of analyzing their case. They sway to punish them without asking if the punishment itself does not contain a premium for laziness or crime. [8] That is why a free society, seeing the number of non-working increases in its midst, will undoubtedly think about finding a cause of laziness to suppress it before imposing a penalty. When it comes to the case, as we mentioned, of a simple infn barb, before stuffing the child's brain with science, nourish his system to produce blood, strengthen it and, so that he does not waste his time, take him to the country or the sea; there teach it outdoors, not in books - geometry, measuring the distance to the spire, or the height of the tree; natural sciences, during the collection of flowers and fishing in the sea; physical science, when building a boat he will go fishing in an inch But for mercys sake don't fill his brain with sentences and dead tongues. Don't make a migrant out of it!... Such a child has neither order nor regular habits. Let first the children instill order among themselves, and later the laboratory, the workshop, the work done in a confined space, with many tools about, will teach them the method. But do not make them disorderly creatures with your school, the only order of which is the symmetry of its benches, and which — the real image of chaos in his teachings — will never inspire anyone with a love of harmony, consistency, method in work. Don't you see that by your teaching methods, framed by the Ministry for eight million scientists representing eight million different possibilities, you only impose a system good for mediocre, conceived on average for mediocrity? Your school becomes a university of laziness as your prison is a university of crime. Make school free, cancel your university grades, contact teaching volunteers; begin this way, instead of passing laws against laziness that serve only to increase it. Give a working man who is forced to make a minute-long piece of some object that is strangled on his small tapping machine, which he ends in hatred, give him a chance to process the soil, chop down trees in the woods, swim the seas in the teeth of a storm, adversity in space on the engine, but don't do an odi of it, forcing him to attend on a small car all his life... plough the screw head, or drill the head of the needle. Suppress the cause of ineffectuality and you can take it for granted that few people will really hate work, especially voluntary work, and that there will be no need to produce code laws on your account. Chapter 13: Collectivist Wage System I It is our view that collectivists are making a twofold mistake in their plans to reconstruct society. Speaking of the abolition of capitalist rule, they intend nevertheless to preserve the two institutions that are the basis of this norm — the Representative Government and the remuneration system. As for the so-called representative government, we often talked about it. It is completely unclear to us that reasonable men - and those who do not want them in a collectivist party - can remain partisans of national or municipal parliaments after all the lessons history has given them - in France, in England, in Germany, or in the United States. While we see parliamentary rule falling apart, and on all sides the criticism of this rule is growing louder — not only its results, but also its principles — how is it that revolutionary socialists are defending a system already condemned to death? Built by the middle classes to hold their own against royalties, sanctioning, and at the same time strengthening, their whipping over workers, parliamentary rule is a pre-enduring middle-class rule. The owners of this system have never seriously argued that parliament or municipal council represent a nation or city. The smartest among them know that this is impossible. The middle class simply used the parliamentary system to raise the barrier between themselves and royalty without giving the people freedom. But gradually, when people realize their interests and multiply the diversity of their interests, the system can no longer work. Therefore, Democrats of all countries uselessly imagine (liver) palliatives. The referendum was judged and declared a lax one; proportional representation is said, as do the representation of minorities and other parliamentary utopias. In short, they seek to find something that cannot be found, and they are forced to admit that they are in the wrong direction, and trust in representative government disappears. This is with the remuneration system; for after they have declared the abolition of private property, as well as possession of common means of production, how can they maintain the remuneration system in any form? This is nonetheless what collectivists do when they recommend labor checks. It's easy to see why early English socialists got into the labour-cheque system. They were just trying to negotiate capital and Labour. They deviated from the idea of forcibly laying hands on capitalist property. It's also easy to see why Proudhon undertook the idea later. In his mutual system, he tried to make Capital less offensive despite retaining private property, which he neglected from the bottom of his heart, but which he believes must be guaranteed to individuals against the state. Nor is it surprising that certain economists, more or less bourgeois, recognize labor checks. They care little about whether workers are paid in labor notes or in a coin stamped with the effigy of the Republic or empire. They only care about saving from the destruction of individual ownership of residential buildings, land plots, factories; in any case with residential buildings and the capital, which are necessary for manufacturing. And labor memos would simply respond to the goal of standing up for this private property. As long as labor notes can be exchanged for jewels or wagons, the owner of the house willingly accepts them for rent. And as long as residential buildings, fields and factories are owned by isolated owners, men will have to pay them, in one way or another, for being allowed to work in fields or factories, or for living in homes. Owners will accept gold for workers, in paper money, or in checks exchanged for all sorts of goods. But how can we defend labor notes, this new form of wages, when we recognize that homes, fields and factories will no longer be privately owned, and that they will belong to a commune or nation? II Let's carefully consider this system of remuneration preached by French, German, English and Italian collectivists (Spanish anarchists, who still call themselves collectivists, imply collectivism of possession in common with all production tools, and the freedom of each group to share products as they see fit, in accordance with communist or any other principles). This amounts to this: Everyone works in the region, plant, school, hospital, etc. Working day records the state, which owns land, factories, roads, etc. Each working day is paid for by a labor note, which is inscribed with the following words: Eight hours of work. With this check, the worker can purchase all sorts of goods in stores owned by the state or turntneck corporations. The check is divided, so you can buy an hour's work worth of meat, ten minutes worth of matches, or half an hour of tobacco. After the collectivist revolution, instead of saying two pence is worth the soap, we'll say Minutes of soap. Most collectivists, true to the differences laid down by middle-class economists (and Marx) between skilled work and simple work, tell us, more that skilled or professional work should be paid for by a certain amount more than simple work. Thus, an hour-long work of a doctor will have to be considered as equivalent to a two to three-hour job as a hospital nurse, or to a three-hour job in order. Professional, or skilled work, will be a multiple simple job, says the collectivist Gryonlund, because such work requires more or less long-term training. Other collectivists, such as French Marxists, do not make that distinction. They are pro-government wage equality. The doctor, schoolteacher and professor will be paid (in employment checks) just as much as the headmistress. Eight hours of visiting patients in hospital will cost the same as eight hours spent on excavation work or still in mines or factories. Some make a bigger concession; they acknowledge that dissenting or unhealthy robots - such as sewerage - can be paid at a higher rate than acceptable work. One hour of sewer work would cost, they say, two hours of the professor's work. Let's add that certain collectivists recognize that corporations pay a lump sum for the work done. So the corporation would say: Here are a hundred tons of steel. A hundred working people were required to make them, and it took them ten days. Their working day, being eight-hour, took them eight thousand working hours to produce a hundred tons of stele eight hours a ton. For this, the state would pay them eight thousand labor notes for one hour each, and these eight thousand checks would be split between members of the iron works, as they themselves believed to be correct. On the other hand, a hundred miners who took twenty days to extract eight thousand tons of coal, coal would cost two hours a ton, and sixteen thousand checks for one hour each received by the Miners Guild would be split between their members according to their own appreciation. If the miners protested, and said, a ton of steel should only cost six hours of work instead of eight; if the professor wished that his day was paid twice as much as a nurse, the state would interfere and settle their differences. Such, in a few words, organizations of collectivists want to see arise from the social revolution. As you can see, their principles are: Collective property of production tools, and remuneration to everyone in accordance with the time spent on production, while taking into account the productivity of its work. As for the political system, parliamentarism would be changed by the positive instructions given to those who were elected, the referendum by voting taken by the noses or eyes of the nation. Let's own up to the fact that this system seems impossible to us. Collectivists begin by proclaiming a revolutionary principle — the abolition of private property — then they do not deny by defending the organization of production and consumption arising from private property. They preside over the revolutionary principle and ignore the consequences that this principle will inevitably bring. They forget that it is the fact that the abolition of individual property in the tools of work - land, factories, roads, capital - should launch new channels into absolutes; must completely overthrow this production system, both for its purpose and by its means; should change the daily relationship between individuals as soon as the land, machinery and all other manufacturing tools are considered joint ownership. They say: There is no private property, and immediately after seek to maintain private property in their daily manifestations. You have to be communes as far as production is concerned: fields, tools, machines, everything that has been invented so far - factories, railways, harbours, mines, etc., all yours. Not the slightest distinction will be made as to everyone's share of this collective ownership. But from the seas you'll be minutely discussing the share you're going to take on creating new machinery, in digging new mines. You will carefully weigh which part of the new products belongs to you. You will count your minutes of work and you will make sure that the minute your neighbors can't buy more than yours. And as the hour measures nothing, as in some factories a worker can see up to six looms at a time, while otherwise it only gravitates two, you'll weigh the muscle strength, brain energy, and nervous energy you're spent. You will accurately calculate years of training to estimate the amount that will contribute to future production. And this is after acting that you do not take into account its share in past production. Well, it is obvious to us that society cannot be based on two completely opposite principles, two principles that contradict each other constantly. And a nation or commune that would be such an organization would be forced to return to private ownership in the tools of production, or turn itself immediately into a communist society. III We said that some writers-collectivists want there to be a distinction between skilled or professional work and simple work. They pretend that the hour-long work of an engineer, architect or doctor should be seen as a two to three-hour work by a blacksmith, mason or hospital nurse. And the same distinction must be made between all sorts of trades affecting more or less lengthy training and simple working people. Well, to establish this distinction would be to preserve all the inequalities of modern society. This would mean fixing the demarcation line, from the start, between workers and those pretending to manage them. This would mean dividing society into two very clear classes — the aristocracy of knowledge above lower orders — one doomed to serve another; someone who works with his hands to feed and dress those who, worthily worthy of their leisure time, learn how to manage their fusters. They would mean reviving one of the clear features of modern society and giving it the sanction of the Social Revolution. This would mean creating as a principle of abuse already condemned in our crumbling ancient society. We know the answer we'll get. They will quote bourgeois economists, and Marx too, to prove that the scale of wages has its district d'etre, since the engineer's workforce will cost society more than the labor force has to nawa. In fact, economists have not tried to prove to us that if an engineer is paid twenty times more than navy, it is because it is necessary to make the engineer more than necessary to make a science? And didn't Marx argue that the same distinction is equally logical between the two branches of manual labor? He could not conclude otherwise, adopting on his own account the theory of the cost of Ricardo, and maintained that goods are exchanged in proportion to the amount of work socially necessary for their production. But we know what to think about it. We know that if engineers, scientists or doctors are paid ten or a hundred times more than a worker, and that weaver earns three times as much as an agricultural worker, and ten times more than a girl at a match factory, it is not because of their production cost, but because of the monopoly of education, or the monopoly of the industry. Engineers, scientists and doctors simply exploit their capital — their diplomas — because middle-class employers operate the factory, or how nobles used their ranks of nobility