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ABSTRACT

An "Anarchist Rabbi": The Life and Teachings of Rudolf Rocker

by

Mina Graur

Rudolf Rocker was born in 1873 in Mainz, Germany, and died in 1958 in New York. During his life, Rocker witnessed a rapidly changing world, and he extensively documented these changes. In a microcosm, Rocker's life reflects the development of the various trends within the anarchist movement, of which he was a prominent member. He joined the anarchist ranks at an early age, and to his last breath he remained an ardent believer in the goals and principles of anarchism. Rocker's main philosophical concern had been personal freedoms and the ability of society to protect these freedoms by non-coercive means. Rocker rejected the morality of all forms of authority, whether state, party or privileged minority. The only form of organization condoned by him was that of workers' federations or syndicates. In Rocker's vision, these federations would serve as the basis for creating a federated Europe, and ultimately a federated world order.

A disciple of Peter Kropotkin, Rocker established his prominence in anarchist philosophy as the ideologue of anarcho-syndicalism, his main contribution being the combination of theoretical anarchist theses with a practical syndicalist platform of action. Rocker's most important contribution to political philosophy,
Nationalism and Culture, contains both a comprehensive analysis of the rise of national sentiments, and a theoretical attempt to refute the morality of the state.

Rocker left his mark on anarchist history not only as a theoretician, but also as a practitioner. He was particularly active among the Jewish immigrants in London's East End, where he organized a cohesive and militant anarchist group. He led the local workers in industrial struggles against the "sweating system," and for two decades Rocker, a gentile with no knowledge of Yiddish, edited the Jewish anarchist organ, the Arbeter Fraint. In 1923, Rocker became known internationally due to his role in founding the Syndicalist International, the aim of which was to halt the growing influence of the Comintern.

Despite his political activities and writings, Rocker's life remained a neglected chapter in the history of anarchism. Drawing extensively on Yiddish sources, this work attempts to save Rocker from his undeserved oblivion.
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INTRODUCTION

"Here is a good fighter, the stalwart rebel, the profound thinker, the soaring poet, a man to be cherished," wrote one of Rudolf Rocker's acquaintances on the occasion of his seventieth birthday.¹ His words echoed the sincere sentiments of many. During his lifetime, Rocker was one of the pillars of the international anarchist movement, his friends and contemporaries having the highest respect for the man and his many decades of activity within the ranks of the anarchists. Yet, an attempt to look up Rudolf Rocker's name in present-day encyclopedias or other works of general reference will not yield much information about the man, his ideas and his seventy odd years of intensive work within the ranks of the international anarchist movement. Two esoteric encyclopedias, in which one can at least find an entry dedicated to Rocker, are the Judaica and the Dutch Grote Winkler Prins, and in both cases the narrative spans a few lines covering only elementary biographical information and dealing not at all or in a laconic form with Rocker's intellectual contributions to libertarian thinking. Similarly, textbooks and other general accounts of the history of the anarchist movement, such as George Woodcock's Anarchism, tend to ignore Rocker or to mention him only in passing. Even scholarly works dealing with events in which Rocker took an active part, historical processes to which Rocker's contributions were significant, and ideas which originated with Rocker, dedicate no more than a few lines to him. In fact, until 1981, there were only two studies which considered certain aspects of Rocker's activities more
seriously. The first was William J. Fishman's *East End Jewish Radicals 1875-1914*, which details the history of the Jewish radical movement in England prior to World War I, and deals quite eloquently with Rocker's activities among the Jewish East End anarchists. The second study is *Syndikalismus und Links Kommunismus von 1918-1923* by Hans Manfred Bock. In this book, Bock relates the emergence and growth of the German syndicalist movement in the first years of the Weimar Republic, emphasizing Rocker's prominent role in its organization. In addition to these two works a short biography of Rocker was published in Italian in 1953, *Rudolf Rocker: La sua Vita e le sue Opere* by Ugo Fedeli. Fedeli's work, however, is incomplete, and it lacks the historical perspective and appreciation of Rocker's life and work.

The lack of modern scholarly interest in Rocker's political activities and the fact that his copious literary and scholarly output is largely ignored is quite a puzzling phenomena considering the fact that Rocker was a remarkably influential figure among his fellow anarchists. The man whom the anarchists regarded as the "father of anarcho-syndicalism," the spiritual leader, and a true friend, somehow attracted very little academic attention in recent times. This oblivion is undeserving, even if we ignore all but one of Rocker's activities, the fact that he was the first to combine the theoretical and practical aspects of anarcho-syndicalism, thus producing a political platform for the syndicalist movement that was both pragmatic and enhanced by a theoretical foundation. His most important work, *Nationalism and Culture*, was hailed at the time of its
publication as a major contribution to political philosophy. In fact, Rocker was the only anarchist to attempt a comprehensive analysis of the emergence of nationalism, its various constituent parts, and its relations to the emergence of the political state and to the cultural development of civilization. The wide scope of Nationalism and Culture, its philosophical consistency and its lucid presentation, inevitably invite comparisons with Oswald Sprengler's The Decline of the West. Yet, while the later remains a cornerstone in philosophical and historical thought, both Nationalism and Culture and its author have been completely forgotten, even though The Decline of the West is vague, evasive, divergent, and unduly pessimistic, whereas Nationalism and Culture is clear, well researched, its theses sustained by extensive documentation and its outlook optimistic. Despite these claims to attention, even during the revival of the anarchist ideas in the 1960's, Rocker's name did not emerge out of the oblivion into which it sank following the demise of the anarchist movement.

The lack of interest in Rocker can be attributed in part to his personal life and style of conduct, which were too mundane and ordinary to draw wide attention. Rocker possessed neither the explosive, extravagant personality of Bakunin, nor Emma Goldman's fiery temper and scandalous sexual life. He was not endowed with Peter Kropotkin's aristocratic upbringing and scientific recognition, and by no stretch of imagination could Rocker be attributed the "degenerate" features usually associated with anarchists during the "Propaganda by Deed" era. In fact, Rocker's personality and life style were the exact opposite to what anarchists were like in the popular view. His mild,
friendly, easy-going nature was an antithesis to the widespread image of the raging, fanatical, bomb-throwing anarchist, who believed in nothing but destruction and scorned moderation and compromise.

An additional factor lessening interest in Rocker is the fact that a major part of his life-long activity was dedicated to the Jewish anarchist movements in London and the United States, two rather esoteric and peripheral branches of the international anarchist movement. Moreover, research into these issues is made difficult by a language barrier, since most documents pertaining to the period and to Rocker's activities were written in Yiddish.

Not until Peter Wienand published a biography of Rocker, entitled Der "Geborene" Rebell in 1981 was there any work which attempted to present the man's life and literary output seriously. Yet, while Wienand's book was novel in at least resurrecting Rocker from its modern scholarly obscurity, it suffered from several major drawbacks, the most obvious of which is the lack of attempt to analyze Rocker's standing in the context of the anarchist movement. Wienand's most comprehensive account of Rocker's activities is the one dealing with the hectic times of the Weimar Republic. In addition, Der "Geborene" Rebell contains quite a good section dealing with Rocker's activities in London in the years preceding World War I. There are, however, some important facets in Rudolf Rocker's work, which Peter Wienand chose not to deal with. In particular, Rocker's attempts and eventual success in merging the practical and theoretical facets of anarcho-syndicalism are largely ignored, and so are Rocker's anomalous enthusiastic attitudes towards violent acts during the phase of
anarchist terrorism, as well as Rocker's fascination with American liberal traditions. In addition, Wienand pays no attention to some original aspects in Rocker's thought, i.e., his heterodox view that labor struggles and gradual improvements in social conditions do not impede the pursuit for the overall social revolution. In the study that follows I deal with these issues, as well as with Rocker's views on racism and antisemitism both within and outside the Socialist movement in Germany and elsewhere, subjects that Wienand also does not discuss.

What Wienand's study lacks most is a broad perception of Rocker's place within the framework of the anarchist movement, both as theoretician and practitioner. This is the main question addressed in this work. Where can Rocker's views and actions be placed in the context of each stage in the historical development of anarchism? By virtue of longevity, Rocker lived through, witnessed and participated in some of the most tumultuous events in history, events that were particularly traumatic for the anarchist movement. It is one of the principal purposes of this study to find out how Rocker influenced the history of the anarchist movement and was influenced by it, and how these interactions changed during Rocker's lifetime.
NOTES


2. A computerized search in the Arts and Humanities Citation Index (1977-1986), published by the Institute for Scientific Information in Philadelphia, showed that Rudolf Rocker is cited approximately three to four times a year, most of the citations being to factual information contained in his biography of Johann Most.
CHAPTER ONE: THE SEARCH FOR IDENTITY

Johann Rudolf Rocker was born on March 25, 1873 in Mainz, Germany, the second son of Georg Philipp Rocker, a printer of music sheets, and Anna Margaretha (née Naumann), who was descendant from one of the old burger families of Mainz. The elder Rocker died in December 1877 at the early age of thirty four, when Rudolf Rocker was less than five years old.¹ Anna Margaretha was left with three children in her care: Philipp, the eldest, Rudolf, and Friedrich, nicknamed Fritz, who was only a few months old. After the father's death, the family circle was augmented by grandmother Naumann moving in to assist in taking care of the children. Although for Anna these were trying times, Rudolf recalls her good natured disposition, her gentle manners and, most of all, the fact that the children were subjected to neither hardship nor deprivation.²

In October 1884, Rudolf's mother remarried. Her second husband was Ludwig Baumgartner, a bookbinder who was younger than Anna, and seemed to care for her very much. This marriage presented Rudolf with a half brother, Ernest Ludwig Heinrich Baumgartner, with whom Rocker did not maintain close contact. Nor did he have a close relationship with his elder brother, Philipp, who, at that time, was already apprenticed to a bookbinder and was no longer living at home. The only family member with whom Rudolf established and maintained intimate relationship was his younger brother, Fritz, for whom Rudolf was caretaker and protector. Anna's second marriage did not last for a long time. She was diagnosed as having cancer and died in 1887. As a
consequence, the children were left under the care of their stepfather. This situation too lasted only for a brief period of time, until the prospects of another marriage forced Rudolf and Fritz out of the Baumgartner's home. Fritz went to live with the Rocker grandparents, and Rudolf was placed in a Catholic orphanage.

Years later, while writing his autobiography, Rocker compared being sent to the orphanage to being exiled to the desert, away from everything that was dear to him or that he cared for, and deprived of any stimulating experiences such as reading or studying extracurricular material. Twice he tried to run away. Because of his unwillingness to compromise his family, however, the first time he ran away Rocker just wandered aimlessly in the woods surrounding the city of Mainz. He was soon found and brought back to the confines of the orphanage. His second escape lasted longer. This time, Rudolf Rocker became a cabin-boy for a shipping company from Cologne-Düsseldorf, and spent six months on a liner boat travelling between Mainz and Rotterdam. This was the first time Rocker left his native city, and he was enchanted by the sights he encountered on the way to Rotterdam. The management of the orphanage, however, did not approve of his new occupation, and the fifteen year old Rudolf Rocker was forced to return to the much hated institution. In his memoirs, Rocker stated that the seeds of his subsequent philosophy of rejection of all forms of authoritarianism and institutionalism were planted in his mind during his stay in the orphanage.

At the same time, Rocker emphasized that the inmates of the orphanage were never badly treated, at least not in the physical sense
of the word. They were, however, completely deprived of individual care, privacy, and consideration, and were mostly looked upon by the institutional authorities as statistical entities. The inevitable result was a prevailing atmosphere of apathy, carelessness and cynicism among the children. Rudolf Rocker refused to give in to the general sense of helplessness, and he maintained that such attitudes can only cripple the mental development of youngsters.

After finishing school, Rocker was apprenticed to the bookbindery profession, following in the steps of his brother, Philipp, and his maternal uncle, Carl Naumann. Carl Rudolf Naumann, nicknamed "The Professor" by the members of his family, was to have a vast and lasting influence on Rudolf's intellectual and spiritual development. The uncle was more than a substitute for Rocker's dead parents, he was a role model for the impressionable youngster, who, while at the orphanage, had been systematically starved for tenderness and guidance. It is obvious from Rocker's recollections that he revered his uncle, whom he describes as a smiling philosopher endowed with infinite patience and deep understanding for "everyone and everything." Although himself a victim of unfavorable circumstances, uncle Carl Naumann did not became a bitter person nor did he carry a grudge against his surroundings. While he was pursuing an education in the natural sciences his family had lost its small capital, and Carl was forced to quit his studies and start working as a bookbinder to help out. Carl's appreciation of knowledge and learning remained untainted, however, and was manifested, for instance, in his sizeable and multifarious library.
It was in this library that Rocker found and eagerly devoured books on a wide variety of topics, and became acquainted with classical and modern prose and poetry, natural and earth sciences, travel literature, German and general history, philosophy and, in particular, socialist thinking. Carl Naumann, although an active socialist, was, according to his nephew's account, reluctant to become excessively involved in party politics. He did, on the other hand, possess a huge collection of books, pamphlets, newspapers and other socialist publications, part of which were considered illegal to hold under the anti-socialist legislations of the Bismarckian era. Young Rudolf liked best the hours when he could visit his uncle's home, either talking to him or reading in the library. With his deep understanding of the human soul and a bit of farsightedness, uncle Carl tried to fill in the vacancies left in Rudolf's life following the death of his parents. Especially, he provided Rocker with a specific direction to his intellectual development. He tutored Rocker in geography and natural sciences, and guided his reading in literature and social thinking. The discussions with his uncle on the socio-political situation prevailing at that time constituted the modest beginning that launched Rocker's career as an inquirer into social conditions.

Rocker, by his own admission, remained all his life an incurable romantic, a condition surely not hurt by his early exposure to romanticist and naturalist works of literature that he found in his uncle's library. In his adult years, he still retained this affection for the romantics, and still valued much of the same literary genres.
Some of his favorite books, such as Don Quixote by Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra and Germinal by Emile Zola, are but obvious manifestations of these tastes. In his youth, Rocker admitted in his memoirs, he was tremendously influenced by naturalist novelists such as Victor Hugo and by romanticist poets like Ferdinand Freiligrath.

It is possible that Rocker was touched not only by Freiligrath's poetry, but also by the romantic aspects of his life. Ferdinand Hermann Freiligrath (1810-1875), an accountant turned radical poet, wrote at first fashionable odes in a Huguesque style under the generous financial patronage of the Prussian king Frederick William IV. Increasingly, however, his poetry became more socialistic, radical, and anti-monarchical, and at various stages in his life he was forced into exile and arrested for subversion. In Cologne he co-edited the Neue Rheinische Zeitung with his long-standing friend Karl Marx. In his memoirs, Rudolf Rocker mentions two of Freiligrath's poems, Die Toten an die Lebenden (1848), the reason for the poet's arrest and subsequent acquittal on charges of subversion, and Die Revolution (1851) which appeared in his collection Neuere Politische und Soziale Gedichte (1849-1851) written in celebration of the 1848 revolutions. These poems, wrote Rocker, fired the young and eager imagination in him.7

Rocker also recalled the specific impression which Victor Hugo's book Les Misérables left on him. Hugo's book, like those of Emile Zola and Heinrik Ibsen later on, strengthened his recognition of the prevailing social injustice and nourished seeds of rebellion against social unfairness and authoritarianism that were already
germinating in his young mind. Rocker maintained, undoubtedly because of his romanticist bias, that social problems cannot be solved by using exclusively cool and rational means. One had to feel the suffering and injustice as vivid images. One had to be incited by anger and fury. The poems of the likes of Freiligrath and the books by Hugo or Eugen Sue served, in Rocker's opinion, these emotional purposes.

Another genre which shaped and stimulated Rocker's political thinking was the utopian novel. He specifies Edward Bellamy's Looking Backward as the most effective and influential. Edward Bellamy (1850-1898) was an American utopist, known best for his novel Looking Backward 2000-1887, which he wrote in 1888. The novel is set in Boston in the year 2000, and it describes the United States under an ideal socialist system. Bellamy's book which became very popular in the United States as well as in Germany - it sold over one million copies - presented Rocker for the first time with a thorough picture of a future socialist society. Looking Backward was Rocker's introduction to utopian literature, and he later came to regard highly this genre not so much for its literary profundity, but for its ability to stimulate the reader into seeing the vast opportunities possible and potential within different social orders. 

In his uncle's library, Rocker also became acquainted for the first time with socialist literature. There he found copies of the newspaper Der Sozialdemokrat and numerous other socialist pamphlets. In this library, he also leafed through or read books by August Bebel, Ferdinand Lassalle, Wilhelm Liebknecht, Wilhelm Wolff, Wilhelm
Weitling and Johann Most. Karl Marx's *Das Kapital* and Eugen Dühring's *Kritische Geschichte der Nationalökonomie und des Sozialismus* (1871) were among the books present, and although Rocker at his age could probably not have grasped the philosophical meaning and social implications of most of these works, they did, probably, influence his subsequent intellectual development. They helped him throughout his discussions with his uncle, and later on with his employer, "Meister" Kitschmann, the man who taught him the bookbinding trade. Rocker prided himself that Kitschmann was his first convert to socialism.

Two other important factors in Rocker's early development had an impact on his adult attitudes, his family's democratic, secular tradition, and the political atmosphere in Mainz. The Rocker family adhered to a democratic tradition dating back to his grandfather, who was an "Old Democrat," i.e., who took part in the revolutionary upheavals of 1848-1849. Rudolf's family on his mother side was nominally Catholic, but, except for his grandmother, no one in this family either attended church or practiced religious rites. Nor were the children in the family subjected to religious education even in the informal sense, a fact that Rocker attributes to the influence of uncle Carl on Anna Margaretha. These religious freedoms were probably important in shaping Rudolf Rocker's free thinking, anti-authoritarian personality.

Mainz, the city of Johann Gutenberg and the cradle of book printing, was in Rocker's youth a rapidly developing industrial city on the Rhine. A fertile ground for the development of social movements and ideas, Mainz had the reputation of being the most republican of
German cities. It had been a center for revolutionary propaganda and activity dating back to the times of the French Revolution. Its citizens received the invading French army of General Custine willingly and enthusiastically. Until the end of the French occupation in 1814, Mainz was part of the French Republic, and even sent delegates to the General Assembly in Paris. Rocker recalls that in his youth one could still feel the love and admiration for the French, as opposed to the hatred and contempt for the Prussians. After the unification of Germany under the leadership of Prussia, Mainz, a strategic location and one of Germany's strongest fortresses, became a huge military bastion for the Prussian army. Mainz's citizens, who objected to the unification of Germany under Prussia, and were less than pleased with the massive Prussian presence, showed their discontent openly and frequently. Violent encounters between soldiers of the Prussian army and civilians, especially sailors, were a common sight.

In such a city it is not surprising that Socialist thinking had a long history, and by the time Rocker came of age, the Socialist Party had a strong following in the city. By 1830, there already existed in Southern Hesse a group called the "Republican-Socialist Revolutionaries," under the leadership of Friedrich Ludwig "Rektor" Weidig and Georg Büchner. Socialist thinking and propaganda kept infiltrating the city through the French and Swiss borders, carried by runaway revolutionaries and wandering craftsmen from the centers of revolutionary emigration. Two of Mainz citizens, Karl Wallau and Paul Stumpf even belonged to Marx's circle of friends in Brussels. In
1848, Wallau issued a call to all German workers to establish a workers' union and prepare for a workers' congress in Mainz, and indeed, in 1848, an All German Workers' Meeting took place in Mainz. The Mainz Workers' Union was, at the time, one of the most active unions in Germany.

After the suppression of the 1848-1849 revolution, Socialist influences were not evident until the 1860's, when a Workers' Social-Democratic Union was established anew by Paul Stumpf, and Mainz became a stronghold of August Bebel, Wilhelm Liebknecht and their followers. Bebel and Liebknecht were the leaders of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party, which they co-founded in 1869. In 1875, the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party merged with the German General Workers' Union of Ferdinand Lassalle, and became the German Social-Democratic Party (S.P.D.). The Mainz group also followed attentively the International, mainly through Stumpf who maintained direct contact with Karl Marx in London. The General Council of the International even decided to hold a congress in Mainz, a plan that was rendered impracticable by the outbreak of the German-French war of 1870.

Significantly, when Rocker was growing up there were still people, among them his uncle Carl, who remembered fondly Johann Most, who had been working in Mainz in the year of Rocker's birth, writing articles for and editing the socialist periodical Süddeutsche Volksstimme. Although the fascination with Most's personality and ideas would appear in a much later stage in Rocker's life, especially after his own disappointment with German Social-democracy, Most's
presence in Mainz and the remnants of his successful propaganda
campaign must have left its imprint on Rocker. Uncle Carl held Most
in high esteem even after Most's "excommunication" from the Social-
Democratic Party on charges of anarchism. Rocker valued enormously his
uncle's opinions, especially on matters of personality, and one can
assume that the message conveyed to young Rocker by such an unorthodox
liking for a renegade socialist was that anarchism may not be such an
evil philosophy after all, despite social-democratic propaganda to the
contrary.

In early 1890, at the age of seventeen, Rudolf Rocker became
a member of the German Social-Democratic Party, which at the time was
the only radical opposition movement in existence in Germany. Rocker
had already been an active participant at the meetings of the
bookbinders' union, and he made there his oratorical debut. During the
campaign for the February elections of 1890 Rocker worked together
with other young party members arranging political meetings and
spreading socialist propaganda. In a political environment dominated
by Bismarck's anti-Socialist laws, the S.P.D. was compelled to engage
in what can only be described as a semi-clandestine electoral
campaign. The anti-Socialist laws were enacted by the Reichstag on
October 21, 1878, after two failed assassination attempts on the life
of Kaiser Wilhelm I had given Bismarck ample pretext to crush the
liberal and socialist movements. The law, which was nullified only
twelve years later, in September 1890, enabled the government to
dissolve circles with social-democratic, socialist or communist
proclivities, to break up meetings where such philosophies were
discussed or disseminated, and to prohibit the publication and
distribution of socialist newspapers and books.\textsuperscript{16} Paradoxically,
however, the law did not debar the Social-Democratic Party from
participating in the elections and did not prohibit socialists from
running for elective public office. Considering the unfavorable
circumstances under which the party conducted its campaign, the
elections proved a remarkable success - the party received almost 20% of
the ballot (nearly one and a half million votes) and won 35 seats
in the parliament.

In this inhospitable milieu, in May of 1890, Rocker and a
number of schoolmates with whom he shared common political convictions
founded a reading circle in Mainz under the name "Freiheit." The group
consisted of about 25 members, most of them between the ages of 18 and
25. The "Freiheit" met once a week for the purpose of reading and
discussing illegal socialist literature. The members of the reading
circle were mostly oblivious to the internal political conflicts
simmering within the Social Democratic Party, and were even less
knowledgeable about the existence and philosophies of radical groups
outside the socialist mainstream either inside or outside Germany. It
was by way of an Hungarian bookbinder, Ignaz Kovacs, that Rudolf
Rocker became aware of the existence of such groups. Kovacs also
supplied Rocker with anarchist literature and commentaries on current
events through which the inquiring Rocker was exposed to alternative
views and explanations on issues about which he read in the official
socialist press. By comparing the positions of the anarchists and
social-democrats, Rocker was perplexed to find himself agreeing more
often with the anarchists than with the official stands of his own party. In his autobiography, Rocker specifically remembers his indignation with the Sozialdemokrat, the S.P.D.'s organ, which on reporting the Haymarket affair in Chicago, attacked the anarchists as the worst enemies of the working class movement.17

Through another acquaintance, Hermann Busch of Magdeburg, Rocker became familiar with the opposition within the Social-Democratic Party. Hermann Busch, a party veteran since the days of Lassalle, knew personally the leaders of the "Jungen," & the opposition faction was dubbed, and had highly favorable opinions of their personalities and ideas. Busch had in his possession numerous issues of the "Jungen's" periodical, Volks Tribune, and Rocker read them eagerly. The fact that Busch and Rocker's uncle, Carl Naumann were close friends, only served to strengthen the influence of the veteran socialist on the impressionable young apprentice.

Subsequently, the Mainz reading circle established contact with the "Jungen," who provided information and clarifications on their ideas and activities. The S.P.D.'s establishment in Mainz did not look favorably on "Freiheit's" contact with the "Jungen," and attempted to dissuade its young members from pursuing the cooperation. Rocker later asserted, in reference to the dispute with the party's regional elders, that it was not only the ideological differences which alienated him from the party's mainstream, but also the authoritarian and paternalistic manner of expression adopted by otherwise reasonable people the moment they started dealing with the party's internal affairs.18 Rocker makes special reference to Karl Bitz, one of the
party's leaders in Mainz, who was the driving force behind the attempts to talk the "Freiheit" out of its unorthodox practices. Karl Bitz regarded Rocker as a rising star with great future within the S.P.D., and he was, consequently, more than ordinarily disappointed with Rocker's nonconformist behavior.

The disagreement with the party's leaders only served to strengthen the doubts Rocker had been entertaining about his place within an organization which he increasingly found narrow-minded and intolerant to even minuscule deviations from orthodoxy. It occurred to him that political parties might not always be the best guardians of democratic principles and that the pursuit of power common to all political parties might be incompatible with aspirations for freedom. 19 The incident also served to drive Rocker and his friends further away from the S.P.D.'s majority line and into establishing an official link with the opposition.

Before the party's elders tried to "talk sense" into the members of the reading circle and show them the "right way," the association between the "Freiheit" circle and the "Jungen" was almost nonexistent, except for a mere fraternity of ideas. After the break with the S.P.D.'s leadership, however, it became imperative to establish an official contact with the "Jungen," since the "Freiheit" was, in any event, being considered as the "Mainzer section of the Berlin opposition." 20

The internal opposition within the S.P.D. was mainly centered in Berlin, Magdeburg, Hamburg and Frankfurt am Main. During 1890 it was engaged in criticizing the principles, methods and
composition of the party, without really offering a substantive alternative. The "Jungen" promoted fundamentally anti-statist ideas and opposed vigorously all forms of parliamentary action. The group claimed that parliamentarism could never lead to the true realization of socialism, which could be accomplished, in their opinion, only through a social revolution. Elections could be useful only in the limited sense that they allow for socialist ideas to be propagated among the masses, but otherwise their usefulness was doubtful. The "Jungen's" main objection to participating in elections was that the parliamentary process would only lead to a further bureaucratization of the party, and in that way would postpone indefinitely the realization of the social revolution. They charged the party's mainstream of being involved in "petty bourgeois parliamentarism," which served as a corrupting factor for both the leaders and the masses. The "Jungen" pointed to the fact that by means of a parliamentary seat it was possible for "the hypocrite, the flatterer and the chair hunter" to assume inflated and undeserved importance. Specifically, they blamed the party's deputies in the Reichstag of overestimating their own worth and importance in ways not always conducive to the interests of their constituency, namely, the workers. As a consequence, claimed the "Jungen," the party, which before the enactment of the anti-socialist laws was a "pure proletarian class movement," was gradually loosing its proletarian character, becoming instead a bourgeois reform party, with only the adjective "socialist" as a pitiful reminder of its original social goals. The opposition also blamed the party's leadership for putting
off indefinitely the social revolution, which the "Jungen" regarded as
the S.P.D.'s raison d'être.

At that time, the young Rocker was also of the opinion that
Socialism could be achieved only through a cataclysmic upheaval and
not by means of parliamentary reforms. The enthusiasm of his youth,
however, would later make way for more moderate convictions. It is
important to emphasize that throughout his life, Rudolf Rocker
vehemently rejected the parliamentary option. Nevertheless, he and
other anarcho-syndicalists recognized the importance of instances in
which improvements in working and living conditions were achieved by
the workers through gradual means. "Even the least of the freedoms won
as a result of constant striving, sets up a milestone on the road to
the liberation of mankind," he would write in the evening of his
life. The mature Rocker would also cease to believe in the
omnipotence and exclusiveness of the revolution as a vehicle for
social change and as a universal weapon through which the human
condition could be uplifted from its degrading and miserable state.

In fact, he even came to the conclusion that a revolution may not even
change the economic structuring of a society. "The era of political
revolutions is over, and where such still occur they do not alter in
the least the bases of capitalist social order." Rocker stated that in his youth he was very much influenced
by the French Revolution and the ideas it spread. Later, however, he
would admit that in his enthusiasm he neglected to take notice of the
negative aspects of this revolution, namely, the government of terror
and the centralist tendencies of the Jacobins, two prerequisite
conditions recognized by Rocker as essential in bringing about the counter-revolution. Rocker confessed to being unduly influenced by a "revolutionary cult," by the mythology that surrounded revolutions, and in particular the French one, and not by objective considerations as to the true nature of such events. The same probably held true for the "Jungen's" fascination with revolution as the only force capable of changing social realities.

Later in his life, Rocker's opinions changed considerably on matters of revolution, and the feasibility of organizing them. His views evolved not only due to age and experience, but also as a result of his becoming more conversant with Pierre-Joseph Proudhon's writings. The philosophy of Proudhon (1809-1865) had a cumulative and lasting effect on Rocker's views on social questions. Proudhon considered revolution to be an organic development occurring within a society, not an impetuous eruption. Accordingly, Rocker would later claim that a true social revolution could be as much organized from above and as predictable as an earthquake. A revolution could materialize only through the initiative of the masses supervening a state of awareness of their social misery, and not through the directives of a party or any other organization. A political party, any political party, played no role, according to the mature Rocker, in revolution. This view differed significantly from the views Rocker held while belonging to the "Jungen," when he joined those who accused the party of neglecting the necessary means to bring about the much longed for revolution.

The "Jungen" were also in profound disagreement with the
S.P.D.'s establishment on several immediate practical issues. One such issue concerned the pragmatic decision on the part of the Social-Democratic party to endorse leftist candidates belonging to the Freisinnige party in the 1890 run-off elections in those districts where the probability of a socialist candidate winning was slim. The "Jungen" were also vocally critical of what they considered a violation of the directives of the July 1889 International Socialist Congress in Paris. The congress decided to proclaim May First as Labor Day and to call for large international demonstrations on May 1, 1890. While the "Jungen" regarded this event as an opportunity to foment massive workers' unrest, the party's leadership decided to preach restraint, claiming that there was really no need for workers' protests or class clashes since the 1890 elections provided the party with a growing parliamentary foundation from which to carry out its intended reforms. Whether the Social-Democratic faction within the Reichstag was indeed carrying out its promises was another point on which the majority and the "Jungen" disagreed. The opposition was very critical of the S.P.D.'s performance in parliament, in particular for introducing watered down pieces of legislation such as the proposal for a ten hours' workday instead of the more desirable eight hours day.

