

The Anarchist Library
Anti-Copyright



Revolutionary Theory

Fernando Tarrida del Mármol

Fernando Tarrida del Mármol
Revolutionary Theory
20 October 1889

Retrieved on 6th May 2023 from www.libertarian-labyrinth.org
Working translation by Shawn P. Wilbur.

theanarchistlibrary.org

20 October 1889

Contents

I. Political Dogmas	5
II. Social Dogmas	7
III. Economic Dogmas	9
IV. Religious Dogmas	11
Summary	11

Nature, Science and Justice is that which rejects all political, social, economic and religious dogmas, that is, *Anarchy without adjectives*.

Lemma: The revolutionary theory that can be considered most in accordance with Nature, Science and Justice is that which dispenses with all political, economic or religious dogma. — X.

We will demonstrate that in order to establish a revolutionary theory that does not conflict with Nature, Science or Justice, or even all three at the same time, it is indispensable to get rid of all dogma, whether political, social, economic or religious.

I. Political Dogmas

Politics is the art of governing nations. From ancient times to the present day, the *artists* who have succeeded in imposing themselves on their peers have practiced one of the three general forms that encompass all kinds of government: despotism, oligarchy and democracy. Despotism is the organization in which an individual governs as he fancies, according to his capricious impulses, the organization becoming the most decisive and frank denial of freedom. Oligarchy is the government of a few, either by their own right, or by right acquired by election; but these few assume the representation of many, impose laws that force them to act in a particular way and, even in the most favorable cases, are necessarily transformed from representatives into oppressors. Oligarchy, then, is also the denial of freedom. As for democracy, which implies the rule of the majority, it is a true utopia, since the art of governing is as tedious as it is deleterious. And if the majority of the people had to take care of attending such a complicated art, they would have to disregard their other employments, resulting in the fact that in democracies the majorities must be represented by a few *artists*, rulers by trade, who elaborate laws and create police to see that they are observed, transforming every democracy into a covert oligarchy and, therefore, a system contrary to freedom.

The idea of Justice is connected to the idea of Liberty. All the political dogmas are contrary to the idea of Liberty. Therefore, all the political dogmas are contrary to the idea of Justice.

Politics is also contrary to Science, since science teaches us that the tendencies of individuals are variable as a result of their organization, and politics, far from able to deal with this infinite variety, — which is only worthy of consideration on the condition of *non-imposition*, — seeks, on the contrary, to unify and regulate acts, completely trampling initiatives and activities.

Finally, to achieve political authority is contrary to Nature, which requires that all organic, mineral and organized entities move in perfect autonomy in order to make the combinations appropriate to them on the basis of their personal constitution. Moreover, human nature is against impositions, even though human selfishness may sometimes try to abuse them. But those same ones who have proclaimed the principle of authority in order to be able to exercise it, have been the first to admit that we are right as soon as they have seen it in the case of suffering its consequences. Take the example of Alcibiades in the Athenian republic, and that of Coriolanus in ancient Rome: friends of the people as long as they were spoiled and obeyed, they turned their arms against their country as soon as they had fallen and, reduced to the role of simple citizens, were forced to accept the authority of others. Speak also of that whole saga of sustained struggles over feudalism with the monarchies: those powerful gentlemen, so jealous of the absolute authority that gave them tithes, first fruits and even the disgusting *jus primae noctis*, turn angrily against the real power that wanted in turn to make them feel the yoke of the authoritarian principle. And without going so far, in modern times, the constant lack of discipline of all parties in all countries shows that the *artists of government* artists are as keen to govern as they are reluctant to be governed. They are the first to demonstrate that all political dogma is contrary to Nature.

a man claims an advantage in exchange for an effort that he does not need to make, but that is advantageous to such a society, and if the advantage suits the main, despite the fatigue, and it suits society that the product of the effort be exchange for the advantage, which can only be momentary, as the fatigue will have been, then what is contrary to anarchy would be the existence of a statute that prevented either entity from acting as they have agreed.

In the same case you would find a collectivist society that was forbidden from adopting communist solutions. This system, which does not advocate any dogma and leaves the entities in a position to adopt in each moment and in each case the economic principles that are most convenient and peaceful, can be called economic anarchy. And this is also the principle most consistent with Science, Nature and Justice.

IV. Religious Dogmas

All religious dogmas are contrary to Justice, because all of them, in a more or less hidden manner, advocate social inequality. They are contrary to Nature, because it has its immutable laws and all religions try to counteract them, either by means of miracles, or by supposing the existence of myths that are capable of more than these immutable laws. Finally, all religions are contrary to Science, because they suppose faith, which consists in blindly believing, whereas Science has precisely the task of clarifying everything dark and admits nothing without prior demonstration.

Here again, the only principle compatible with Science, Nature and Justice is religious Anarchy, or atheism.