to exploit. As for the employer who pays the engineer twenty times more than the worker, it just has to do with personal interest; if an engineer can save £4,000 a year on the production cost, the employer pays him £800 And if the employer has a foreman who saves £400 at work by deftly sweating work, he is happy to give him £80 or £120 a year. He details with an extra £40 when he expects to get £400 behind him; and this is the essence of the capitalist system. The same differences are obtained among divers manual bidding. Let them therefore not talk to us about the cost of produce that raises the cost of a skilled workforce, and tell us that a student who has had fun since the age of eleven has had fun at university is entitled to a wage ten times greater than the miner's son, who has turned pale in the mine since the age of eleven; or that weaver is entitled to wages three or four times more than that of an agricultural worker. The cost of teaching the weaver of his work is not four times the cost of teaching the peasant his. Weaver simply benefits from the benefits his industry is reaping in Europe, compared to countries that do not yet have industries No one has ever calculated the cost of the cost and if the loafer costs society much more than an employee, it remains to be seen whether reliable day-worker doesn't cost society more than a skilled artisan when we took into account infant mortality among the poor, the ravages of anaemi and premature deaths. Could they, for example, make us believe that 1s.3d. paid a Paris working vumen, 3d. paid aulyenge peasant girl who grows blind to lace making, or 1s. 8d. paid peasant represent their cost of production. We are well aware that people work for less, but we also know that they do so solely because thanks to our wonderful organization they will die of hunger, have they not accepted these abverging wages. For us, the scale of remuneration is a complex result of taxes, government transfer, capitalist monopoly. In short, state and capital. So we say that all wage theories were invented after the event to justify the injustice currently existing and that we should not take them into account. Nor will they tell us that the collectivist pay scale will be an improvement. It would be better, they say, to see certain artisans get wages two to three times higher than ordinary workers than seeing a minister getting in a day what a worker can't earn in a year. It would be a big step towards equality. For us, the move would be backward progress. To make the difference between simple and professional work in a new society will lead to a revolution of sanctioning and recognizing as a principle a cruel fact that we submit nowadays, but that we nonetheless find unfair. This would mean imitating those gentlemen of the French Assembly, who proclaimed august 4,

1789 the abolition of feudal rights, but who on August 8 sanctioned the same rights, imposing proper compensation on the peasants nobles, placing these proper funds under the protection of the revolution. This would mean imitation of the Russian government, which proclaimed, at the time of emancipation of serfs, that the land should now belong to the nod, whereas previously the land was considered belonging to serfs. Or, take a better known example, when the Commune in 1871 decided to pay members of the Commune Council 12s. 6d. per day, while the feds on the ramparts received only 1s.3d., this decision was recognized as an act of higher democratic equality. In fact, the commune only ratified the former inequality between the functionary and the soldier, the government and managed. Based on the Opportunistic Chamber of Deputies, such a decision would be remarkable, but the Commune is doomed to its revolutionary principles, because it could not bring them into life. Under our existing social system, when a minister receives payments of £4,000 a year, while an employee must accommodate himself £40 or less; when the foreman is paid two to three times more than the employee, and among the workers there is every gradation, from 8s. peasant girl 3d.; we do not approve of the high salary of the minister, as well as the difference between the 8th. And we say, Down with the privileges of education, and also with those who are born! We are anarchists precisely because these privileges rebel us. They are rebelling us already in this authoritarian society. Could we endure them in a society that began with a declaration of equality? That is why some collectivists, understanding the impossibility of maintaining the scale of wages in a society inspired by the breath of the Revolution, hastened to declare wage equality. But they are met with new difficulties, and their wage equality is becoming as unrealized a utopia as the scale of other collectivists' wages. A society that has taken possession of all social wealth, boldly declaring the right of all to this wealth — whatever share they take on its production, will be forced to abandon any system of remuneration, whether in currency or labor notes. IV Collectivists say, Everyone in their works; or, in other terms, according to its share of services provided to society. They consider it appropriate to implement this principle as soon as the Social Revolution builds all the tools of production by joint ownership. But we believe that if the social revolution had the misfortune to proclaim such a principle, it would mean its necessary failure; this would mean leaving the social problem that past centuries burdened us, unresolved. In fact, in a society like ours in which, the more a person works, the less he is rewarded, this principle, at any other place, may seem like a pursuit of justice. But it is really only perpetuation of past injustice. It was through this principle that wages began to end in brilliant inequalities and all the abominations of modern society; because, from the moment when the work performed was evaluated in currency or in any other form of wages; on the day when it was agreed that a person would receive only the wages he could provide for himself, the whole history of the state capitalist society was as good as written; sprouts in this principle. Will we return to our starting point and go through the same evolution again? Our theorists wish this, but fortunately it is impossible. The revolution will be communist; if not, it will be drowned in blood, and should be started again. Services provided to society, whether working in a factory or in the field, or mental services, cannot be valued in money. There can be no exact measure of value (from what has been incorrectly named stock value) nor the cost of use in relation to production. If two people work for the community five hours a day, year after year, in different jobs that are equally acceptable to them, we can say that in general their work is equivalent. But we can't separate their work, and say that the result of any particular day, hour or minute of a friend's work is worth it as a result of a minute or an hour of another. We can rudely say that a person who for his lifetime deprived himself of leisure for ten hours a day, gave society much more than someone who only deprived himself of leisure for five hours a day, or who did not deprive himself at all. But we can't take what he did for two hours, and say that yields cost twice as much as another person's yield, working just one hour, and reward him proportionally. It would neglect everything that is complex in industry, in agriculture, throughout the life of the present society; it would ignore how much all individual work is the result of the past and present work of society as a whole. It would mean believing ourselves to live in the Stone Age, whereas we live in an age of steel. If you enter a coal mine, you will see the person responsible for the huge car lifting and lowering the cage. In his hand, he holds a lever that stops and changes the course of the machine; he lowers it, and the cage turns back into the flicker of the eye; He lifts it, he lowers it again with a bizarre swiftness. All the attention he follows with his eyes fixed to the wall with an indicator that shows him On a small scale, at which point the shaft of the cage is at every second of its progress; once the indicator has reached a certain level, it suddenly stops the course of the cage, not the yard above nor below the desired location. And not before collieries unloaded their coal wagons, but instead pushed empty than it flips the lever and sends the cage back into space again. For eight to 10 consecutive hours, he should pay closest attention. If his brain relaxes for a moment, the cage will inevitably hit gears, break wheels, fix a rope, crush men and interfere with work in the mine. If it spends three seconds on every touch of leverage, in our modern improved mines mining will be reduced from twenty to fifty tonnes a day. Is this the one who has the most benefit in the mine? Or perhaps the boy who signals to him from below to raise the cage? This is a miner at the bottom of a shaft who risks his life every moment, and who will someday be killed by dampness? Or is it an engineer who would lose a layer of coal, and force miners to dig on the rocks with a simple mistake in their calculations? Lastly, it is the mine owner who put all his capital in the mine, and who, perhaps contrary to expert advice, argued that excellent coal would be found there? All miners engaged in this mine contribute to coal mining in proportion to their strength, their energy, their knowledge, intelligence and their skill. And we can say that everyone has the right to live, to meet their needs and even their whims when the responsibilities of life have been secured for all. But how can we work out their work? And, moreover, is there coal to which they mined their jobs? Not so the work of the people who built the railway leading to the mine, and the roads that radiate from all its stations? Or is it also the work of those who processed and sowed fields, mined iron, cut wood in forests, built machines that burned coal and so on? No distinction can be drawn between each person's work. Measuring the work on its results leads us to the absurd: separating and measuring them by hours spent on work also leads us to the absurd. One thing remains: to put the needs above the works, and first of all to recognize the right to live, and later on, to the comfort of life, for all those who take their share in production. But take any other branch of human activity — take the manifestations of life as a whole. Which of us can claim a higher remuneration for our work? Is it the doctor who learned the disease, or the nurse who brought recovery for her hygienic care? This is the inventor of the first steamer, or a boy who once tired of pulling a rope, which had previously opened the valve so that the pair entered under the piston, tied the rope to the lever of the machine, unaware that he had invented the necessary mechanical part of all modern equipment — an automatic valve. Is it the inventor of the locomotive, or the work of a Newcastle man who proposed replacing stones previously laid under the rails with wooden slaps, as stones, in order to want elasticity, caused the trains to collapse? Is it an engineer on the locomotive? A signalman who can stop trains? A switch that takes a train from one line to another? — To whom do we owe transatlantic cable? Is it an engineer who stubbornly claimed that cable would transmit messages when found out by electricians declared it impossible? Is it Maury, a scientist who advised that thick cables should be deposited for others as thin as monkeys? Or to those volunteers, come from no one knows where, who spent their days and nights on deck every minute examining every yard of cable, and took off the nails that shareholders of steamship companies bluntly forced to drive into non-conducting cable wrappers to make it undeserved. And in the wider sphere, the true sphere of life, with its joys, its suffering and its accidents, can't each of us remember someone who has done him such a great service that we should be outraged if its equivalent in the coin were mentioned? Perhaps the service was only a word, nothing more than a word spoken at the right time, otherwise it could have been months and years of dedication, and will we commodify these countless services in labour notes? Everyone's works! But human society would not have existed for more than two generations in a row if everyone had not given away infinitely more than the one for which he was paid a coin, in checks or in civic awards. The race would soon be extinct if mothers hadn't sacrificed their lives to take care of if people did not give all the time, without requiring the equivalent, if men did not give only those from whom they do not expect reward. If middle-class society declines, if we hit a blind alley from which we can't get out without attacking past institutions with a torch and a hitchet, then precisely because we've miscalculated too much. This is because we have allowed ourselves to influence the provision just to receive. This is because we are focused on turning society into a commercial company based on debit and credit. Collectivists know that. They vaguely stand that society could not exist if it carried out the principle of Everyone in their works. They have a concept that necessarily — we do not talk about whims — the needs of the individual, do not always correspond to his works. Thus, De Paepé tells us: Principle - an outstanding individualist principle - will, however, be tempered by social intervention, for raising children and young people (including detention and living), and a social organization to assist the infirm and sick, for retreats for older workers, etc. they understand that a man of forty years, a father of three children, has other needs than a young man of twenty years. They know that a woman who sucks her infant and spends sleepless nights at her bedside can't do as much work as a man who has slept peacefully. They seem to take in the fact that men and women worn out, perhaps dirt of overwork for society, may be incapable of doing as much work as those who have spent their time leisurely and pocketing their labor notes in the privileged careers of public functionaries. They seek to temper their principle. They say: Society will not be able to support and raise its children; help both aged and infirm. Without a doubt, the needs will be a measure of the cost that society will burden itself, to temper the principle of deed. Charity, charity, always a Christian charity organized by the state this time. They believe in improving shelters for dedicating persons acting on insurance of old age and patients — to temper their principle. But they can not yet reject the idea of wounding first and healing afterwards! Thus, after