The rift within the party soon widened beyond the scope of a disagreement on tactics and acquired a personal dimension. Both sides proved extremely keen in pointing out the moral faults in the leaders of the rival faction, and in doing so, both factions sought to give its views maximum publicity. While the "Jungen" charged the party's
leadership with corruption, opportunism and petty bourgeois mentality, the heads of the S.P.D. retaliated, claiming that the "Jungen" were nothing more than a collection of literati divorced of any real connections with the proletariat on whose behalf they professed to speak. It seems that unlike the older generation of the party, the ranks of the "Jungen" included a considerable number of university trained intellectuals, men like Hans Mueller and Paul Ernest. 31 Rocker, however, later wrote that the attempt of the party leaders to portray the opposition merely as a group of intellectuals lacking grass-root support was a gross prevarication, and that the "Jungen," in fact, enjoyed significant popular following. 32 The personal bickering reached its climax when the "Jungen" were accused of being no less than police agents sent for the purpose of wrecking apart the party's unity. The accusation came from the very top. In a letter dated October 24, 1891, Engels charged the opposition of being composed of "agents provocateurs" and "anarchising" elements. Engels was also the one who dubbed the "Jungen" movement "a revolt of literati," claiming that its following never exceeded 200 sympathizers. 33

The split within the party reached such levels that it could not be bridged anymore, and at the convention of the S.D.P. in Erfurt, in October 1891, Bebel and Liebknecht were able to easily carry the congress with them and expel the "Jungen's" leaders and spokesmen from membership in the party. Rocker and his friends of the "Freiheit" circle had been subjected to the same treatment approximately a year earlier, following a "Jungen"-related disagreement with the Mainz
party machinery. At the party congress in Halle in October 1890, the Mainzer delegate and Reichstag deputy, Franz Jöst, branded the "Jungen" as a bunch of "police machinators."\(^{34}\) In a public meeting in Mainz Rocker characterized Jöst's accusations as "malevolent nonsense," to which Jöst and the party bosses promptly responded by demanding a written apology. Rocker bluntly refused, and as a consequence he was unceremoniously expelled from the S.P.D.. The other members of the reading circle were given official notice to chose between a continuation of their association with Rudolf Rocker and their party affiliation. They chose the former alternative.\(^{35}\) Rudolf Rocker's ousting was but a small example of the party's methods. The party that prided itself on discipline, loyalty and unity did not allow doubt and criticism to threaten its line. Instead, ideological disputes and individualist tendencies were treated swiftly with expulsion.

Despite their activism and idealism, the "Jungen" failed to carry any significant proportion of the S.P.D.'s members. They managed to attract only a few young enthusiasts who were eager for action and dissatisfied with reformist tactics, but on the whole they never constituted a serious challenge to the party. The "Jungen" simply failed to provide a credible alternative to the policies they attacked. Their alternative had always been the social revolution, which, considering the conservative political realities in Germany, was a far-fetched idea. Bebel was fully justified in telling Engels that the "opposition was dead from the moment it did not know what it wanted."\(^{36}\) Indeed, after the expulsion, some of the "Jungen" leaders
recanted their former heresies, and soon became respectable right-wing Socialists. 37

Rocker attributed the schism within the party to the authoritarian spirit of the German Socialist movement, a spirit which was evident from its very first days. According to Rocker, the tragedy of the worker's movement in Germany, and of German socialism in general, lay in the fact that its formative development occurred within the oppressive atmosphere of the Prussian state. The Germans possessed neither the revolutionary tradition of the French nor the liberal philosophy and practice of the English. Thus, they were incapable of developing a strong democratic movement to fight Prussian absolutism and to turn Germany into a bourgeois democracy. In addition, says Rocker, the founders of the socialist party were excessively influenced by Hegel's dicta on centralization, discipline and historical necessity. 38 Thus, the uncritical adoption of Hegel's ideas on historical determinism brought about a certain measure of social fatalism within the German Socialist movement, characterized by an obedient acceptance of all social developments as inevitable results of an ongoing economic process. 39 Excessive activism, like that advocated by the "Jungen," did not fit well within the framework of German Socialist philosophy.

Rocker, in particular, pointed an accusing finger toward the founding father of German Socialism, Ferdinand Lassalle (1825-1864). According to Rocker, Lassalle was a Prussian statist and a fanatical believer in Hegelian doctrines, who ruled the newly founded party with a dictatorial hand. 40 Lassalle's influence on the movement remained
immense even after his death, and Rocker claimed that his authority exceeded even that of Marx and Engels. It was from Lassalle that the German movement inherited its "lustful belief in the state and a part of its anti-freedom endeavors." Rocker, in fact, joked that if Lassalle had not been Jewish, monuments would have been erected in his honor by the leaders of the Third Reich, commemorating his invaluable contributions to the propagation of the idea of the totalitarian state.

In addition to these factors, which dated back to the party's inception, Rocker identified parliamentarism as a major reason for the party's political malaise. The socialist party became crippled, in his opinion, by long years of parliamentary routine and conformity and was no longer capable of either creative or effective political activity. The S.P.D. was an organization with millions of loyal followers, yet during its long existence, not once was this immense force mobilized and channelled into specific action against Germany's political absolutism. Obviously, Rocker claimed, bringing an end to absolutism was not one of the priorities of the leadership of the Social-Democratic Party. True, the party's leaders talked incessantly about class struggle and its historical inevitability, but in practice they preached moderation and compromise, always adhering to the principle that "calmness is the first duty of the citizen." Rocker concluded that his own estrangement from the party occurred not because the theory of Socialism intrinsically repulsed him. Rather, he was taken aback by the practices of the S.P.D., in particular, its dogmatic interpretation of socialist ideals and its total lack of
libertarian spirit.45

Despite being expelled from the S.P.D., in May 1891 Rocker was elected by the bookbinders' union as their representative to the Socialist International Congress that was scheduled to convene in Brussels in August. As both he and the union lacked the financial means to provide for traveling expenses, Rocker and a friend, Jean Meudt, decided to undertake the journey on foot. Arriving at the Belgian capital two days before the congress started, Rocker headed directly for Café "Fruck," which served at the time as the main meeting place for the German socialists residing in Brussels. At the café he made the acquaintance of Karl Höfer, a German anarchist known better by his pseudonym, Lambert. The meeting and subsequent conversations with Lambert played a crucial role in transferring Rocker's sympathies to the anarchist camp. From Lambert, who frequently engaged in smuggling anarchist literature into Germany, Rocker obtained several issues of the London-based anarchist newspaper Autonomie as well as a variety of pamphlets and books. Prominent among them were Michael Bakunin's God and the State and Peter Kropotkin's Anarchist Morality.

The Brussels congress from its beginning was plagued by endless arguments on technicalities, particularly on issues concerning membership eligibility. At the opening session it was pointed out to the anarchists that turned up uninvited that they could not attend. The reason given was partly procedural and partly ideological. The congress protocol prescribed that only those belonging to worker's organizations and only those who considered political action as a
legitimate means of class struggle could be considered delegates. These clauses meant, of course, that none of the anarchists qualified for participation. The rest of the congress' agenda dealt with what Rocker considered to be minor topics, such as the need for legislation to better the conditions of the working class and problems concerning the coordination of international trade union activity to parallel the international enterprises of the various socialist parties. While dealing with trivial and noncontroversial topics, the congress consistently avoided all fundamental questions like parliamentarism, universal suffrage and the efficacy of the general strike, issues which the Dutch socialist Domela Nieuwenhuis tried repeatedly and unsuccessfully to bring up for discussion.

Nieuwenhuis' personality and ideas exercised a tremendous influence on Rocker, who recalled in particular the debate, or rather the duel, between Nieuwenhuis and Karl Liebknecht on the issue of militarism. Militarism and the potential countermeasures available to the socialists in combating it constituted an unending and irritating issue that surfaced ominously in every socialist congress from 1891 to the outbreak of World War I. The majority's resolution on this subject introduced by Liebknecht and the French Socialist leader Edouard Valliant urged the congress to declare militarism a direct result of capitalist exploitation. Peace, according to the resolution, could be achieved only by a socialist government. Significantly, the motion, which blamed a possible outbreak of war on the ruling classes, was completely devoid of any practical suggestions as to what the socialists should do to prevent one, or in case war did break out, to
stop it. Liebknecht was mostly responsible for removing all practical implications from the resolution, explaining that the German Socialists had to be careful with their policies and proclamations so as not to play into the hands of the government and supply it with the pretext needed to reenact anti-Socialist laws.\textsuperscript{47}

Nieuwenhuis bitterly criticized the spirit of compromise which he thought underlined the insipidness of the motion introduced by Liebknecht and Valliant, claiming that if the word "Christianity" were substituted for the word "socialism" throughout the text, even the Pope could subscribe to the resolution. Prophetically, he also expressed doubts as to whether "the international sentiments presupposed by socialism" do indeed exist among "our German brothers."\textsuperscript{48} The Dutch delegate claimed that it was not sufficient to blame the ruling class. A socialist should insist on concrete steps to put an end to the militarization of Europe. He acknowledged the possibility of grave repercussions against socialists, but stated that these would constitute a negligible sacrifice in comparison with the unimaginable catastrophe due to an all-European war. He urged the congress to adopt a resolution which would call for an encompassing anti-militarist propaganda campaign, stating that it was the socialists' duty to inform and persuade the workers on the possibility that the approaching war could be efficiently halted by means of a general and international strike. He went even further, arguing that in case a war did break out it was the duty of the Socialist parties to extend and modify its scope, and turn it into a civil war between classes.\textsuperscript{49}
Liebknecht's answer was that it was more important and effective to strengthen working class organization and to try to improve workers' conditions than to talk endlessly of revolution. Rocker regarded Liebknecht's reply to Nieuwenhuis as unsatisfying and uninspiring. Still faithful to the philosophy of the "Jungen," he preferred action, even modest action, over vacuous words. With only few dissenting voices, the Liebknecht-Valliant resolution was adopted. Conversely, Nieuwenhuis' activism was rejected by a large majority. The issue lay dormant until the next congress in Zürich, August 1893.

The Brussels congress proved a very disappointing experience for the eighteen-year-old Rocker, who anticipated that it would be more enlightening on the important issues of the day. In particular, he abhorred the procedural bickering over the membership issue, which rendered the slogan "Workers of the World Unite!" empty and banal. Nevertheless, for Rocker, the congress was more than a juvenile exercise in disillusionment and indignation. The congress was a turning point, a catalyst that quickened the process of Rocker's political conversion. According to his memoirs he arrived at Brussels a skeptical socialist and left it standing on the threshold of anarchism. His friendship with Lambert soon expanded into political camaraderie, and Rocker eventually joined Lambert in spreading anarchist propaganda throughout Germany.

Conceivably, the most significant consequence of Rocker's trip to Belgium was his "discovery" of Bakunin, toward whose personality and ideas he was drawn like a magnet. In Brussels, Rocker obtained some anarchist literature from Lambert, and following the
congress he immediately immersed himself in Bakunin's *God and the State* (1871), an uncompleted exposition of the different forms of religion and government, and the reciprocal relationship between them. As with all of his other revolutionary endeavors, which were always cut short of completion, Michael Bakunin (1814-1876) could never bring himself to finish a book. *God and the State* is in fact not even an uncompleted book, but what can be more properly described as a fragment of a fragment. During the first months of 1871 Bakunin was engaged in writing the second part of an essay on the "Knouto-Germanic Empire." He never finished this second part, and the uncompleted result was published six years after his death as *God and the State*. The central theme of this work is the historical claim that government and church have always combined forces to keep men in chains. From this fragmentary treatise Rocker developed the conviction that all political institutions originate in the same source - the irrational belief in a higher authority that determines the fate of humanity. Rocker also adopted Bakunin's conclusion that one has to fight the idea that all laws are sanctioned by Heaven, and therefore have to be obeyed always and at any price. Many years later, Rocker dedicated a large part of his most important work, *Nationalism and Culture* (1937), to the same theme - the parallels between secular order and religious order, trying to trace their historical roots and social implications. Rocker, however, accepted neither Bakunin's convictions on the uselessness of theoretical propaganda carried by small groups, nor Bakunin's strong belief in the exclusiveness of revolution in bringing about change in the people's perception of higher authorities and
their legitimacy. Throughout his life, Rocker remained a firm believer in the power of the written and spoken word to educate the masses and to evoke in them the consciousness of their own worth. The masses, Rocker thought, can be schooled to realize the truth in Bakunin's words "if God is everything, then the real world and the individual are nothing." 

Bakunin's animated and personal style, which reflected his tumultuous way of life, was in particular appealing to Rocker, who was tired of the wearisome polemical writing featured in the socialist newspapers. Bakunin's energetic compositions were not only full of pathos and emotion, but they also displayed a disregard for the rules of organized and systematic writing, rules which in a way were foreign to his character. Rocker especially admired Bakunin's technique of putting ardor, enthusiasm and fire into words. According to Rocker, Bakunin's literary works were not only produced in the heat of the moment, in response to burning contemporary events, but by reading them one could actually feel the direct impact of these events, and more importantly, one could acquire a genuine feeling for the zeitgeist. Rocker testified that Bakunin's writings were an important factor in unleashing his anarchist propensities and in arousing his passion against all political doctrines and religious dogmas.

On his way back from the congress in Brussels, Rocker, who had no money in his possession, was arrested by the Belgian police on charges of "vagabondism." Despite a letter of recommendation to the effect that he was to receive work as a trained bookbinder, he was
treated like all other vagabonds, and he spent ten days in jail without a trial. Following this short incarceration, Rocker was expelled from Belgium, and transported by train over the border. Back in Mainz, Rocker started to correspond with Lambert, who convinced him to found a local anarchist group. The members of the group which Rocker founded at the end of 1891 were all veterans of the "Jungen," who, like Rocker, slowly crossed over to the anarchist camp. Initially, Rocker's group included his friends Jean Meudt, Louis Gerlach, "Red" Wolf and "Shoemaker" Oberhuber. Later, they were joined by others, including Karl Biller, Hermann Tietze, Jean Heffner, Fritz Twieg and Heinrich Zahn.

Anarchist cells in Germany existed mainly in the big urban concentrations, cities like Berlin, Frankfurt am Main, Hannover and Hamburg. The main activity of the Mainz group, like that of the others, was to distribute anarchist material, which was proscribed by law. The literature which used to be smuggled into Germany through the Belgian and Dutch borders included among other things Most's Freiheit and the organs of the exiled German anarchist groups in London, Autonomie and Wahrheit. The quality of the publications received by the Mainz group and intended for dissemination varied greatly. Rocker recalled that among the books and pamphlets that arrived for distribution there had been some rather bizarre examples of anarchist thinking with names like Revenge and The Strike of the Children-Manufacturers," all the brain-children of a certain Konrad Freilich, who specialized in literary obscenities. The Mainz-based group also distributed the newspaper published by the "Jungen," Der
Socialist, which after the expulsion of the opposition from the S.P.D. started to manifest increasing anarchist tendencies under the editorship of Gustav Landauer.

During the Bismarckian era the anarchist movement in Germany operated underground, but unlike the Social-Democrats it had very little following. During the 1880's several factors conspired to lower the movement's membership even further. Due to changes in economic realities, and consequently, in the employment structure, the number of handicraftsmen, who formed the backbone of the anarchist movement, declined drastically. Many of the former artisans were forced into the growing German industrial sector and in their new positions they found the program of the S.P.D. more befitting to their interests. In addition, the method of "Propaganda by Deed" advocated and practiced by anarchists in the 1880's served not only to alienate most veteran members of the German anarchist movement, but also created a wave of repression. On top of that, the small anarchist movement was plagued by power struggles, factionalism and ideological disputes with various German exile groups. All of these factors contributed to its almost complete annihilation.

In the 1890's, however, the movement experienced a slow recovery and a broadening of its base of appeal. Its new members included industrial workers as well as a number of intellectuals - mostly discontented Social-Democrats who were disenchanted with the S.P.D.'s reformist policies. The anarchist movement, however, never achieved as broad a base or as uniform a platform as the socialists. In addition to internal strife and organizational difficulties, the
anarchists had to spend much of their resources and time in constant fighting on two fronts, the police and the S.P.D..

Nevertheless, the beginning of the 1890's were ripe, according to Rocker, for organizing the different groups in the big cities into a cohesive, strong movement. This would have been possible if only the various anarchist cells could have agreed on a common ideological basis and line of action. German anarchists belonged mainly to one of two trends. The minority adhered to individualist anarchism, an extreme fringe of libertarian philosophy seeking to assure the absolute independence of the individual, thus negating the social basis of anarchism. This theory derived its fundamentals from Max Stirner's (Johann Kaspar Schmidt, 1806-1856) book Der Einzige und sein Eigentum (The Only One and his Property, 1843, translated into English by Steven T. Byington in 1907 as The Ego and his Own). Stirner rejected the state, as well as any other form of social organization, and reduced society to a union of egoists. French anarchism during the 1890's was particularly inclined toward individualism, characterized by an extreme rejection and distrust of all forms of organization, and a particularly violent form of individual terror.

The majority of anarchists in Germany, however, belonged to the anarcho-communist current. Anarchist communism is associated particularly with Peter Kropotkin (1842-1921), who was the most articulate exponent of a trend that grew out of discussions among anarchist intellectuals in Geneva during the years following the Paris Commune of 1871. Through Kropotkin's literary efforts, anarchist communism was much more elaborately worked out than any other trend in
anarchism. In his major books: The Conquest of Bread (1892), Fields, Factories and Workshops (1899) and Mutual Aid (1902), Kropotkin worked out a scheme of a decentralized society based on the integration of agriculture and industry, education and manual work. Underlying anarcho-communism is the idea that the individual is entitled to be provided by the community with the basic means of living, regardless of one's contribution to the productivity of society. This notion was in turn derived from François Marie Charles Fourier's (1772-1837) dictum on the right of every individual to receive from the community the basic means of subsistence, even if he did not or could not provide anything useful in return.

Rocker claimed that most of the German anarchists adhered to the anarcho-communist current not because they considered it the most plausible among anarchist trends, but for the simple reason that they did not know about the existence of competing theories. Rocker claimed that about "99%" of the anarchists were not even familiar with the fundamentals of anarchist theory, and had little, if any, contact with anarchist groups outside Germany. Rocker blamed this ignorance on the limited anarchist literature available in the German language. The irony is that when anarchists did acquire some knowledge on the existence of alternative trends in anarchist thinking it served only to further the factionalism within the movement. In fact, says Rocker, every new influence instead of stimulating to activity and invigorating the ideological basis of the German anarchist movement served only to split it into smaller and smaller cliques. Another factor that contributed to the weakness of anarchism
in Germany was that anarchist cells were made up of mainly young enthusiasts who adhered to anarchism more because of their romantic predilections than out of rational understanding of the ideas underlying anarchist philosophy. Rocker confesses that, at the time, he and other members of the group were mostly attracted to anarchist activity by the atmosphere of conspiracy and adventure associated with the act of smuggling and distributing illegal material under the nose of the police. "We played with danger and had our satisfaction," admitted Rocker in his autobiography.\(^1\) Needless to emphasize, the experiences of those who were caught were more painful than romantic.

Towards the end of 1892 Rocker toyed with the idea of traveling abroad to broaden his horizons - to learn new languages, to become acquainted with anarchist groups outside Germany and to study anarchist history and theory. Besides, as he was approaching his twentieth birthday he was drawing perilously near to being enlisted for military service, a prospect which he did not relish very much. During his youth in Mainz, which was a garrison city, Rocker had ample opportunities to watch the life of soldiers in the barracks, and he frequently witnessed the humiliations to which they were subjected from the hands of their superiors. Understandably, Rocker had difficulty visualizing himself in their position, all the more so given the purpose of service - protecting the Kaiser and his social order, two entities he so dearly yearned to overthrow. Rocker's departure from Germany was determined, nevertheless, more by unexpected and rather sudden circumstances than by any other considerations. During a meeting of unemployed workers that Rocker
helped to organize, and where he was the main speaker, Sepp Oerter, who replaced Lambert in smuggling forbidden literature after the latter's arrest, took the podium and delivered a fiery speech touching on the issue of expropriation. Overestimating the tolerance of the two policemen who were present at the meeting by placing the right to life above the right for property and challenging his audience to help themselves to whatever they needed, Oerter brought about his own arrest. The day after the incident a friend tipped off Rocker that policemen had come to arrest him in his working place. Rocker managed to flee, arriving in Paris in November 1892, thus, starting an exile which lasted for more than a quarter of a century.
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CHAPTER TWO: THE TERRORIST PHASE OF ANARCHISM

When Rudolf Rocker arrived in Paris on a cold November day in 1892 his first concerns were finding lodging and work. With the help of a fellow German exile, the shoemaker Leopold Zack, he rented a small room on 146 Rue St. Honoré, a narrow street in a suburb which at the time was inhabited mainly by petty craftsmen. From his new base he started exploring the city, which as the site of the great revolution possessed an almost magical fascination for Rocker. Finding a job, however, proved to be a more complicated enterprise. Rocker did not speak French well enough to work on his own, and among his German friends there was not a single self-employed bookbinder for whom he could start working. At this point, Rocker was aided by Jean Grave, the editor of the French anarchist newspaper, La Révolte. Grave helped Rocker get acquainted with several local bookbinders, and these provided Rocker with occasional work. In addition, Rocker's German friends from the "Union of Independent Socialists" financed Rocker's initial private and professional needs, thus enabling Rocker to become partially self-employed, and to execute small commissions furnished by several of Paris' book dealers.

Rocker resided in France for a little more than two years. In his memoirs he documented at considerable length the public facets of his life in Paris. His personal affairs, on the other hand, received meager coverage. "Like most of the young people," wrote Rocker, "I too had various experiences by the age of twenty." As it
happened, the result of one such experience was a son by the name of Rudolf, born on August 30, 1893. Rocker had already been acquainted with the mother, a woman by the name of Charlotte, in Mainz. Soon after Rocker's sudden departure from Germany, Charlotte joined him in Paris. They lived together for several years in both Paris and London. "The relationship never developed," claimed Rocker, "because between us there was no spiritual bond." In London they separated by mutual agreement so as "not to ruin their young lives," and despite Rocker's pleas she took young Rudolf with her to Germany. Later she married and wrote to Rocker to the effect that the child was a source of annoyance for her husband. Rocker took his six-years-old son into his house, where he raised him together with Fermin, Rocker's other son. Fermin's mother and Rocker's life-long companion, Milly Witkop-Rocker served as mother for both children.²

If the above narrative sounds vague, inexact and parenthetical, it is because Rocker was extremely laconic in his descriptions of the affair. So laconic, in fact, that Charlotte is not even mentioned by name in the single paragraph dedicated to this issue in Rocker's memoirs, but is referred to as "a maidl" (a girl). The few facts known to us are bits and pieces of information gathered from various indirect resources, such as memoirs of friends and tributes to Rocker written by his contemporaries.

In February 1893 Rocker was invited by the "Autonomie" group to London to discuss the possibility of undertaking the task of smuggling anarchist literature into Germany, a job which was then vacant as a result of Lambert's and Oerter's successive arrests.
Although at the time the offer clashed with his activity in France, Rudolf Rocker was, nonetheless, ready to accept the venture. According to Rocker's own testimony, all considerations against the offered job were set aside, shadowed by his sense of duty, and, more importantly, by his juvenile inclinations towards adventure. Immediately after receiving the invitation, Rocker crossed the Channel. Surprisingly, he found the London group having serious second thoughts in regard to the entire project. The misgivings were due to changed circumstances, mainly their realization of the fact that the German newspaper, *Sozialist*, edited at the time by Gustav Landauer, was gradually becoming an important and outspoken organ of German anarchism, having the added advantage of being published in situ. The "Autonomie" group reasoned that it probably would be more effective to support what seemed to be an active and influential propaganda tool in Germany than to continue to propagate essentially the same views as the *Sozialist* from their isolated exile. Consequently, the London group decided to discontinue the publication of *Autonomie*. The last issue appeared in April 1893. The project of smuggling anarchist literature into Germany was rendered obsolete, and Rocker, who, by his own admission, was rather relieved, returned to Paris.

Back in Paris from London Rocker took an active part in the meetings and activities of the "Union of Independent Socialists," an organization founded by exiled German radicals. Rocker estimated that the group consisted of 50-60 members. Their meeting places were either at a café on Rue Faubourg du Temple or at the residence of Father Mayer, an old Hungarian revolutionary who played an uncertain
role in the Austrian radical movement before being forced into exile. The activities of the Independent Socialists consisted mainly of discussing and arguing contemporary issues and social problems.

Rocker, however, did not confine himself to German circles in Paris. In the spring of 1893, for instance, he had his first encounter with Jewish radicals through a German friend, who invited him to attend a meeting of Jewish anarchists. The Jewish anarchist group held regular meetings on Sunday evenings in a café on Boulevard Barbès, and Rocker soon became a frequent visitor. On several occasions Rocker lectured in German at these gatherings.

Before these meetings, Rocker had little opportunity to meet Jews. His previous contacts had been superficial, sporadic and, more importantly, limited to encounters with Jews from his hometown, Mainz. Whatever perfunctory opinions he had formed on Jews prior to his Parisian encounters conformed, by and large, to the prevailing prejudices of German bigotry. Rocker was, thus, taken by surprise to find none of the stereotypical traits routinely attributed to Jews in the caricatures of the period, and associated with Jewishness in the minds of the common people. Since the Jews in Mainz were mostly tradesmen and professionals, Rocker was astonished to find out that almost all the Jewish anarchists he came to know in Paris were laborers and artisans. Another phenomenon which struck Rocker as extraordinary was the magnitude of active female participation in the work of the Jewish anarchist circle. Rocker commented favorably on their atypical behavior, setting them apart from both traditional women as well as from the suffragettes of the period, pointing out
that their revolutionary activities did not seem to adversely effect their femininity and motherliness. He concluded that their independence and self-determination was more than skin-deep. Those women, claimed Rocker, gained their human dignity through a process of true emancipation coming from within, and experienced no inner conflicts as a result of their assuming a new role in society. Consequently, Jewish women anarchists did not experience the need to, and indeed they did not resort to irritating external earmarks to proclaim their freedom.  

The Jewish anarchist group in Paris was founded by young Russian students who were forced to abandon their academic pursuits and flee their homeland as a consequence of their revolutionary activities. In order to make a living they acquired a trade, thus becoming shoemakers, bookbinders, etc. At the time Rocker came to know these radicals there did not exist any separate organization or party of the Jewish proletariat in either Russia or Poland. This happened only in 1897 when the Bund, the Jewish Socialist Party, was founded and started carrying on a Marxist program. Unlike the Bund, which adopted Otto Bauer's vision of an extraterritorial autonomy as a solution to the Jewish national problem, the Zionists, who favored political self-determination in the form of a Jewish state, the radical Jews in Paris treated the problem of Jewish national self determination as an essentially non-national issue. Instead, they regarded the problem as part of a more general social question, which would, accordingly, be resolved by means of an all-engulfing social revolution. Thus, for the young Jewish revolutionaries, the social
revolution became an absolute necessity, a cataclysmic event for which they were ready to sacrifice everything. Rocker was fascinated by these anarchists who embodied in their very existence the Bakuninist type of a revolutionary, dedicating themselves, body and soul, to the idea of the coming revolution. Their lives corresponded to some extent to the description of the revolutionary in Sergei Nechaev and Michael Bakunin's Catechism of a Revolutionary. "The revolutionary is a lost man... Everything in him is absorbed by a single, exclusive interest, a single thought, a single passion - the revolution."7

One of the more remarkable personalities belonging to the Jewish anarchist group was Solomon Zainwil Rapaport (or Salomon Seinwil Rapoport, 1863-1920), who later became better known by his nom de plume, S. An-Ski. An-Ski became famous as the author of the much acclaimed Yiddish play, the Dybbuk, as well as a writer of short stories and compiler and editor of Jewish folk-tales. In Russia, Rapaport had belonged to the populist movement, and for a while even went to live among Russian peasants, working as a blacksmith, bookbinder, factory hand, and teacher. He was forced to leave Russia in 1892, and settled in Paris two years later,8 where Rocker met him. For a while Rapaport and Rocker worked together, sharing both the tools of their trade and ideas. Through their long discussions Rocker became familiar with the daily life of the Jewish proletariat. In addition, Rapaport informed Rocker on the ideas and ways of life of the Russian revolutionaries. Rapaport, who was Peter Lavrov's secretary for six years, introduced Rocker to the renowned Russian revolutionary.
As an anarchist in 1890's France, Rocker was confronted with one of the most controversial issues in anarchist philosophy, namely the issue of anarchist terror. The last two decades of the nineteenth century were dotted with terrorist activities carried out by individuals who were either anarchists or at least professed publicly to be influenced by anarchist ideology.

The 1890's were traumatic years in the history of the anarchist movement. Internally, it was a period of division and polarization between those who advocated violent means and those who opposed this approach to solving sociopolitical issues. Externally, anarchism became forever stigmatized in the eyes of the public as a violent ideology. Politically, the anarchist movement brought on itself the unified wrath of its enemies, and the consequent measures of the authorities in effect paralyzed its activities. For these reasons, the 1890's were a period of utter defeat for the anarchists, marking the end of the romantic era in anarchist history. Later anarchist regroupings differed greatly from previous ones, organizing their political program along more pragmatic and realistic lines, with less emphasis on theory. Interestingly, the soul searching brought about by the events forced the anarchists to reach the conclusion that not all forms of organization should be damned. True, they never agreed to representative parliamentarism as a moral form of political action. But they recognized the need to circumvent the impractical alternative of direct democracy, and the anarcho-syndicalist movement became organized around the representative structures of the labor unions.
The catalyst behind these upheavals was the issue of violence. Dealing with violence on the philosophical level was by no means a novelty. One way or another, most anarchist theoreticians referred to and discussed the issue of violence. While some justified terror as a means of bringing about drastic change in the social order, others expressed doubts as to its efficacy or rejected violent means altogether.

William Godwin (1756-1836), one of the early precursors of anarchist thinking, rejected violence as being contrary to reason, and thus antagonistic to the best interests of mankind. Godwin did advocate resistance to injustices perpetrated by the community or its rulers, but he objected to forcible means. He opposed all forms of violent resistance, including revolution and tyrannicide, claiming that wherever there is assassination, there ends the confidence among fellow men. Instead, Godwin preached using passive modes of resistance, mainly censuring and educating. Notwithstanding, Godwin admitted to exceptional instances where violent means may be justified, such as in cases of self-defense against violent aggressors, both private and public. Significantly, however, while condoning the practical use of force in rare cases, he was careful neither to glorify violence per se nor to provide it with a philosophical support. To Godwin, violence was a philosophically indefensible method even in those cases where he himself deemed it unavoidable.