Summary

Among the various revolutionary theories that claim to guarantee complete social emancipation, the one most in accordance with

organization. Why, say the first, should the idler and the worker have their needs met equally? — Why, say the second, should the privilege of the strong and intelligent continue to prevail over men who are weak and of limited powers? Both questions deserve serious reflection and are well founded, when placed on the terrain of work as it is usually understood today; that is, as a synonym of fatigue, as an unpleasant thing. But it turns out that in the society of the future, work will present a very different aspect from the one it presents today. Today the proletarian, in order to just get by, must dedicate a number of hours to work that tires his organism, already weakened by lack of food and bored by the absolute lack of the intellectual, artistic and scientific enjoyments to which he is entitled. What is left over is fatigue. What he lacks is recreation and growth: later he yearns for the latter and curses the former. On the other hand, in a society rid of exploitation and monopolization, three or four hours a day will be enough for man to fulfill his part of the work that gives him the right to fulfill his needs. Of the twenty-four hours a day, twenty employed in rest and growth will make the work of the remaining four a resource, a hygienic exercise, a necessity, and more when each producer has chosen the kind of production most appropriate to their tastes and knowledge. This is the general case. As for the particular cases, they will probably compensate each other, since there may be an individual who does not like to work even the three or four hours for which they are responsible. On the other hand, there may be individuals who, for pleasure or as a hobby, dedicate more hours than are required of them. And will it be an injustice that the latter does not receive a supplement? No, because in the end they will have done nothing more than satisfy their taste.

As for the particular cases that may occur in collectivities governed anarchically, it can be guaranteed of course that there will be cases in which the collectivist solution is resorted to and cases in which the communist approach will be used, without breaking in the least with the anarchic principle. If in a communist society

For if every political dogma is contrary to Justice, to Science and to Nature, the revolutionary theory that claims to be in conformity with these three principles must begin by dispensing with all political dogma, or what is the same, declare itself henceforth anarchic.

II. Social Dogmas

Ignorance, faulty education, and, at times, established habits, often engender preoccupations that are sometimes rooted in such a way that the one who possesses them defends them with more heat and faith than they would scientific principles. From these concerns emerged a number of forms related to the social relations of humanity. The matrimonial family, the homeland, the law and morality are hollow principles to which, unfortunately, some organizations of good faith that call themselves revolutionaries still render fervent worship. And these principles remain so rooted that almost all of them have passed into the state of dogmas. And yet nothing is more contrary to Justice, Science and Nature. The latter advocates and demands love, but not a bond. The former advises mutual respect between sociological entities, but not a relative moral that varies according to the times, the climates, the races and even the organisms. It imposes right, but not law. In our society, replete with laws, right is trampled on everywhere. In a free society, which looked after the rights of all, the despotic law must give way before spontaneous agreement, always modifiable and revocable. Right is just, because it is essentially human. Law is tyrannical, because it favors some men to the detriment of others. The only laws that do not constitute tyranny, because they are linked to Science, are the natural laws to which we are all subject and without which we would not exist: laws that have given man heart and senses giving rise to the right to love; laws that have given him a stomach giving rise to the right to eat; laws that have

given him a brain giving rise to the right to think; laws that have given him sensibility giving rise to the right not to be abused.

And as any bisexual contract that departs from free love has to be regulated by laws, and as human laws are contrary to Nature, Science and Justice, any legislated or legislatable bisexual contract is also contrary to these three great principles.

Likewise, the homeland should have no more general limits than the Universe, nor any more particular limits than the sympathies and affinities, and should never have limits arbitrarily set by laws elaborated in a capricious way or to sanction an act of force and abuse.

As for the moral dogma, or rather, moral dogmas, as with religions, their variety proves the falsity of all. The widow of the Indian will be very moral if she allows herself to be burned alive on the grave of her husband; and the oriental wife will be immoral if she lets her face be seen in the street, thus defying the Science that would provide growth to her organism, pure air for her lungs and sunlight for the freshness of her complexion and the health of her body. On the other hand, in the same oriental climes, it is a very moral and honorable act to marry an odalisque already abandoned by the sultan! Usury is moral among Jews and immoral among Christians, who are no less likely to practice it if possible. For the proprietor it is immoral to attack the property of others; for the disinherited it is immoral to possess it. In a word, what is moral for some is immoral for others, and it is therefore illogical to want the morality that one creates to be moral for the whole world.

We see, then, that social dogmas, in whatever form they present themselves to us, are contrary to Science, Nature, and Justice; thus, the theory that wants to be in agreement with these three principles must inscribe on its flag the motto: *societary anarchy*.

III. Economic Dogmas

The schools to which the dictation of revolutionaries can be given proclaim, of course, the abolition of individual property, replacing it with property belonging to everyone and no one. The land and the tools of labor, being then available to those who want to make them produce, nevertheless need someone to make them produce. That is, men must work to meet their needs. From this relation between production and consumption, three main schools are deduced: authoritarian socialism, with all its divisions; collectivist anarchism and anarchist communism. The first does not concern us, because we have already shown in the first part of this work that no political or authoritarian party can be considered consistent with Science, Nature and Justice. There remain, then, the two economic aspirations of the anarchic camp: communism and collectivism. The first says: to each according to his needs; from each according to his capacities [*fuerzas*]. The second says: to each according to his works; from each according to his will.

Of course we can declare that both principles are good and not at all contrary to the anarchic idea, provided that they are not imposed and are consequences of a free and revocable agreement between the entities that practice them. From this point of view, the study of this important problem is very useful, with the understanding that the results that each one obtains from his studies will be new data that will help him to make his decision in his turn; but never a dogmatic formula that would become in the long run an imposition on individuals and sometimes on entire localities.

However we look at it, both the communist and collectivist forms are perfectly compatible with Science and Nature. The same is not true with respect to Justice. Placed on the terrain to which the present society has accustomed us, communist is unjust for those who consider man the product of his works and not his will. On the other hand, collectivism will be considered unfair by those one who sees in man a product of his double cerebral and muscular