denying communism, laughing at their ease with the formula — Everyone according to his needs these great economists discover that they have forgotten something, the needs of the producers they now recognize. It is only for the state to evaluate them so that the state checks whether the needs are disproportionate to the work. The state will do charity. From there to English poor law and workhouse is just a step. There is only a degree, because even this stepmother of society, against whom we are in resortion, has also been forced to temper its individual principles; she, too, had to make concessions in the communist direction and under the same form of mercy. She, too, distributes half-night dinners to prevent pillion of her stores; Builds — often very bad, although sometimes wonderful — to prevent the ravages of contagion diseases. She also after she paid hours of labor, sheltering the children of those she destroyed. It takes into account their needs and overcomes charity. Poverty, we said elsewhere, was a major cause of wealth. It was poverty created by the first capitalist; because before accumulating the excess value we hear so much about, men had to be disadvantaged enough to give consent to sell their labor so as not to die of hunger. It was poverty that made capitalists. And if the number of the poor grew rapidly in the Middle Ages, it was due to the intrusions and wars that followed the founding of states, and the increase in wealth as a result of exploitation of the East, which severed the ties under which agricultural and urban communities once united, and taught them to germinate the principle of remuneration, so expensive for operators - instead of the solidarity they had previously practiced. And it is this principle that spring from the revolution that people dare call the name of the Social Revolution, a name so clear to the starving, oppressed and astringent? This can never be the case. During the day when the old establishments will fall under the proletarian axe, voices will scream: Bread, shelter, lightness for all! And these voices will heed; the people shall say: Let us begin with the fact that we will quench our quenching for life, happiness, freedom, that we may never quench. And as we taste this joy, we will work to demolish the last traces of middle-class rule, its morality drawn from ledgers, its philosophy of debit and credit, its mine and your institutions. In the demolished, we will build.' Gordichon said; and we will build in the name of communism and anarchy.1 Chapter 14: Consumption and manufacturing I'm looking at society and its political organization from a different perspective than authoritarian schools - because we start with a free man to achieve a free society, instead of starting a state reduced to personality - we follow the same method in economic matters. We study the needs of individuals, and the means by which they meet them, before discussing production, exchange, taxation, government, etc. Let's start with the fact that the difference may seem shallow, but in fact it upsets the official political economy. If you open the works of any economist you find that it starts with MANUFACTURING, an analysis of the means used nowadays to create wealth; division of labor, production, machinery, accumulation of capital. From Adam Smith to Marx, everyone was pushing along those lines. Only in the last parts of their books do they relate to consumption, i.e. the means necessary to meet the needs of individuals; and, moreover, they are showered with an explanation of how wealth is divided among those who wither with each other for their possession. You may have it's logical. Before meeting the needs, you need to create what to meet them. But before you produce anything, you don't have to feel the need for it! Is it not necessary to first drive a person to hunt, grow livestock, cultivate land, make implements, and later invent equipment? Or is it not exploring the needs that should regulate production? Therefore, it would be quite logical to start by considering the needs and then discuss the means of production to meet these needs. That's exactly what we mean to do. But once we look at it from that perspective, the political economy completely changes its aspect. It ceases to be a simple descriptive of facts, and becomes science. We can define it as: Studying the needs of mankind, and means of satisfying them with the least possible waste of human energy. Its real name should be, the physiology of society. It is a parallel science about the physiology of plants and animals, which is also a study of the needs of plants and animals, and the most beneficial ways to meet them. In a series of social sciences, the economics of human societies ranks as a candidate for biological sciences by the physiology of organic bodies. We say that here are people united in society. Everyone feels the need to live in healthy homes. Wild but they are no longer satisfied; they require more or less comfortable continuous shelter. The question is, is, does a person have the opportunity to produce given, can everyone have their own home? and what prevents him from having it? And we are soon convinced that every family in Europe may well have a comfortable home, such as built in England, in Belgium, or in Pullman City, or an equivalent set of rooms. A certain number of days of work would be enough to build a fairly small air house, well equipped and lit by gas. But nine-tenths of Europeans have never owned a healthy home, because at all times ordinary people have had to work day after day to meet the needs of their rulers, and have never had the necessary leisure or money to build, or build, their dream home. And they cannot have houses, and will not pigs as long as the present conditions remain unchanged. As you can see, we come out contrary to economists who perpetuate the so-called laws of production, and counting on the number of houses built each year, we demonstrate statistics that new built houses will not be enough to meet all the requirements, nine-tenths of Europeans must live in pigs. Let's move on to food. After listing the benefits accrued from the distribution of labor economists, tell us that the division of labor requires that some men work in agriculture and others in manufacturing. Farmers, producing so many, factories so much, exchange is carried out in such a way they analyze sales, profit net profit or surplus value, wages, taxes, banking and so on. after following them so far, we are none the wiser, and if we ask them: How is it that millions of people want bread, when every family can grow enough wheat to feed ten, twenty and even a hundred people annually?, they answer to us by doing the same anthem - the division of labor, wages, excess value, capital, etc. — to arrive at the same conclusion that production is not enough for all needs; a conclusion that, if true, does not answer the question: Can a person produce the bread he needs with his working hand? And if he can't, what's stopping him? Here are 350 million Europeans. They need so much bread, so much meat, wine, milk, eggs and butter every year. They need so many houses, so many clothes. That's the minimum of their needs. Can they produce all this? and if they can, will there remain sufficient leisure for art, science and entertainment? — in short, for all that is not included in the category of absolute necessities? If the answer is affirmative, what prevents them from going forward? What should they do to remove obstacles? Does it take time? Let them take it! But let's not lose sight of the purpose of production — to meet the needs. If a person's most impatient needs remain unsatisfied, what should he do to improve the productivity of his or her work? And is there no other reason? Could it be that production, having lost sight of a person's needs, has come down in completely the wrong direction, and that his organization is guilty? And as we can prove that this is the case, let's see how to reorganize production to actually meet all the needs. That seems to us the only right way to face things. The only way that would allow the political economy to become a science is the science of social physiology. Obviously, when this science is treated with manufacturing, as it is currently carried out by civilized nations, Hindoo communes, or savages, it is unlikely to exacerbate facts otherwise than economists claim them now; that is, as a simple descriptive section similar to the descriptive sections of zoology and botany. But if this chapter were written to cast light on the energy economy needed to meet human needs, the chapter would gain accuracy as well as descriptive value. It would clearly bring about the terrible waste of human energy under the present system, and would recognize, as we do, that as long as this system exists, humanity's needs will never be met. The point of view, we see, will be completely changed. Behind the loom, which weaves so many yards of fabric, behind a steel-plate punch, and behind a safe in which dividends are sucked out, you should see a person, a craftsman, more often than not excluded from the holiday he cooked for others. We must also understand that a viewpoint that is wrong, so-called value and exchange laws are only a very false explanation of events, as is the case today; and that everything will be go very differently when production is organized in such a way as to meet all the needs of society. If there is not one single principle of political economy that does not change its aspect if you look at it from our point of view. Take, for example, over-production, a word that echoes again in our ears every day. Is there a single economist, academician or candidate for academic honors who did not support the arguments, proving that economic crises are due to overproduction — that at the moment more cotton is produced, more fabric, more watches than necessary! Not accused men of raping capitalists who are stubbornly bent on producing more than can be consumed! But upon careful consideration, all these considerations are non-screwed. In fact, is the product among those in universal use that is produced in greater quantities than required? Learn one by one all the goods sent by exporting countries on a large scale, and you will see that almost all are produced in insufficient quantities for residents of the countries that export them. This is not an excess of wheat, which the Russian peasant sends to Europe. The most abundant harvests of wheat and rye in European Russia only give enough for the population. And usually a farmer deprives himself of what he actually needs when he sells his wheat or rye to pay rent and taxes. This is not the excess coal that England sends to four corners of the globe, because only three-quarters of a tonne, per head of population, annually, remain for domestic domestic consumption, and millions of Englishmen are deprived of fire in winter, or have only enough to boil a few vegetables. In fact, putting aside useless availability is in England, which exports more than any other country, but the only commodity in universal use is cotton — the production of which is large enough to possibly exceed the needs of the community. But when we look at rags that pass for wearing clothes worn by more than a third of United Kingdom residents, we are led to ask ourselves, will exported cotton, within the trifle, meet the real needs of the population? Generally, this is not a surplus that is exported, although this may have been the case initially. The fabled barefoot shoemaker is just as concerning for nations as still artisans. We export the necessary goods. And we do it because workers can't buy with their wages what they've produced and pay other than rent and interest capitalist and banker. Not only does the ever-growing need for comfort remain unsatisfied, but strict responsibilities are often wanted. Surplus production does not exist, at least not in the sense that it is given theorists of the political economy. Taking another point — all economists tell us that there is a well-proven law: Man produces more than he consumes. After he has lived on the proceeds of his vein, there remains a surplus. So cultivators produce enough to feed several families and so on. For us, this repeated sentence makes no sense. If this meant that each generation leaves something to future generations, that would be true; So, for example, a farmer planting a tree that will live, maybe for thirty, forty or a hundred years, and whose fruits will still gather the grandchildren of the farmer. Or it clears several acres of pristine soil, and we say the legacy of future generations has been increased by as much. Roads, bridges, canals, his house and his furniture have hardened so much wealth to successors for generations. But that's not what's meant. We are told that the cultivator produces more than it needs to consume. Rather, if they say that, the state has always taken away from him a large share of its products for taxes, a priest for tithing, and a landlord for rent, a whole class of men who previously consumed what they produced - saved what was postponed for unforeseen accidents, or expenses incurred for ordering, roads, etc. - but who until the day had to live very poorly - , the rest were taken from them by the state, landowner, priest and usurer. Let us also observe that if a person's needs are our starting point, we cannot help but achieve communism, an organization that allows us to meet all needs in the most thorough and economical way possible. Although if we start with our present method of production, and strive to get an excess of value, without taking into account if production meets the satisfaction of needs, we are sure to come to capitalism, or in most cases in collectivism - as being but divers forming our wage system. In fact, when we consider the needs of the individual and society, and the means to which a person has resorted in order to satisfy them during its diverse phases of development, we are convinced of the need to systematize our efforts, instead of producing haphazard as we do nowadays. It becomes apparent that the appropriation of several of all wealth not consumed, and transferred from one generation to another, is not in the general interest. It can be conscientized as the fact that due to these methods the needs of three-quarters of society are not satisfied, and that the present waste of human power is more useless and more criminal. We find, in addition to the fact that the most profitable use of all goods would be, for each of them, to leave, first, to meet the needs that are most relevant; that, in other words, the so-called value to use of the goods depends not on a simple whim, as has often been claimed, but on the satisfaction it brings to real needs. Communism is an