Max Stirner, the spiritual father of individual anarchism, represents the other end of the philosophical spectrum. Viewing
society as a union of egoists, Stirner carried individualism to its logical limit, and regarded violence as a legitimate form of expression by way of which the Ego of an individual reacts to given circumstances. Stirner did not even bother to provide moral justification for violence since he had already proclaimed that he has no objections to acts, the individual might commit in order to satisfy one's Ego. Stirner sanctioned all crimes providing they enabled the Ego to enjoy and express itself. The Ego, according to Stirner, ranks well above the State. "I, myself, decide over the life and death of others and not the state. Notions like theft and murder disappear before the sovereignty of the Ego."¹⁰ No further elaboration was needed in cases of self defense. In such cases, say the need to overcome the violence practiced by the state, one is completely free, according to Stirner, to use whatever means at his disposal, including those means which are defined by non-Stirnerians as criminal acts.¹¹

Pierre Joseph Proudhon, the creator of mutualism in anarchist thinking, was what can only be politely described as ambiguous on the subject of violence and its political desirability. His ideas on the issue are both vague and philosophically inconsistent, not surprisingly for a thinker whom one scholar has called a "deliberately and avowedly anti-systematic philosopher."¹² For instance, in referring to the subject of multinational violence, i.e. war, Proudhon closely follows the viewpoints of Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel and Immanuel Kant by regarding war as the source and nurturer of human culture and progress. "War is divine, that is to say it is primordial, essential to life and to the production of men and
society. On the other hand, Proudhon's essay on war, *La Guerre et la Paix*, ends with a proclamation to the effect that mankind needs and wants no more war, a statement that obviously contradicts his previous opinions on war as a vital prerequisite to all social and moral progress. One is tempted to reconcile these contradictions by concluding that Proudhon believed that war is a good thing as long as it is not used. And indeed, international problems, according to Proudhon, are ideally solved by achieving not war but a potentiality of war, a balance of power between the quarrelling sides. Proudhon preached this solution in particular in regard to disputes between the great powers, a solution he modeled on the Peace of Vienna, 1815. He believed that such a balance of power would render all political supremacy by one side unattainable. Proudhon, however, makes no explicit reference to individual violence, nor does he discuss much the subject of violent revolutions. In a letter to Karl Marx, probably from 1846, Proudhon denied the need for revolution in order to change society. One should not resort to violent means, according to Proudhon, because changes in society will occur through an economic process.

Michael Bakunin, the man who believed that "the lust for destruction is at the same time a creative lust," referred little in his writings to individual acts of terror. Bakunin preached and worked for a violent upheaval, but not one that is perpetrated by individuals. He wanted this violent act to be a social act. The basic supposition behind Bakunin's call for social violence was that since policy holders will defend their privileges, if need be violently, the
anarchist challenging them will, out of necessity, be forced to resort to power to overcome them. Bakunin's unrelenting hostility to authority and social institutions caused him to regard a violent revolution as the least of possible evils, in a sense reducing the moral question to a quantitative question. It was morally more humane, according to Bakunin's vivid description, to "stab and strangle dozens" during one revolutionary event, than to continuously and systematically murder "the millions," as was the practice of the state towards its citizens. However, whereas Bakunin preached a collectivist mode of revolution, the revolutionaries of his visions were highly idiosyncratic creatures. Bakunin was very much taken in by the romantic figure of the robber, the likes of Robin Hood and the Cossack leader Stenka Razin. In them Bakunin saw the essence of the true revolutionary, "...a revolutionary without fine phrases, without book-learned rhetoric, an implacable, tireless, practical revolutionary, a social revolutionary sprung up from the people..."

Peter Kropotkin's attitudes toward the necessity of violence are more problematic than those of his predecessors, and scholars tend to disagree on the extent, if any, of this saintly figure's support of violent means. In general, Kropotkin wished the social revolution to be as painless and as bloodless as possible. Nevertheless, he was not in particular fond of the Tolstoyan doctrine of non-resistance to evil, since there were times, he felt, when acts of violence were the only available means of protesting against tyranny and exploitation. He claimed that while terror was profoundly repulsive to his tastes, submitting passively to violence, especially that was emanating from
the State, was even more unsavory. Thus, he endorsed the practice of assassinating tyrants, as long as the assassins were motivated by "noble reasons" and were interested in the "common good of society." Kropotkin's articles in *Le Révolté* in the beginning of the 1880's served as theoretical foundations for the ill-famed doctrine of "Propaganda by Deed," a doctrine expounding the use of terror and revolutionary violence as a means of achieving the necessary social awareness to bring about an upheaval of the masses. In the most famous of these articles, Kropotkin called for a continuous incitement through the written and spoken word as well as through "the knife," "the rifle" and "the dynamite." The method gained popularity among prominent anarchist theorists, who, like Kropotkin, regarded it as a legitimate and highly effective tool for promoting revolutionary causes. Kropotkin embraced the method quite warmly when he wrote in 1880: "By actions which compel general attention, the new idea seeps into people's minds and wins converts. One such act, may in a few days, make more propaganda than thousands of pamphlets." A decade after giving this advice, Kropotkin admitted that the tactics was wrong, and that it was "grotesque" to believe that a handful of revolutionaries armed with a few bombs could bring about a social revolution. "A structure founded on centuries of history," he realized, could hardly be brought to its knees "by a few kilos of explosives..." In addition, Kropotkin grew increasingly nauseated with the acts of murder committed in the name of anarchism, and he disassociated himself from his previously held views. Martin Oppenheimer correctly identifies the problem faced by the anarchists
as an unbridgeable gap between radical ideology and radical practice. 24 "Propaganda by Deed" was acceptable in theory, but in the aftermath of its application, the anarchist theoreticians could not face the practical consequences of the idea. One might add in the case of Kropotkin's that his earlier defense of violent acts was extremely out of character. Tolstoy even remarked that Kropotkin's arguments in favor of violence sounded less like an expression of his own opinions and more like a profession of loyalty to the banner under which he and his friends served.

The concept of "Propaganda by Deed" was the brain child of two of the leaders of Italian anarchism, Errico Malatesta (1853-1932) and Carlo Cafiero (1846-1892), who first presented it in a joint statement before the Bern Congress of the Anarchist International in October 1876. The concept was christened "Propaganda by Deed" by a young French physician, Paul Brousse. Malatesta, who later became one of Rudolf Rocker's closest friends, accepted violence as a defense against state oppression. He regarded a violent revolution as the only effective instrument of putting an end to the perpetual terror practiced by the state and its ruling classes. Force was, according to Malatesta, the only answer to a situation whereby a small minority keeps the overwhelming majority of mankind in a state of servitude. 25 Specifically, the doctrine maintained that theoretical propaganda was of limited efficacy. Furthermore, theoretical literature reached a very limited audience, mostly the wrong audience, i.e. the educated and the leisurely, thus missing its intended constituency, the hard-working masses.
Ulrich Linse advances the rather unusual thesis that at the time of its inception, "Propaganda by Deed" was understood to mean insurrection rather than individual terror. If that was ever the case, it did not stay like that for long. However, I am of the opinion that no such ambiguity existed as to the intentions of those who advocated the method. I believe that Linse's thesis is part of his considerable efforts to play down the role of anarchists and anarchism in the violent events of the last two decades of the nineteenth century. Unfortunately, the historical events which resulted, directly or indirectly, from the doctrine of "Propaganda by Deed" prove Linse's rather heterodox opinions wrong. Six heads of state were assassinated starting with Tsar Alexander II in 1881 and followed by President Marie François Sadi Carnot of France in 1894, Premier Antonio Cánovas of Spain in 1897, Empress Elisabeth of Austria in 1898, King Umberto I of Italy in 1900, and U.S. President William McKinley in 1901. Numerous other officials as well as countless of innocent bystanders fell also victims to the indiscriminate use of terrorist tactics carried out under the slogan of "Propaganda by Deed."

The doctrine of "Propaganda by Deed" became the main theme of the Anarchist International Congress convened in London in July 1881. The Congress passed a resolution urging both individuals and organizations to devote themselves to the study of science in general and of chemistry in particular so as to be able to manufacture the instruments needed for the revolutionary cause. Johann Most, for instance, actually took a job in an explosives plant in Jersey City Heights, receiving training in the production of explosives. As a
result he published in 1883 a leaflet entitled Science of Revolutionary Warfare, in which he provided his readers with detailed instructions on the preparation of home made devices such as dynamite, bombs and fuses. Anarchist publications of the time carried articles instructing their readers in the "how to" business of bomb making and giving practical advice as to how such devices should be planted in order to maximize their effect. Some even suggested that domestic servants should poison their employers. One must, however, emphasize that several of the most outrageous anarchist periodicals were published and financed by the police, and served merely as means of provocation. For instance, the editor of La Révolution Sociale, Serreau, whose real name was Égide Spilleux, was on the payroll of the Paris Prefect of Police, Louis Andrieux.

Contrary to what might have been expected, the theory of "Propaganda by Deed" did not have an immediate influence on the practices of anarchists. More than a decade passed before it was turned into an active, though in retrospect ineffective, means of igniting the fuse of the social revolution. Most bombings and assassinations in Europe in the 1880's were carried out by non-anarchists, although the press invariably attributed the atrocities to the anarchists, thus creating a public image of a great international anarchist conspiracy. The ironic fact is that by the time "Propaganda by Deed" was actually adopted and put into practice by rank-and-file anarchists, the major theoreticians of anarchism stopped prescribing it. Anarchist periodicals virtually ceased recommending "Propaganda by Deed" in the late 1880's, mostly on the ground that it was "utopian"
to believe that individual terror can serve as a basis for a rational and sustainable propaganda campaign. The anarchist periodical La Révolte squarely admitted in 1892 that the planting of bombs did more harm than good to the anarchist cause. Kropotkin, too, recanted his previous positions in regard to individual terror, and denounced the doctrine of "Propaganda by Deed" as a mistake. "Revolutions are not made by heroic acts," he said. "Revolution is above all a popular movement."  

Years later, when dealing with anarchist violence, Rocker combined Kropotkin's pro- and anti-terror views, arriving at an intermediate position. Following his spiritual mentor's earlier views, Rocker considered individual terror to have an effect, but only a temporary one, in creating confusion and fear among the leaders of the existing social system. But such acts, added Rocker, this time incorporating Kropotkin's later views, could never serve as a solid foundation upon which a social movement can be built. Terror rapidly exhausts its efficacy, and in the long run it has little or no effect at all on the process of altering the social system.  

In a book he wrote about the terrorist movement in France, Rudolf Rocker was not content with merely repeating the prevailing pragmatist justifications of the anarchists. Instead, he was looking for a deeper, maybe hidden, morality that would render those acts just. Unfortunately, the only justification he could come up with was the Deuteronomic dictum of an eye for an eye. Rocker's basic argument was that the privileged had monopolized terror, as they had been doing in regard to everything else in society. Although theoretically and
morally violence was supposed to be outlawed, in reality violence was widespread and was used lightheartedly by the state and its leaders. Moreover, politicians who led their countrymen into bloody wars were not considered criminals. On the contrary, they were praised for their political cleverness in complete disregard to the number of corpses their policies left behind. The ruling classes, claimed Rocker, were using violence as a means of preserving their privileges. In contrast, none of the anarchists involved in violent acts advanced his personal interests. The revolutionary was motivated by a social instinct, trying to remove, if necessary by brutal force, the causes of human misery. Their acts were a protest, a manifestation of anger. They were motivated by social, even humanitarian, reasons. Naturally, then, according to Rocker, the means these anarchists used were social and humanitarian as well. Rocker likened the acts of anarchist terror to a heart surgery, which is needed to save a life. In this respect, Rocker fully accepts the Bakuninist attitude toward violence, defining it as a spontaneous outburst of revulsion and indignation against social injustice. Except for retaliatory purposes, Rocker failed to find any moral justification for violence. He evaded the question by claiming that these acts, be they moral or not, were the inevitable consequences of a certain moral order. "In a system founded on terror and violence, on reign and exploitation, political terror is the logical and unavoidable prospect." Continuing this deterministic line of reasoning, Rocker predicted that terror would reappear whenever and wherever oppressing circumstances would render violent means necessary. Rocker's apology of anarchist terror may, thus, be
summed up in two words: retaliation and inevitability.

Other anarchist theoreticians also justified violence as an inevitable countermeasure for the injustices perpetrated by society. Elisée Reclus (1830-1905), for instance, declared in 1892 that the act of revenge against injustices is a "definite right." The view that terror was inevitable had also been expressed by Peter Kropotkin, who in a letter to his Danish friend Georg Morris Brandes referring to the meaningless murder of the Austrian Empress Elisabeth, claimed that individuals were not to be blamed since they were driven to this extreme form of behavior by the appalling social conditions in which they lived.

Later in his years, Rocker's views concerning violence evolved considerably and he became a stout adversary of violent acts as a means to further the prospects of a social revolution. Working in Germany between the two world wars he preached pacifism and respect for human life. Nevertheless, one cannot dismiss the views expressed in his *Di Geshikhte fun der Terroristisher Bavegung in Frankraikh* (The History of the Terrorist Movement in France, 1906) as youthful deviations stemming from a momentary fit of infatuation with aggressive means. They were more than that. His views at the time reflected a zeitgeist, a consensus of opinions among contemporaneous fellow anarchists about what was right and moral. Later, when circumstances changed and the mentor, Kropotkin, backed away from supporting terrorist acts, so did Rocker, as well as many other anarchist thinkers. Interestingly, not all fascination with violence disappeared with time. Something of the era remained, and Rocker
confessed that even when writing his memoirs, he was over seventy at the time, he still believed that there were circumstances in which terrorist acts were not only justified, but abstaining from violence in these circumstances would be immoral.  

Rocker's views on violence were shaped during a unique period in anarchist history. They are, in this sense, a reflection of the times more than a result of careful and systematic thinking. Rocker, who preached pacifism and lived like a pacifist, may have never developed such a fascination with terror and terrorists, had he not lived in France in those violent times. During his stay in England, for instance, Rocker consistently and persistently condemned terror on both moral and practical grounds. Terror was endangering the very existence of the anarchist movement, he claimed. Be that as it may, Rocker was living in Paris in the first years of the 1890's, and he witnessed a tumultuous era that he documented in both his memoirs and in his book on the terrorist movement in France, and that influenced his way of thinking, at least temporarily. His recollections, although obviously biased, are important because they help not only to capture the atmosphere of the period, but also provide information on the ideas and emotions existing among his fellow anarchists in regard to "Propaganda by Deed" and its relevance to the question of revolution. Rocker regarded the period as a mandatory stage required for the development of the anarchist movement. It is true that violence, except for its propagandistic value did not result in the expected social change, unless by social change one means sheer chaos. Nevertheless, the importance of the
violent acts was that they dared to challenge and undermine the "holy institutions" of the existing society. Barrington Moore saw a similar connection between violence and the emergence of democracy. He notes that the chopping off heads of kings was "by no means the least important aspect" of controlling arbitrary rulers, and controlling rulers was one of the prerequisite stages towards a democratic system of government.\textsuperscript{42} Rocker agreed, since such violence disproved the belief in the exclusiveness of parliamentary activity in bringing about fundamental changes in the socioeconomic conditions.\textsuperscript{43} He held this belief even when recognizing the fact that terror, as a method, failed to achieve the aims of the working classes. In fact, the failure of terror served as a catalyst in bringing the anarchist movement to reconsider its long-term strategy as well as its tactics. The anarchist movement was thus forced both to choose more realistic, albeit more modest, targets, i.e., the betterment of the workers' living conditions, and to change its tactics, from strict adherence in revolutions to more gradualistic methods, like syndicalism.

The years immediately preceding the terrorist era in France were marked by political corruption, instability and what seemed to be an interminable series of scandals on a spectacular scale. In 1887, Daniel Wilson, the son in law of Jules Grévy, a Republican leader, who served as the President of the Republic since 1879, was found to own a prosperous "business," trafficking in honors and decorations. A long political crisis developed, which brought about the resignation of both the government and the president. This event marked the beginning of an era of instability. In 1889, General Boulanger, sponsored by the
monarchists and the Bonapartists, attempted a coup d'état. He failed, but despite swift action by the government against the General's supporters, the Third Republic was perceived as weak and getting weaker. The biggest scandal unravelled between 1890 and 1892, when a chain of shady events concerning the Panama Canal was made known to the public. One hundred and four deputies of the French parliament were implicated in a massive scandal of bribery, monetary irregularities and protectionism. Six ministers were brought to trial, and one of them was convicted. Even George Clemenceau's name was smeared by association. The image of the Republic and its representatives sank to an all time low and fueled criticism against the regime. In addition to being corrupt to the core, the French regime also pursued an economic policy that led directly to mass unemployment and consequent labor unrest. From the point of view of a would be revolutionary, there could be no better time to strike at a regime.

A series of terrorist acts in France started in March 1892 and lasted to June 1894. During this time nine people were killed and numerous others wounded in eleven separate detonations. In addition, the Serbian minister to France, Georgewitch, was severely wounded and the president of the Republic, Carnot, was stabbed to death. These acts took the form of a chain reaction, their perpetrators proclaiming that they were avenging either social injustices or the mistreatment or execution of previous perpetrators of terrorist acts. Ravachol, the person who had set the cascade of violence into motion, for instance, declared that his acts were in retaliation to the
mistreatment of anarchists involved in the Clichy affair.

On May 1, 1891, a group of anarchists tried to hold a demonstration in the Parisian suburb of Levallois. The police dispersed the demonstrators and chased their leaders, ultimately catching them in a wine shop in Clichy, a workers' suburb. In a gunfight that followed, five policemen were slightly injured and three anarchists were severely wounded. The three wounded anarchists were dragged to the police station, and while still bleeding were subjected to brutal treatment. At the trial, the prosecutor, Bulot, demanded the death penalty, an exaggerated judicial request considering the fact that no one was actually killed in the affair. The judge acquitted one of the leaders, and sentenced the other two to five and three years imprisonment, respectively. Close to a year after the Clichy affair, on March 14, 1892, the home of Benoist, the presiding judge at the Clichy trial was blown up by a bomb. A fortnight later, on March 27, 1892, another bomb exploded, this time in the home of the prosecuting attorney. In both cases there were no casualties.

Both acts were committed by a dyer's assistant, Claude François Koenigstein, who assumed the name Ravachol. Ravachol had previously violated the law, only his previous transgressions were thought, at least initially, to be minor ones, such as petty theft, liquor smuggling, and counterfeiting. He claimed that he became outraged by the brutality the Clichy anarchists were subjected to and consequently decided to victimize those who had played a role in the affair. Two days after the second explosion, he was spotted in Restaurant Véry by a waiter and arrested. On April 26, Ravachol was
sentenced to hard labor for life. At his trial, Ravachol professed to be an anarchist, and claimed to have acted as he did in order "to terrorize so as to force society to look attentively at those who suffer." But the Ravachol affair was not yet finished. An unknown avenger of Ravachol planted a bomb in Restaurant Véry, and the explosion killed the owner of the place, a relative of the waiter who informed the police about Ravachol. By then the police unearthed more of Ravachol's previous crimes, which included a case of grave robbery and, more significantly the murder of among others a ninety-two-year old beggar, Jacques Brunnel, known as the Hermit of Chambles. In his second trial, which opened on June 21, 1892, Ravachol was sentenced to death. He was executed on July 11, 1892.

The anarchists, to whom Ravachol claimed affinity, reacted in different ways to the man, his personality, and his deeds. One has to remember that Ravachol's acts were carried out under the banner of "Propaganda by Deed" at a time when most anarchist leaders had already abandoned this controversial idea. Peter Kropotkin, who ten years earlier might have hailed Ravachol as an activist who tried with his acts to rouse the masses, described Ravachol not as a true revolutionary but as a revolutionary of the "opera-bouffé variety." Malatesta, one of the forefathers of "Propaganda by Deed," likewise rejected Ravachol's acts.

But it seems that theirs were the only voices in the anarchist camp to unqualifiedly reject Ravachol's acts. Most other anarchists hailed Ravachol and his followers as the true revolutionaries of the period, the activists whose deeds might deliver
the coup de grâce to the existing social order. The same opinion was
shared by many in France literary circles. Octave Mirbeau, Laurent
Tailhade, Bernard Lazare, and Paul Adam were fascinated by the
terrorists and their daring, complicated, and suicidal personalities.
Octave Mirbeau, for instance, described Ravachol as the "peal of
thunder to which succeeds the joy of sunlight and of peaceful
skies."46

In contrast to the anarchists, most other contemporaneous
observers regarded the terrorist acts as an expression of madness and
their perpetrators as suffering from physical and mental disorders.
That was the time when the stereotype of the vile anarchist, a dagger
in his hand and a fuming bomb in his pocket, was planted in the
public's mind. The press and the police did their best to reinforce
this image and frighten the public with their specter of the "great
international anarchist conspiracy." The spirit of the period inspired
such famous novels like The Secret Agent by Joseph Conrad and Princess
Casamassima by Henry James. The possible relationship between
terrorism and environmental factors such as barometric pressure, moon
phases and droughts were seriously investigated, as were the effects
of alcohol and nutrition. Cesare Lombroso (1835-1909), the physician,
anthropologist and inventor of phrenology, even saw a connection
between bomb throwing and pellagra, a vitamin B deficiency.47 Lombroso
also claimed, justly in my opinion, that terrorist acts were in an
indirect sense a form of suicide, a Samsonic let-me-die-with-the-
Philistines type of suicide, fulfilling both a personal need as well
as a social one. The social need in this case were their perception
that social conscience could be evoked by hitting at the heart of the social order.

Morally, terrorism was indefensible, such that the anarchists who condoned acts of terror were forced to rationalize those acts by presenting them as a rebellion of the distressed against society. The most common apologetic theme evoked the inevitability factor, blaming all consequences on oppressive circumstances created by a particular social system. Emma Goldman (1869-1940), for instance, noted that the anarchist terrorists were drawn to violence as a result of tremendous pressures which rendered life unbearable. "High strung like a violin string, the anarchists weep and moan for life, so cruel, so terribly unhuman. In a desperate moment the string breaks." Rocker, too, used the same apologetic themes, maintaining that terrorist acts were the logical consequences of a prevailing social order that inflicted misery and despair. The violent acts were not the result of specific ideas. Rather they were spontaneous outbursts dictated by circumstances.

Rocker reached Paris three months after Ravachol was executed, but the debate on his personality and deeds still raged. Ravachol, who most likely was a petty thief and murderer of no political persuasion, assumed the vestment of a revolutionary with social conscience and thus, became a popular hero, a martyr who died for a cause. A new verb was coined, "ravacholisez." It meant to wipe out an enemy. Several ballads were written on his life, and these were sung with fervor in many revolutionary meetings. One of the songs ended with the words:
"It will come, it will come.  
Every bourgeois will have his bomb." \(^{50}\)

Rocker's reaction to Ravachol's affair was similar to that of his anarchist contemporaries. Ignoring Ravachol's criminal past and somewhat pathological personality, he described him as a positive, naive character, whose conscience had been awakened by an act of social injustice. Rocker, who was tremendously influenced by everything Bakunin wrote or said, applied the Bakuninist fascination with the figure of the robber to Ravachol. In a different period, Rocker claimed, Ravachol might have become a modern Robin Hood. Farfetched is probably not strong enough an adjective to describe Rocker's portrayal of Ravachol as a "chivalrous bandit who undertook single-handedly the struggle against the bourgeois social order." \(^{51}\)

A related issue which proved to be ideologically problematic for the anarchists of that dynamic era was the question of expropriation. Following Ravachol's example, there was a series of petty thefts and robberies whose performers upon being caught described themselves as anarchists and their felonies as revolutionary acts. Curiously, Rocker, who previously entertained doubts as to the revolutionary morality of murder, had no doubts whatsoever on whether the expropriation of property was revolutionarily justifiable or not. He was quick to assure his readers that there was no connection between these people and the anarchist movement. Personally, he continued, not only did he disapprove of expropriation, but he also objected to the dubbing of such acts as revolutionary acts. Rocker's views were in complete accord with those of Jean Grave. Theft, carried
out as a result of personal distress, such as poverty or hunger, could not be classified as crime, since the right to life was a higher right than the sanctity of property, but Rocker concurred with Grave when he said that theft, even in morally justifiable circumstances, was not in itself a revolutionary act.\textsuperscript{52}

Not all anarchists shared the same opinion in regard to expropriation. Some journals openly advocated the practice, and some even depended financially on the loot to continue their publication. Johann Most, for instance, was an avid supporter of expropriation as a means to subsidize revolutionary activities. He claimed that if the revolutionary act was right, then the manner in which the funds that made the act possible had been obtained was irrelevant. Moreover, he accused those anarchists who expressed indignation at robbery and theft of practicing high-brow morality, and he described their sanctimonious feelings as "idiotic."\textsuperscript{53}

After Ravachol's execution, there was a short lull in terrorist activities. The peace ended during the miners' strike against the Société des Mines de Carmaux, when on November 8, 1892, a bomb was planted in the Paris headquarters of the company. The bomb was discovered and carried away by a policeman to the nearest police station on Rue des Bons Enfants. There it exploded, killing five policemen. This act, however, was an isolated case. A new series of terrorist acts started only a year later, on November 13, 1893, when a shoemaker, Léon-Jules Léauthier, decided to plunge his cobbler's knife into the first bourgeois he met. The unfortunate bourgeois happened to be the Serbian Minister to France, who was severely wounded but
subsequently survived his injuries. Four weeks later, on December 9, Auguste Vaillant hurled a bomb from the gallery into the full Chamber of Deputies.

Vaillant's case was ideal for the anarchists, since in many respects it supported their previous contentions on the roots of violence. His was the perfect example of the despairing man taking revenge for the unbearable living conditions inflicted upon him by the social order. Bred in poverty, and frequently changing occupations, Vaillant managed to acquire some education, slowly drifting towards anarchist circles. He emigrated to Argentina trying to make a fortune, but failed and returned to Paris, where he tried in vain to find work with which to support his family. Deeply distressed by their misery and hopelessness, he decided to commit a symbolic act which would become "the cry of a whole class which demands its rights and will soon add acts to words."\(^5\) With this aim in mind, Vaillant manufactured a bomb out of a saucepan filled with nails and explosives. The bomb proved to be quite ineffective. Several deputies were wounded, but none was killed. The effect of Vaillant's act, however, went beyond a mere body count. His was an attack upon a symbol of authority, the core of the bourgeois governing system, and as such, the act itself became a symbol of defiance. Consequently, Vaillant's act could not have been simply ignored by the state. Nor, could it be hoped that it would soon be forgotten. Thus, despite the fact that no one was killed, Vaillant was sentenced to death, the first time since the beginning of the nineteenth century that such a penalty was imposed on a person who did not actually kill. Petitions
for clemency were ignored, and at the highest instance, President
Carnot refused to commute the sentence. Vaillant was beheaded on
February 5, 1894, uttering what subsequently became the standard cry
of anarchists on the gallows: "Long live Anarchy! My death shall be
avenged!"

Interestingly, Rudolf Rocker attended Vaillant's public
execution. Many years later, he confessed that it was still not very
clear to him why he went. He blamed his young age, and rationalized
in retrospect that this act might have been motivated by the fact that
"we, the young, were engulfed with a martyrs' cult."55

Vaillant's death was indeed avenged. A week after his
execution, a bomb was hurled into Café Terminus at La Gare St.
Lazare, killing one and wounding twenty. The perpetrator, Émile Henry,
subsequently confessed responsibility also for the November 8, 1892,
planting of the bomb which ultimately exploded inside a police
station. He declared that the act at the Café was meant to revenge
Vaillant's death, adding matter-of-factly that his purpose had been to
kill as many bourgeois as possible. A son of a famous Communard, Émile
Henry was the most educated and well-off among the French terrorists
of the era. Yet, his cold-blooded logic and soulless reasoning did
not endear him to his fellow anarchists, who almost unanimously
denounced his acts. The anarchists, who had had mixed feelings about
Ravachol and Vaillant, were horrified by Henry's explanations as to
why one should not discriminate between the innocents and the guilty
and why anarchists should fight the ruling class as an indivisible
entity. His was the worst kind of propaganda the anarchists had ever
hoped to promote by means of the "Propaganda by Deed." It was no
longer an attack directed at the symbols of authority and repression,
nor was it an outcry of distress. His acts were deliberate and
indiscriminate attacks on innocent people whose only guilt was
belonging, or being thought to belong, to a certain class. Henry's
acts were perfect examples of what later became known as "unmotivated
terror."

Writer Octave Mirbeau expressed the opinion of every
anarchist when he wrote that a "mortal enemy of anarchy could have
acted no better than this Émile Henry when he threw his inexplicable
bomb into the midst of peaceful and anonymous people..."56 Rudolf
Rocker himself confessed that neither he nor anyone else he was
acquainted with could understand Henry's acts. But Rocker's objections
to indiscriminate violence went beyond his disapproval of Henry's
personality and reasoning. Rocker objected to all acts of
"unmotivated terror" on fundamental grounds. Every act of "unmotivated
terror," even that resulting from a just wrath, had to be rejected,
according to Rocker, since justifying the act would require one to
presuppose the existence of collective guilt or collective
responsibility, a concept that Rocker deeply disliked and thought to
be wrong. It was not sufficient, he claimed, to belong to a certain
class to lose one's right to live. One might add in this context that
Rocker was consistent on the subject of collective guilt and
responsibility even when dealing with extremely controversial
instances. Even during World War II he maintained that a nation
should not be held collectively responsible for its leaders'
atrocities. Thus, he concluded, Germany as a nation was not responsible for the crimes committed by the Nazis. Collective responsibility was, according to Rocker, an element derived from Fascist ideology. If one assumes, as the fascists did, that the individual exists solely for the community and through it, then one is logically compelled to acknowledge that the notion of collective responsibility is a valid concept. On the other hand, for anarchists, collective responsibility would be a valid notion only in a nation which all the individuals share common interests regardless of class barriers. For the time being, concluded Rocker, the actual situation was far removed from this ideal, and thus anarchists must vehemently reject the concept of collective responsibility.

Rudolf Rocker maintained all his life an ambivalent attitude towards the terrorist era in France. On the one hand, he rejected violent acts as inhumane, even if in some particular cases he provided sociological reasons to why such acts might have been unavoidable. On the other hand, he judged the terrorist era in France to be of historical importance. He was of the opinion that terror accomplished a great deal in spreading anarchist ideas, and in drawing attention to the plights of the working classes, but he also recognized the negative effects of violent acts on the anarchist movement. He pointed an accusing finger towards those anarchists who had lost their ability to evaluate objectively the propagandistic value of certain acts, such as by accepting "unmotivated terror" as a justifiable means. On the other hand, he deeply respected the young terrorists for their willingness to sacrifice their lives for the sake of an idea. He
went to great pains to disassociate the anarchist movement, ideologically at least, from the violent acts of individuals, and yet he professed camaraderie with men the likes of Ravachol and Vaillant who were "flesh from our flesh and blood from our blood."  

Rocker recreated in his memoirs the vibrant atmosphere of the period, pointing out how he and his young friends greatly exaggerated the importance of what they considered to be revolutionary acts. They regarded the era of "Propaganda by Deed" as an historical turning point. They heard the bells toll for the nearing revolution. Years later, Rocker adopted a more sober outlook, claiming that the anarchists' mistake had been that in their enthusiasm they did not estimate correctly the balance of power between the anarchists and their foes. They took up the habit of overestimating their own worth, while at the same time underestimating the strength and determination of the authorities.

The last violent act that shook France took place in Lyons, on June 24, 1894, when a young Italian anarchist, Santo Caserio, stabbed to death President Carnot. Even before Carnot's assassination the authorities had grown impatient with the anarchists. On February 21, 1894, one of the leading anarchist newspapers, Le Père Peinard, was closed down by the police. Three weeks later La Révolte ceased to appear. As a result of the President's assassination many anarchists were arrested, others fled France while others laid quietly till the storm would pass. A series of laws directed against the anarchists, known as "les lois scélérates," were passed. Anarchist propaganda and meetings were prohibited.
On August 6, a group of some of the most prominent anarchists were brought to trial in what came to be known as the "Trial of the Thirty." The group included Jean Grave, Sébastien Faure, Paul Reclus, and Émile Pouget. The proceedings, which the authorities intended to turn into a show trial against anarchist ideology, lasted for a week. All anarchist leaders were acquitted. It was a small victory for anarchism, but a Pyrrhic one. The trial marked the end of an era in French anarchism. For all practical purposes, the local movement ceased to exist. When anarchism reappeared on the political scene in France at the beginning of the twentieth century it was a different type of anarchism. France became then one of the most important European strongholds of the anarcho-syndicalist trend.