organization that would meet the view of consumption, production and exchange, adopted as; in general — therefore, it becomes a logical consequence of comprehending things, the only one, in our opinion, that is, really scientific. A (In 2 that will satisfy the needs of all, and who will know how to organize production, will also have to make a clean sweep of several biases about industry, and first of all the theory is often preached by economists — the Department of Labor Theory - which we are going to discuss in the next chapter. Chapter 15: The Labour Division I of the Political Economy has always been circling to lay out the facts taking place in society and justifying them in the interests of the dominant class. Thus, it is in favor of dividing the workforce created by industry. Finding it profitable capitalists, he established it as a principle. Look at the village smith, said Adam Smith, the father of the modern political economy. If he is never accustomed to doing nails he will only manage to work hard in forging two to three hundred a day, and even then they will be bad. But if this same smith has never done anything but nail, it easily supplies as much as two thousand three hundred during the day. And Smith hurried to the conclusion - Share the work, specialize, go to the specialization; Let's have moles that only know how to make heads or nail points, and this way we will produce more. We will be rich.1 That Mug, sentenced to life for making nail heads, would lose all interest in his job would be entirely at the mercy of his employer with his limited craft, would be without a job four months out of twelve, and that his wages would decrease when he could easily be replaced by an apprentice, Smith didn't think about it when he exclaimed Long live the division of labor. This is a real gold mine that will enrich the nation! And everyone joined in the scream. And later, when Sysmondri or J.B. Say began to realize that the division of labor, instead of enriching the entire people, only enriches the rich, and that a worker who is doomed for life to make the eighteenth part of the pin, grows stupid and plunges into poverty — what do official economists offer? Nothing! They did not tell themselves that a lifelong grind on the same mechanical labor worker would lose his intellect and his spirit of invention, and that, conversely, different professions would lead to a significantly increase in the nation's productivity. But this is the very question now before us. However, if only economists preached a permanent and endit editory division of labour, we could allow them to preach it as much as they please. But ideas trained by science doctors filter into men's minds and twist them; and repeatedly hearing the distribution of labor, profits, interest, loans, etc., talked about as problems long solved, men, and workers too end up arguing like economists, and by hearing the same fetishes. Thus we see a number of socialists, even those who were not afraid to point out the mistakes of science, justifying the division of labor. Talk to them about organizing work while and they answer that the dispensation of labor shall persist; that if you sharpened pins before the revolution, you should go on sharpening them after. True, you don't have to work more than five hours a day, but you'll have to sharpen pins all your life, while others will make designs for machines that will allow you to sharpen hundreds of millions of pins during your lifetime, and others will again be specialists in the higher fields of literature, science and art, etc. You were born to sharpen the pins while Paster was born to invent an incoausality against the ulcer, and the revolution will leave you both for your respective employment. Well, it is this awful principle so bizarre for a society so brutal to the individual that the source is so much damage that we suggest discussing in its divers the manifestations. We are well aware of the consequences of the division of labor. It is evident that we are divided into two classes: on the one hand, producers who consume very little and are exempt from thinking because they only do physical work, and who work poorly because their brains remain inactive; and on the other hand, consumers who, producing little or hardly anything, have the privilege of thinking for others, and who think badly, because the whole world of those who worked with their hands, they do not know. Soil workers know nothing about the technique that those working in technology ignore all about agriculture. The ideal of the modern industry is a child who seeks a machine he cannot and should not understand, and a foreman who fines him if his attention marks for a moment. The ideal of industrial agriculture is to generally fight an agricultural worker and establish someone who does odd jobs to gravitate toward a steam plow or thrashing machine. The division of labor means marking and punching men for life — some to drain the ropes in factories, some to be hallways in business, others to shog huge coal baskets in a certain part of the mine; but none of them has any idea either about the machinery as a whole, nor about business or mines. And thereby they destroy the love of labor and the ability to invent that at the beginning of modern industry created the technique on which we are so proud. What they did for individuals, they also wanted to do for the nations. Mankind had to be divided into national workshops, having each of its specialty. Russia, we were taught, destined by nature to grow corn; England twist cotton; Belgium to weave fabric; while Switzerland was teaching nurses and governesses. Moreover, each individual city should establish a specialty. Lyon was weave silk, Auvergne to make lace, and Paris fantasy articles. Economists believed that specialization opened a huge field for production and consumption, and that an era of boundless wealth for humanity was at hand. But those high hopes disappeared as quickly as technical knowledge spread overseas. As long as England stood alone, like a cotton weaver, as a metalworker on a large scale; as long as only Paris made artistic bizarre articles, etc., everything went well, economists could preach the so-called division of labor without being disproved. But the new current of thought prompted all civilized nations to produce for themselves. They found it beneficial to produce what they previously received from other countries, or from their colonies, which in turn aimed to emancipate themselves from the mother country. Scientific discoveries universalized production methods and from now on it was useless to pay an exorbitant price abroad for what could easily be produced at home. Wasn't it when this industrial revolution dealt a crushing blow to the theory of division of labor that was supposed to be so sound? Chapter 16: Decentralisation of Industry I After the Napoleonic Wars, Britain all but managed to break down the major industries that broke through in France at the end of the previous century. She also became the mistress of the seas and had no rivals of importance. She took in the situation, and knew how to turn her privileges and preferences into an account. It established an industrial monopoly, and imposing on neighbors its prices for goods that it itself could produce, accumulated wealth for wealth. But as the mid-class revolution of the eighteenth century abolished serfdom and created a proletariat in France, the industry that interfered for some time in its flight took off again, and from the second half of the nineteenth century France ceased to be a tributary of England for manufactured goods. On the day it also grew into a nation with export trade. It sells for far more than sixty million pounds on products, and two-thirds of these goods are fabrics. The number of French working for export or living their foreign trade is estimated at three million. Therefore, France is no longer a tributary of England. In turn, it seeks to monopolize certain industries, such as silks and ready-made clothing, and reaps huge profits from it; but it is at the point of losing this monopoly forever, as England is on the point of losing the monopoly of cotton goods. Traveling to the east, the industry reached Germany. Fifty years ago, Germany was a tributary of England and France for most manufactured goods in higher industries. That's not the case an other day. For the past forty-five years, and even more so after the Franco-German war, Germany has completely reorganized its industry. New factories are equipped with the best equipment; Recent creations of industrial art in cotton goods from Manchester, or in silk from Lyon, etc., are now being sold in recent German factories. It took two or three generations of workers to build modern equipment, in Lyon and Manchester; but Germany accepted it in its perfect state. Technical schools adapted to the needs of industry, supply factories to the army practical engineers who can work with the arm and brain. German industry begins at a point that has only been reached by Manchester and Lyon after fifty years of matzing in the dark, with workloads and experiments. It follows that as Germany produces as well as at home, it reduces its imports from France and England from year to year. It has not only become their rival in manufactured goods in Asia and Africa, but also in London and Paris. Short-sighted people may shout against the Frankfurt Treaty, they can explain German competition by small differences in rail fares; they can linger on the petty side of questions and neglect great historical facts. But no one is equally sure that the major industries, formerly in the hands of England and France, have advanced eastwards, and in Germany they have found a country young, full of energy, possessing a reasonable middle class, and eager in turn to enrich foreign trade. While Germany was exempt from the subjectivity of France and England, made its own cotton fabric, built their own machines - actually manufactured all the goods - the main industries also took root in Russia, where the development of production is all the more surprising, as it found out, but yesterday. At the time of the abolition of serfdom in 1861, there were hardly any factories in Russia. All they needed - cars, rails, railway engines, rich materials - came from the West. Twenty years later, it has already owned 85,000 factories, and goods from these plants have quadrupled in value. The old equipment has been evaporated, and now almost all the steel used in Russia, three-quarters of iron, two-thirds of coal, all railway engines, rail cars, almost all steamships, are manufactured in Russia. Russia, destined - so wrote economists to remain agricultural territory, rapidly developed into a country-production. She orders hardly anything from England, and very few from Germany. Economists are customs responsible for these facts, and yet cotton produced in Russia is sold at the same price as in London. The capital, taking no knowledge of the homeland, German and English capitalists accompanied by engineers and first persons of their own nationalities, introduced in Russia and Poland manufactums, the perfection of which goods competes with the best of England. If the customs was canceled to the seas, production would receive only it. Not so long ago, British manufacturers delivered another hard blow to imports of fabric and wool fabrics from the West. They created in southern and middle Russia huge wool factories, equipped with the most improved machines from Bradford, and now Russia is unlikely to import more than a few pieces of English fabric and French wool fabrics as samples. Major industries are not only moving east, they extend to the southern peninsulas. The Turin Exhibition Centre in 1884 has already shown the progress made by the Italian produce, and, let's not make any mistake about this, mutual hatred of the French and Italian middle classes has no other origin than their industrial rivalry. Spain is also becoming an industrialized country; While in the East, Bohemia unexpectedly rose to importance as a new production center, provided with improved technique and applying the best scientific methods. We can also mention the rapid progress of Hungary in the main industries, but let's take Brazil as an example faster. Economists have condemned Brazil to cultivate cotton forever, export it in a raw state, and get cotton fabric from Europe in exchange. In fact, forty years ago, there were only nine ill-fated small cotton factories with 385 spindles in Brazil. Today, there are 108 cotton mills owning 715,000 spindle and 26,050 looms that are thrown into the market annually for 234 million yards of textiles. Even Mexico is setting about producing cotton fabric, instead importing it from Europe. As for the United States, they were completely exempt from the European tuth, and triumphantly developed their production powers. But it was India that gave the clearest evidence against the specialization of national industry. We all know the theory: great European peoples need colonies, for colonies send raw materials - cotton fiber, un washed wool, spices, etc. to mother earth. And mother-of-the-earth, under the pretext of sending them manufactured goods, gets rid of her burned belongings, her car's scrap iron and everything she no longer has to use for. It costs her little or nothing, and no fewer articles are sold at exorbitant prices. Such was the theory — this was the practice for a long time. In London and Manchester, fortunes were made while India was destroyed. At the Indian Museum in London you can see the unheard wealth gathered in Calcutta and Bombay by English merchants. But other British merchants and capitalists conceived a very simple idea that it would be more appropriate to exploit immigrants from India by carving cotton fabric in India itself than importing twenty to twenty-four million pounds worth of goods annually. Initially, a series of experiments ended in failure. Indian weavers - artists and experts in their own craft - could not insure themselves to factory life; The technique sent from Liverpool was poor; climate had to be taken into account; and merchants have had to adapt to the new conditions now fully respected before British India can become the formidable mother-of-the-earth rival it is today. It now owns 200 cotton factories employing about 196,400 workers, and contains 5,231,000 spindles and 48,400 looms and 38 jute mills, with 409,000 spindle. It exports annually to China, to Dutch India, and to Africa, almost eight million pounds worth of the same white cotton canvas, said to be a specialty of England. And although workers are unemployed and in a very wanted, Indian women weave a cotton machine machine far east at a rate of six percent per day. In short, smart manufacturers are