Following the repressions against the anarchists, Rocker and his friends had to cease all political activity. Both the "Union of Independent Socialists" and the circle of Jewish anarchists in which Rocker was active had to curtail their activities. Many of Rocker's émigré friends left France looking for yet another place of refuge, while others were deported by the French authorities. The police also issued a deportation warrant for Rocker, only it could not be served since Rocker had previously changed his address, and did not bother to notify the police as required by law. Thirteen years later when Rocker returned to France for a visit, he was arrested, presented with the old warrant, and asked to leave France in three days.62

The end of 1894 was a difficult moment for Rocker. Burdened more than usual with financial problems, he realized that his continuing stay in France had become politically useless. As long as
he was active he did not feel isolated as a foreigner. Now that all activities were prohibited, he felt, like no other time in the past, the full impact of being in exile. At this point he decided he should resume political activity in a familiar environment and in a language he knew well. Rocker, however, was legally a deserter from the German army, and as such was faced with both prison and subsequent enlistment if he returned to his homeland. Becoming a soldier, a servant of the state and its anti-individualist spirit, was out of the question. Rocker concluded that his way back to Germany was for the time being blocked. He then considered the possibility of settling in Switzerland, but he ruled out this option since so many anarchists were at the time being deported from Switzerland. Rocker also toyed with the idea of crossing the Atlantic, but letters from friends in the United States were not very optimistic as to his chances of building a new life there.

At the end of November 1894, R. Gunderson, the former publisher of "Autonomie," arrived in France from England. He told Rocker about the possibility of undergoing a physical examination for determining the military fitness in the German Consulate in London. The physician in charge of these matters, so he told Rocker, was known to write medical recommendations for exemption from military service in return for a bribe. Accordingly, the chances were good, or so Rocker thought, of being able to return to Germany without passing through the military hurdle. It was a plan with no risks involved since if it did not work, Rocker would then be able to remain in London, where the prospects of resuming anarchist activities were
rozier than those in France. Rocker followed Gunderson's advice, and on the eve of 1895, he left for London.
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CHAPTER THREE: THE ANARCHIST "RABBI"

Rocker arrived in London on January 1, 1895. His friends from the local German exile group helped him find a room on Carburton Street in an area inhabited mainly by German, Austrian and French immigrants. Initially, Rocker did not bother with finding a permanent job or lodging because he was intent on returning to Germany as soon as possible. For sustenance he occasionally worked in bookbinding. Circumstances, however, proved Rocker's plans for the future overly optimistic. The German consulate refused his request to submit himself to medical examinations in London, and he was told unequivocally that exemptions from military service on medical grounds could only be issued in Germany by accredited German physicians.¹ This rule, Rocker knew, was an insurmountable obstacle, for without a document exempting him from military service he would be subject to arrest the moment he set foot on German soil. Rocker had no other choice but to come to terms with the fact that his return to his homeland was in effect blocked.

With the realization that London would serve as his home for a considerable period of time came the practical considerations. Rocker began accommodating to life in exile, thinking of getting a permanent job and immersing himself in renewed political activity. But first he decided to familiarize himself with the city. Every Saturday afternoon he took time to survey systematically the different parts of London, learning not only about the city's main cultural and
historical attractions but also studying closely the external manifestations of London's social structure and class stratification. He intended, in particular, to familiarize himself with those facets of the city he considered to be the dark side of the metropolis, the poverty stricken slums.²

Rocker must have been shocked badly by the extreme physical conditions prevailing in certain quarters of London, but he was particularly impressed by the psychological consequences of economic hardship, i.e. desperation and fatalism. In retrospect, he summarized the social setting of the slums in London's East End in almost Dickensian terms: "I saw with my own eyes thousands of human beings, who could hardly be considered such." "They went about in foul rags, through which their skin showed, dirty and lousy, never free from hunger, scavenging their food out of dustbins and the refuse heaps that were left behind after the markets closed." Rocker was also very much impressed by the indifference, and sometimes outright hostility exhibited at all levels towards the poorest of London's inhabitants. Speaking obliquely of the attitudes of the authorities he remarked: "There were at times thousands of people in London who had never slept in a bed, who just crept into some filthy hole where the police would not disturb them." Society at large exhibited no enlightened attitude either, and the poor were, according to Rocker, "shunned like lepers."³

Rocker's political activities centered initially around the immigrants' clubs, especially one that was frequented by German exiles in Grafton Street. The official name of the German group in Grafton
was "The First Section of the Communist Workers' Educational Unit."
The group had a following of about 500 members, and it consisted
mostly of three sections: veteran followers of Johann Most, adherents
of the Social-Revolutionary movement and members of the "Jungen"
faction in Germany. The later had by that time severed all relations
with the German Social-Democratic Party and after several metamorphic
changes became an integral part of the German anarchist movement. Some
members of the Grafton Street group had been associated in the past
with the journal *Autonomie*, and among its members Rocker found several
of his friends from both Mainz and Paris. Soon he was elected to the
post of librarian. This job provided Rocker not only with an
interesting occupation, but also with a more or less stable, albeit
very modest, livelihood. As the group no longer published *Autonomie*,
the activities of the club were reduced to organizing theoretical
discussions and financially assisting the anarchist movement in
Germany. Rocker became almost immediately aware of the fact that an
immigrant group, regardless of goodwill and vitality, was incapable of
exercising significant influence on its foreign surroundings. In
addition, he became impatient with the futility of the work. Seeing
the same faces again and again and listening to the same arguments
repeated with monotonous regularity was not what Rocker regarded as
purposeful political activity. To remedy this situation Rocker worked
out a plan to enliven the group's activities and channel its energy
into some worthwhile project. He suggested to start working on
translating into German works by Kropotkin, Gravé, and other
philosophers of libertarian vein. Ultimately, these works, which had
not been previously available in the German language, were to be sent to Germany. His suggestion was accepted enthusiastically by the group. According to the plan the translation project was to be a group effort, and the first work to be translated was Kropotkin's *Paroles d'un Révolté*.

In July 1896 Rocker took part in the stormy meetings of the London Congress of the Socialist International. Once again much of the agenda was devoted to the right of the anarchists to attend the congress, but once again the result was the same as at the Brussels Congress and the anarchists were re-expelled. Consequently, the anarchists convened their separate meetings, which they held in Saint Hall between July 29 and July 31. Among the luminaries who attended these meetings were Peter Kropotkin, Élisée Reclus, Ferdinand Domela Nieuwenhuis, Errico Malatesta and Gustav Landauer. These were joined by several socialists from among those sharing convictions other than the strict Marxism preached at the Socialists' Congress. Among those were Kier Hardie and Tom Mann, the representatives of the English Independent Labor Party.

For Rocker, the London Congress served to confirm and enhance his fear of the spreading of intolerance and dogmatism within the socialist camp. He became particularly aware of this tendency among the German socialists as exemplified, for instance, by their uncompromising position towards the anarchists. On the personal level, the most important outcome of the meeting was Rocker's getting acquainted with some outstanding figures in the anarchist movement in Europe. In these meetings Rocker established initiatory contacts,
which turned in time into long lasting friendships, with men like Max Nettlau, the anarchist historian, Gustav Landauer, a leader of the German anarchist movement, and Alfred Sanftleben, a German anarchist active among the workers of Switzerland's German and Italian cantons. The most influential of those meetings was with Peter Kropotkin, who after the Congress invited Rocker to his residence to discuss the political situation in Germany. Thus started a long-lasting relationship, initially one between a teacher and his pupil, but which later developed into a deep friendship between the two men and their families.

Rocker's work with the German group came to an end at the beginning of 1897 as a result of a personal conflict between him and a certain Theodor Machner. Machner, who had arrived in London from Berlin at the end of 1896, probably aspired to a leadership role within the German exiles. In order to achieve his aim he had to remove Rocker from his various duties. He, thus, publicly challenged Rocker's personal integrity, and managed to incite some members of the group against him. These demanded Rocker to give up most of his public responsibilities, especially that of corresponding with the movement in Germany. One of the charges brought against Rocker was that he stole money destined for the Spanish anarchist movement. A meticulous person who kept receipts, Rocker had no difficulty proving his innocence. And indeed, Errico Malatesta, who was asked to serve as arbitrator, cleared Rocker's name. Despite the fact that most of the members backed Rocker throughout the ups and downs of the crisis, and despite his ultimate exoneration, Rocker felt it was impossible for
him to continue working among people who seemed to enjoy public libeling, and constantly engaged in what he described as amateur traitor hunting.

In retrospect, it seems that the German anarchists had a special fascination with intrigues, conspiratory theories and spy hunting. In 1905, the story repeated itself, and Rocker, who after the first episode rarely felt at ease in the company of his fellow Germans, was accused by them of being a spy working for the German government. A conference of the London-based anarchists gathered to discuss these accusations and Rocker's name was again cleared. The Austrian anarchist Pierre Ramus (also known as Rudolf Grossmann) was later suspected of spreading the rumors. Ramus, who regarded himself as a qualified candidate to lead the German anarchists in exile, had been treating Rocker as a potential adversary since the moment he set foot in England. After the conclusion of this additional episode, the relations between the two anarchists remained forever cool, and Rocker took every necessary precaution to avoid ever having to work or even accidentally meet Ramus.

The break with the German anarchists was one of the reasons that prompted Rocker to seek political activity elsewhere. He soon found himself attracted with increasing frequency towards the East End, the center of the Jewish anarchist movement in Britain. A more important reason for Rocker's attraction to the East End might have been Milly Witkop, soon to become his life-long companion and ideological partner. Long before the split with the German group, Rocker had started attending the meetings of the Jewish anarchists
belonging to the "Arbeter Fraint" (The Worker's Friend) circle. The group usually held its meetings at a club on Hanbury Street named the "Sugar Loaf." The club was located in the rear hall of a pub, and Rocker recalled that the mixture of "revolutionaries" and drunks, compounded by the fact that the club had no separate entrance except through the bar, resulted in many unpleasant incidents. The rent charged, on the other hand, was about all that the Jewish anarchists could afford. After attending several meetings, Rocker was asked to lecture to the group, which he did on November 8, 1895 on the topic "The role of Karl Marx and Ferdinand Lassalle within the workers' movement."

Following the change in his affiliations Rocker moved from Carburton to the East End, finding lodgings in the house of Aaron Atkin, a shopkeeper, whose parlor frequently served as a meeting place for the local groups of anarchists. It was in this place, the "Sugar Loaf," according to Milly, that she and Rocker met for the first time, although in his memoirs, Rocker confessed that he had already set eyes on Milly before, in the East End, where she used to distribute radical newspapers and publications.

Milly Witkop was born in Slotopol, a small town in the Ukraine, and was raised up in the traditional atmosphere of the "Shtetl." Her family adhered to strict Jewish orthodoxy, and Milly too, in her youth, showed signs of deep religious sentiments. During one of the frequent spells of economic hardship, Milly emigrated to Britain. Her move to London in 1894 was meant to pave the way, economically, for her family to join her. Even considering the urgency
of the economic constraints, it was still highly unusual, to say the least, for a fifteen year old unmarried Jewish girl, bred in strict orthodoxy, to set out alone on such a journey. One must conclude that Milly Witkop must have been a woman of exceptionally strong character to be able to undertake such a mission, and that she must have been a very persuasive person to be able to leave home with her parents' blessings. Soon after her arrival in London, Milly started working and saving every scarce penny, until finally, after three years she managed to save enough to bring over her parents and three sisters: Rose, Polly and Fanny. When Rocker met Milly she was 18 years old. By that time she had already abandoned the old religious ways and was dedicated body and soul to the new ideas and activities of the Jewish radicals. Deeply moved by the social injustices of the "sweat system" in the East End, and influenced by Kropotkin's Appeal to the Young, she joined the "Arbeter Fraint" group and plunged herself into propaganda activities.

Physically, Milly and Rocker were two opposites. While he was tall, heavily built with fair hair and blue eyes, she possessed an emaciated dark figure accentuated by deep dark eyes and hair. Emma Goldman once described her as possessing a "gypsy beauty." Their personalities were different too. Rudolf Rocker was friendly, lively, self-confident, and easy going. Milly Witkop, on the other hand, was earnest, introverted, and driven by a "mercury temperament," quick to rise and as quick to abate. Tarrida del Marmol, the Spanish anarchist, nicknamed them the "romantic pair," and as such they were known to their friends. For the fifty-eight years they shared
together, they actually felt like a romantic pair. "We never had to look for the 'blue bird,' for it was always amidst us," wrote Rocker in his tribute to Milly after her death.  

In December 1897 Rocker received a letter from a friend in New York asking him to come to the United States and offering to send both him and Milly the tickets for the journey. At first Rocker declined the invitation, but four months later, when as a result of a strike he lost his job, Rocker started giving the matter more serious consideration. Milly consented to the move, and on May 15, 1898, they sailed from Southampton heading for the New World. On board they registered as a married couple to be able to share the same cabin, not knowing how important a role their official marital status was destined to play in their lives. The journey lasted for two weeks, and they arrived in New York on May 29. As most immigrants of the period, the Rockers' first encounter with the Land of the Free consisted of facing the countless immigration officials on Ellis Island. The experience, shared by all other immigrants, was shocking.  

The couple's particular troubles, however, started when a clerk asked for their marriage papers. Being unmarried, they found it difficult to produce such documentation. They were brought in front of a committee which questioned the nature of their relation. Both Rudolf Rocker and Milly argued that the bond between them was a private matter, in which the state and its representatives should show no interest. An old lady, a member of the panel, turned to Milly and snapped that if everyone would behave like that, it would eventually
bring about free love. To that Milly responded that love is always free, and when it ceases to be "there starts prostitution." Their story leaked to the popular press and for several days the Rockers were in the news. Predictably, the committee, which discussed their case, informed the couple that they will be allowed to enter the United States only after they legally formalized their union. Rudolf and Milly opted to return to Europe rather than compromise their principles. They returned to England aboard the same ship that brought them to America.

Back in London, Rocker could find no work, and the couple considered leaving for Brussels. The alternative turned out to be impractical since there were very few jobs for bookbinders in Brussels too. The couple decided to postpone their trip until fall, summer being the dead season in bookbindery. In the meantime, they decided to try their luck in the provinces, and settled in Liverpool. There they rented a room in the house of Morris Jeger, the owner of a small printing shop. The Liverpool Jewish anarchists, although officially organized, were an inactive and loosely connected group. Rocker's arrival spurred them to new activities. A hall was rented, and there Rocker lectured almost every Sunday. Since the Arbeter Fraint, the organ of the Jewish anarchists in London was not appearing at the time, Jeger suggested that the Liverpool group publish its own weekly newspaper, for which he would provide the printing facilities. The offer was enthusiastically adopted by all involved. It was generally agreed that Rocker was the only suitable candidate for editor, but Rocker hesitated, reasoning that an editor of a Yiddish newspaper
should at least know how to read and write Yiddish. Rocker, who knew neither, was finally persuaded to take the job after arranging that his articles would be written in German and subsequently translated before print. Jeger was appointed as translator. On July 29, 1898 *Dos Fraye Vort* (The Free Word) was born. It lasted for eight issues. From the very beginning Rocker was not very happy with Jeger's translations, in particular with Jeger's taking the liberty of adding his own opinions to the articles signed by Rocker. More than once Rocker considered resigning, but each time he was persuaded to continue for reasons no better than the enthusiasm of the group involved in the production of the paper. Rocker finally decided it would be much simpler to learn Yiddish.

In the meanwhile the Jewish anarchists in London decided to revive the then defunct *Arbeter Fraint*. Thomas Hyges, the secretary of the *Arbeter Fraint* committee asked Rocker to return to London and edit the journal. The request was justified on grounds that a paper published in the capital would serve the anarchist movement much better than a provincial one in Liverpool. The last issue of *Dos Fraye Vort* was published on September 17, 1898. Four weeks later, on October 19, the revived *Arbeter Fraint* appeared under the editorship of Rudolf Rocker.

Before moving on to analyze Rocker's role among the Jewish anarchists in the East End of London, there is a need to describe the history of the Jewish settlement in London and to trace the origins of the socialist and anarchist movements among the Jewish immigrant population.
A Jewish colony already existed in the East End of London in the seventeenth century founded by exiles from Spain and Portugal. During the 1870's they were joined by Jews from Germany, Russia and Eastern Europe. These included a fair number of political exiles, mainly members of the Russian revolutionary movement who were forced to flee Russia and some German socialists who left their country as a result of the enactment of Bismarck's anti-socialist laws. The 1880's witnessed a massive immigration of Russian Jews into England. Following the assassination of Tsar Alexander II in 1881, the Jewish communities in Russia were increasingly subjected to officially condoned attacks. The first pogrom occurred in Elisavetgrad and the terror spread like a wave to the entire southern region of Russia. In 1882 the May Laws prohibited Jews from either owning agricultural lands or even reside in vast portions of Russia that were designated as rural areas in these laws. Furthermore, the mobility and right of residence were arbitrarily restricted even outside the so-called agricultural zones. In 1891, for instance, all Jews were expelled from Moscow and Kiev. Many of the uprooted emigrated to England. The situation elsewhere in Eastern Europe was similar. The persecution of the Jews in Romania, for instance, resulted in an exodus of considerable magnitude westward. In 1899-1900 several thousands young Jews, in a gesture of protest, joined in a march on foot across Europe. No country agreed to accept them, and they were passed over from country to country until they ended up in England, where the pilgrimage ended for most of them. Nevertheless, out of the approximately 3000 people that arrived in England more than 1300 were
subsequently sent back to the continent.\textsuperscript{20} The Kishinev pogrom of 1903, the outbreak of the Russo-Japanese hostilities in 1904 and the revolution of 1905 with its spin-off pogroms that lasted into 1906, all contributed to the massive influx of Jewish Russian emigrants into England.

It has been estimated that between 1880 and 1914 nearly 150,000 Jews from Eastern European countries had settled in England.\textsuperscript{21} The Jewish population in London was estimated by the \textit{Jewish Chronicle} to increase from 27,000 in 1883 to 64,000 in 1891, reaching 100,000 in 1898.\textsuperscript{22} Lipman presents similar, though slightly higher figures. According to him the number of Jews in London totaled 46,000 in 1881, 60,000 to 70,000 in 1888, 97,000 in 1901 and 150,000 in 1902-1903.\textsuperscript{23} The total number of Jews in England in 1914 was estimated to be at least 250,000, of which about 180,000, about 75\%, resided within London's municipal limits.\textsuperscript{24} Most of the Jewish immigrants, however, regarded England only as a temporary station on their way to the "Goldene Medine" [The Golden State], the United States. England was viewed, at best, as a poor man's America, and the newcomers kept constantly in mind the final destination.

Unlike the earlier waves of immigration, the Eastern European immigrants of the 1880's and the 1890's were mostly poor, consisting mainly of uneducated artisans and tradesmen. These were not the revolutionary intellectuals of the 1870's who found in England a political haven. None of them mastered the English language, in fact most did not speak Russian well and many of them had difficulties even in Yiddish, which they could neither read nor write properly. Their
education was limited and their political awareness and tendency to
act within a political framework was as minimal. Avraham Frumkin, one
of the first editors of the Arbeter Fraind recalled that the first
issues of the magazine were written in a very simple language. That
in itself was commendable, were it not for the fact that basic Yiddish
was employed not only to help the Jewish readership to grasp the
meaning of the articles, but mostly because the writers of these
articles were themselves not very proficient in the language.25 The
fact that Rocker, a gentile, who could neither read nor write nor
speak Yiddish, was asked to edit the newspaper of the London Jewish
anarchist movement constitutes ample proof to the fact that the Jewish
community of new immigrants to England did not abound in literary
talent.

The situation in New York was not significantly different
from that in London. When the publication of the Freie Arbeiter
Stimme was renewed in October 1899, the American anarchist group
seriously considered inviting Rocker to edit their newspaper. The
scheme did not go through for no better reason than their not wanting
to deprive the London movement of their best worker.26

The Jewish immigrants were drawn primarily into the garment
industry, and to a lesser extent into the footwear, furniture, and
tobacco industries.27 It was within the small workshops of London's
East End that the term "sweating system," or "sweat-shop" was coined.
The term was an emotional expression connoting a sense of oppression
rather than a precise description of an objective reality.28 It
generally referred to a cramped, dirty workshop, where dozens of
employees were crammed into small rooms deprived of light, air and basic sanitary facilities. Earnings were minimal, conditions of work were debilitating and working hours were interminable, extending to 12 and even 15 hours a day. The laborers were often hired from among those standing and waiting for prospective employers in an open area in Whitechapel, an area which became known as the "Pigs' Market." This "slave market" was active mostly on Saturday mornings. Working conditions were not regulated since neither factory legislations nor trade union rules were enforced in the shops. The East End of London was practically a "trade unionist desert." The few local Jewish unions active in the East End faced even more difficulties than the native British unions. First, they were mostly denied the right to function as Jewish branches of the English trade unions, but more importantly they were plagued by faulty organization and fluctuations in the number of members. As previously noted most Jews used Britain as a temporary stop on their way to the New World. There were also objective economic reasons for the hostility faced by the Jewish newcomers. The British economy experienced one depression after another in the period between 1870 and 1905. The depressions normally resulted in heavy unemployment spells, and the newcomers added to the pressure on the labor market, bringing down even further the already depressed wages. In addition, their concentration in one quarter of London caused rents to soar up in an area which was already over-priced and over-populated.

The leaders of the Jewish community were not prepared to deal with an immigration of this magnitude. The Jewish Board of
Guardians, which was the main Jewish self-help organization in Britain, adopted a dual policy of helping the immigrants while at the same time trying to limit the numbers of the Jews arriving in England. One means of controlling the flow of newcomers was by publishing discouraging advertisements in which the difficulties of obtaining employment in England were vividly described. The Board of Guardians also established strict rules according to which only those Jews who resided in Britain for at least six months prior to their application were eligible for aid from the community. The efforts of the established Jewish community at either preventing further Jewish immigration or drastically limiting the flow of newcomers and their attempt at redirecting the immigrants elsewhere must be understood in two contexts. First, the newcomers altered the social, economic and cultural makeup of the Jewish community in England, and the Jewish establishment resented the change. And second, the established Jewish community rightly perceived the flow of immigrants as endangering the delicate relationships between the Jews and the gentile majority. The strain added to the labor market was already resulting in scholarly articles being published on the dangers of "Jewish occupation." A report published in the Economic Review by E. C. Carter on the conditions prevailing in Whitechapel since the arrival of the new immigrants concluded that "it would not take much to get a Jew-hunt down here; we are literally swallowed up by the Jews."

Where Jewish relief was absent, the Anglican church and various Protestant organizations stepped in, trying to proselytize the
newly arrived through charity. The most prominent among these bodies was the "London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews." The missions provided free board and lodging, continuous charitable assistance after conversion, and free education and maintenance for the Jewish children brought up in the Christian faith. Yet, although the conditions were tempting, the number of converts was infinitesimally small. Ultimately the Jewish community was forced to take up countermeasures, and in October 1885 a "Poor Jews Temporary Shelter" was inaugurated.

Among the Jews in London's East End the conditions were ripe both economically and socially for libertarian movements to flourish. Harry Kelly, a contemporary observer rightly remarked that when combining the objective present of economic misery and social resentment on the one hand, and the future dreams for betterment promised by the English tradition of civil liberty on the other, the development of movements preaching radical social change were inevitable.

The first experiments in Jewish socialism in England were performed by Aaron Shmuel Lieberman (1844-1880), a Russian revolutionary, who arrived in London in 1875. Lieberman was deeply influenced by the socialism of Peter Lavrov and at one time he was a frequent contributor to Lavrov's journal, Vperiod [Forward]. On May 30, 1876, Lieberman and several of his friends founded the first Jewish socialist group in England. "Agudath Hasotsialistim Haivriim" [The Hebrew Socialist Association]. The organization lasted for only a short period, five or six months, before disintegrating. Lieberman
was also the first to recognize the plight of the unorganized Jewish labor in the small industries of the East End, and on September 9, 1876, he founded the first Jewish trade union, "Kol Baalei Melakha Khaverim" [All Tradesmen Are Comrades]. Its membership was small, the Jewish masses still resenting any organization that attacked religion and the traditional Jewish way of life. There were no recorded attempts to organize workers from the time Lieberman had left London in 1877 until his return in 1880. In 1880 Lieberman organized a Jewish workingmen's benefit and educational society, which like all his previous endeavors lasted only a very short period of time. In the short run, the efforts of Lieberman, whom Rocker regarded as the "father of Jewish socialism," were an unequivocal failure. His legacy, on the other hand, proved long lasting. Lieberman prepared the ground for further developments. Henceforth, the East End was never without some radical group.

On July 25, 1884, the first socialist newspaper in Yiddish was published. It bore the title Di Polishe Yiddl [The Little Polish Jew], and lasted for about nine months. After sixteen weekly appearances it changed its name to Di Teukunft [The Future]. The founder and editor of the newspaper was Morris Winchevsky (1859-1930), a Russian Jewish socialist and fine journalist, who arrived in London in 1879.

The socially conscious Jewish workers in the East End were suspicious of the main stream political parties with their centralized organizations. Thus, by definition, they resented being assimilated within the English political system. Nor did they form parties of
their own. They were comfortable with small informal groups, consisting mainly of friends who knew each other well, with whom they discussed political problems and arranged the dissemination of socialist propaganda. In a sense, these groups combined two traditions. They were modelled on the Russian revolutionary circles, to which, one might add, some of the immigrants had belonged before coming to London. This type of organization provided the members with the security and inconspicuousness necessary for underground activities. In addition, they continued the talmudic scholarly tradition of the Jewish town of small interactive groups. One of these groups gathered in 1885 and decided that the time was ripe for another try at issuing a socialist newspaper in Yiddish. Thus, the Arbeter Fraint [Workers' Friend] was born. Its first issue appeared on July 15, 1885. The paper was initially planned as an eight page monthly. Its first editor, Philip Kranz (1858-1922), whose real name was Yaakov Rambra, was a social democrat and the only person in England at that time, except Winchevsky, capable of editing a newspaper in Yiddish.

A year earlier, in 1884, another circle of Jewish socialists founded the "International Workers' Educational Club," and in February 1885 they inaugurated their permanent residence at 40 Berner Street. The club was located inside an old wooden two-story building with an estimated capacity of over 200 people. The club developed close ties with other revolutionary clubs, mainly in West Side London, and it was frequented by both local and foreign radicals, Jews as well as gentiles. In June 1886 the club took over the Arbeter Fraint, and
within a month it was transformed into a four-page weekly publication. 40

The development of the Arbeter Fraint mirrors the history of the anarchist movement in England. Initially, the newspaper was meant to be an independent political organ affiliated with no organization and open to all socialist trends. 41 The ideological differences between the various currents were not yet evident among the Jewish immigrants in London, most of whom obtained their basic socialist education from the Arbeter Fraint. The outlook of the newspaper was cosmopolitan and it tended not to deal exclusively with Jewish affairs. Its motto, taken from Hillel, the great Talmudist scholar, was, "If I am not for myself who is for me? And, when I am for myself what am I?" 42 The paper's philosophy was anti-religious and anti-nationalistic, and it dealt mainly with general social affairs and basic questions in socialist theory. At its inception the paper neglected practical issues. For instance, the most pressing problem in the East End, the exploitation of workers in the sweat shops and their appalling living conditions, was not dealt with at all by the Arbeter Fraint. The newspaper avoided the issue of trade unionism and its effects on improving the workers' lot. Instead, it propagated abstract revolutionary sentiments. Rocker attributed this policy to the prevailing opinion that the revolution was at hand's reach. The young revolutionary movement believed that it was their duty to prepare their brethren for the all-encompassing social revolution. Establishing trade unions and working for the gradual improvement of the worker's social and economic status was considered at best a
peripheral occupation, and at worst an irrelevance practiced by those who failed to anticipate the nearing social upheaval and its far-reaching consequences.43

Such a rejection of gradual improvements in view of the immediacy of the social revolution was not characteristic of the anarchists alone. The same view prevailed Marxist thought during the first years of the twentieth century. In his pamphlet What is to be done (1902), Lenin attacked "Economism," a school of Marxists who believed that an outright revolution was premature for an undeveloped country like Russia. Therefore, argued the Economists, Russian Marxists should limit their struggle for the time being to the achievement of material benefits for the workers. This view was uncompromisingly rejected by militant Marxists, most notably Lenin, who regarded gradual changes in the social standing of the masses as "crumbs" not worth settling for. Instead they advocated an all encompassing social change, starting with the abolition of Tsarism.

Both the religious and the lay leaders of the Jewish community viewed the propaganda spread by the Arbeter Frainf as dangerous to the local community. Therefore, they started a campaign aiming at stopping its publication. Some of the methods used in this campaign were highly original. They would, for example, bribe the printer or the proofreader to change the meaning of articles published in the Arbeter Frainf by inserting or deleting words. The perpetrator was then rewarded with a ship ticket to the United States, which was the final destination for most immigrant Jews.44 Finally, however, the Jewish community resorted to more orthodox methods. They bought the
printing facilities of the *Arbeter Fraint*, and on May 6, 1887 the paper ceased publication. After only three months, however, the group managed to collect enough money to purchase a printing machine, and on August 5, 1887, the paper reappeared. By January 1889 the *Arbeter Fraint* doubled its number of weekly pages from four to eight, a gain reflecting a significant rise in circulation. In May, Kranz resigned his editorship and left for the United States. His place was filled by Constantine Gallop, a social revolutionary.

By the end of the 1880's, it seems, the *Arbeter Fraint* began a process best described as a major ideological shift. The paper started as an organ for all socialists regardless of their inclination. Slowly, however, the group managing the *Arbeter Fraint* crystallized into a circle of anarchists. As the arguments between the various camps within the socialist movement intensified, becoming at the same time both more pungent and more focussed, the journal gradually lost its neutrality, showing at first a strong bias towards the anarchist camp, and finally siding completely with the anarchists. The differences between the various camps became even more accentuated with the arrival of Shaul Yanovsky in London.