fully aware that the day is just around the lines when they won't know what to do with the factory hands that previously weaved cotton fabric taken out of England. Furthermore, it is becoming increasingly apparent that India will not import a single ton of iron from England. The initial difficulties in the use of coal and iron ore obtained in India have been overcome; and the sheds that destilate in England were built on the shores of the Indian Ocean. Colonies compete with mother-land in the production of manufactured goods, such is the factor that will regulate the economy in the twentieth century. And why shouldn't India produce ? What should be the obstacle? Capital? But capital goes where there are men, poor enough to be exploited. Knowledge? But knowledge does not recognize any national barriers. Technical skill of the worker? - No, I'm not. Are there then 237,000 Hindo boys and girls, rather than eighteen, currently working in English textile factories? Al after looking at national industries would be very interesting to turn to special industries. Take silk, for example, eminate French production in the first half of the nineteenth century. We all know how Lyon has become a silk trade empory. Initially, raw silk was collected in the south of France, and it was ordered from Italy, from Spain, from Austria, from the Caucasus, and from Japan, for the manufacture of its silk fabrics. In 1875, of the five million kilograms of raw silk converted into things in the vicinity of Lyon, there were only four hundred thousand kilograms of French silk. But if Lyon was making imported silk, why would Switzerland, Germany, Russia not have to do as much? Silk weaving developed indeed in villages around Zurich. Bâle has become a major center of silk trading. The Caucasian administration enlisted women from Marseille and worms from Lyon to teach Georgians an improved silkworm grower, as well as the art of turning silk into fabrics to Caucasian villagers. Austria followed. Then Germany with the help of Lyon workers built large silk factories. The United States also did in Paterson. And by the day, silk trading is no longer a French monopoly. Silks are made in Germany, Austria, the United States, as well as in England. In winter, Caucasian villagers woves silk handkerchiefs on wages, which would mean starvation for Lyon's silk weavers. Italy sends silks to France; and Lyon, which in 1870-4 exported 460 million francs to silk fabrics, now exports only half of this amount. In fact, time is just around the world when Lyon will only ship top-class goods and a few novelties as models to Germany, Russia and Japan. And so it is in all industries. Belgium no longer has a monopoly of fabrics; the fabric is made in Germany, in Russia, in Austria, in the United States. Switzerland and French Jura have longer monopoly of the clock; clocks are made every other. Scotland no longer overestimates sugar for Russia; Russian sugar is imported into England. Italy, although it has neither coal nor iron, produces its own iron masonry and engines for its steamships. The chemical industry is no longer an English monopoly; sulfuric acid and soda are made even in the Urals. Steam engines made at Winterthur have gained a wide reputation everywhere, and at the moment Switzerland, which has neither coal nor iron - anything but excellent technique - makes the technique better and cheaper than England. This is how the exchange theory ends. The trade trend, like everything else, is about decentralisation. Each nation considers it beneficial to combine agriculture with the most diverse lichens and manufacturers. The specialization, which economists have spoken so highly of, has enriched a number of capitalists, but is now of no use. On the contrary, it is for the benefit of each region, each nation, to grow their own wheat, their own vegetables, as well as to produce all the foods they consume at home. This diversity is the surest pledge of full production development through mutual cooperation, and a moving reason for progress, while specialization is an obstacle to progress. Agriculture can thrive only in close proximity to factories. And no sooner does one plant appear than the infinite variety of other factories should appear around, so that by mutually supporting and stimulating each other with their inventions, they increase their productivity. 33 may be foolish to export wheat and import flour, export wool and import fabric, export iron and imported machinery; not only because transportation is a waste of time and money, but above all because a country without a developed industry inevitably is left behind by times in agriculture; because a country without large factories to bring steel to a ready state has also lagged behind in all other industries; and finally because the nation's industrial and technical capacities remain undeveloped. In the world of production everything is being held together in our time. Tillage is no longer possible without machinery, without large irrigation works, without railways, without manure factories. And to adapt this technique, these railways, these irrigation engines, etc., to local conditions, a certain spirit of invention, a certain amount of technical skill that lie dormant as long as shovels and lemlish are the only realizations of cultivation, must be developed. If fields are to be properly cultivated, and should give abundant yields a person has the right to expect, it is important that the factories, lygolins, and factories evolve within reach of the fields. A variety of professions, a variety of skills that arise from the end, work together for a common purpose — these are the true forces of progress. And now let's imagine the inhabitants of a city or territory — whether it's huge or — for the first time going on the path of social revolution. We are sometimes told that nothing will change, that mines, factories, etc., will be expropriated, and declared national or communal property, that everyone will return to their usual work, and that the revolution will then be fulfilled. But it's a dream come true: social revolution can't happen that way. We mentioned that if the revolution explodes in Paris, Lyon or any other city - if workers lay their hands on factories, houses and banks, present products will be completely revolutionary by this simple fact. International commerce will come to a standstill; there will also be the importation of foreign bakeries; turnover of goods and regulations will be paralyzed. And then the city or territory in the thruty will be forced to provide for themselves, and reorganize production. If it fails to do so, it is death. If successful, it will lead to the economic life of the country. The number of import provisions has decreased, consumption has increased, one million Parisians working for export purposes have been thrown out of work, a large number of things imported a day from distant or neighboring countries without reaching their destination, fancy-trade being temporarily in a state of waiting. What residents will have to eat six months after the revolution? We think that when shops are empty, the masses will seek to get their food off the ground. They will be forced to

cultivate soil, combine agricultural production with industrial production in Paris and its surroundings. They will have to abandon just ornamental trades and consider the most urgent need — bread. Citizens will be obliged to become agrocultivists. Not just as self-eating farmers are ploughing into wages that barely provide them with enough food a year, but by following the principles of intensive farming marketers employed on a large scale through the best technique a person has come up with or can invent. They will be up to earth - no, as ever, as the country's beast burdens the Parisian jeweler will object to it. They reorganize cultivation not a decade later, but immediately, during the revolutionary struggle, out of fear of being the worst enemy. Agriculture will have to be carried out by intelligent beings; using their knowledge, organizing themselves in joyful gangs for a pleasant job, like men who a hundred years ago worked at Champ de Mars on a Federation holiday , is a work of delight when not carried to excess, when scientifically organized, when a person invents and improves his tools and realizes that he is a useful member of the community. Of course, they will not only cultivate, they will also produce those things that they have previously used to order from foreign parts. And let's not forget that for rebel territory, foreign parts can include all areas that have not joined the revolutionary movement. During the revolutions of 1793 and 1871, Paris was made to feel that foreign parts meant even a suburban area at its gate. Speculator beans in Troyes starved to death on the Sanskults of Paris more spectacularly than the German army, brought to The French land versaic co-leaders. The rebel city will be forced to overtake without foreigners, and why not? France invented beetroot sugar when the sugar troika ran for a short time during the continental blockade. Parisians discovered salt parlies in their cellars when they no longer received any from abroad. Will we yield to our grandfathers, who with difficulty glistened the first words of science? Revolution is more than the destruction of the political system. It means awakening human intelligence, increasing the inventive spirit tenfold, a hundred times; this is the dawn of a new science - the sciences of people like Laplas, Lamarque, Lavoisier. This is a revolution in people's minds, more than in their institutions. And economists tell us to go back to our workshops as if going through a revolution were going home after a walk in the Epping Forest! Let's start with the fact that the only fact that he put his hands on the property of the middle class implies the need to completely reorganize all economic life in shops, at marinas and factories. And the revolution will not be able to act in this direction. If Paris, during the social revolution, is cut off from the world by a year or two by advocates of middle-class rule, its millions of intellectuals not yet depressed by factory life - that the City of Small Trades that stimulates the spirit of invention - will show the world what a person's brain can achieve without asking for any help without, but the motor power of the sun that gives light , the power of the wind that sweeps away impurities, and silent vitality at work we're knocking on. Then we will see what various trades, mutually cooperative in place of the globe and animated by social revolution, can do to feed, dress, give and supply all sorts of glowing to millions of intelligent people. We don't need to write any fiction to prove it. That we are confident that we have already experimented and recognized as practical would be enough to put it into action if the attempt were insinuated, by the ominous bold inspiration of the Revolution and the spontaneous impulse of the masses. Chapter 17: Agriculture I of the political economy is often reproached, taking all its deductions out of the decidedly false principle that the only incentive capable of forcing a person to increase their production capacity is personal interest in its most pressing sense. The rebukes are absolutely true; so true that the eras of great industrial discoveries and true progress in industry are precisely those in which the happiness of all was the purpose pursued and which personal enrichment was least considered. Great researchers and great inventors have targeted, without a doubt, the emancipation of mankind. And if Watt, Stevenson, Jacquard, etc. could only predict what state of misery their sleepless nights would have brought, they would probably have burned their designs and broken their models. Another principle that provises the political economy is just as misguided. It is a tacit admission, common to all economists, that if there is often overwork in certain sectors, society will nonetheless never have enough products to meet all needs, and that therefore the day will never come when no one will be forced to sell their labour in exchange for wages. This silent admission is at the heart of all theories and so-called laws taught by economists. And yet it is certain that on a day when any civilized association of individuals would ask themselves what everyone's needs are, and the means of meeting them, he will see that in an industry, as in agriculture, he already has enough to provide abundantly for all needs, provided he knows how to apply these means to meet real needs. What is true is that no one can dispute the industry. Indeed, it is enough to study the processes already used for coal and ore mining, to get steel and work on it, to produce what is used for clothing, etc., in large industrial institutions, to perceive that we could already increase our production four times and yet save work. Let's move on. We argue that agriculture is in the same position: the worker, like the manufacturer, already possesses the means to increase his production, not only four times, but also tenfold, and he will be able to implement it as soon as he feels his need, once a socialist organization of work is established instead of the present capitalist one. Whenever agriculture is talked about, men imagine a farmer bending over a plough, throwing a poorly sorted corn haphazard into the ground and looking forward to bringing a good or bad season; or a family that runs from morn to night and reaps as a reward a rough bed, dry bread and a rough drink. In short, they are paintings of the wild beast of La Bruyère. And for this person, thus exposed to unhapp, the maximum relief society offers to reduce their taxes or their rent. But they do not even dare to imagine a cultivator standing up straight, taking leisure time, and producing a few hours of work a day enough food to nourish not only their own family, but also a hundred men at least. In their most luminous dreams of future socialists do not go beyond the American branched culture, which, after all, is only a germ state of agricultural art. The agrocultrualist has broader ideas for the day - his concepts are on a much larger scale. He only asks for a share in order to produce enough vegetables for the family; and feed twenty-five five beasts he needs no more space than previously needed to feed one; its purpose is to make its own soil, to challenge the seasons and climate, to warm and air, and to land around a young plant; produce, in short, on one acre what he used for sowing on fifty acres, and that without any excessive fatigue — significantly reducing, on the contrary, the total amount of former labor. He knows that we can feed everyone by giving the field culture no more time than what everyone can give with pleasure and joy. This is a modern trend of agriculture. While scientific men, led by Liebig, the creator of chemical farming theory, often came on the wrong attack in their love of simple theories, the unlearned agrocultures opened new roads to prosperity. Market gardeners in Paris, Troyes, Rouen, Scotland and English gardeners, Flemian farmers, farmers in Jersey, Guernsey and farmers in the Isles of Scilly have opened such great horizons that the mind hesitates to grab them. Until recently, families of peasants needed at least seventeen or twenty acres to live on the soil — and we know how farmers live — we can no longer say what is the minimum area on which to grow all the necessary families, even including luxury products, if the soil works with the help of intensive culture. Ten years ago it could already be argued that a population of thirty million people could live very well without importing anything into what could be grown in the UK. But now that we are seeing the progress recently made in France as well as in England, and when we contemplate the new horizons that are opening up in front of us, we can say that in the cultivation of land, as it has already been cultivated in many places, even on poor soils, fifty or sixty million inhabitants into British territory would still be a very weak proportion of what a person could exactly from the soil. In any case (as we are about to demonstrate) we can consider it absolutely proven that if the pre-morrow Paris and the two departments of the Seine and the Seine and The Uaz organized themselves as an anarchist commune in which everyone worked their hands, and if the whole universe refused to send them a single bushel of wheat, the only head of cattle, a single basket of fruit, and left them only the territory of the two departments, they could not only produce , meat, vegetables, necessary for themselves, but also luxury products in sufficient quantities for all. And, moreover, we argue that the total amount of this workforce will be much less than at present to feed these people corn harvested in Auvergne and Russia, with vegetables produced a little everywhere by large agriculture, and with fruit grown in the South. It goes without saying that we in no way wish the exchange of all to be suppressed, nor that each region seek to produce something that will only grow in its climate more or less an artificial culture. But we care to draw attention to the fact that the theory of exchange, for example, is understood for a day is surprisingly exaggerated — that the exchange is often useless and even harmful. We argue, in addition to the fact that people have never had the right conception of the huge labor of southern wine producers, nor Russian and Hungarian corn producers, whose excessive labor can also be greatly reduced if they have taken over an intensive crop rather than their present system of extensive agriculture. If it would be impossible to quote here a lot of facts on which we base our statements. Therefore, we are obliged to send our readers who want more information to another field book, factory and seminars. First of all, we sincerely invite those interested in the issue to read some wonderful works published in France and other countries, and from which we give a list at the closing of this book [9]. As for the inhabitants of large towns, who do not yet have a real clue about what agriculture can be, we advise them to explore the surrounding market gardens and study cultivation. They need to, but observe and question marketers, and the new world will be open to them. Thus, they will be able to see what European agriculture can be like in the twentieth century; and they will understand with what power the armed social revolution will be, when we learn the secret of taking all necessary out of the earth. A few facts are enough to show that our statements are in no way exaggerated. We wish they were preceded by only a few general comments. We know what an unfortunate state European agriculture is in. If the cultivator does not rob the landowner, it is plundered by the state. If the state taxes it moderately, the money-lender enslaves it with the help of vexels, and soon turns it into a simple tenant of soil owned in reality by a financial company. The landlord, state and banker thus plunder the tiller using rent, taxes and interest. The amount varies in each country, but it never falls below a quarter, very often half of the raw materials. In France, agrocultures paid the state most recently as much as 44 percent of gross output. Moreover, the share of the owner and the state always goes to increase. Once the cultivator has gained more abundant crops by suppressing labor, invention or initiative, the tributes it will owe to the landowner, the state, and the banker will increase proportionally. If it doubles the number of bushels reaped per acre, rents will also be doubled and taxes, and the state will make sure to raise them even more if prices go up. And so on. In short, everywhere the soil cultivator works from twelve to sixteen hours a day; These three vultures take away from him all that he could lay; they rob him everywhere, which will allow him to improve his culture. That's why agriculture is progressing so slowly. The cultivator can only make some progress from time to time, in some exceptional after a quarrel between three vampires. And yet we said nothing about the tribute that each cultivator pays to the manufacturer. Each machine, each shovel, every barrel of chemical manure, is sold to it for three to four times its real value. And let's not forget the intermediary that lionesses the lion's share of earthy products. That is why for all this century of invention and progress agriculture only occasionally improves in very limited areas. Fortunately, there have always been little oavations abandoned for some time by the stering; and here we learn what intensive agriculture can produce for mankind. Remember a few examples. In the U.S. prérias (which, however, are second only to meager spring wheat crops, 7 to 15 bushel acres, and even they often overshadow periodic droughts), 500 men who work only for eight months produce annual food of 50,000 people. With all the improvements of the past few years, the annual labor one person (300 days) gives, delivered to Chicago as flour, annually food 250 men. Here the result gets a large economy in manual labor: on those vast plains that the eye can not cover, ploughing, harvesting, thrashing, organized almost in military fashion. There is nothing useless running and fro, no loss of time - everything is done with precision similar to the parade. This agriculture on a large scale - extensive agriculture, which takes the soil from nature, not seeking to improve it. When the earth has given a suffridge, it can, they leave it; they aim elsewhere for pristine soil to be depleted one by one. But there is also intensive agriculture, which is already working, and will be more and more, machines. Its facility is to cultivate a well-placed limited space, to manure, to improve, to concentrate work, and to get the largest harvest. This kind of culture spreads every year, and while agrocultures in southern France and the fertile plains of West America are satisfied with an average crop of 11 to 15 bushels per acre through a large culture, they regularly reap 39 even 55 and sometimes 60 bushels per acre in northern France. Thus, the annual consumption of a man is received from less than a quarter of an acre. And the more intense the culture, the less work spent on getting a bushel of wheat. The technique replaces man in previous works and for improvements to the necessary land - such as drainage, clearing stones - that will double crops in the future, once and for all. Sometimes nothing but keeping the soil free from punching without manuration, allows the average soil to give excellent crops year after year. This has been done for twenty consecutive years in Rothamstead, in Hertfordshire. Let's not write an agricultural romance, but we will be satisfied with the harvest of 44 bushels per acre. This does not require exceptional soil, but only a rational culture; and let's see what that means. 3,600,000 people inhabing two Seine and Seine-e-Uaz consume a little less than 22 million bushels of cereals annually for their food, in the main — wheat; and in our hypothesis they would have to cultivate to get this harvest. 494,200 acres out of the 1,507,300 acres they own. Obviously, they won't cultivate them with shovels. It will take too long - 96 working days of 5 hours per acre. It would be better to improve the soil once for everyone — to merge what needed to be drained to align what needed alignment, to clean the soil of stones, whether it was even necessary to spend 5 million days for 5 hours on this preparatory work — an average of 10 working days for each acre. They then plough on with a pair of diggers who would take one and three fifths a day per acre, and they'd give another and three-fifths a day to work with a double plow. The seeds will be sorted in steam instead of taking haphazard, and they will be thoroughly sown in rows rather than thrown away by four winds. Now all this work would not take 10 days for 5 hours per acre, if the work had been done in good conditions. But if within 3-4 years 10 million working days are given to a good culture, the result will be later on crops of 44 to 55 bushels per acre, only working half the time. Thus, fifteen million working days will be spent on giving bread to a population of 3,600,000 inhabitants. And the job would be such that everyone could do it without having steel muscles, or even working off the ground before. The initiative and the overall distribution of works will come from those who know the soil. As for the work itself, there is no townspeople of any sex so confusing that he is unable to look after machines and contribute his share to agricultural work after several hours of training. Well, when we believe that in the present chaos there are, in a city like Paris, not counting the unemployed upper classes, about 100,000 men without a job in their multiple trades, we see that the government lost in our current organization would be on its own to give, with a rational culture, the bread needed by three or four million residents of the two departments. We repeat, this is not a bizarre dream, and we have not talked about truly intensive agriculture. We did not depend on wheat (received in three years by Mr Hallett), of which one grain planted produced 5,000 or 6,000 and sometimes 10,000 grains, which would give the wheat needed for a family of five individuals on an area of 120 square metres. On the contrary, we have only mentioned what numerous farmers have already achieved in France, England, Belgium, etc., and what can be done in order to overgrow with the experience and knowledge already acquired by practice on a large scale. But without a revolution neither to the moroth nor after it is done, because it is not to the interest of landowners and capitalists; and because the peasants who would find their profits in it no knowledge, no money, no time to get what needs to go forward. The present society has not yet reached this stage. But let Parisians proclaim an anarchist commune, and they will be forced to come to it because they will not be foolish enough to continue making luxury toys (which are already made by Vienna, Warsaw and Berlin) and risk being left without bread. Moreover, agricultural work with the help of machinery will soon become the most attractive and joyful of all professions. We had enough jewelry and enough clothes for dolls,' they would say; It is time for workers to gain their strength in agriculture, to go in search of cheerfulness, impressions of nature, the joy of life that they have forgotten in the dark factories of the suburbs. In the Middle Ages it was alpine pastures, not guns, allowing the Swiss to shake lords and kings. Modern agriculture will allow the city in the uprising to break free from the combined bourgeois forces. III We saw how 31/2 million residents of the two departments around Paris could find a lot of bread, growing only a third of their territory. Let's move on to livestock now. The British, who eat a lot of meat, consume on average just under 220 pounds a year per adult. Assuming all the meat consumed were oxtains, making just under a third of the bull. Bull per year for 5 individuals (including children) is already a sufficient diet. For 31/2 million residents, this would make an annual intake of 700,000 head of cattle. A day, with a pasture system, we need at least 5 million acres to nourish 660,000 head of cattle. This makes 9 acres per head of cattle. However, with the prérias moderately watering spring water (as recently done on thousands of acres in southwest France), 11/4 million acres are enough. But if an intense culture is practiced and beetroot is grown for feed, only a quarter of that area is required, i.e. about 310,000 acres. And if we have an appeal to corn and practice ensilage (compression feed while green) like Arabs), we get feed on an area of 217,500 acres. In areas of Milan where sewage water is used to dampen fields, feed on 2-3 cattle per acre overlooks an area of 22,000 acres; and in several favorable fields, up to 177 tons of hay to 10 acres were trimmed, an annual proven 36 moth cows. Nearly nine acres per head of cattle are needed under the pasture system, and only 21/2 acres for 9 oxen or cows under the new system. These are the opposite extremes in modern agriculture. In Guernsey, a total of 9,884 acres are disposed of, with nearly half (4,695 acres) covered in cereals and kitchen gardens; only 5,189 acres remain meadows. These 5,189 acres feed 1,480 horses, 7,260 head of cattle, 900 sheep and 4,200 pigs, which is more than 3 heads of cattle on 2 acres, without sheep or pigs. Needless to add that soil fertility is made by algae and chemical dingo. Going back to our 31/2 million inhabitants belonging to Paris and its surroundings, we see that the land needed to grow cattle is reduced from 5 million acres to 197,000. Well, then, let's not d stop at the lowest numbers, let's take those of the usual intense culture; let's liberally add to the land needed for smaller cattle, which should replace some horned beasts and allow 395,000 acres for cattle cultivation — 494,000, if you will, on the 1,013,000 acres left after bread has been provided to the people. Let's be generous and give 5 million working days to put this land to a productive state. After 20 million working days were employed during the year, half of which are for constant improvements, we will have bread and meat guaranteed to us, not including all the extra meat that can be obtained in the form of poultry, pigs, rabbits, etc.: without taking into account the fact that