Shaul Yanovsky (1864-1939) was one of the founders of the *Freie Arbeiter Stimme* [Free Voice of Labor], the anarchist paper of the Jewish working movement in New York. A very talented journalist and controversialist, Yanovsky was invited by the *Arbeter Fraint* group to take over the editorship of the newspaper, a position he held from February 1891 until the beginning of 1895, when he returned to New York. Yanovsky's contribution to the development of the Jewish
anarchist movement in London focused on two issues: unambiguously 
defining the Arbeter Fraint as an anarchist organ, and strengthening 
trade union activities among the anarchists. Under Yanovsky's 
leadership and guidance the Arbeter Fraint was quick to develop a 
cohesive anarchist program, which served not only to redefine the 
purposes of the paper but also severed all relations with other 
socialist factions. It was due to his leadership that, in the internal 
conflict that followed between the various factions connected with the 
Arbeter Fraint, the anarchist group emerged as the winner, getting the 
newspaper and the majority of members. Years after the fact, Yanovsky 
played down his own role in the conflicts and subsequent split within 
the London anarchist movement, claiming that the London schism was 
inevitable since it only reflected the ongoing ideological struggles 
between the anarchists and the social-democrats in the United 
States.45

Towards the end of the 1880's, relations between the 
anarchists and the socialists in the United States became increasingly 
strained. The anarchists understood that in order to gain influence on 
the Jewish masses, they had to respond to the daily needs of the 
workers, which led them to participate in the formation of a number of 
unions. The increasingly vociferous ideological conflict between the 
anarchists and the socialists simply reflected the raising stakes in 
the struggle for control of these unions. At the end of 1889 the 
anarchists proposed to publish a joint, bipartisan weekly with the 
socialists that will be headed by two editors, one from each camp. A 
conference was convened on December 25, 1889 to discuss these
proposals. At the conference, the anarchists argued that the Jewish worker should be acquainted with all streams of thought, and be free to choose among competing political theories. The socialists, on the other hand, claimed that a labor newspaper should possess a clear ideological line, and present a unified stand on sociopolitical and economic issues. The result was a split in the ranks of the Jewish labor movement in the United States. The socialists launched the Arbeter Tsaytung (The Workers' Newspaper) in March 1890. In June the anarchists published the first issue of their new organ, the Freie Arbeiter Stimme.

My opinion is that while Yanovsky is right in the sense that the London struggle was indeed imported from the United States, he conveniently ignores the fact that he himself was the importer. In addition, the rigid ideological definitions imposed as the newspaper's line and Yanovsky's uncompromising positions on a wide range of subjects, served to accelerate tendencies that were already in evidence within the anarchist movement even before his arrival in London.

The departure of the social democrats worsened the financial difficulties of both the club and newspaper. On November 25, 1892, the Berner Street club ceased to exist. The Arbeter Fraint too did not remain unscathed. From January 22 to April 8, 1892 it ceased publication. When it reemerged from its new headquarters on 77 Aldgate Avenue, it bore a new subtitle, "Anarchist-Communist Organ." Its financial problems, however, remained as acute as ever. For the next several years the newspaper appeared irregularly. The anarchist
members of the defunct Berner Club reorganized as a section of the "London International Working Men's Association." The meetings of the group took place henceforth in the "Sugar Loaf." Rocker joined the sessions of this club in 1896.

The debates among the various socialist factions and the resulting schism were more matters of theory than practice, because the movement maintained no solid ties with either the Jewish masses or with the trade unions. The trade unions were particularly weak, their membership small and mostly inactive. In addition, the anarchists abstained from what little activity the trade unions did carry out. For instance, the anarchists remained aloof in the "anti-sweating" demonstrations of 1888-1889 that resulted in a power struggle within the Jewish Community. When Yanovsky resolved to involve the anarchists in trade union activities so as not to perpetuate their isolation from the masses of workers, he encountered serious opposition within the anarchist ranks. Yanovsky, nevertheless, used his considerable talents as journalist and orator to strengthen the local trade unions and turn them into activist units. He even tried to persuade union leaders to organize themselves as revolutionary organizations, and to encourage mutual assistance within the working masses.47

The opposition to the uncharismatic Yanovsky further intensified and he became increasingly estranged from the movement following his stands in the debate on "Propaganda by Deed." The active debate in the anarchist movement at this time concerned the morality, practical correctness, and efficacy of violent means. Yanovsky unequivocally opposed violent means on the ground that individual acts
could not and would not bring about the revolution. Moreover, according to Yanovsky, the ultimate effects of such acts would be more detrimental to the anarchist movement than to the capitalist system. Unlike the younger generation which regarded the acts of terror as preludes to the nearing social revolution, as Rocker did when he resided in Paris, Yanovsky wisely foresaw the catastrophic consequences of these acts on the anarchist movement. In retrospect, he claimed, that the weakness of the anarchist movement in the United States, its lack of influence among the Jewish workers, and its ultimate demise could all be traced to that fateful period in the history of anarchism. Opposed by the theorists for his union activism and disrespected by the firebrands for his opposition to "Propaganda by Deed," Yanovsky finally resigned as editor and returned to New York. While on the level of human relations many people may have felt relieved, Yanovsky's departure undoubtedly left an irreplaceable vacuum in the London anarchist movement. The anarchists possessed preciously few capable men to afford Yanovsky's loss.

In addition to the perpetual monetary problems, after Yanovsky's resignation the Arbeter Fraint suffered a series of editors who lacked the basic capacities to fill their position properly. The paper ceased publication between July 27, 1894 and April 19, 1895. The Arbeter Fraint reappeared again under the editorship of I. Kaplan, but the incompetence of the new editor caused the newspaper to close after only six issues. On October 11, 1895, the paper appeared once again, this time under the editorship of William Wess. In May 1896, the very capable Avraham Frumkin joined the paper as co-editor with Wess. For a
very short period the editorial problems seemed solved.

Unfortunately, pressing monetary shortages brought about yet another closing on March 26, 1897. When it reappeared nineteen months later, on October 19, 1898, its editorship had been entrusted to Rudolf Rocker.

When Rocker accepted the offer to become editor of the Arbeter Fraint, he received in addition to a paper chronically plagued by finances, a rich political legacy and a tool of growing influence and prestige. The paper's influence extended well beyond the limits of the London-based Jewish anarchist movement. Most of the Jewish immigrants stayed in London on a temporary basis, earning their travel fare to the New World. When they finally reached their destination, be it the United States, Canada, or Argentina, they took with them the organizations and types of activities they had familiarized themselves with in London. They founded clubs, mutual-aid organizations and radical publishing houses. More importantly, they continued subscribing to the Arbeter Fraint and supporting the paper financially whenever they could. England remained the motherland of the movement, the center with which the far flung anarchists kept in close contact. According to the testimony of contemporaries, London served as the Mecca of the international Jewish anarchist movement. The Arbeter Fraint and later Germinal, were eagerly awaited in the Americas, and so were the books, pamphlets, and other publications originating in London. In addition to prestige, however, Rocker inherited also the Arbeter Fraint's chronic maladies, such as shortages in both capital to print the journal and people to write it.
But the revived Arbeter Frainf managed to maintain itself with
difficulty through the financial crises which seemed to closely follow
each other. During one of these periods, the movement enlisted Emma
Goldman's help. In November 1899 Emma Goldman came to London where she
stayed for two months. At that time she was en route to Switzerland
where she intended to study medicine. It was Rocker's first
encounter with the famous anarchist, and the beginning of a long and
close friendship between the two. On becoming aware of the Arbeter
Frainf's financial difficulties, Emma Goldman volunteered to try and
raise money by giving three public lectures. The money collected,
however, proved barely sufficient to cover the expenses incurred, such
as renting lecture halls and printing the announcements.

Rocker's new position as editor did nothing to improve his
own financial situation either. In his memoirs he described with the
humor usually acquired long after the fact the method his own salary
was paid. Theoretically, Rocker was supposed to earn one pound a
week. In practice, however, he was paid varying smaller sums on only
those occasions when there was some leftover money in the cash box.
These occasions one might add were exceedingly rare and far between.
The books, on the other hand, were managed correctly and the balance
owed by the paper to Rocker was always meticulously added to his
credit. When the debt reached sums that no one could imagine that they
would ever be paid, the credit was crossed out, and they started the
counting all over again, turning, as it were, a new page in the
balance books. Rocker claimed the system worked marvelously as far
as book keeping was concerned, on the other hand, a person could not
"grow fat" on it. Consequently, the Rockers lived from hand to mouth, mainly on Milly's earnings at a tobbaco work shop. Rocker also found occasional employment as bookbinder. The members of the movement did all they could and gave away their last pennies to sustain the newspaper. Nevertheless, considering their own financial situation it was simply not enough. In such a state of affairs it became a weekly puzzle whether the next issue of the Arbeter Fraint would appear or not.

On January 26, 1900, the Arbeter Fraint ceased publication once again. There was little hope of renewing its appearance in the near future, for the newspaper managed to accumulate debts, which the anarchists could not easily repay. A temporary attempt at rehabilitation lasted only a very short period of time, from February 8, 1901 to May 10, 1901. The newspaper made a more remarkable comeback on March 20, 1903. By then, it seems the financial hard times were over. The Arbeter Fraint was published henceforth without interruption until 1915, when the British authorities closed it down as an organ of subversive propaganda against the war.

During the 1900-1903 lull, a young printer named Narodiczky, approached Rocker with the idea of publishing a new journal, independent of the Arbeter Fraint group. At first Rocker rejected the offer reasoning that it would have been more important to revive the Arbeter Fraint, which after all enjoyed an unparalleled reputation and could a priori restore its influence faster than any new journal could establish one. The new venture, said Rocker, was also financially infeasible. Narodiczky, however, offered to print the journal without
a fee. Rocker gradually accepted the idea, and *Germinal*, so named after Emile Zola's novel, was born. *Germinal* was intended to deal with both propaganda and social and intellectual issues. Rocker wanted *Germinal* to deal mainly with theoretical issues, to familiarize its readers with libertarian ideologies, and to deal in particular with the expressions of these ideas in the literature. While the *Arbeter Fraint* addressed itself to the masses, and was consequently written in a simple language and dealt mainly with day to day practicalities, *Germinal* was intended to appeal to the more literate reader. Its pages contained besides discussions on philosophical and sociological problems, translations into Yiddish of various literary works, essays of literary criticism and historical reviews. To list only few examples, one could find in *Germinal* an article dealing with the philosophy of Rousseau, a piece on the "Encyclopedists," and a series of essays by Rocker entitled "Karl Marx and Anarchism," in which the author traced back the influences that anarchist thinkers and ideas had on socialist philosophers. In particular, he traced Proudhon's influence on Marx. *Germinal* provided Rocker with a tool through which his ideas crystallized and matured. Dealing with basic philosophical questions helped Rocker in forming solid opinions on practical matters. In addition, *Germinal* enabled Rocker to pursue his insatiable interest in literature and write not so much about the pressing issues demanding urgent attention, but about more fundamental questions of the human existence.

From the beginning, Rocker tended to the new "baby" almost exclusively by himself. He wrote the articles, set the pages, and
prepared the manuscripts for print. By that time the Rockers moved to 58 Dunstan Houses in Stepney Green, where a number of the Arbeter Faint group began to congregate. All the work on Germinal was done in the Rockers' home, where one room served the triple function of living room, bedroom and editorial office. 55

Germinal started as a fortnightly sixteen pages journal. Its first issue appeared on March 16, 1900. Monetary problems, however, interfered with its regular issuance. When the Rockers moved to Leeds in October 1901, the paper moved with them, and was published in Leeds for about a year, until the Rockers returned to London in September 1902. The anarchist movement in London in 1901 was at its lowest ebb in years, and Rocker, in need for a change and following the advice of one of his friends, David Izakovits, settled in Leeds. There he worked with the local anarchist group and engaged in extensive traveling and lecturing in Liverpool, Manchester, Hull, and other cities where Jewish anarchist groups were organized.

On December 26, 1902, an All-London conference of Jewish anarchists was convened in Whitechapel. High on the agenda was the proposal to resurrect the Arbeter Faint. In addition, the distribution of anarchist propaganda, the forming of a Jewish anarchist federation, and the locating of suitable premises for a new club, were also discussed. As usual, Rocker was the driving force behind the convention. He stressed the need for organization, in particular the pressing need to organize the Jewish workers in trade unions. He also emphasized the necessity to better the relations between the English population and the immigrants, an issue which he
thought the trade unions will help to solve. It is interesting to note at this point, that Rocker essentially adopted Yanovsky's agenda, yet his program passed unopposed. I tend to attribute this change in the attitudes of the anarchists more to Rocker's charismatic personality than to any radical change of heart in the anarchist movement.

At the beginning of the 1900's, London alone housed seventeen Jewish anarchist organizations, out of which sixteen worked harmoniously with each other. The odd man out was a group centered around the journal Freiheit (Freedom) which led a separate uncooperative existence. As a result of the convention the sixteen groups decided to incorporate into one federation including the anarchist cells in the provinces. When after a couple of months of careful preparations, the Arbeter Fraint was reissued on March 20, 1903, it became the official organ of this united federation. It carried the subtitle "Organ of the Yiddish Speaking Anarchist Groups in Great Britain and Paris." As a result of the revival of the Arbeter Fraint Rocker ceased to publish Germinal. Two years later, in January 1905, a new edition of Germinal was published, due mainly to the efforts of a group which called also itself "Germinal." Rocker officially served as its editor-in-chief, but he no longer could devote as much time and energy as he did in the times of Germinal's first incarnation.

Rocker did not work exclusively with the Jewish anarchists in England, he was also involved in various international initiatives. For example, in August 1907, Rudolf Rocker and Alexander Shapiro
represented the Jewish Anarchist Federation at the International Congress of Anarchists held in Amsterdam.

Alexander (Sanya) Shapiro (1882-1946) was an active member of the London Anarchist Federation and a close friend of both Kropotkin and Rocker. Shapiro was born in Russia, raised in Turkey, and later studied biology in Paris. In 1917 he returned to Russia after 25 years in exile and played a major role in the Russian anarchist movement following the revolution. Soon he became, as most other anarchists, disillusioned with the directions of the revolution, and unlike most of them he managed to escape. He joined Rocker in Berlin, where he took part in the formation and subsequent activities of the Anarcho-Syndicalist International. Later he settled in New York, where until his death he edited a monthly journal called New Trends.

The Amsterdam Congress was the first major international gathering of anarchists since their expulsion from the Socialist International Congress, first in Zurich in 1893 and later in London in 1895. The congress discussed the main developments in the movement, especially the growing current of syndicalism in countries like France and Spain. The delegates also decided to establish an international bureau based in London. Errico Malatesta, Alexander Shapiro, Rudolf Rocker, John Turner, and Jean Wilquet were elected as bureau secretaries. The bureau was supposed to function as coordinator for maintaining contacts between the anarchist groups in various countries. It was also asked to undertake the necessary actions to found an archive which would provide future historians with research
material. The main task, however, of the newly established bureau was to publish a monthly newsletter disseminating current information on the anarchist movement and its members. Accordingly, Rocker, Shapiro and Malatesta met weekly to discuss issues related to the International and to take care of the Bulletin, which was published in French since January 1908. In the long run, however, the Anarchist International proved to be a "stillborn," and not only according to Nettlau who coined the definition. After the congress ended its sessions, its activities waned with amazing speed, and the Bulletin was all that remained. Attempts to establish contacts with anarchists around the globe, such as with the Chinese and Japanese, failed. Even the contacts between the European anarchists were limited. An attempt to convene a second congress in 1910 failed and the meetings were postponed indefinitely. When the date, August 1914, was finally agreed upon, the plans were foiled by the outbreak of World War I. For Rocker, the Amsterdam congress served mainly social purposes, reestablishing contacts with old comrades like Emma Goldman, Max Baginsky, Domela Nieuwenhuis, and Rudolf Lange, as well as establishing new ones.

During the first decade of the century Rocker directed his efforts towards other ventures as well. The Arbeter Fraint group needed, he thought, some permanent premises where educational activities could take place. In the beginning of 1906 the group was able to amass enough money to rent a disused but spacious Salvation Army storehouse, located on 165 Jubilee Street, which the anarchists transformed into a club. The first floor contained a large hall with a
capacity of 800 persons that was used for mass gatherings. Adjoining rooms served as classrooms. The second floor housed a library and a reading room. A small adjacent building was acquired to serve as the editorial offices and to house the printing facilities of the Arbeter Fraint. The inauguration of the club was celebrated on Saturday, February 3, 1906. Peter Kropotkin, despite his illness and his doctor's proscriptions, attended the ceremony, but the excitement proved too intense, and on the night between February 3 and February 4, he sustained a coronary failure.

The Jubilee Street Club was open to all sections of the working class movement. Lenin, for instance, was seen there drinking tea at the time of the 1907 Congress and created quite an uproar when he accused one of the people in attendance of being a spy for the Russian police. In the disturbance that followed, Lenin was arrested and the police had to intervene to rescue the alleged spy from a growingly hostile crowd. Members of the newly founded "Poalei Tsion" [Workers of Zion] Party frequented the club too, and Ber Borochov, the Jewish socialist and nationalist philosopher, frequently debated national problems with Rocker there. Various groups rented the facilities of the club for their meetings, among them the Russian Social-Revolutionaries in London and the British anarchists, who used the premises of the Jubilee Street Club every Sunday morning. The activities of the club were very diverse. They included lectures, concerts, recitals, theatrical productions and balls. The list of courses ranged from English for beginners to physics, history and sociology. There was even a class in the art of rhetorics, teaching
students how to express themselves clearly and training future orators.

Rocker's specialty was literature. At first, Rocker's classes were attended by no more than "ten to twelve" people. Gradually, however, Rocker's lectures built a reputation and a following, and the classes were transferred to the big hall. Rocker's lectures were meant to expose the immigrants to both western and Yiddish literature. Thus, he dealt not only with Ibsen, Zola, Oscar Wilde, Maxim Gorki, Strindberg, Hamsun and Tolstoy, but also with Jewish writers such as Mendele Mokher Sefarim, I. L. Peretz, Sholom Aleichem, and An-Ski. Rocker believed that through art and in particular through literature, the audience could be brought to a better understanding of their social and emotional circumstances. He thought that by bringing his audience to identify itself with either a hero or a story he could achieve better results in educating them to social awareness than through the traditional exposition of revolutionary theories. In a sense, the shift towards educational activities marked a radical change from the earlier pragmatist policies of the Arbeter Fraint.

Rocker did not limit his talks to literature only. He lectured on art, exposing his students to works of Goya, Rembrandt and Daumier. His classes in the visual arts were complemented by tours to the famous British museums and art galleries. Rocker opened new worlds for the "greens," as the newly arrived immigrants were called in the East End. For many of them the lectures in the Jubilee Street Club constituted their only secular education. Rocker became the teacher,
the guide introducing them to their new life, familiarizing them with the strange ways that were alien to their former existence. He was the first person to whom one turned for help and advise. Sam Dreen, one of the young activists in the Arbeter Fraink group summed it up when saying: "He united us, filled us with revolutionary ardor, inspired us with his clear thinking and wide knowledge, his love and understanding of art and literature and the values of culture. Rocker was our Rabbi."64

Rocker, himself an autodidact, attributed great importance to the education of adults. The education of children, however, was not ignored. The club sponsored a Sunday school, operating along the principles of Francisco Ferrer's "Escuela Moderna."65 The Modern School movement established schools for children of workers, which were managed and directed by the workers themselves. The aim was to do away with formality and discipline in the conventional classroom, and to abolish all restrictions and regulations concerning form and substance that stifled and suppressed all individuality and creativity. True to Kropotkin's vision of an integrated educational system which would cultivate both mental and manual skills, the Modern School equally emphasized physical as well as mental development. These aims were accomplished via a curriculum that combined traditional subjects together with training in arts and crafts. The schools were in essence anticoercive and antiauthoritarian, stressing the dignity and natural rights of children as equals to adults.66

Francisco Ferrer (1859-1909) was a Spanish libertarian and educator who in August 1901 established in Barcelona his Modern
School. Ferrer was not the founder of the modern education movement in Spain, but he became its foremost representative. In 1909 Ferrer was executed by the Spanish government on a false charge of inciting to rebellion in Barcelona, and he became a martyr for libertarian causes. Ferrer wanted his modern school to be erected on the foundations of science and rationalist thinking. He regarded the church and its dogmas antithetical to knowledge and the worst enemies of free education. Ferrer claimed that the traditional educational system was a tool of domination in the hands of the ruling classes, factories for producing loyal and uncritical citizens. Ferrer wished to abolish all religious, political and social dogmas and via a process of modern, uninhabited education to shape a new generation of "free people."

"Freedom in education" meant freedom from the authority of the state and the church, but also freedom from the authority of the teacher. The true educator, maintained Ferrer, did not impose his ideas or wishes on the child, but merely channelled the child's individuality, talent and energy, into purposeful venues.  

Ferrer regarded education only as a means towards achieving a higher goal, that of creating a new generation possessing new morals and ideals, a generation sensitive to injustice and filled with the ardors necessary to change society.  

Rocker, following in Ferrer's steps sought to secularize his students and rid their heart of their former religious indoctrination, and he had to fight against the religious establishment that was still exercising a powerful influence on the newly arrived immigrants.

Although both Rocker and Ferrer dedicated much of their
lives to education and never lost sight of their practical purpose, creating an educational system free of coercion, they seemed to have regarded education not as a goal in itself, but as a means towards changing the psychological makeup of the new generation. Fortunately, the Modern School did not degenerate into dogmatic assertion, but remained free and uncoercive for as long as it existed. Yet, theoretically at least, there always lurks the double danger of dogmatism and compulsiveness in the very wish to create a "new man," as is amply demonstrated by both fascist and communist educational systems. Both fascism and communism started with the premise that there is a need to change the makeup of the population, suggesting that a new generation, culturally rehabilitated by a new educational methodology or another, would emerge sharing ideals that were held by no previous generations. In practice, however, new dogmas merely replaced old ones, the true nature of these new conformisms being disguised by crediting them with such attributes as modernity, correctness and naturalness. That this did not occur in the Modern School testifies probably to the unusual character of the teachers and to the sustained practices of not treating the child as a tabula rase to be molded in a predetermined shape. The Modern School was probably one of the first institutions of learning to abolish western Platonic views that regarded children as less than human beings. It is also interesting to note in the context of education that most reformists and revolutionaries of both left and right seek to use educational techniques to break the cultural link between succeeding generations. However, education is a process whereby value judgments and
information are transferred from one generation to another, usually in an unaltered form, and thus it can only assure a cultural continuum connecting one generation to another. Consequently, revolutions in educations are doomed to either fail or merely destroy the educational process itself.

The persecutions in the aftermath of the 1905 revolution in Russia brought into London's East End a new influx of immigrants. Among these were many young revolutionaries and desperados, who brought along not only their admirable dedication to the social cause but also their pathological fascination with terror. In London, these young rebels continued to form Bakuninist-like secret cells and combative groups. They did not bother with the distinctions between the Russian government and the British one. A ruling government, be it despotic or tolerant, was for them the enemy. They regarded with scorn the educational and cultural activities of the Jewish anarchists, and viewed the enormous efforts directed towards better ties with the trade unions as an exercise in futility. The Arbeter Fraint group was constantly haunted by the nightmare of one of these young conspirators who frequented the Jubilee Street Club placing the whole London movement in jeopardy by a reckless act of "Propaganda by Deed." By that time Rocker no longer exhibited the same fascination with terrorist acts, as he did two decades previously when staying in France. Basically, he accepted Yanovsky's point of view that terrorist acts were more harmful to the anarchist movement and its acceptability into society than they were to the intended targets. Rocker was obviously concerned with the effect that such an act might have on the
anarchist ranks, fearing it would cause schisms and alienate the moderate elements. He was in particular worried about the reaction of the British public to such an act by a foreigner. He correctly assumed that following an act of terror, restrictive legislation against immigrants and political exiles would be enacted.69

The nightmare almost turned into reality when a young Russian confided in Rocker, revealing a scheme to detonate a bomb during the Lord Mayor Day. On that particular occasion the newly appointed Mayor of London was being celebrated and exceptional crowds were expected to attend the traditional parade. The Russian also told Rocker that the members of his cell seriously debated the possibility of assassinating Kropotkin, on grounds that Kropotkin's moderating influence hindered the "revolutionary development of the anarchist movement."70 A disaster was prevented when Rocker presented himself to the group and revealed his knowledge of their plans. He also attempted to explain to them the futility of violence and the stupidity of the particular form of violence these people were trying to perpetrate, i.e. "terror without motive." Whether, Rocker's persuasive powers worked miracles on the members or they withdrew from their original plan because their secret plan was revealed to an outsider, we shall never know.

The anarchist movement could not, however, rely on such lucky coincidences for long, and indeed when the nightmare materialized, in the form of the Houndsditch affair and its sequel in Sidney Street, it caused as much harm to the anarchist movement as Rocker expected.
The affair started with a robbery at a jeweller's shop on Houndsditch street in the East End on the night of December 17, 1910. Five policemen went to investigate a disturbance reported by a neighbor. The robbers opened fire, killing three and wounding the other two. More police forces arrived but in the interval the robbers, one of them wounded, ran away. They dropped their wounded friend at a girlfriend's house and went into deep hiding. The girl eventually called for a doctor but it was too late. The body, that of a young Latvian social revolutionary named Muronzeff, was identified by Errico Malatesta, in whose workshop Muronzeff used to work irregularly. The girl was arrested, and upon searching the apartment the police found so-called "nihilist literature." Among the many Russian pamphlets the police also came across several issues of the Arbeter Fraint and Germinal. The Jewish anarchist movement thus became deeply implicated in the affair. The search after the other runaways continued until they were traced to a house on 100 Sidney Street in Whitechapel, close to Rocker's house. On January 3, 1911, police forces reinforced by men from the Foot Guards and a section of the Royal Horse Artillery surrounded the house. Winston Churchill, then Home Secretary, supervised the entire operation. After intense exchanges of gun shots that lasted for almost an entire day, the house was set on fire. The two men inside were found dead. Rocker in his memoirs claimed that the two killed themselves when they realized that all was over. The alleged leader of the gang, Peter the Painter, vanished into thin air. Some claimed he was only a fictitious figure, others, like Alexander Shapiro claimed to have met him years later in
St. Petersburg during the Russian revolution, working as an agent for the Cheka. 73

The consequences of the Houndsditch affair for the anarchist movement soon followed. Beside a general assault on the anarchist movement in the British newspapers, there seemed to be an increase in surveillance of the anarchists and their activities. In addition, the authorities tried to put into practice the previously unenforced Aliens Act of 1905, in particular those rules concerning the deportation of undesirable aliens. According to the law, an alien could have been deported by a magistrate's decree without recourse to actual litigation. An attempt to use the power of a sole magistrate to deport aliens, however, was met with massive opposition. 74 Since the Jubilee Street Club became involuntarily involved with the Latvian terrorists, the Jewish anarchist movement had to curtail its activities until the storm was over. A few weeks before the incident, the Jewish anarchists had already given up their club because of financial difficulties. After the Houndsditch affair they were not able to rent new halls even when their financial situation improved considerably. The landlords simply refused to get involved with anarchists. 75

The affair touched the Rockers personally. Muronzeff's girlfriend, Nina, was imprisoned for a few months and then released without charge. When she realized that she had no place to go, she asked the Rockers for shelter, and although they did not know her personally, they took her into their home. Milly, in fact, believed in her innocence implicitly, and had visited Nina in jail. Nina lived
in the Rockers' house until she found work and could afford an apartment.

In addition to education, Rocker spent much of his energy on the issue of trade unionism. By 1896, there existed thirteen Jewish trade unions in the East End. The number of Jewish trade unions increased to 32 by 1906. The unions, however, were not professionally organized, and the speed of founding new unions was only slightly higher than the speed in which old unions faltered. Those unions which did last for long periods of time suffered from changing membership and fluctuating numbers. Consequently, the influence of the trade unions on work conditions and the overall well being of their constituency was minimal. In June 1903, Rocker launched a series of articles in the Arbeter Frain, in which he expostulated a list of proposals on how to increase the efficacy of the trade unions. He started his articles by outlining the ills of the unions' present state of affairs and traced the roots of the evil to the sweating system and the mentality of the Jewish worker. The sweating system, claimed Rocker, was based on hierarchy, on a ladder of positions on which one could climb upwards and improve one's earnings. In the tailoring business, for example, at the top of the hierarchy were the master tailors, below them were the ironing men, and at the bottom were the apprentices. Each position was subordinate to the one above and superior to the one below. The workers aspired to climb the ladder, become master tailors, save some money, and achieve independence by opening their own workshop. The system was self perpetuating in the sense that it prevented unity among the workers.
Each category of workers had to protect its own interests, which were not always identical with the interests of a lower or a higher category. Once a worker moved up, his interests changed, thus, entering in a conflict with his previous comrades.

This social mobility also made the Jewish worker difficult to organize. Jewish workers did not share Rocker's view that being a member of the proletariat was a fate. Most of them regarded their station in life as temporary until they would save enough capital to become masters on their own. The consequence, as Rocker observed, was that the average Jewish worker was devoid completely of proletarian spirit and a sense of identification with his class. Thus Rocker's efforts to create effective trade unions among the Jewish immigrants of the East End were more difficult than they might have been with any other group. Rocker insisted that creating unions was important for two reasons. First, there was the question of improving the immediate living conditions of the Jewish worker in the sweat shops. Second, the unions could help create a better atmosphere, thus bringing the English workers and the Jewish ones closer to the realization that they shared common goals. Without unions, Rocker maintained, the English workers would continue to regard the Jewish emigrants as a bunch of wage cutters and strike breakers. Years later in his work on Anarcho-Syndicalism, Rocker would elaborate on the importance of achieving unity among unions, dispelling myths about competition between unions. In addition, Rocker theorized that a union's most effective weapon was the strike. He suggested, for instance, that the strike, in particular the sympathetic strike, one which is staged in
support of another union or sector, was not only an effective means of improving the workers' lot, but was also a tool of immense educational importance.

As a matter of fact, Rocker believed more in the educational value of the strike than in its efficacy in bringing about the social change needed to topple the capitalistic system. The merits of the strike were twofold. Achieving better pay and working conditions was one. But the most important achievement of a strike was in its ability to educate the workers and to train them for the further struggles needed to achieve liberation from capitalism. Solidarity among the workers was a crucial element in this struggle, and Rocker believed that strikes were furthering the cooperation between the workers. In this connection, the sympathetic strike was of special importance, because through it the economic battle, usually associated with narrow and egoistic interests, became a deliberate action of all the workers as a class. 80

February 1904 provided the first opportunity to put the theory into practice, and prove the importance of solidarity between workers. The East End bakers went on strike, and backed by other unions they achieved their demand, a union label affixed to the bread. It was a small victory, but a victory nonetheless. 1906 provided a better opportunity. It started with labor unrest and weekly walk-outs in various trades. On June 8, 1906, the Arbeter Fraint called for a mass walk out in the tailoring industry. The employers refused to negotiate with the strikers' committee and instead resorted to strike breakers. The employers reasoned correctly that when the strikers'
funds would end so would the strike. Despite commendable efforts and many examples of mutual aid, it took more than fiery speeches by Rocker to win the strike. The strikers lacked organization, money, and more importantly they did not receive support from their fellow workers. The strike failed. As a consequence of the failure, the unions' membership and influence was reduced to a virtual nil. Strangely, however, Rocker's personal prestige did not suffer at all. 81

It took six years for the trade unionist movement to regroup its forces. In April 1912, the London Society of Tailors backed a strike by 15,000 of their West End comrades. The East End was seen as holding the key to the situation, since work was being diverted from the West to the East End. 82 Rocker called for a solidarity strike, warning that failure to take such action would be interpreted as strike breaking, and the East End workers would bear responsibility for being forever branded enemies of trade unionism. 83

On May 8, 1912, the East End workers decided to join in the strike. The decision was arrived at a mass meeting held at the Great Assembly Hall in Whitechapel. In the next two days 13,000 workers quit their jobs. The strikers main demands were a nine hours working day, wages calculated according to hours worked and not according to piece work, abolition of overtime work, higher wages, improvement in sanitary conditions and acceptance of union members only to the work shops. 84 The master tailors retaliated with a three week lock-out, convinced that the workers would surrender due to lack of funds, as in the previous strike. The employers were wrong. The spirit of
solidarity that had been cultivated since 1906 and the better organization of the strikers meant that this strike was not going to falter as easily. In addition the tailors did not stand alone. The whole East End rallied in support of the strikers. Rocker, who was appointed chairman of the finance committee, used the *Arbeter Fraint* to call upon the Jewish workers to help the out of work tailors with contribution. The response was considerable. The Jewish Bakers' Union and the cigarette workers provided free supplies. Strike funds grew because of a voluntary levy paid by other Jewish trade unionists. Special performances by the Jewish Theater and a flow of contributions from sympathizers enabled Rocker to pay the strikers a few shillings during the first week of strike. Rocker also managed to organize temporary canteens on trade union premises, where workers were provided with tea, bread and cheese. Hot meals, however, could be provided only rarely.