the population, provided with excellent vegetables and fruits, consumes less meat than the British, who supplement their poor supply of vegetables with animal feed. Now, how many 20 million working days 5 hours do per occupant? Very little really. A population of 31/2 million should have at least 1,200,000 adult men, and as many women are able to work. Well, and then, to give bread and meat to everyone, it would take only 17 half days of work a year per person. Add 3 million working days, or double that number if you want to get milk. This will make 25 working days of 5 hours in all - nothing more than a bit of a nice country exercise - to produce three main foods of bread, meat and milk. Three products that after housing cause daily anxiety to nine-tenths of humanity. And also — do not tire of repeating — these are not fanciful dreams. We only told us that there was, gained experience on a large scale. Agriculture could be reorganized in this way if property laws and general ignorance were not offered by the opposition. The day Paris realized that knowing what you are eating and how it is produced is a matter of public interest, the day when everyone will understand that these issues are infinitely more important than all the parliamentary debates of our time — on this day the revolution will be a perfect fact. Paris will take possession of two departments and cultivate them. And then the Parisian worker, having worked out a third of its existence in order to buy poor and insufficient food, will produce it himself, under its walls, within the enclosure of his garet (if they still exist), in a few hours of healthy and attractive work. And now we move on to fruits and vegetables. Let's go beyond Paris and visit the creation of a market gardener who achieves miracles (ignored by learned economists) a few miles from academies. Let's visit, suppose M. author of the work from a market gardener, who has made no secret of what the land gives him, and who published it all together. M. Ponce, and especially he worked as. It takes eight men to cultivate a plot of just under 3 acres (27/10). They work 12 or even 15 hours a day, that is three times more than necessary. Twenty-four of them wouldn't be too much. To which M. Ponce is likely to answer that when he pays a terrible amount of £100 rent a year for his 27/10 acres of land, and £100 for manure bought from barracks, he is obliged to exploit. He undoubtedly replied: Being exploitative, I'm exploiting one by one. His installation also cost him £1,200, of which surely more than half went as a tribute to the failing barons of the industry. In fact, this institution represents no more than 3,000 working days, probably much less. But let's examine his crops: nearly 10 tons of carrots, nearly 10 tons of onions, radishes and small vegetables, 6,000 heads of cabbage, 3,000 heads of cauliflower, 5,000 baskets of tomatoes, 5,000 dozens of fruit choices, 154,000 salads; In short, a total of 123 tons of vegetables and fruits to 27/10 acres - 120 yards in widows for 109 yards in total, making more than 44 tons of vegetables to acres. But a man doesn't eat more than 660 pounds of vegetables and fruit a year, and the 21/2-acre market-garden yield enough vegetables and fruit to abundantly supply the table to 350 adults throughout the year. So 24 people employed all year round in processing 27/10 acres of land, and only working 5 hours a day, will produce enough vegetables and fruit for 350 adults, equivalent to at least 500 individuals. Simply put: in cultivation like M. Ponce — and its results have already been surpassed — 350 adults should be given a little more than 100 hours a year (103) for the production of vegetables and fruits needed for 500 people. Remember that such production is no exception. It runs under the walls of Paris, on 2,220 acres, on 5,000 market gardeners. Only these market gardeners nowadays are reduced to a state of beasts of burden to pay an average rent of £32 per acre. But aren't these facts that can be tested by everyone, to prove that 17,300 acres (with 519,000 remaining before us) would be enough to give all the necessary vegetables as well as a liberal amount of fruit to the 31/2 million inhabitants of our two departments? As for the amount of work required for the production of these fruits and vegetables, it is 50 million working days of 5 hours (50 days per adult male), if measured according to the standard of work of marketers. But we could have reduced that number if we had an appeal to the process in fashion in Jersey and Guernsey. We must also remember that the Parisian market gardener is forced to work so hard because he basically produces the fruits of the early season, the high prices of which are paid to pay for fabulous rents, and that this culture system entails more work than there is Necessary. Paris market gardeners, with no means to make big costs for their gardens, and are required to pay heavily for glass, wood, iron, coal, get their artificial heat with manure, while it can be a much lower price in a greenhouse. IV Market gardeners, let's just say, are forced to become machines and renouke all the joys of lifting to get their amazing crops. But these hard grinders have done great service to humanity in teaching us that soil can be made. Make it with old cells of manure, which have already served to give the necessary warmth to young plants and early fruits; and they do it in such large numbers that they are forced to sell it in part, otherwise it will raise the level of their gardens by one inch each year. They do it so well (so Barral teaches us, in his Farming Dictionary, in an article about market gardeners) that in recent contracts, the market-grower assumes he will carry his soil with him when he leaves some of the land he cultivates. The loaf was taken away on trolleys, with furniture and glass frames — that's the answer of practical cultivators to the digested treatises of Ricardo, which represented the lease as a means of equaling the natural advantages of the soil. The soil is worth what man is worth, it is the motto of gardeners. And yet the market gardeners of Paris and Rouen are working three times in fatigue to get the same results as their fellow workers in Guernsey or in England. Applying industry to agriculture these latter make their climate in addition to their soil, with the help of a greenhouse. Fifty years ago, the greenhouse was the luxury of the rich. It was stored to grow exotic plants for fun. But nowadays its use begins to generalize. The huge industry has grown recently in Guernsey and Jersey, where hundreds of acres are already covered in glass - not to mention countless small greenhouses kept in every small farm garden. Acres and acres of greenhouses have recently also been built in Worthing, in suburban London, and in several other parts of England and Scotland. They are built of all qualities, ranging from those that have granite walls, to those that represent just shelters made in doscades and glass frames that cost, even now, with all the tribute paid to capitalists and intermediaries, less than 3s. 6d. per square yard under glass. Most of them heat up for at least three to four months each year; but even cool greenhouses, which do not heat up at all, give excellent results — of course, not for growing grapes and tropical plants, but for potatoes, carrots, peas, tomatoes and so on. Thus, a person emancipates himself from the climate, and at the same time avoids hard work with hot beds, and he saves much less manure and work. Three men to acres, each working less than sixty hours a week, grow in very small spaces that used to require acres and Earth. The result of all these recent subsets of culture is that if one half of the city's only adults gave everyone about fifty-half days for a culture of the best fruits and vegetables out of season, they would have a year-round unlimited offer of this kind of fruit and vegetable to the entire population. But there is an even more important fact to notice. The greenhouse is now trending to become just a kitchen garden under glass. And when he is accustomed to such a goal, the simplest rainforest-glass uncoated shelters already give fabulous crops — such as, for example, 500 bushels of potatoes per acre as the first harvest, ready by the end of April; after that, the second and third harvests come out at an extremely high temperature, which prevails in the summer under glass. I gave in my fields, factories and workshops, the clearest facts in this direction. Suffice to say here that in Jersey, 34 men, with only one trained gardener, grow 13 acres under glass, of which they get 143 tons of fruit and early vegetables, using less than 1,000 tons of coal for this extraordinary crop. And this is done now in Guernsey and Jersey on a very large scale, a fairly large number of steamships constantly amounting to between Guernsey and London, only for the export of greenhouse crops. Nowadays, in order to get the same harvest of 500 bushels of potatoes, we have to plough the surface in 4 acres each year, plant it, cultivate, sell it, and so on; while with glass, even if we have to give perhaps a start with, half a day of work per square yard in order to build a greenhouse - we'll save then at least half, and probably three-quarters of the previously required annual labor. These are facts, the results of which everyone can check for themselves. And these facts are already a hint of what a person could gain from the earth if he had treated it wisely. V In all of the above, we have stipulated what has already been tested by experience. An intense culture of fields, irrigation meadows, a lighthouse, and finally a kitchen garden under glass are realities. What's more, the trend is to expand and generalize these culture methods because they allow you to get more products with less work and with more confidence. In fact, having studied Guernsey's simplest glass shelters, we argue that by taking everything in general, much less work is spent on getting potatoes under glass in April than in growing them outdoors, requiring digging space four times as much, watering it down, flushing, etc. Work is also saving in using an improved tool or machine, even when the initial costs have to be incurred to buy the tool. Full figures relating to the culture of common vegetables under glass still want. This culture is of recent origin, and is held only in small areas. But we already have figures relating to fifty years of early-season grape culture, and these are compelling. In the north of England, on the Scottish border, where coal costs only 3s. a tonne at the throes of a hole, they have long taken to growing varietal grapes. Thirty years ago, these grape varieties, ripe in January, were sold by a producer in their 20s for a pound. On the day, the same manufacturer sells them only at 2s. 6d. per pound. He tells us about it himself in a horticultural magazine. The fall is caused by tons and tons of grapes arriving in January in London and Paris. Thanks to the cheapies of coal and intellectual culture, grapes from the north travel now south, in the opposite direction to conventional fruit. They cost so little that in May English and jersey grapes are sold in 1s. 8d. per pound. In March, Belgium's grapes are sold from 6d. up to 8d., whereas in October grapes grown in huge quantities — under glass, and with a little artificial heating in the vicinity of London — are sold at the same price as grapes bought by the pound in the vineyards of Switzerland and the Rhine, that is, for several halves. And yet they still cost two-thirds too expensive, due to excessive soil rent and installation and heating costs, on which the gardener pays a formidable tribute to the manufacturer and intermediary. It's understandable, we can say, that it costs next to nothing to have delicious grapes under latitude, and in our misty London autumn. In one suburb, for example, cursed glass and gypsum shelter, 9 feet. The harvest came from Hamburg grape-stem, six years old. And the shelter was so bad that it rained. At night the temperature was always that outside. It obviously doesn't heat up because it would be just as useless as heating the street! And the worries to be given were: pruning the vine for half an hour each year; and bringing a harrowing wheel of manure, which is thrown upon the stem of the vine, planted with red clay outside the shelter. On the other hand, if we estimate the amount of care provided by grape relics on the borders of the Rhine or Lake Lehman, the terraces built by stone on the hillsides, the transportation of manure, as well as land up to two to three hundred feet high, we conclude that in general the costs of the work required for growing vines are more significant in Switzerland or on the banks of the Rhine than under the glass in the suburbs of London. This may seem paradoxical, because it is generally believed that the vines grow themselves in southern Europe, and that the work of the vinaigrauer costs nothing. But gardeners and gardeners, far from us contradict, confirm our assertions. The most profitable culture in England is the vine vated a practical gardener, editor of the English Journal of Horticulture. Prices speak eloquently for themselves as we know it. Translating these facts into communist language, it can be argued that a man or woman who takes twenty hours a year from his leisure time to give a little care — very nice in the main language — to two or three grape stalks, protected by a simple glass under any European climate, will collect as many grapes as their family and friends can eat. And this applies not only to vines, but also to all fruit trees. The commune, which will enter the processes of intensive culture in practice on a large scale, will have all possible vegetables, indigenous or exotic, and all the desired fruits, do not apply more than ten hours a year per inhabitant. In fact, nothing would be easier than verifying the above statements by direct experiment. Suppose 100 acres of light baton (for example, we have in Worthing) are transformed into a number of market gardens, each with its own glass houses for raising seedlings and young plants. Suppose also that another 50 acres are covered with glass, houses, and the organization of everything remains practical experienced by French maraichers, and Guernsey or Worthing greenhouse gardeners. At the heart of serving these 150 acres on average, requiring the work of three men per acre under glass - which is less than 8,600 hours of work a year - it would take about 1,300,000 hours for 150 acres. Fifty literate gardeners could give five hours a day to this work, and the rest would simply be done by people who, without being gardeners by degrees, would soon learn to use a shovel as well as process plants. But this work would give at least — we saw it in the previous section — all duties and luxury goods in the way of fruits and vegetables for at least 40 000 or 50 000 people. Let's admit that among this number of 13,500 adults who want to work in the kitchen-garden; then everyone will have to give 100 hours a year distributed throughout the year. These hours of work will be hours of rest spent among friends and children in beautiful gardens, more beautiful, probably, than the legendary Semiramis. It's a balance of work that needs to be spent to be able to eat the hearty fruits were deprived of today, and to have vegetables galore, now so meticulously rationed by a housewife when she has to count every halfpenny that has to go to enrich capitalists and landowners [10]. If only mankind had the consciousness of what it can, and if that consciousness only gave it willpower! If only she knew that the cowardice of spirit is the rock on which all revolutions have been stranded so far. VI We can easily perceive the opening of new horizons before the social revolution. Every time we talk about the revolution, a worker who has seen children who want food lower his eyebrow and repeat first — What about bread? Will enough if everyone eats according to his appetite? What if farmers, ignorant reaction tools, starved to death in our cities, as did the black bars in France in 1793 — what should we do? Let them do all the worst! Big cities will have to do without them. At the same time, hundreds of thousands of workers who are asc fixated today in small workshops and factories will be employed on the day they restore their freedom? Will they continue to be edging up in factories after the revolution? Will they continue to make luxury toys for export when they see their corn stock running out, meat becoming scarce and vegetables disappearing without replacement? Obviously not! They will leave the city and go to the fields! With the help of a technique that will allow the weakest of us to put our shoulder to the wheel, they will carry a revolution into a previously enslaved culture as they will carry it into institutions and ideas. Hundreds of hectares will be covered with glass, and men, and women with delicate fingers, will contribute to the growth of young plants. Hundreds of other acres will be pled with steam, improved by dingy or enriched with artificial soil obtained by spraying rocks. Happy crowds of random workers will cover these hectares of cultures, guided by work and experimentation in part by those who know agriculture, but especially the great and practical spirit of the people, who were angry with the long slumber and illuminated by that bright beacon — the happiness of all. And in two or three months, early crops will deprive the most relevant desires, as well as provide food for people who, after many centuries of waiting, will at least be able to soothe their hunger and eat according to their appetite. Meanwhile, the popular genius, a nation genius who rebels and knows his wants, will work on experimenting with new culture processes that we are already catching a glimpse of, and that it only takes a baptism of experience to become universal. The light will experiment with — the unknown agent of culture, which causes barley to mature in forty-five days under the latitude of Yakutsk; lightweight, concentrated or artificial, will compete with the heat in hurried plant growth. The mush of the future will invent a machine to guide the rays of the sun and make them work so that we no longer look for solar heat stored in coal in the depths of the earth. They will experiment with soil watering cultures of microorganisms — a rational idea conceived, but yesterday, which will allow us to give to the soil those small living creatures necessary for feeding incorrup, for decomposition and assimilation of components of the soil. They will experiment... But let's stop here or enter the realm of fantasy. Let's stay in the reality of the acquired facts. With culture processes in use applied on a large scale and already victorious in the fight against industrial competition, we can give ourselves ease luxury in exchange for a nice job. The near future will show what is practical in processes that give us insight into recent scientific discoveries. Let's be limited now to the discovery of a new path, which is to study the needs of man, and the means of their satisfaction. The only thing that can be wanting for the Revolution is the courage of the initiative. With our minds already narrowed in our youth, enslaved by the past in adulthood and to the grave, we hardly dare to think. If a new idea is mentioned — before airing our own opinion, we consult with musty books for a hundred years to find out what the ancient masters thought on this topic. This is not a food that fails if the courage of thought and initiative do not want a revolution. Of all the great days of the French Revolution, the most beautiful, the greatest was the one on which delegates who came from all over France to Paris worked with all the shovels to square the land of Champs de Mars, preparing it for the feta of the Federation. That day, France was united: animated by a new spirit, it had a vision of the future in a work common to the soil. And it will again be work on common ground that infrared societies will find their unity and will erase the hatred and harassment that have divided them. From now on, able to conceive solidarity — that tremendous power that increases human energy and creative forces a hundred times — a new society will go to conquer the future with all the power of youth. Leaving production to unknown buyers, and looking in its midst at needs and tastes to be satisfied, society will be free to guarantee the life and lightness of each of its members, as well as the moral satisfaction that work gives when freely chosen and freely executed, and the joy of life without insincering on the lives of others. Inspired by the new daring - thanks to the mood of solidarity - all together will march to conquer the high joys of knowledge and artistic creation. A society that is thus inspired will not be afraid of either scatterings within or enemies without them. Before the coalitions of the past, she will oppose a new harmony, an initiative of everyone and everyone, an audacious one that dwindling from the awakening of a people's genius. Before such an irresistible force, the monikers of kings will be powerless. Nothing will remain for them except to bow to it, and use themselves to wheel humanity by rolling to new horizons opened by social revolution. Table 1 U.S. departments and SENA-E-UJAZ The number of inhabitants per acre of 3,900,000 acres in acres 1,507,300 The average number of inhabitants per acre of 2.6 area should be you for feeding residents (in acres): Corn and cereals 494 000 Natural and artificial meadows 494 000 Vegetables and fruits from 17 300 to 25 000 Leaving a balance for homes, roads, parks , forests 494,000 The number of annual works required for improvement and five hours of working days: Total 70,000,000 grain crops (corn culture) 15,000,000 grasslands, milk, cattle cultivation 10,000,000 Market gardening culture, high-end fruit, 33,000,000 Extras 12,000,000 [1] For international Paris exhibitions of 1889 and 1900. [2] The Duke's Saber is an expression commisted by Carly; it's somewhat loose rendering of The Msiue le Vi Kropotkin, but I think it expresses its significance. — Trans. [3] The municipal debt of Paris amounted to 2,266,579,100 francs in 1904, and the charges for it are 121,000,000 francs. [4] Kropotkin here proposes revolutions to break out first in France. - It's trans. [5] Decree of March 30: This decree canceled rents due to the terms of October 1870, as well as January and April 1871. [6] We know this from Playfair, which mentioned it at Joule's death. It seems that the Communists of Young Icaria understood the importance of free choice in their daily relationships, in addition to work. The ideal of religious communists has always been co-eating: It was by food in general that early Christians showed their adhesion to Christianity. The sacrament is still his footprint. Young Iarians have distanced themselves from this religious tradition. They dined in the shared dining room, but at small separate tables at which they sat according to the sights of the moment. Aman's communists have each their own home and dine at home, while taking their provisions for their own services in communal shops. [8] See my book In Russian and French Prisons. London 1887 [9] Consult La Réparation métrique des impôts by A. Toob, two volumes., published by Guime in 1880. (We don't least agree with Toubeau's findings, but it's a true encyclopedia indicating sources that prove it can be obtained from the soil.) La Culture maraichère, M. Ponce, Paris, 1869. Le Potager Gressent, Paris, 1885, excellent practical work. Physiologie et culture du blé, Rislser, Paris, 1881. Le blé, sa culture intense and great, Lecouteux, Paris, 1883. La Cité Encyclopedie, Egen Simon. Le dictionnaire d'agriculture, Barral (Hachette, editor). Experiments Rothhamsted, Wm. Fream, London, 1888 - culture without manure, etc. (office Field, editor). Fields, factories and workshops, author. London (Swan Sonnenschein); cheap editions in 6d. and 1s. [10] Summing up the figures given on agriculture, the figures proving that residents of the two departments of seine and Seine-e-Oise can live perfectly in their own territory, applying very little time annually to receive food, we have: [see Table 1 at the end of the document]. Assuming that half of only able-bodied adults (men and women) are willing to work in agriculture, we see that 70 million working days should be divided between 1,200,000 people, which gives us 58 working days of 5 hours for each of these workers. With this population of two departments have all the necessary bread, meat, milk, vegetables and fruits, both ordinary and luxurious. A day a worker spends on the necessary food of his family (generally less than necessary) at least a third of his 300 working days a year, about 1,000 hours be it, not 290. That is, he thus gives about 700 hours too much to fatten up downsizing and would-be administrators because he doesn't produce his own food, but buys it to intermediaries who in turn buy it from peasants who exhaust themselves by working with bad tools because, being robbed by landowners and the state, they can't procure the best. Page 2 summaryrefslogtecscommitdiff path: root/pk/petr-kropotkin-the-conquest-of-bread.museCommit message (collapse)AuthorAge | * 2020-07-06T16:51:31 Fixed misspelled dates. -- Shreyax | | * 2020-06-07T22:10:25 fixed bug (would not convince him -> would not be convinced) -- xebin * 20 20-06-07T22:19:38 removed space before exclamation mark (cause ! -> cause!) -- xebin | | * 2020-03-28T07:35:29 Fixed inappropriate comma - xebin | * 2020-03-17T21:13:31 Fixed typo - midnitewolf | * 2020-01-29T15:54:14 Fixed typo - themindwiner | * 2020-01-27T17:57:08 Fixed paragraphs that don't end with a period. Inclusioniveness has changed to industry. All quotation marks have been changed to smart quotation marks. -- kuleshovs | | * 2018-11-14T13:24:46 in section 11 of Section 2 and 3 the first paragraph was interpered as part of the heading, I inserted an empty line before and after *** II and *** III to make the title only include Roman numerals - Jan | * 2018-08-26T17:34:59 had some sections missing in section 11 -- matslats | This normalizes the output of search faces. | | | | | | | * 2017-10-14T16:38:35 Removed

duplicate titles in or how nobles are used to exploit their nobility titles. -- Device | * 2017-08-20T23:22:46 Added spaces after comma. Everyone has changed wherever. Changed tllow to throw. -- Device ||| * 2017-08-09T22:17:17 Added spaces in Unitedcity and strenghtin. Changed San Francisco to San Francisco and bencd whcn to bench when. Periods and commas outside the talc are also moved to align with the rest of the document. -- Device || * 2017-08-01T21:44:03 | changed H to He. (chapter 4 II) Did I also change the rebellion? revolt? (Chapter 5 I) -- Device * 2017-08-03T12:21:03 Added multiple spaces and removed space. -- Device ||| * 2017-07-26T07:30:49 Deleted mid-sentence period and added space between two words - jaydeecw | * 2017-06-06T20:10:54 More to More or less in part I of Part 9. -- jp88 || * 2017-02-01T21:37:48 | read through it and noticed some basic typo and I wanted to fix. Я уникав усього, що не було очевидною помилкою і потенційно може бути звичайним написанням періоду часу Кропоткіна. На жаль, я не закінчив все це через час обмеження, але я отримав більш ніж на півдорозі. -- захсord ||| досить, що, можливо, збентежило деяких наших товаришів. Я просто переїхав його, так що було б легше знайти. Завантажувач: Натан Петр-Кропоткін-завоювання хліба || Завантажувач: bumbo петр-кропоткін-завоювання хліба | modified: a/ab/alexander-berkman-what-is-communist-anarchism.muse modified: a/al/alternative-libertaire-the-ecological-challenge-three-revolutions-are-necessary.muse modified: c/cl/c-l-james-anarchism-and-malthus.muse modified: c/ct/c-t-butler-and-amy-rothstein-on-conflict-and-consensus-a-handbook-on-formal-consensus-decisionm.muse modified: f/ff/francisco-ferrer-the-origin-and-ideals-of-the-modern-school.muse modified: h/hd/henry-david-thoreau-walden.muse modified: i/ip/isaac-puente-libertarian-communism.muse modified: j/jz/john-zerzan-rank-and-file-radicalism-within-the-ku-klux-klan-of-the-1920s.muse modified: p/pj/pierre-joseph-proudhon-system-of-economical-contradictions-or-the-philosophy-of-poverty.muse modified: p/pk/petr-kropotkin-the-conquest-of-bread.muse modified: p/pl/paul-lafargue-the-right-to-be-lazy.muse modified: r/ra/robert-anton-wilson-the-semantic-of-good-evil.muse modified: r/rp/robert-paul-wofff-in-defense-of-anarchism.muse modified: s/sn/saul-newman-anarchism-marxism-and-the-bonapartist-state.muse modified: s/ss/savage-state-why-you-shouldn-t-call-the-police-pigs.muse modified: v/va/various-authors-ecodefense-a-field-guide-to-monkeywrenching.muse modified: v/vt/voline-the-unknown-revolution-1917-1921-book-two-bolshevism-and-anarchism.muse modified: x/xo/xavier-oliveras-gonzalez-deny-anarchic-spaces-and-places-an-anarchist-critique-of-mosaic-statis.muse Conflicts: p/pj/pierre-joseph-proudhon-system-of-economical-contradictions-or-the-philosophy-of-poverty.muse s/ss/savage-state-why-you-shouldn-t-call-the-police-pigs.muse ||| p/pk/petr-kropotkin-the-conquest-of-bread.muse p/pk/petr-kropotkin-the-conquest-of-bread.muse

anjaan songs free starmusiq , fiery ferments.pdf , sketch art drawing easy , legendary game of heroes mod apk 2020 , 86f807c7b9.pdf , heron circle gloucester ma , system_integration_testing_interview_questions.pdf , 8308241.pdf , practice b adding and subtracting polynomials , 6016314.pdf ,