Rocker was to be found everywhere, doing his utmost for the success of the strike. Showing almost limitless energy, "this was his hour of glory," as Fishman puts it. He was a member of the strike board as well as chairman of the finance committee. He organized meetings, staged demonstrations, and gave innumerable speeches. In addition, he continued to edit the *Arbeter Fraint*, which for the duration of the strike came out daily, keeping its readers updated on the situation of the strike. Rocker also used the opportunity to try and bring together the English and Jewish workers. He addressed joint meetings and organized joint protest marches.

On the third week of the strike the West End tailors reached
a settlement with their employers. In the East End, the Masters Association agreed to meet most of the workers' demands. The employers refused, however, to commit themselves to hiring only union members. Rocker considered this point to be the key to the workers' condition. Securing better wages and working conditions was commandable in itself, but Rocker regarded union recognition to be the only means by which long term security could be achieved. The main obstacle, however, to continuing the struggle was an exhausted strike fund. At a meeting convened in the Pavilion Theater in Whitechapel, Rocker conveyed his belief that without recognition of the union all other material achievements would be short lived. A crowd of worn out strikers answered with the cry: "The strike goes on!" The next morning the employers caved in to all the demands. The workshops became unionized.

Although the strike did not do away completely with the sweat shop system, it dealt the old methods of exploitation a severe blow. The East End workers came to realize the importance of trade unionism and workers' solidarity, and henceforth acted accordingly. Trade union membership increased dramatically. In the same year, the "Arbeter Ring" [Workers' Circle], a workers' mutual aid organization was established in London. It was a branch of the "Arbeter Ring" organization, which was founded in New York twenty years before, in 1892.

Rocker viewed the strike not merely as a weapon in an economic struggle. He wanted the strike to become a moral issue, an extension of Kropotkin's theory on mutual aid. He emphasized the need
to aid not only those in one's professional union or those belonging to one's immediate neighborhood. Mutual aid by workers should be extended beyond boundaries of nationality and occupation. Thus, when parallel to the tailors strike there was also an unrelated walk out by the English dock workers, the Jewish tailors, fresh from winning their own battle, rallied to their support. A trade union committee of aid was set up, and the *Arbeter Faint* issued a call to help the children of the striking. Rocker and Milly personally took home some children from the docks, most of which were in "a terribly undernourished state, barefoot, in rags." Over three hundred children were taken to Jewish homes, fed, clothed and taken care of during the strike. The dockers' strike and the massive enlistment of Jewish aid and hospitality, helped create a new atmosphere of friendship between the Jewish and gentile workers, thus bringing to fruition Rocker's efforts.

The tailors' strike helped elevate Rocker's prestige. His role in the struggle and his personality assumed legendary proportions in the East End. The activities of the *Arbeter Faint* group expanded, and the newspaper itself increased its number of pages to twelve. Rocker's fame extended well beyond the borders of the British Isles, and soon after the strike he was invited to Canada for a lecture tour.

After arranging with Frumkin to substitute for him as editor of the *Arbeter Faint*, Rocker left for Canada in February 1913. He was accompanied by his older son Rudolf, who decided to settle in the United States. The tour was a success, politically as well as financially. The lectures were well attended, and the debates lively.
In addition the profits helped improve the situation of the *Arbeiter Frain* and the small publishing house operated by the newspaper. Rocker also found the time to visit Milly's sister, Fanny, in Towanda, and from there he proceeded on a pilgrimage to Chicago, to visit the graves of the Haymarket martyrs. In June 1913, he arrived back in England.
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CHAPTER FOUR: AN "ENEMY ALIEN"

World War I constituted a stringent test of the strength, durability and survivability of social movements. It was a particularly stringent test for the Socialist and Anarchist Internationals, since both their fundamental pacifist principles and their commitment to international unity were put on trial. The Socialists failed miserably on both counts. Most of the European Social-Democratic parties, which had, prior to the outbreak of war, adopted anti-war resolutions, quickly abandoned their internationalist commitments and rallied enthusiastically in support of their respective governments. In doing so the Social Democrats buried officially the Second International, its principles and institutions. The Anarchist International did not fare any better. The conflicting attitudes towards the war split the anarchist leadership and dealt the movement a severe blow from which it never properly recovered. The similarities, however, end here. For while the Social Democrats increased their membership and influence in most of Europe and soon after the war emerged as a political force to be seriously reckoned with, the anarchists retained their pre-war loose organizational structure, and that in conjunction with a newly divided leadership on fundamental issues helped diminish their influence among the masses and dwindle their membership in almost every country in Europe. In retrospect, the historical lesson that seems to emerge is that betrayal of principles is excusable by the masses, indecisiveness is
not. The socialists, despite casting away their professed aversion to war and joining in nationalist causes, emerged as winners. In comparison, the anarchists, the great majority of whom adhered canonically to pacifism, lost ground.

During the war anarchist papers ceased to be published, anarchist groups were dissolved either coercively or due to lack of members, and no effective underground movement came into existence. The revolutionary élan of the anarchist movement prior to the war simply faded away. Apart from the syndicalist trend, which enjoyed some popularity in several European countries, and a brief revival of the international anarchist camaraderie during the Civil War in Spain, anarchism as a social theory and political force declined dramatically in the years following World War I.

The split within the anarchist movement was caused mainly by Kropotkin's uncompromising Francophilic attitudes. He was unambiguously on the side of France, and he publicly preached fighting the German invader by all possible means. Kropotkin's attitudes during World War I are difficult to explain rationally in light of his previous writings on war. Until 1914, Kropotkin's historical examinations of modern wars pointed to the evil and uselessness of all armed conflicts, be they offensive or defensive according to traditional classification. Kropotkin showed that wars, all wars, are but means of exploiting the masses and enriching the capitalist classes. Wars, he pronounced, are waged in the interest of capitalism and imperialism for the sole purpose of gaining new markets and forcing alien products upon unwilling societies, thereby, gaining
supremacy in one spot or another on the globe. In 1885, in an article dealing with the Anglo-Russian conflict on the Afghan border, Kropotkin reiterated his claim that the causes of modern wars are neither political nor national anymore. They are mainly violent economic quests for new markets. Following this line of reasoning, Kropotkin damned the Boer War as senseless slaughter, and urged the British workers to oppose it. Similarly, Kropotkin avoided taking sides in the Russo-Japanese War, which for him was just another example of imperialist struggles for dominance of markets. The Russian-Japanese War was in particular a good illustration of Kropotkin's analysis of modern warfare, since both sides had no legitimate claim over the territory they were fighting for. Kropotkin was in particular aware of the danger that a peripheral war, that initially seemed well contained geographically, might spill over and ignite a global confrontation.

Kropotkin's condemnation of war, however, was not indiscriminate. In the Fall of 1905 Kropotkin wrote a letter to the Parisian newspaper *Le Temps* in which he distinguished between patriotic and imperialist wars, on the one hand, and wars of national defense, on the other. This distinction, while extremely shallow and convoluted in its logic, ought to be born in mind when trying to understand Kropotkin's unexpected positions towards World War I. Kropotkin divided wars into two categories. The first category included those wars motivated by either greed or unjustified feelings of supremacy of one nation over another. The masses should not join in these type of wars, in fact they could, according to Kropotkin and
many other anarchists, effectively prevent such wars from being waged by means of the general strike and the consequent economic collapse of the war machine. Kropotkin's second category included wars of national defense. The logical difficulties start here, because it is next to impossible to provide a criterion consistent with anarchist philosophy by which to classify a war as justified. This category was created by Kropotkin for wars involving France, and in particular for wars involving France and Germany. Kropotkin was essentially a pacifist, with one substantial reservation; his positive sentiments towards France as the cradle of revolution. Like Bakunin before him, Kropotkin feared German absolutism and militarism, and he regarded Germany to be the biggest obstacle to the development of the revolutionary spirit in Europe. France, on the other hand, was imbued, according to Kropotkin, with revolutionary sentiments. It was, in a sense, a question of revolutionary potential. If a nation like France with an appreciable revolutionary potential was to be attacked by another country, and especially Germany, whose revolutionary potential was negligible, then the revolutionaries should not sit idle and give a carte blanche to the reactionaries. Such a war, even if to an anarchist it superficially resembled any other conflict delineated by nationality, was closely linked in Kropotkin's mind to the revolution. The defense of France was synonymous to the preservation of the spirit of revolution. Therefore, Kropotkin regarded a potential mass refusal of the French workers to serve the war effort in case of a German invasion as a useless and damaging form of protest, using the right medicine in the wrong illness. The general strike was to be used in
unjustified wars. Fighting against Germany was justified, for the French workers had the moral obligation to defend the revolutionary spirit and tradition, and preserve France's role as the flag bearer of social change. In this particular case Kropotkin advocated replacing national patriotism with revolutionary patriotism.

Kropotkin's distinction between wars in general and wars in which France was the attacked side served as the igniting spark of a bitter conflict within the anarchist camp. Prior to the outbreak of World War I the official anarchist position, formulated and adopted at the 1907 Anarchist Congress in Amsterdam, had been uncompromisingly anti-militaristic. The anarchists encouraged all people of all nations to resist military service and work together toward the destruction of all military forces. For this reason, Kropotkin was already in disagreement with the majority of the anarchist movement as early as 1907.

The moment the war started, Kropotkin embarked on a propaganda campaign aimed at persuading the anarchists to take France's side. In a letter to a friend, Professor Gustav Stefen of Sweden, Kropotkin argued that everyone had the responsibility to aid in pushing back the German reactionaries. Germany, maintained Kropotkin, was menacing European progress since 1871. Bakunin was right, continued Kropotkin, for without France and the French revolutionary influence, Europe might have regressed socially "at least fifty years." The anarchist movement, Kropotkin argued, had to reevaluate its indiscriminate anti-militarist policy. Most anarchists had put their faith in the ability of a general strike to prevent war,
a belief which proved overly optimistic. Now, that they were confronted with the reality of war, more realistic, i.e. militant, moves were necessary. Defending France against the German invader was the only possible resort in the present circumstances.\textsuperscript{7}

A few of Kropotkin's friends, like Jean Grave, Varlaam Cherkezov, and Marie Goldsmitd, shared his views and they set the tone for the rank and file in Russia and France. Most of the leading anarchists of the time, however, people like Errico Malatesta, Rudolf Rocker, Emma Goldman, and Alexander Berkman, opposed their teacher and friend's pro-war stand. The opposition to war had a strong following among the anarchists in Spain, Italy, Switzerland, the Netherlands, and England.\textsuperscript{8} Errico Malatesta spearheaded the attack on Kropotkin's positions. He failed to see the difference between an Allied dominated Europe and one dominated by Germany. Both would have been detrimental for the revolution, he claimed. Malatesta, therefore, suggested that anarchists should continue pursuing their original goal, the social revolution, and take whatever measures necessary not to compromise with any government.\textsuperscript{9}

Rocker supported Malatesta's views and was particularly enraged by Kropotkin's nationalistic prejudices, which were bluntly expressed in Kropotkin's call to the anarchists to fight the "German Huns" in the name of a higher culture. Germany, claimed Rocker, was not the only country to be blamed for the present war. Although militarism was more developed in Germany, all European countries had contributed their fair share to fomenting the atmosphere of belligerence in the last fifteen years.\textsuperscript{10} Rocker viewed war as a
"curse to mankind, a hindrance to real progress, and an enemy to every
development of freedom." Only in the hypothetical situation where a
revolution had broken out in France, and the German army had
intervened to suppress the revolution, it would have been justified
for both socialists and anarchists to mobilize for the protection of
the revolution. But, as that was not the case, anarchists had to
oppose the senseless mass slaughter in Europe.\textsuperscript{11}

Rocker went as far as characterizing Kropotkin's position as
that of a radical bourgeois and not of an anarchist.\textsuperscript{12} Comparing
Kropotkin's views with those of the German Social Democrats, Rocker
concluded that they were identical in principle, except for the fact
that each regarded another side as the enemy. Kropotkin thus heavily
contributed, according to Rocker, to the bankruptcy of international
solidarity. The words engraved on the banner of the International,
said Rocker, were not "'Proletarians of All Lands Kill Each Other!'
but 'Proletarians of All Lands Unite!'".\textsuperscript{13}

On the personal level one can imagine that it was very
painful for Rocker not only to oppose his teacher and friend, but also
to have to attack him so sharply and publicly. Rocker, nonetheless,
was unique among the anarchists opposing the war in that he seriously
tried to understand the mental reasons underlying Kropotkin's pro-war
attitudes. Rocker's explanations of Kropotkin's behavior, while almost
as convoluted as Kropotkin's own justifications, should at least be
regarded as an honest try, and he rejected as slender the claim by
some of his anarchist friends that Kropotkin was motivated by sheer
Russian nationalism and patriotism. It was rather Kropotkin's concern
for the libertarian spirit, the heritage of the great French
Revolution that caused him to adopt such stands. On several
occasions Rocker proposed that Kropotkin's stand in regard to World
War I had to be understood as an outcome of Kropotkin's historical
studies, and especially his fascination with the French Revolution, on
which he wrote a book. Kropotkin, according to Rocker, believed that
the French were endowed with an historic mission, that of being
Europe's revolutionary vanguard. The Germans, on the other hand, were
viewed by Kropotkin as a militarist nation with no revolutionary
tradition, a nation whose leaders were responsible for all that was
regressive and reactionary in European politics. The militarization of
Europe, led by Germany, blocked the "natural" socialist development
started, spiritually at least, by the French. World War I was the
climax of this process of reaction, and Kropotkin could not bring
himself to remain neutral in an act, i.e. France being conquered by
Germany, that would kill all hopes for a revolution in the foreseeable
future. Rocker concluded that while Kropotkin's arguments were
logically consistent, and as such understandable, his conclusions in
regard to the war were based on nationalistic premises, if not
outright prejudices, and thus contradicted all that was correct and
just in anarchist philosophy.

As the war went on, the conflicting attitudes of the two
anarchist camps became further polarized. In the Spring of 1915,
Malatesta and the anti-war faction published a manifesto in which they
not only defined their unambiguous position towards the war, but also
distanced themselves completely and officially from Kropotkin. The
manifesto reiterated the position of the anarchists that all wars ought to be condemned, regardless of their offensive or defensive nature, since this distinction was neither practical nor important in terms of the revolution. The anarchists, continued the manifesto, should reject all forms of government with equal vigor and should concentrate their efforts on the ultimate goal, the liberation of the masses. The manifesto was signed among others by Emma Goldman, Alexander Berkman, Alexander Shapiro and, of course, its initiator, Errico Malatesta, all of whom had been previously close associates of Kropotkin.

A retaliatory manifesto was issued by Kropotkin and his supporters in February 1916. The text contained repeated references to the fact that Germany was an aggressive, militarist country, a menace to both France and the revolutionary movement. The manifesto ended with a strong rejection of the "illusion of pacifism" advocated by some anarchists. Rudolf Rocker, who by that time was in an internment camp, could follow the conflict only through sporadic reports from visiting friends.

There is a bitter irony in the fact that during World War II, Rocker was the center of a controversy which raged over his support of the Allies against Hitler's Germany. Rocker argued, like Kropotkin three decades before him, that the war was justified in terms of the ultimate preservation of libertarian values. In a twist of fate, Rocker adopted Kropotkin's old arguments to prove that the war involved a conflict between two opposing forces: one wanting to regress to absolutism, the other striving for progress. The only
difference was that whereas Kropotkin had been concerned with France's and Germany's revolutionary potentials, Rocker focused on Britain and Germany, and decided that the British Commonwealth could be used as a tentative model for a future federation of Europe. 18

During World War II most anarchists supported a policy of non-intervention, reiterating Malatesta's and Rocker's arguments from the previous war, on the fact that it did not matter who the winner was, the result in terms of its social implications would be the same, i.e., regression and reaction. This position was strongly repudiated by Rocker. "To assert that to us it is all the same who is victor [sic] in this terrible conflict, means to aid the cowardly murderers, and to prepare the world for the 'blessing' of Hitler's 'New Order'." 19 During World War II, Rocker, like Kropotkin previously, had to cope, albeit temporarily, with rejection and ideological isolation within a movement to which he dedicated his entire life.

Several weeks after the outbreak of World War I, the British authorities started registering German nationals living in England as "enemy aliens." The yellow press incited its readers with slogans such as "Watch Your German Neighbor!", resulting in sporadic rioting against German citizens and businesses. 20 German workers were fired, and the authorities soon began interning aliens, proclaiming initially that these were precautionary measures taken for protecting the aliens against the violent mobs.

In order to lessen the plight of their unemployed friends, the German and French anarchists in London opened a communal kitchen that provided food to all those left without jobs. The Jewish
anarchists soon followed, and opened a similar facility in the East End. The kitchen supplied basic food items such as bread, cheese and tea, but could only occasionally provide its clients with a hot meal. True to Kropotkin’s dictum "from each according to his means, to each according to his needs," everyone contributed toward the cost according to his ability, and most ate for free. Kropotkin, of course, showed great interest in the project which was administered according to the principles of his theory of mutual aid.

Anticipating an imminent arrest, Rocker started to put his own affairs in order. For years Rocker served as the treasurer of the Anarchist Red Cross, an international organization whose task had been to help anarchist prisoners and supply them with small amounts of money. Fearing that following his arrest the English government might confiscate the money of the Anarchist Red Cross Organization, which were deposited under his name, Rocker transferred all the funds to Alexander Shapiro. He also made the necessary arrangements so that the Arbeter Fraint, whose format had been drastically reduced since the outbreak of the war, would continue to be published in his absence. In fact, Rocker was so certain as to the inevitability of his arrest, that his suitcase was packed and ready several weeks before it actually happened.

Rocker’s internment marked the end of the most successful era in the history of the Jewish anarchist movement in England. The Arbeter Fraint group, while continuing to function as well as it could, visibly lacked Rocker’s leadership and inexhaustible vigor. Two years later, in July 1916, the Arbeter Fraint office and press were
shut down by the police, and the group's top activists were arrested. The Jewish anarchist movement in England, which was thriving in the beginning of the 1910’s, became a sad anachronism by the end of the decade.

It was "the triple pulls of Zionism, Orthodoxy, and Communism after 1917," wrote Fishman, that became viable alternatives to anarchism and finally eroded the membership of the Jewish anarchist movement in England. Political Zionism gained in strength during World War I and its aftermath, especially following the Balfour Declaration of November 1917, which announced British support for the establishment of a Jewish national homeland in Palestine. Furthermore, many immigrants, disillusioned with all the universal social creeds of the nineteenth century, returned to the safety of their fathers' religion and to the tight organization of the Jewish Orthodox community. Many more abandoned anarchism for the salvation emanating from the Russian Revolution, and returned to their country of birth to take part in the building of the new society. Some did not adopt Communism, but still returned to Russia in hope of shaping the revolution in their own ideological image. Kropotkin and Emma Goldman, for instance, found their dreams there shattered. Most anarchists were even less fortunate and they simply vanished in Soviet prisons.

The greatest catalysts, however, in the decline of the anarchist movement were intrinsic to the objective realities of World War I itself and its outcome. First, it divided both the leadership and the rank and file into pro- and anti-intervention factions.
Second, many of the top activists of the anarchist movement were interned, and when the war was over they were either deported to their countries of origin, or left voluntarily, usually for the New World. In addition, the War resulted in an austere economic depression, and, consequently, immigration quotas to Britain were severely curtailed. The Jewish immigration from Eastern Europe, which for a long time fed the ranks of the anarchist movement, nearly ceased. On top of everything else, the second generation repudiated their parents' ideals, and pursued a course of assimilation within the English middle class. Thus, they disassociated themselves from every aspect of life that would hinder their acceptance into society, especially the use of the Yiddish language. Deprived of both immigrational input and demographic renewal, the anarchist movement in England simply dwindled away.

Rocker was arrested on December 2, 1914, by a special decree issued by the Ministry of War, and was sent to the "Olympia," two adjacent exhibition halls transformed into a prisoner camp for about 2000 inmates. The "Olympia" served mainly as a clearing house for the inmates before they were transferred to more permanent facilities. Rocker stayed for two weeks in the "Olympia," after which he was transferred to the "Royal Edward," a ship turned into a floating prison. The ship housed close to 1300 prisoners, yet although the space was scarce, the living conditions on the "Royal Edward" were, according to Rocker's testimony, much improved in comparison with those at the "Olympia." Rudolf Rocker was the second member of the family to be arrested and not the last one. Ernst Simmerling, his
brother-in-law, whom he met on the ship, had been arrested during the first wave.

Immediately after his arrest, a Rocker's Release Committee was formed, counting among its members W.A. Appleton, the Secretary General of the Trade Union Federation of England, James O'Grady, the M.P. for Leeds, and Peter Kropotkin, who pleaded on Rocker's behalf in spite of their ideological differences in regard to the war. Rocker suspected that since he had not been arrested in the first round up, and since his arrest was brought about by a special decree, the reasons for his internment had nothing to do with his nationality, but that he was being punished for propagating anti-war stands. Thus, he concluded, the chances of him being released prior to the ending of the war were slim.

The first months of internment had a devastating effect on Rocker's morale. In an overly dramatic tone he described his feelings as though a major part of his life ended abruptly and his life work was broken to pieces. His desperation is evident in a letter to Milly, in which he expressed feelings of disappointment with civilization in general. "I think it is high time for us to retire to some deserted island, somewhere in the Pacific Ocean, when the war is over, and to seek a new home among savages, where we can forget the wonderful blessings of 'Christian Culture'.” In his hour of despair, Rocker subconsciously took refuge in Rousseau's notion of the noble savage, living peacefully and undisturbed in a happy, uncorrupted society, yearning to be part of it.

Rocker's psychological makeup, however, prevented him from
indulging is self pity for long, and he soon came to terms with reality, starting taking part in whatever activities the camp provided. Rocker recalled that his most interesting hours in the camp had been those he spent in the smoking cabin, where he could debate freely and uncensored political topics with his fellow prisoners. Indeed, some of the debates became very passionate, especially when Rocker expressed his uncompromising views on militarism and pan-Germanism, two extremely popular causes among most of the interned. 28

It soon occurred to Rocker that he could turn these informal discussions into a series of formal lectures, and use them for educational purposes. These talks, besides providing Rocker with a propaganda tool, a means by which to disseminate his ideas, were meant first and foremost to relieve the hardship and monotony of the camp. 29

The first lecture delivered by Rocker dealt with a literary topic and was entitled "Six Characters in World Literature." Later he talked about social, political, philosophical and historical issues. "The Social and Intellectual Conditions in Europe during the Years 1848-1849," "The Philosophy of History," "The Development of Modern Art and Literature," and "The General Conditions and the Various Intellectual Movements in Europe after 1848-1849," are but few of the topics Rocker lectured about during his forty months of imprisonment. 30

His talks on "Six Characters in World Literature," however, remained a favorite of the interned, and Rocker was asked to deliver them several times. Years later, Rocker would use this series of lectures as the foundation of a book, which carried the same title. Rocker, who was always partial to the utopian style, adopted this
genre in writing The Six, as the book was called in its English
translation. The Six was Rocker’s only attempt at writing fiction, and
as such it is a very mediocre piece, quite repetitive and simplistic
in its style, and carrying a rather obvious and propagandistic
message. It is, however, an illuminating piece in trying to
understand Rudolf Rocker’s weltanschauung.

The narrative involves six more or less well known figures
from classical literature, whom Rocker uses to convey a simple
message, i.e. that the liberation of mankind would be accomplished
only through cooperative efforts. The six characters are introduced to
the reader in three contrasting pairs: Faust versus Don Juan, Hamlet
versus Don Quixote, and Medardus, the monk, versus the poet, Heinrich
von Ofterdingen. The plot is rigidly structured and repetitious,
each of the characters pursuing a particular goal, each failing to
achieve the goal, and finally concluding that the quest was
meaningless. In the first chapter, Mephistopheles enters Faust’s
study, tempting and alluring him with the promise of knowledge and
understanding. Faust spends years in the pursuit of knowledge and the
absolute truth, but the quest for intellectual understanding leads him
to nowhere. His opposite, Don Juan, is presented as a cynical realist
in search of the pleasures of the moment. His life of debauchery ends,
however, the moment carnal lust and earthly desires burn out, and he
finds himself haunted by the inevitability of old age. The third
figure, Hamlet, is a rationalist dedicated to analysing motives and
consequences. He possesses the knowledge but lacks the courage to act
accordingly. He is eaten by the “worm” of doubt, which destroys his
instincts and ultimately denies him revenge. Hamlet is paralyzed by excessive reasoning, and is gradually losing both moral strength and will to act. Don Quixote, on the other hand, is the embodiment of pure idealism, instinctive and immediate, unhampered by either comprehension or knowledge. His acts, consequently, are but parodies. The fifth figure, Medardus the Monk, is an introvert. By constantly searching for his real self, he becomes the center of his world. He is aware of no one and nothing besides himself, until everything becomes a reflection of his own self, and everything around him ceases to exist. In contrast, Heinrich von Ofterdingen, the poet, is an extrovert, who is concerned with the whole world, sees its pains and suffering, and desires to relieve all misery. He searches for the blue flower, which is the world's only salvation, but when he finds it and brings it back to the people, he finds out that the flower had already wilted.

The six characters are wondering on six separate roads, all ending near the feet of a Sphinx, placed enigmatically in the middle of a desolate desert. There, in front of the Sphinx, all six collapse. Time passes by, and the desert wakes up, and so do the six protagonists. They talk to each other, each pair resolving its differences. The Sphinx, consequently, disintegrates, and in its place a blue flower blooms. Old society is replaced by a beautiful new world.

The message Rocker was trying to convey was a simple one. Each way, if pursued alone, would be an exhaustive and futile search. Only by means of unity, combining the variation in temperaments and
talents within the world, would men solve the riddle of the Sphinx and bring about the desired change. The union of intellect and impulse, act and understanding, the inner and outer self, would result in a new life, a new world. No supernatural power can help in bringing about salvation. The task is man's alone. The disillusioned Faust expresses this feeling when proclaiming: "God and Satan are of the same race," and no dependence should be placed on either.\(^32\) Heinrich von Ofterdingen declares that "no chosen one can break our chains, man must be his own redeemer, must free himself from the heavy yoke of servitude."\(^{33}\) The same message is echoed in Medardus' words: "Only from the We release can come."\(^{34}\) Understanding the social reality, the urge to act and change, and the ultimate salvation via creation of a new world, all would be possible only by and through man's action.

It is easy to understand why the interned on the "Royal Edward" and elsewhere were so fascinated by this series of lectures. In addition to opening for them new intellectual vistas, Rocker also provided them with hope for a better future. Like many literary utopias, The Six created for the audiences a dreamlike reality, a vision completely different and contrasting from that which they actually lived in.

On June 1, 1915, the "Royal Edward" was evacuated, and the prisoners were transferred to a new camp, this time a terrestrial one. The "Alexandra Palace" was originally an old exhibition hall in North London and was spacious in comparison with the cramped quarters on the ship. The interned were organized in three battalions, each divided into 15 groups. Every group contained 80-100 prisoners with an
elected captain, whose task was the supervision of order and sanitation. Each battalion had an elected leader, who served as a liaison between the prisoners and the authorities of the camp.

Rocker, who became prisoner number 4040, refused to be nominated for the position of battalion leader, because at that time he was considering the possibility of running away. According to the plan, a fellow prisoner would break out of the camp, contact Rocker's friends in the East End, and these would arrange for a temporary hide away until the opportunity arose of smuggling Rocker and his family to a neutral country. The plan called for the first escapee to return to the camp the same night, unnoticed by the guards, and inform Rocker on the arrangements. The reasons for the complexity of the plan and for Rocker's need of a partner was that he was too well known in the East End, and in the absence of a pre-arranged hideout his escape could be easily foiled. Rocker chose as partner a young prisoner, August Ludolf Arendt. On July 14, 1915, Arendt succeeded in breaking out of the camp, but failed to return as planned. As it turned out, Arendt, not being familiar with London and knowing not one word of English, lost his way back, and was found a couple of days later wondering aimlessly in the vicinity of the camp. He was brought back to "Alexandra Palace," but to Rocker's relief did not disclose the identity of his accomplice.

Soon after this incident, Rocker gave up the idea of breaking out, and dedicated his time to what he did best, working with people. He was first elected as group captain, and a year later, in May 1916, he became battalion leader, in which capacity he served
until leaving the camp and England in March 1918. As battalion leader, Rocker worked for the improvement of the living conditions in prison. He managed to persuade the authorities to better the visiting terms and to allow the prisoners to receive books and packages. He also helped organize concerts and classes, and continued to lecture. By the time of his release Rocker's lectures totaled 139.

On July 28, 1916, Milly and Rocker's eldest son, Rudolf, were arrested. She was accused of spreading anti-war propaganda, in particular urging Russian nationals living in England not to join in the armies of the Tsar. She was not indicted, but was held on administrative orders in the Hylesbury Prison for Women without a trial until the last months of the war. Rocker requested the Minister of War that his son be transferred to "Alexandra Palace," and his request was granted. As previously noted, despite ideological differences, Kropotkin tried his best to secure the release of the Rockers. Interestingly, Milly proved to be more inflexible, if not outright fanatical, than her husband in her anti-war beliefs, and refused to accept Kropotkin's help because of his theoretical stands concerning the war.

The outbreak of the Russian Revolution in February 1917 was for the interned like the awakening of the desert in The Six. They were sure the war would soon be over, and they themselves would be set free. From red pieces of rags, the prisoners of "Alexandra Palace" assembled little flags, which they tied to their beds to signal their joy and identification with the revolution. Rocker's first reaction to the news about the revolution was total disbelief, which changed
rapidly into overwhelming elation. 39

Many of Rocker's friends flocked backed to Russia to take part in the making of a new society. Rocker was flooded with a constant stream of visitors coming to bid him farewell before leaving for Russia. Among them was Alexander Shapiro and his wife. Kropotkin, too, wrote a letter before departure, leaving Rocker with the uneasy feeling that he would never see his teacher and friend again. Errico Malatesta also came to visit Rocker, as he himself intended to join the revolution as soon as possible. He conveyed to Rocker his belief that the Russian Revolution would soon engulf all Europe, and that the war would culminate in a revolutionary crescendo. Malatesta's desire to go to Russia could not be realized, however, because the British government forbade his departure on the ground that he was an Italian citizen, and only Russians expatriates were allowed to return. 40

Rocker shared Malatesta's enthusiasm and was sorry he could not join his friends in taking part in the historical events in Russia. In a letter to Milly he expressed his hope that their life work might not have been a waste after all, and that many of the ideas they had fought for would soon be realized. Rocker did not regard the fact that the first socialist revolution erupted in Russia as a handicap. In fact he regarded this as an advantage, since unlike the Slavophils, who claimed that Russians had been uncritically adopting western habits and institutions, Rocker maintained that Russia had not been yet corrupted by western civilization. 41 Rocker's excitement soon abated mainly because of the policies enacted by the Russian Provisional Government. In particular, Rocker was disappointed by the
Russian Government's surrender to pressures from the west to continue the war effort as before. Rocker also expressed grave doubts as to the capability of the Provisional Government to solve the much debated land question. In his letter, Rocker was probably referring to the law, passed on July 12, 1917, in which Kerensky issued a ban on all commercial transactions of land, unless approved by both a local committee and, more importantly, by the appropriate ministry, thus presumably presaging the nationalization of land. His reservations were based on the anarchist tenet that land and ownership should not be concentrated in the hands of the state. Both land and political power should be divided among the Soviets, which were unions of peasants and workers, and as such the true representatives of the people. The concentration of power by the state is directly contradicting the aims of the revolution, and thus endangered it. Milly, on the other hand, entertained no such strong reservations, and was more optimistic concerning the ultimate achievements of the revolution. In a letter to Milly, dated August 18, 1917, Rocker expressed his reluctance to share in her enthusiasm concerning the future prospects for the revolution, since it was, in his opinion, much simpler to abolish tyranny than to root out the instincts of serfdom imbued in the people. His fear was that the Russians are only going to exchange old chains for new ones, with no real prospects of social emancipation.

On September 20, 1917, Rocker received notice from Milly that her case would soon be brought up before an advisory committee. Milly informed the committee that if released she would like to return
to Russia, provided her husband and their two sons would be allowed to join her. The committee's chairman told Milly that her request could not be granted since Rudolf was a German citizen, and as such in a state of war with Russia. Milly responded that Rudolf Rocker's nationality would in no way affect the Russian government's willingness to accept both of them.  

After seventeen months of separation, Milly and Rocker were allowed to see each other, and on October 17, 1917, they met to discuss among other things the option of being deported to Russia. Their decision had been to move to Russia even without their elder son.  

The Russian government did in fact agree to accept the Rockers, and there were even rumors that Trotsky himself telegraphed his consent to the British authorities after the Bolsheviks gained power, but Rudolf was skeptical whether this fact would indeed change their status. Rocker's skepticism was fully justified, and soon after their meeting, Milly received a letter from the Home Secretary, announcing that her internment would not be canceled. In the beginning of 1918, however, Milly was once again offered her freedom on condition that she would leave for Russia with Fermin but without Rudolf. Despite Rocker's pleas for her to accept the offer, Milly refused to leave England without him.

Rocker's enthusiasm and optimism for the revolution gained renewed momentum after the Bolshevik seizure of power. He still rejected the dogmatism and centralized policies of the Bolsheviks, but he shared in the hope of many of his fellow revolutionaries that under the Bolshevik guidance the revolution would soon spread to other countries. He once again expressed his regrets as to the fact that he
would not be able to join in the action. Rocker was, however, much quicker than most of his anarchist friends to recognize the fact that the Bolshevik revolutionary myth was just that, a myth, and it yielded no real social betterment. Alexander Berkman, for instance, continued to justify the Bolshevik methods as historical necessities and refused to denounce them until March 1921, when the Bolsheviks barbarously suppressed the rebellion of the Kronstadt sailors. Rocker opened his eyes much sooner to the realities of the revolution, i.e. its dogmatism, state-directed abuse of human rights, and signs of an emerging dictatorship.

Already in August 1918 Rocker wrote to Milly that the regime of the Bolsheviks was but a new system of tyranny, and that Lenin and Trotsky were sacrificing the real revolutionaries to stay in power. He added that the treaty of Brest Litovsk, which ended the war between Russia and Germany in March 1918 had been the "death blow" to the revolution. This may seem contradictory in light of Rocker's ardent opposition to the war, and his support of any action designed to put an end to the hostilities. Yet, the terms of the Brest Litovsk treaty were such that the Bolsheviks had to give up the idea of aiding or even encouraging revolutionary movements outside Russia. In Rocker's opinion, the Bolsheviks gave up the prospects of a world revolution for the sake of consolidating their exclusive power at home. Disappointed and worried as he was from the course of the revolution, Rocker still opposed the foreign military intervention in Russia's affairs, which began in the Summer of 1918. For the first time during the war he found himself siding with Kropotkin, who claimed that the
policy of blockade and intervention practiced by the Western Allies could only hinder the work of the genuine revolutionary elements, without actually achieving its goals. In addition, Kropotkin rightly feared that the Bolsheviks would use the foreign enemy as a pretext to justify the horrors and misery they unnecessarily brought on the population.\(^53\) Rocker's argument was a little different than Kropotkin's. He claimed that the anarchists should support the Bolsheviks in their struggle against the outside intervention, not because they supported the communists, but because otherwise they would play the revolution into the hands of its enemies, who would unleash a counter revolution. The anarchists, however, should not be blind to the dangers of the Russian Revolution and the dictatorial propensities of its leaders.\(^54\) It is clear then, that at least in its initial stages, Rocker adopted the position that the Bolshevik Revolution is better than no revolution. Consequently, the anarchists should, in Rocker's opinion, take active part in the effort to create a new society. His views evolved quite rapidly, however, and later in his life Rocker became a relentless and unequivocal critic of the Soviet state, while showing sympathy to several aspects of Western social democracy.

Rudolf Rocker was the first prominent anarchist to publish a pamphlet on the bankruptcy of the Russian Revolution. Two years before Emma Goldman's *My Disillusionment in Russia* in 1923, and four years before Alexander Berkman broke the *Bolshevik Myth*, Rocker published a booklet entitled *Der Bankrott des Russischen Staats Kommunismus*, in which he sharply attacked the revolution and its
leaders. One of Rocker's main points of criticism was the cynical way the Bolsheviks managed to manipulate the anarchists when they needed them to further their own interests. It may be that Rocker was in particular enraged by the anarchists' over readiness to believe that the Marxist wolf had changed its skin. Determined to fight the Provisional Government of Kerensky, and support the Soviets of Workers and Peasants, the anarchists found themselves allied with the Bolsheviks in a common cause. This informal alliance had been facilitated by the fact that after returning to Russia, Lenin made several declarations, which caused the anarchists to believe that the Bolsheviks were casting away their old Marxist dogmatism in favor of essentially anarchist ideas. For instance, in his "April Theses," Lenin declared that Russia need not experience a stage of "bourgeois democracy," an inevitable and necessary step preceding the proletarian revolution according to Marx's rigid historicism. Lenin declared that Russia might as well skip this requirement and proceed directly to a stage where the power was placed directly in the hands of the workers and peasants. More significantly, according to most anarchists, were Lenin's condemnations of a parliament as a governing body of the Russian post-revolutionary society, advocating instead a decentralized regime of Soviets, modeled after the Paris Commune. Topping all that, the anarchists were delighted to see in writing Lenin's solemn declarations in favor of abolishing all state bureaucratic systems, in particular the army and the police.

For many anarchists Lenin's "April Theses" marked a breach with Marxist dogmatism, and indeed many hard-line Marxists regarded
the "Theses" as an act of heresy. I. P. Goldenberg, a veteran Russian Marxist, declared that "Lenin has now made himself a candidate for one European throne that has been vacant for thirty years - the throne of Bakunin." What is clear is that both the anarchists and Goldenberg were reading too much into Lenin's "Theses." The "Theses" were not a significant ideological shift on the part of Lenin, but a rough change in emphasis with pragmatic implications that were made necessary by circumstances.

The anarchists responded positively to Lenin's change of heart, and they joined the Bolsheviks in trying to topple the Provisional Government. Communists and anarchists suddenly found themselves working together and voting together at labor conferences in support of factory committees and workers' control. This cooperation culminated in October, when the anarchists mobilized their members and actually assisted the Bolsheviks in overthrowing Kerensky's regime. The anarchists were, however, soon to find out that the old wolf did not stay tamed for long. As soon as the Bolsheviks gained power a "Provisional Workers' and Peasants' Government" was proclaimed, and the notion of "Dictatorship of the Proletariat," which was not even mentioned in the "April Theses," regained ideological supremacy. During the Spring and Summer of 1917, when Lenin's immediate concern had been the toppling of the Provisional Government, he allied himself and his party with the anarchists. As soon as the Bolsheviks gained power, the alliance became redundant, and Lenin quickly reverted to his centralized policies, which in the context of the trade unions, meant siding with
those trade unionists advocating state control. During the First All-Russian Congress of Trade Unions, which was convened in January 1918, the factory committees were converted into local cells of national unions, which in turn, became state institutions. Furthermore, the Bolsheviks could now easily and with no political consequences discard their allies, and indeed they soon started a massive campaign of repression and persecution against their former temporary allies. Anarchist activities were severely restricted, newspapers were raided and ultimately closed down, and many anarchists were arrested and executed as "counter revolutionaries."

Rocker maintained that without the help of the anarchists, the Bolsheviks would not have been able to seize power, a statement that obviously cannot be verified. Moreover, Rocker drew a very interesting analogy between the role of the anarchists in the October Revolution with what had been said about Bakunin in the course of the 1848 uprising in France. It is said that during the stormy days of the fighting, Caussidière, the commander of one of the barricades, remarked that during the first day of the revolution Bakunin had been a treasure, but that he should have been shot the day after. Rocker suggested that the Bolsheviks' tactics had been similar. When the anarchists were needed came the cry "join them," soon after the slogan was replaced by "shoot them." The comedy could have been grotesque, remarked Rocker, were it not for the fact that it was at the same time "so dreadfully sad."

The persecutions and betrayal of trust were not, however, Rocker's main concerns, although they were obviously the most painful
ones. His main criticism was directed against the Bolsheviks' abandonment of the Soviets as a model of government and their establishing instead the "Dictatorship of the Proletariat." Rocker warned against the popular and widespread misconception that the Soviets and the "Dictatorship of the Proletariat" were two connected entities, the existence of one logically deduced from the other. They were in fact two opposite forms of organization, said Rocker, in no way complementing each other, but more or less contradicting. The Soviets, the Russian version of the Syndicates, were a direct manifestation of the people's will. As such, they were the clearest expression of the anarchist ideal on how society should be organized after the revolution. 63

The "Dictatorship of the Proletariat," on the other hand, was a system in which power was concentrated in few privileged hands. The system was just a new form of dictatorship, albeit a peculiar one. The power was not in the hands of a class, nor in the hands of a single person. Power became delegated involuntarily and successively with no checks and balances in between. One could not speak of a true reign of the working classes, because the power had been delegated to the party, which decided arbitrarily on its right to represent the class. Nor, said Rocker, could one speak of a dictatorship of a party, for it soon became evident that a selected number of party bosses were already beyond the reach of the party and could not be controlled by it. 64 Thus started the reign of a Commissarocracy, not a class, but a clique of parasites, living and conducting themselves exactly like the upper classes during the reign of the Tsars. 65 After the brutal
suppression of the Kronstadt rebellion, Rocker remarked that "it is not the wish of a class which is manifested in the so-called 'Dictatorship of the Proletariat' in Russia, but the power of the rifles, the power of the Red Army."\(^{66}\)

Under the new regime, said Rocker, Russia turned into a huge prison, ruled by terror, where no signs of freedom were evident. Comparing the Russian Revolution with the French one, Rocker concluded that while the French had been a progressive one, the Bolshevik revolution marked a point of regression in the history of humanity. The French Revolution crushed feudalism, opened new vistas of material development, and encouraged the evolution of new social and philosophical theories. The Bolshevik Revolution, on the other hand, abolished all the human rights that were gained by the French Revolution. In fact, concluded Rocker, Bolshevik rule was worse than Tsarist absolutism. Rocker, who was a keen student of arts, literature and culture, was one of the first to point out a major difference between Tsarist Russia and Revolutionary Russia. Under the Tsar, an artist could at least think freely and create in relative independence. Under the Bolsheviks independent thinking was discouraged, and expressivity, originality and creativity were suppressed. These constraints obviously resulted in a state of stagnation in both arts and letters.\(^{67}\)

Another point in Bolshevik thinking that was subject to Rocker's criticism was their interpretation of the role of the state in the aftermath of the revolution. Rocker dealt mainly with The State and Revolution, a pamphlet written by Lenin during his forced hiding
in August and September 1917. The State and Revolution is a strange
document in the sense that Marxist and anarchist ideas are used
interchangeably. Rocker correctly identified this document as the
most influential in persuading the anarchists to ally themselves to
the Bolsheviks. Rocker's view is indeed validated from several
sources. Alfred Rosmer, for instance, the French Syndicalist turned
communist, recalled that such language, as that used in The State and
Revolution, was unheard of before in the Marxist camp. Anarchists
read and reread Lenin's interpretations of Marx in The State and
Revolution, not believing their eyes. Joaquin Maurin, the Spanish
Syndicalist, who also joined the communists, branded the pamphlet "the
doctrinal bridge which linked Bolshevism with Syndicalism and
anarchism." 68

In The State and Revolution Lenin presented a new
interpretation of the Marxist idea of the "withering away" of the
state. Lenin claimed that Marx never opposed the ultimate dismantling
of the state, he only conditioned its dissolution on abolishing the
class structure of society. The state was destined to become
redundant, and would be abolished the moment the differences between
the various classes would be erased. Lenin claimed that the state,
according to Marx, was but a "revolutionary and transient form." The
state was needed by the proletariat only as a temporary device, whose
instruments, resources and methods would be sparsely used only until
the exploiters of the workers were defeated. Similarly, the
"Dictatorship of the Proletariat" would be just an ad hoc method
employed for the sole purpose of abolishing the classes. 69 Lenin
claimed that there was no real difference between the anarchists and the communists in their regard of the state, the only difference was one of timing, the anarchists wishing to do away with the state immediately. Lenin objected to this "muddled and non-revolutionary" idea on the ground that it was practically infeasible.  

Rocker rejected Lenin's conclusion, i.e. that the state is needed as long as classes exist, as illogical. It is intrinsic to the state almost by definition, said Rocker, that it creates new classes and propagates old ones. The state is the creator of class antagonism and exploitation. Thus, the power invested in the state could only be used to institute new class privileges and consolidate and perpetuate old ones. The state could be only what it always had been, an apparatus for protecting the privileged, a creator of new stratifications within society and a political umbrella under which economic monopolies flourish. If such basics were unclear to Lenin, stated Rocker, it meant that he was either incapable or unwilling to understand the historical reasons for the existence of the present social order. Either way, Lenin's lack of grasp of basic sociological laws meant that he was unfit to lead mankind towards new venues of development.

At the end of January 1918 the prisoners at "Alexandra Palace" were told that those of them suffering from ill health could be transferred on request to the Netherlands as part of a prisoners' exchange between England and Germany. By then the prospects of the Rockers leaving for Russia grew fainter by the day, and since Rocker's health was indeed deteriorating, he suffered from acute intestinal
bleeding, Rocker decided to apply. Rocker's idea had been that given that the Netherlands were neutral, Milly might be released too and allowed to join him in Amsterdam. The decision had not been an easy one because Rocker actually had no assurances that his family would indeed be allowed to leave England, but on the insistence of his fellow prisoners, he did enlist. To his dismay he soon found out that his name was listed among those prisoners headed for repatriation in Germany. Rocker reasoned that as long as the war goes on, what repatriation really meant for him was incarceration in a new camp, probably under stricter conditions than in England.

On March 15, 1918, Rocker embarked on a ship headed for Rotterdam, entertaining the slim hope of being able to remain in the Netherlands and not to have to continue for the final destination. Rocker, however, was transferred directly from the ship to a train headed for the German border. He tried to escape by jumping from the wagon but was caught by Dutch soldiers and escorted back to the train. He arrived at the border town of Goch, but to his great relief he was informed that the German authorities had not yet decided his case and hence he could not enter Germany. On April 10 he was officially told that the German authorities decided to strip him off his German citizenship since he lived abroad for more than ten years without being registered at a German Consulate, and that consequently he was to be denied entrance. Rocker settled for a while in Hilversum, in the home of his old comrade, Domela Nieuwenhuis, and after resting for ten days he moved to Amsterdam to a small apartment rented by his friends. In Amsterdam, Rocker earned his living by giving private
lessons in languages, and also by occasionally being invited to lecture. Soon after settling down in Amsterdam Rocker's health required him to undergo surgery.

Not hearing a word from Milly, Rocker wrote to the Home Secretary asking him to release Milly and allow her to join him in the Netherlands. It was probably this letter which ended the Rockers' wartime ordeal, because a few weeks later Milly and Fermin arrived in Amsterdam.
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CHAPTER FIVE: THEORETICIAN OF ANARCHO-SYNDICALISM

The November revolution of 1918 in Germany abolished the old regime and established a Socialist government. Rocker was thus free to return to his country, where he hoped he would be able to influence the social changes that the unsettled conditions made likely. Soon after the revolution, Rocker arrived in Berlin.

The period just before and just after the end of World War I was a time of turmoil and major political change. Labor unrest had in fact started long before the war was actually over. In April 1917, German workers staged a strike to protest government attempts to cut the bread rations by 25%. War weary workers struck again in January 1918, and on October 28, 1918, sailors refused to obey orders to sail against the British fleet. On November 4, 1918, rioting sailors captured Kiel, and together with the city's dockers formed a Workers' and Soldiers' Council. The spirit of rebellion spread quickly throughout Germany's big cities, and revolutionary councils (Räte) of workers, soldiers and peasants sprang up everywhere. On November 9, Kaiser Wilhelm II abdicated, and the socialist Friedrich Ebert was asked to form a provisional government.

Although revolutionary councils coexisted side by side with the provisional government, Germany did not succumb to the "dual power" syndrome that had afflicted Russia in 1917. Most of the councils in Germany proved to be more revolutionary in form than in substance. The majority of their members regarded the councils as
temporary institutions to be eventually replaced by a democratically elected parliament. A congress of the various councils in Germany, which was convened on December 16, 1918, voted overwhelmingly for a resolution calling for elections to a national assembly. Motions by the communists and independent socialists calling for immediate assumption of power were rejected. However, the decision of the congress of the revolutionary councils in favor of the democratic process was not accepted unanimously throughout the political spectrum in Germany, and at various times dissenters from the left as well as from the right tried to alter the political situation by alternative means.

The first challenge to the provisional government came from a mutiny by several thousands sailors in Berlin. On Ebert's orders, the riots were suppressed by the army. Thirty people died in the process, most of them sailors. Following this incident, the Independent Social Democratic Party (U.S.P.D.), severed its relationships with Ebert's Social Democratic Party (S.P.D.), and its commissars resigned from the provisional government.

January 1919 witnessed another uprising, this time spearheaded by the Spartacists, who had opposed Ebert's government from its inception. By December 1918, The Spartacists had already seceded from the S.P.D., and formed the Communist Party of Germany (K.P.D.). The Spartacist uprising followed the discharge from office of Emil Eichhorn, Berlin's chief of police, who belonged to the extreme left of the U.S.P.D. On January 5, 1919, a group of communist militants occupied the offices of several newspapers including that of
Vorwaerts, the official organ of the Social Democrats. A revolutionary committee was set up, issuing a manifesto in which it proclaimed itself to have replaced Ebert's government as the legitimate ruler. This act was supposed to constitute the second German revolution, modeled after the Bolshevik experience. The socialist government retaliated by appointing Gustav Noske as commander in chief of Berlin, with orders to restore the power of Ebert's administration at all costs. Gustav Noske (1868-1946) was an S.P.D. member who was given the defense portfolio in the socialist government after the members of the U.S.P.D. resigned. He soon became Ebert's right hand and faithful executioner in his struggle against the extreme left. On January 11, Noske led a march of about 3000 troops into central Berlin, starting a systematic reconquest and mopping up of the city. In the process, Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, the two leaders of the Spartacists, were murdered.¹

In the late winter of 1918 and the early spring of 1919 there was a succession of communist uprisings throughout Germany. The tactics employed by both the communists and the government were similar to the ones used in Berlin in January. The outcomes were invariably defeat for the communists. Noske, helped by the Freikorps, the volunteer military troops that were put at his disposal, suppressed all rebellions. The bloodiest and most significant of these occurred in Munich, where on April 6, a left wing group declared Bavaria a Soviet Republic. The group, which was mainly composed of intellectuals, reflected more the ideas and aspirations of Munich's disenchanted thinkers than those of the Bavarian workers' movement.
The new government headed by the writer Ernst Toller was known by its nickname, "the government of the anarchist café." In this government, Gustav Landauer served as minister for cultural affairs. The Bavarian Soviet Republic lasted for no more than a week, when on April 13, the Munich army garrison revolted and toppled Toller's government. A group of young communists took advantage of the confusion that resulted from the April 13 events, and declared a Soviet dictatorship. They began to arm the workers, seized banks and banned the bourgeois press. On May 1, Noske's troops and the Bavarian Freikorps recaptured the city. During the fighting many atrocities were committed, among them the brutal murder of Gustav Landauer, who had taken no part in the second Soviet.

In the meantime, Berlin continued to be a hotbed of mass street riotings and general strikes. Noske declared martial law and issued an order that all persons taking arms against the government forces would be shot on sight. In the process of restoring order to the capital, at least 1200 people were killed. Many more were arrested. Rudolf Rocker was one of those who were put in "protective custody." He was arrested on February 3, 1920, and spent several weeks in jail, sharing a cell with an anarchist friend, Fritz Kater. He used most of his time translating Kropotkin's works into German.

General unrest continued despite Noske's efforts, and the next attempt to topple the government came from the extreme right. On March 12, 1920, the Ehrhardt brigade, a detachment of several thousand former sailors, whom the government intended to dismiss, started a march on Berlin with the explicit intent of establishing a right wing
dictatorship. The socialist government fled Berlin, and moved first to Dresden and then to Stuttgart. On March 13, the insurrectionists reached Berlin and occupied all government buildings. Dr. Wolfgang Kapp, a retired conservative public servant, was appointed as chancellor. The "Kapp Putsch," as the mutiny came to be known, was met with a general strike called by the Social Democrats and the labor unions. Berlin was paralyzed, and Kapp could not even obtain money from the Reichsbank to cover the expenses of his government. A. J. P. Taylor downplays the role of the strike in the downfall of Kapp, and maintains that Kapp's government failed not because of the general strike but because the army did not support him. The strike would have proven useless otherwise. 4 Be that as it may, Kapp's government lasted for less than a week and the Eberhardt brigade withdrew from Berlin on March 17.

The revolutionary events in Germany in the first years of the Weimar Republic instilled in many radical elements the hope that Germany might soon follow the course set up by Russia, and that a socialist millennium was imminent. Hence, the disappointment was more painful when these hopes were shattered. The blame for missing the opportunity for a social revolution was placed, almost unanimously on the leadership of the Social Democratic Party. Revolution was a possibility the Social Democrats wished to avoid, and even worse, an eventuality they were not prepared for. The initiatives came always from the lower echelons, with the leadership of the party usually assuming responsibility after the fact, when they could exert very little if any influence on the course of events. In a sense, the
revolution was practically imposed on the S.P.D., who would have rather preferred to ascend to power through parliamentary elections.

Rocker correctly maintained that the tragedy of the 1918 revolution was that the S.P.D. had become used to parliamentary activity to such an extent that the party became an integral part of the German political establishment. It was neither ready for a revolutionary take over nor was it able to show initiative when it was demanded of it. "An organization without a revolutionary élan, without initiative," wrote Rocker, "is no more than a fictitious power." The S.P.D. was too nationalistic to be able to direct the revolution into a progressive course. Instead, the German socialists remained loyal to the old statist institutions and aligned themselves with the army. J. L. Talmon maintains that the party lacked faith in its own capacities, and could never work out a realistic socialist policy to be carried out. In his view the pact between the socialists and the army, made the army's generals into the de facto rulers of Germany, who would tolerate the republic only as long as it furthered their own interests.

Rudolf Rocker was probably not very much disappointed with the S.P.D.'s failure to advance the socialist millennium. He believed that the German working movement was not ready for this stage in its developmental history, at least not from the ideological point of view. He considered all factions within German socialism to be centralist and authoritative in their outlook, and believed that none of them advocated free, libertarian socialism. Were they to succeed, the outcome could only have been another dictatorship modeled after
the one in Russia. Rocker, however, blamed the socialists for not
being able to maintain the status quo, thus delivering Germany back
into the hands of the Prussian generals and their counter-
revolutionary allies. He was in particular irritated with Noske, the
Freikorps, and their brutal treatment of fellow socialists. Noske, in
retrospect, was credited by Rocker with being the precursor of, and
indirectly paving the way for Hitlerism. "A nation which can tolerate
a Noske at the onset of its revolution, must not wonder when later a
Hitler becomes its gravedigger." 8

Soon after his arrival in Berlin, Rocker became seriously
ill due to complications following an operation on intestinal ulcers
he had undergone in Amsterdam. Having ignored his physicians' advice,
he left for Germany too soon after the operation, and consequently was
confined to bed for several months. He resumed political activity
only in March 1919, when he was invited to address the congress of
munition workers in Erfurt. In this speech Rocker introduced the
pacifist tone that later would be adopted by the German Syndicalist
movement. "We should not produce murder tools anymore!," he told his
audience. "We should not supply the state with cannons and guns." 9
The war industry, he suggested, should be restructured to peacetime
production, and should take part in the rebuilding of Germany. 10
Rocker further argued that ceasing the production of arms would aid
the revolution immensely, since it would deprive the reviving
reactionary forces of their main tools of exercising authority. 11 The
participants, in an act of spontaneous and selfless enthusiasm,
adopted Rocker's suggestions as part of the official resolutions of
the congress. The speech was published as a pamphlet, which Rocker claimed had the widest circulation of all of his writings.\textsuperscript{12}

Rocker found the German syndicalist movement the most suitable organization within which to act. After the war, he was one of the most prominent activists in reviving the movement and orienting it towards anarchism. The anarchist movement per se was at the time small, insignificant and chronically divided by factionalism. Most of its members, however, were active within the syndicalist movement. As a matter of fact, Rocker came to Berlin, following a request by Fritz Kater, who was the president of the German Syndicalist Unions from 1903 until their dissolution in 1914.

The "Freie Vereinigung Deutscher Gewerkschaften" (F.V.G.D.) organized initially as a dissident group within the S.P.D.'s trade unions in the early 1890's. The "Lokalisten," as the group was originally called, split away from the S.P.D. and organized independently in May 1897. The schism was caused by a dispute concerning the S.P.D.'s centralist policies on the subject of trade unions. The "Lokalisten" continued to adhere to social democratic principles, but differed from the S.P.D.'s unions by advocating a federalist party organization. Taking the name F.V.G.D. in 1901, the group embarked on the road to syndicalism in 1904, when it accepted the principle of the general strike as a revolutionary tool in the social struggle and professed its non-affiliation with any political party. At its peak at the end of the nineteenth century, the F.V.G.D. had a membership of about 18,000 people. By 1914, however, it had shrunken considerably, as more than half of its members returned to
the Social Democrats. Most of its approximately 6000 members in that year resided in Berlin. During the war, the F.V.G.D. continued its activities as an underground organization, and consequently when the war was over it was able to reorganize rapidly. As early as December 1918, the F.V.G.D. put together its own newspaper, the Syndikalist.

On December 26-27, 1918, Fritz Kater convened in Berlin a conference of the pre-war unions. The 33 delegates discussed future strategy and decided to reaffirm the movement’s vehement anti-militarism and its opposition to parliamentary politics in general and to taking part in the national assembly in particular. By August 1919, the F.V.D.G. boasted 60,000 members, and became the strongest syndicalist organization in Germany.

One of Rocker’s first activities within the movement had been to meet with the managing committee of the "Freie Vereinigung," to study their ideological orientation and proposed line of action. Rocker disputed some aspects of the syndicalists' program, in particular their support of the idea of the "Dictatorship of the Proletariat," a notion Rocker abhorred as contradictory to libertarian principles. Rocker also opposed the F.V.D.G.'s alignment with the U.S.P.D. and the Spartacists, whom he regarded as mere variants on the theme of centralism and authoritarianism that characterized the S.P.D. Instead, he proposed to establish an independent movement that would be able to unite all socialist currents in Germany, and that would affiliate neither officially nor on an ad hoc basis with any of the organizations on the German political scene. At the meeting, Rocker was asked by the managing committee of the F.V.G.D. to write a
declaration of principles to be debated at its next congress, in December 1919.

The unofficial cooperation between the F.V.D.G. and the Spartacists, which Rocker objected to, reached an impasse in 1919. The Spartacists initially spurned parliamentaryism, supported federalism and advocated direct action. The German syndicalists could readily approve of such policies, and an informal alliance existed for a short while between the two movements. As the Bolshevik grip on foreign communist parties tightened, however, the K.P.D.'s policies underwent a radical change. During 1919 the Spartacists came to terms with parliamentaryism. The party went on to ban syndicalist propaganda within its ranks, and declared syndicalism incompatible with communist principles. The signal for the breach with the syndicalists came in June 1919, with a declaration of new policies issued by the party's central committee. According to the new line it was necessary for the proletariat to be organized within political parties, and the organization of these parties should be politically centralized. Revolutionary struggles should result out of these political organizations. Following the Spartacists shift towards parliamentary activity, it became clear that there was no common ground left for further cooperation between the communists and the syndicalists. In July, an article in the Internationale, the theoretical journal of the communist party, branded the syndicalists "the vexing brother" of the "opportunists" trade unions affiliated with the S.P.D. The Spartacists' definition of the syndicalists as opportunists was correct in one respect, insofar as the syndicalists did not adhere to
any well defined ideology. As a matter of fact, however, the F.V.D.G. acquired an ideological identity only after accepting Rocker's declaration of principles in its twelfth congress. During the congress, which was held in Berlin on December 27-30, 1919, the F.V.D.G was dissolved, and a new organization was founded, the "Freie Arbeiter Union Deutschlands" (Syndikalisten), F.A.U.D.

Rocker's declaration of principles marked a turning point in the development of the German syndicalist organization, especially in the attitudes of the newly founded F.A.U.D. towards political parties and the "Dictatorship of the Proletariat." Rocker rejected political parties as an organizational form of the bourgeoisie. The socialist movement in Europe, claimed Rocker, originated as a counter power to political parties and parliamentarism. The primeval socialism of Saint-Simon and Fourier was a-political, an experiment on a small scale of finding alternatives to capitalism. The First International too was a-political at its inception, and only after its surrender to Marx' authoritarian propensities did it become a centralized body. The First International was conceived as a superstructure, a big labor union, which recognized only economic organizations, such as labor associations and federative organizations, and did not deal with political parties. Rocker urged his listeners to return to the original intentions of the First International, and recognize only militant economic organizations of workers, i.e. the trade unions. The trade unions were, according to Rocker, the foundations for the future economic organization of society. Surprisingly, Rocker's attitudes towards membership in political parties was extremely liberal.
individual worker may, according to Rocker, join a political party if he is so inclined, and no one should prevent him from doing so; the syndicates, on the other hand, may not as organizations affiliate themselves with a political party. Rocker, however, recognized the fact that his ideas might not be very popular with German socialists. The reason was, according to him, that Germany was not as influenced by the spirit of the First International as the Latin countries, Spain and France, were. The German workers grew accustomed to the idea that socialism could only be brought about through political organizations. Even those German socialists who were regarded as radicals could still not free themselves from Marx's heritage.

In addition to criticizing political parties, Rocker also strongly objected to the idea that the "Dictatorship of the Proletariat" is somehow compatible with socialist philosophy, or worse, a logical consequence of socialist objectives. Arguing that the Marxist concept that a class could assume power and transform society through coercive means was based on illogical assumptions, Rocker held that there could not be such a thing as a concentration of power in the hands of a class. It will always be the party which would concentrate powers in its hands, and ultimately, the power will end in the hands of few individuals. Thus, a socialist party which takes over merely continues the tradition of the state government. On a larger scale, Rocker preached not only the abolition of internal coercions such as parties and class domination, but he also presented his strong opposition to external coercions, in particular to the division of workers by political and national boundaries.
On the economic front, Rocker suggested that the syndicalists should oppose all forms of economic monopoly. Land, raw materials and means of production should be owned by the public. The reorganization of society would be on the basis of voluntary association within the framework of stateless communism. The syndicates should be federative in character, and they should derive their power from the masses. Power and influence should flow upwards. The new society will administer itself according to Kropotkin's motto: "from everyone according to his abilities, to everyone according to his needs." Social change would come through direct action; the general strike being singled out as the most effective means to achieve emancipation.

Rocker's declaration of principles at the syndicalist congress was far from being a self-contained, comprehensive theory. It was a short summary of somewhat crude and sporadic ideas, tailored, in a sense, for the relatively uninitiated German audience. His more comprehensive account of the anarcho-syndicalist theory was written almost twenty years later, following a request made by Emma Goldman. The declaration of principles meanwhile served to guide the German syndicalist movement, and gave it a clear and distinct ideological bent which it previously lacked. By adopting Rocker's program, the German syndicalists accepted an anarchist world view, for the declaration was heavily influenced by Kropotkin's philosophy, especially on issues such as the economy and political authority.

According to many of his contemporaries, one of Rocker's greatest contributions to anarchist philosophy was his proposal and
exposition of the anarcho-syndicalist theory. Augustin Souchy, who was an active member in the German syndicalist movement, called Rocker the founder and theorist of German syndicalism. Eduard Willeke, a contemporary historian, saw in Rocker not only the theoretician of German syndicalism, but also of the whole international syndicalist movement after World War I.

Syndicalist theory is based on the idea of class war. Like the Marxists, the syndicalists believe in the existence of a clash of interests, and hence in the inevitability of a conflict between producers and employers. But whereas Marx claimed that the economic struggle and the political action of the working class should be "indissolubly united," Rocker maintained that the economic struggle ought to be carried outside the frame of political activities. No party, government or state would be either able or willing to free the workers from their state of exploitation. Political rights and genuine economic concessions, said Rocker, had never been achieved through political activities; parliametarism being in particular an inefficient vehicle. Reforms were rather enforced upon the governing body from without, and granted only when the ruling government felt that the masses should be appeased, usually following direct, revolutionary actions. Parliaments exist for the purpose of perpetuating the existing capitalist system and securing the privileges of the upper classes. The workers' goals are, thus, incompatible with the tasks of parliament. The freest ballot and the greatest parliamentary reform cannot do away with the sharp contrast between the haves and have-nots in society. Parliaments can only give
the servitude of the working classes its stamp of legality. Rocker compares the worker who entrusts his lot in the hands of politicians and parliaments, to that of the giant Antaeus from Greek mythology, whom Hercules could easily overcome while he no longer touched the ground. The workers have to understand that they should not confuse their interests with those of the state. The most important element in the workers' struggle is the recognition that the interests of all workers, regardless of their national affiliation, coincide, and at the same time are at odds with the so-called national interests. History shows, adds Rocker, that whenever a professional organization of workers decided to take part in parliamentary activity, there was always a decline in its efficiency in achieving its professed goals. Rocker's obvious example was the German Social Democratic Party, which by 1914 had accumulated a dismal record of legislative achievement. Rocker rightly claimed that the S.P.D. had forgotten the difference between means and goals, and had been reduced to a ballot machine, whose activities were exclusively directed towards strengthening its numerical share in the parliament. Rocker's generalization, however, is not supported by the British example, where the Liberal and Labour parties combined forces after 1906, and managed to introduce important social security legislation. It is true that such legislation did not drastically alter the capitalist system, but working conditions did improve, and these acts constituted the beginning of a general awareness into the need to promote the welfare of the citizen. Rocker was aware of these facts having lived in England for a considerable length of time, but he probably chose to ignore the English example
because of his fundamental opposition to parliamentarism.

Anarcho-syndicalism was conceived as a reaction against the methodology and practices of political socialism. Instead of parliamentary politics, it advocates economic means. The operative organization is the trade union, the syndicate. And it is only through the trade union that the battle against economic exploitation should be carried out.

The syndicate serves a dual purpose. It works within the existing system to secure the demands of the producers for betterment of working conditions and material well being. It also aims for the future. It educates the workers in the technical aspects of management, production and economic coordination, so that the workers are prepared to take charge of their own life and shape the socialist society following the overthrow of capitalism. The syndicates, therefore, are not mere transitory organizations bound up by the duration of capitalism. They are, rather, the germ of the socialist society and future economic order.36 The syndicates will, thus, serve as the organizational link between the present and the future.

The major weapons of the trade unions are boycott, sabotage and general strike. The workers can use the boycott as both producers and consumers. It can also be used not only as a direct means of influence, but also indirectly to steer public opinion in favor of the workers. The union label should be used to identify products that the union endorses. Rocker believed that the success of the bakers' strike in East London in 1904, where women refused to buy bread which did not carry the union label, was a good example to the effectiveness of the
boycott.

Rocker described sabotage, the second weapon in the worker's arsenal, as a "method of economic petty warfare that is as old as the system of exploitation." Sabotage is a method whereby a worker impedes the normal production process. Sabotage is not meant by Rocker to stand for the deliberate destruction of machinery and materiel. It is rather an ethical quid pro quo affair, "for bad wages, bad labor." Rocker also emphasized that sabotage should be exclusively directed against the employers and not against consumers or fellow workers.

Notwithstanding the last two methods, the general strike is singled out as the most effective tool in the hands of the workers in their fight against exploiters. In a sense, in anarcho-syndicalist ideology as understood by Rocker, the general strike replaces the Marxist political revolution, that Rocker believed is neither effective nor desirable. "The general strike," said Rocker, "takes the place of the barricades of the political uprising." The general strike, according to Rocker, should be used sparingly, and after careful planning, reasoning and preparation. It should not be used arbitrarily whenever the occasion seems to the superficial eye to be appropriate, because for the general strike to succeed morally as well as materially certain social circumstances must be fulfilled. In addition, warned Rocker, it would be a grave mistake to believe that the general strike could achieve a transformation of society into a socialist one in a matter of days. Within certain limits, the general strike has indeed the potential to promote a socialist system, because
it can bring the capitalist economic system to a standstill and shake the foundations of the capitalist society. It is implied in Rocker's view, however, that the general strike would in time evolve into a social revolution, yet the mechanics are not spelled out anywhere in his writings. It is not clear what are the conditions necessary for a general strike to evolve into a social revolution, nor is it clear when and how the syndicates would take over the management of social and economic life. The weakest part in Rocker's reasoning is that he remains silent on a most crucial point, by what means will the state and its political institutions be abolished and substituted by anarcho-syndicalism.

In contrast to Rocker, Errico Malatesta, expressing a purely anarchist stand, did not regard the general strike as a sufficient alternative for a revolution. He considered the general strike as an excellent means of initiating the social revolution, yet at the same time he emphasized that anarchists should not engage in the fatal illusion that "with the general strike, armed insurrection becomes a redundancy." According to Rocker, the general strike is essentially peaceful and does not degenerate into violence, at least it should not. He objected to the claims of Georges Sorel, that the general strike has a violent character. Sorel's conclusions were, according to Rocker, a great misrepresentation of the facts.

Georges Sorel (1847-1922) was regarded by many as the philosopher of syndicalism, mainly due to his work Reflections on Violence (1906-1908), which deals almost exclusively with the general
strike and the role of violence in the shaping of society. Sorel, unlike Rocker, praised the concept of the general strike not because he thought it could achieve its aims, the improvement of the workers' conditions. As a matter of fact, Sorel was not at all concerned with the outcome of the strike. He deemed the general strike important for the sole reason that he viewed it as an essential myth of socialism, a body of images capable of evoking instinctively the workers enthusiasm for the struggle. The strike, said Sorel, was meant "to create an epic state of mind." Georges Sorel, an irrationalist philosopher, who at one time professed his admiration to both Mussolini and Lenin, based his argument that the general strike was violent and at the same time morally justified, on the artificial distinction between force and violence. Force, according to Sorel, is the imposition of a certain order by a governing minority. Violence, on the other hand is the destruction of this order. Sorel regarded violence as an invigorating force through which the proletariat reinforces the division of society into well defined classes. This division is, according to Sorel, a necessary precondition for the destruction of capitalism. Violence is not pure aggression, but resistance, the shaking off of social and economic bonds.

Rocker's objection to Sorel, or for that matter to any suggestion that there may be an association between violence and the general strike, won his brand of syndicalism the nickname the "direct action of pacifism." Rocker admitted that most strikes do contain an element of violence, but he manages to escape the logical trap of this line of reasoning by invoking the principle of the greater evil. It is
justifiable to endorse acts of violence associated with the general strike, according to Rocker, as long as they are meant to prevent direr circumstances, such as a war. 49

One of the most important problems confronted by the syndicalists was whether the trade unions should work for a gradual improvement in the workers' lot through small concessions, or fight for a radical change in the structure of society and not waste their energy on small gains. Rocker adamantly opposed the notion of all or nothing. He believed in the efficacy of small strikes as well as the general strike, and he maintained that every material achievement by the worker was meaningful even if it did not bring total emancipation from exploitation. 50 Rocker rejected the notion that the desire for material improvement was a counter-revolutionary sentiment. Unlike Georges Sorel, who seemed to disregard the potential material benefits that could result out of a strike, Rocker placed great emphasis on the practical outcome of the economic struggle. Rocker regarded Sorel's notion that the struggle has merits regardless of its achievements with deserved scorn. One must recognize the fact that the workers are struggling in order to make ends meet, not in order to achieve some abstract spiritual satisfaction from the mere act of striking, said Rocker. The syndicalists, however, he added, were not only fighting for the minimal necessities of life, for "daily bread" alone. They were also fighting to secure for themselves a higher spiritual and cultural development, which previous generations were barred from achieving. 51 By viewing syndicalism as a cultural movement, Rocker distinguished himself not only from Sorel, but also from the majority
of syndicalists who regarded the unions as practical organizations dedicated solely to material gains.

Rocker agreed with Kropotkin that the wage system was one of the greatest evils of society, and he concurred with his master on that it should be abolished as expeditiously as possible. In the future society no one would receive payments for his labor, but everyone would be entitled to supply his needs from the commonly owned reservoir of resources. However, Rocker was realistic enough to proclaim that as long as the capitalist system had not been abolished, wage struggles were not futile nor did they hinder the ascent of the revolution. On the contrary, he regarded struggles over wages as educational, serving to train the workers for future battles on greater issues, such as overall liberation.\footnote{52} Rocker went even further than that in assessing the importance of wage struggles. He started with the premise that the era of the big political revolutions was over, given the fact that the bourgeoisie was controlling the armed forces. Moreover, he claimed that even when the army is changing sides, like during the November 1918 revolution in Germany, it is still unable by definition to alter the foundations of the capitalist society.\footnote{53} Hence, the need for a string of small battles, that together have accumulative effects. Consequently, every wage struggle should be regarded as a partial revolution, a step towards the final goal. Strange as it may seem, Rocker and other anarcho-syndicalists believed that struggles for wage improvements would ultimately lead to the abolition of the wage system.

The exploitation of the worker, according to Rocker, is not
limited to his role as producer; he is also taken advantage of as a consumer. The end product changes hands many times before it reaches the worker, a process which not only affects its cost above and beyond its real value, but also serves to sustain an army of needless middlemen who contribute absolutely nothing to the product. Parenthetically, one should add that Rocker's concept of prices is primitively Marxist; any given object has an intrinsic, immutable value, determined by its constituent material components and labor investment, regardless of the constraints of supply and demand. The workers dual role as producer and consumer means, according to Rocker, that whatever the worker is gaining through the struggles of the trade unions, he is loosing as an unorganized consumer. Robert Owen (1771-1858) was the first person to suggest the establishment of cooperatives under the direct control of the workers. Following Owen's idea, Rocker encouraged the workers to organize not only in trade unions, but also in consumers' cooperatives. These organizations would be responsible for providing cheap and hygienic products, and also would engage in propaganda aimed at abolishing the capitalist system of intermediaries.

Syndicalism, as proposed by Rocker, was incompatible with dialectical materialism and, in particular with the Marxist beliefs in the inevitability of revolution and the predestined victory of the proletariat due to the sheer forces of historical determinism. Rocker criticized the Marxists for overemphasizing economic parameters, in fact reducing all facets of society to economic considerations, while at the same time neglecting the more profound aspects of humanist
socialism, such as spiritual ideals and cultural values. According to Rocker, the Marxist school of thought does not understand that economic equality alone is not a sufficient condition for social liberation. "The equality of economic conditions is nothing but a necessary premise for the freedom of man, but never its substitute." No historical process will ever liberate the workers from their exploiters; liberation will result only through the actions of the workers themselves.

While Marxists viewed the strengthening of industry as an important step in the process leading to revolution, Rocker regarded industrial centralization and the creation of monopolies as almost insurmountable obstacles impeding social change. This difference of opinions stems from the fact that the Marxists believed that the creation of deep social and economic gaps between the classes, and the growing discontent among the dispossessed resulting from the centralization of industry, would serve as a catalyst which would ignite the revolutionary spark. Rocker, on the other hand, had ceased to believe in the feasibility or even desirability of great, violent upheavals. Rocker's alternative was the gradual, preferably non-violent, abolition of capitalism, brought about by the syndicates' direct action. Industrial centralization should be replaced by a system that had been suggested by Kropotkin, the integration of industry with agriculture. The only foundation for a constructive socialist system would be a society in which each individual works in both the fields and the industrial workshop, in which each worker is a producer of both material and intellectual assets.
The anarcho-syndicalist view of the future society which would replace capitalism was based on Proudhon's concept of independent communes federatively associated on the basis of voluntary agreements. In this society, work will be regarded as a creative outlet, a means through which a worker may express his individuality and talents. Work will cease to have a mere existentialist purpose, and will reveal its creative and emotionally fulfilling potentials. This idea too is not originally Rocker's. He derived it from Charles Fourier's notion of "attractive labor." Fourier, one might add, also preceded Kropotkin in envisioning a society which would be composed of groups engaged simultaneously in both industry and agriculture.

While the theoretical roots of Anarcho-Syndicalism lay in the teachings of libertarian or anarchist socialists like Fourier, Proudhon and Kropotkin, its practical organization was based on that of the French syndicalist movement, which flourished in the last decade of the nineteenth century and in the years preceding the outbreak of World War I. The trade union was the basic unit in the form of organization advocated by anarcho-syndicalists. The workers in each locality join the unions representing their trades. The Trade Unions of an urban or rural district combine in Labor Chambers. These serve mainly as centers for educating the workers and as originators of propaganda. All the Labor Chambers are grouped together in the National Federation of Labor Chambers. The tasks of the Federation are to maintain channels of communication between the local bodies, to coordinate educational activities and to serve as council and guide to the local chambers. The Chambers and the Federation represent one type
of organization along geographic lines. The syndicates, however, maintain a parallel type of organization, along professional lines. Every trade union allies itself with all other unions in the country that represent workers in the same trade to form a Professional Alliance. These, in turn, will combine forces with Alliances representing related professions. All Alliances are combined to form a Federation of Industrial and Agricultural Alliances. The task of the Alliances would be to coordinate solidarity strikes whenever necessary and to coordinate the waging of the daily struggle between labor and capitalism. 63 The worker, consequently, becomes part of two parallel forms of organization, one based on geography, the other according to trade. The Federation of the Labor Chambers and the Federation of the Industrial and Agricultural Alliances constitute the two poles of syndicalist organization. Interestingly, elements of Rocker's syndicalist organizational system were adopted by both Mussolini in his corporative state and by Tito in the self-managing system he introduced in Yugoslavia.

In the future economic order, the Labor Chambers would take over the administration of capital within each community, determine the needs of the population in their districts and supervise local consumption. Through the Federation of Labor Chambers it would be possible to calculate the total consumption for the country and adjust production accordingly. The Industrial and Agricultural Alliances would take control of all instruments of production, transportation, etc., and would provide the separate producing groups with material support. Work would be directed by labor councils, elected by the
workers themselves. 64

The organizational system advocated by Anarcho-Syndicalism was not a theoretical utopia, it was rather a system that its rudimentary foundations had already existed in one form or another. It was not meant to be an intellectual construct, but a system that would develop organically out of the practical needs of the workers. It was this practical approach that caused many scholars to view syndicalism as a down to earth, almost anti-intellectual movement, dedicated to material gains at the expense of theoretical considerations. Joseph Schumpeter, for instance, regarded the syndicalist movement as unique among socialist movements in its rejection of intellectualism. He claimed that syndicalism was anti-intellectual on two counts: in despising even constructive social programs based on theory, and in rejecting the leadership of intellectuals. 65 As a matter of fact, many syndicalist activists indeed proclaimed anti-intellectual stands. Victor Griffuelhes, the secretary general of the French Confédération Générale de Travail (C.G.T.) from 1902 to 1909, claimed that syndicalist action was the result of practical experience, reflecting the needs of the moment, instead of an expression of a previously worked out theory. 66 Émile Pouget, assistant secretary of the C.G.T. under Griffuelhes, maintained that the grouping of workers into syndicates took place spontaneously and without the benefit of preconceived ideas. 67 Pouget regarded the syndicalist refusal to adhere to philosophical theories as an advantage over other currents of socialism. Rocker too held the opinion that social movements do not emerge from abstract ideas, but are rather practical answers to
basic necessities of daily life. Their growth and further development, however, depended on their being influenced by a grand and just idea.\(^68\)

Syndicalist activists viewed the role of the theorist mainly as an educational one. The theorist should clarify and explain the motivation that leads to action. He should be a propagandist and an interpreter of direct action. He should raise the awareness of the workers about the nature and outcome of their action, but he should neither impose his philosophy on the syndicates nor try to influence them. Griffuelhes summed up the attitudes of the syndicates to intellectual guidance in these words: "It is not a question of teaching a strategy of action but of exposing its raison d'être and its justification, thereby giving syndicalist action the clarity and authority it requires."\(^69\)

Rocker, although viewed by many as the major theorist of Anarcho-Syndicalism, did not regard himself as one. Griffuelhes' definition suits his role well. He was a journalist, a propagandist, a teacher and a historian. In his writings he exposed the sociological background in which the syndicates operated, thereby making workers aware of their power and their capacity to change their miserable circumstances through direct action. Even by combining syndicalism with anarchism, Rocker created no new philosophy. All that he said or wrote in this context had been previously expounded by Fourier, Proudhon and Kropotkin. Rocker's synthesis, however, supplied the workers' movement with "the clarity and authority" Griffuelhes demanded. The importance of Rocker's writings was in providing the
movement with an ideological backing it previously lacked.

It is symbolic of the tragedy of the German Anarchosyndicalist movement that its founding congress also marked the pinnacle of its influence. After 1921 the movement was constantly on the decline, its members lost either to other groups or to indifference. Rocker estimated that in 1921 the F.A.U.D. counted among its members about 150,000 people. In 1924 the membership was estimated at 25,000, out of which only a small percentage took active interest in its work. In 1931 the movement was already decimated, its membership being approximately 4000 people. The numbers declined even further, to about 3000 in 1932.

Rocker's memoirs contain a serious and candid discussion on the reasons behind the utter failure of syndicalism in Germany. Rocker tended to blame factionalism and inter-factional struggles within the workers' movement for the short lived success of the syndicalists. He argued that the socialist camp ought to have stood united against the common enemy, which Rocker identified with the Prussian state system. Instead, the workers were too busy fighting each other to turn themselves against the real danger. In addition, syndicalism, both in theory and in practice, was incompatible with the parliamentary, anti-activist orientation preferred by most German socialists. The German anarchist movement was always a minority group with no tangible influence on the masses. It could never compete with the strongly organized Social Democrats, whose program of parliamentary diplomacy seemed to be more to the liking of the German worker than anarchist activism.
In an untypical expression of intellectual elitism, Rocker also strongly criticized the workers. He blamed the working masses for becoming indifferent to their fate, passively and fatalistically accepting their miserable living conditions. The hope for a better future which had been such a prevailing sentiment among the workers in the years immediately following World War I gave way to paralyzing indifference and a blind trust in the leadership of the Social Democrats. The same kind of apathy also afflicted the rank and file of the syndicalist movement. Moreover, both Rocker and Max Nettlau identified a streak of intolerance and dogmatism setting in among German syndicalists, in a manner very similar to the one that years earlier had changed the S.P.D. into a centralist, hierarchical party. Most syndicalist groups, claimed Rocker, were ruled by either one dictator or a small clique, that determined policy and decided on all practical matters. In a sense, the German syndicalist movement became afflicted very rapidly with all the maladies of the German workers' movement in general, i.e. authoritarianism and dogmatism.

Actually, the major shortcoming of German Syndicalism was that it could compete with neither the Social Democrats nor the Communists. The Social Democratic Party could offer the worker the security and organization of a big, institutionalized movement, while the Communists provided revolutionary zeal, central organization, and the example of the Russian Revolution to aspire to. The syndicalists had nothing comparable to offer. Their loose, federative organization, combined with their vehement anti-parliamentarian attitude did not correspond to the needs of the workers following the Great War. The
syndicalists were literally squeezed off the political map by the two dominant groups, their members either returning to the ranks of the S.P.D., or joining the Communists. It took Rocker twenty years to admit his personal disappointment with German syndicalism. The Syndicalist movement "never did realize its practical aim which we had hoped it would fulfill." The only achievement of the syndicalists had been their success in publishing a vast body of anarchist literature, which until then had been previously unavailable in the German language.

Rocker's activities between the two World Wars was not limited to his work as journalist and lecturer on behalf of the German Syndicalist movement. He was also most active in the international arena, and was one of the initiators and founders of the Syndicalist International.

From its inception, in March 1919, The Communist International (Comintern), attempted to split the international trade union movement by erecting an organization affiliated with and completely controlled by Moscow. The new body, the Red International of Labor Unions (Profintern, or R.I.L.U.) was scheduled to convene in Moscow in July 1921. Its professed target was to split the International Federation of Trade Unions (I.F.T.U), which had been revived in July 1919 with headquarters in Amsterdam. R.I.L.U. was meant to win over groups belonging to the I.F.T.U. The new organization posed a difficult dilemma for the Syndicalists, because the condition for being admitted to the R.I.L.U. essentially consisted of accepting the twenty-one terms used for admission to the Comintern.
These terms were in particular contentious for the syndicalists, since they called for political centralization, strict subordination to the central committees of the communist parliamentary groups and active promotion of the idea of the "Dictatorship of the Proletariat." Rocker argued that to accept the twenty-one conditions would have amounted to an act of suicide on the syndicalists' part.

In order to clarify the position of the international syndicalist groups toward the challenge issued from Moscow, the F.A.U.D. organized a conference in Berlin in December 1920. Except for the German F.A.U.D. and the Swedish S.A.C. (Sveriges Arbetare Centralorganisation), most other delegations showed little inclination to pursue doctrinal questions. The aura of the Russian Revolution was still at its height, which explains the persistent enthusiasm of the delegates for Moscow's proposals to the point where they were ready to ignore the differences between the Communists and the Syndicalists. The German and Swedish delegations, however, pointed out the unbridgeable differences between the ideals of Syndicalism and the policies pursued by the Bolsheviks. The Comintern, they argued, was only intent on using the labor unions as an instrument to seize political power. The Bolsheviks, they claimed, had no intention of separating economic action from political targets. Nor would they consider the idea of the trade unions managing production. Less than a month after the congress, in January 1921, Lenin confirmed the veracity of this argument when he declared that "all this Syndicalist nonsense about mandatory nominations of producers must go into the wastepaper basket." The delegates of the F.A.U.D. and the S.A.C.
also pointed out that the Bolsheviks did not intend to allow the newly established labor international even the smallest measure of independence from the Comintern, and that the R.I.L.U.'s sole purpose was to extend the ideological hegemony of the communist parties over the entire labor movement.

The German and Swedish groups, although presenting logical and sustained arguments against joining the new organization, ended up in the minority and the congress decided to join the R.I.L.U. The conference nominated an International Bureau whose task was to enter into negotiations with the R.I.L.U.'s council. But, the founders of the R.I.L.U. were not very interested in the syndicalists, and all the communications from the International Bureau were pretty much ignored. When the founding congress of the R.I.L.U. was convened in Moscow in July 1921, one of its first decisions was to affiliate itself with the Comintern. Following this, most syndicalist organizations around the world became torn apart by internal controversy over whether syndicalists should affiliate with R.I.L.U. and consequently subordinate themselves to the Bolsheviks.

The German F.A.U.D. undertook the task of unifying the opposition to Moscow. As a first step it organized a conference in Berlin in June 1922. The assembly accepted a ten point declaration of principles and strategy for the independent syndicalist movement drafted by Rocker. Following Moscow's lack of response to their past overtures, the syndicalists showed no inclination this time to appease Moscow. The June conference marked the final break between the Communists and the Syndicalists. Most of the delegations now accepted
the positions of the Germans and the Swedes, which they had rejected a year and a half before. In Rocker's view, the circumstances required that the syndicalists found an international of their own, and a founding congress duly convened in Berlin from December 25, 1922 to January 2, 1923. It was christened the International Working Men's Association, I.A.A., and it boasted close to two million members. Rudolf Rocker, Alexander Schapiro and Augustin Souchy were chosen as secretaries. The I.A.A. published an official organ, Die Internationale, and its secretariat issued a monthly information bulletin in German, French, Spanish, and most interestingly in Esperanto. The I.A.A. secretariat remained in Berlin until the Nazis' ascent to power. In 1933, it moved to the Netherlands and later to Spain. The fall of the Spanish Republic and the defeat of its forces in the Spanish Civil War marked also the end of the Syndicalist International.

The founding of the I.A.A. required that Rocker explain why the establishment of yet another splinter group did not mark a damaging division within the ranks of the workers' movement. Rocker maintained that the I.A.A. was founded out of necessity, since the syndicalists finally came to grips with the unbridgeable gap between their views and the positions adopted by other socialist currents. The historical importance of the I.A.A., according to Rocker, was that it prevented Moscow from assuming total control over all the labor organizations throughout the world.

In addition to the I.A.A., Rocker took also part in the activities of that portion of the German anarchist movement that was
not affiliated to the syndicalists. When Rocker returned to Germany in November 1918, he naturally paid a visit to the headquarters of the local anarchist group, which called itself the "Föderation Kommunistischer Anarchisten Deutschlands," F.K.A.D. The Freie Arbeiter, which had once been the official journal of the German anarchists was revived by the F.K.A.D. in April 1919. Although Rocker was more sympathetic towards the syndicalists, he also became a regular contributor to the Freie Arbeiter. Rocker's collaboration with the Freie Arbeiter got off to a rocky start and never went smoothly. This was mostly due to a reciprocal personal animosity between Rudolf Oestreich, the editor, and Rocker. It started when Oestreich criticized Rocker's speech at Erfurt. According to Rocker, he did not mind the criticism, but he objected to Oestreich's habit of ascribing him opinions he did not in fact hold. In spite of the animosity between the two, Rocker continued to write for the Freie Arbeiter for about six years. Rocker did not entertain great expectations from the F.K.A.D. In a letter to Max Nettlau in 1921, he stated that more than half of the members of the anarchist movement had in fact deserted to the communists, and among the remaining comrades he found that anarchist theory had stiffened into a dead dogma. In 1921 Rocker believed that the only hope for the German libertarian movement lied in the anarcho-syndicalist current.

Six years latter, in 1925, another incident caused Rocker to distance himself completely from the F.K.A.D. It followed an anti-semitic article in the Freie Arbeiter entitled "The Jewish Nimbus" by Paul Robiens. Rocker, who was very sensitive to racist propaganda,
especially after having spent so much time among the Jewish anarchists in London, was enraged. It hurt him most that an anarchist newspaper, which ought to have denounced any sign of racism, served in fact as a vehicle for circulating such views. In his Berlin years, Rocker devoted many articles to combating racism and anti-semitism, and calling upon the working classes not to adopt such views as they serve only a tool in the hands of the reaction. 87 Rocker replied to Robiens in an article entitled "The Nimbus of Imbecility," which he wanted to publish in the Freie Arbeiter. To his surprise, the editorial board refused to publish his rebuttal on the grounds that Rocker unjustly singled out Robiens and the editors for special harassment. The article was ultimately published in Der Syndikalist. Rocker felt not only ashamed for the entire German anarchist movement, but also was worried about its international image. He expressed these feelings most eloquently in the concluding words of his article: "I have merely spoken in order that the thought that the German anarchists landed happily in the camp of anti-semitism and nationalistic reaction would not find a foothold among the comrades abroad." 88

Rocker's breakup with the F.K.A.D. and the Freie Arbeiter did not, however, end Oestreich's vendetta. The unofficial truce between him and Rocker lasted for less than three years, when in 1928 a new issue popped up to fan the conflict between the two. The new controversy stemmed from a decision by the small group of German anarchists that was still residing in London after World War I to transfer the library of the "Kommunistischen Arbeiter Bildungsvereins" to the F.A.U.D. Their decision might have been influenced by the fact
that Rocker, while in London, organized the library, and served as librarian. Oestreich objected to the transfer, claiming that the F.K.A.D. was its rightful heir, and insinuating that the decision might have been taken under pressure from Rocker. In his memoirs, Rocker claimed that were he to be consulted, he would have advised against such a move, and would have suggested housing the rare brochures, out-of-print books and manuscripts in the British Museum or any other such public institution. Berlin was at that time far from being the best suited place for founding an anarchist library. In the British Museum, on the other hand, the collection would have been taken care of, and its contents available to interested readers. 89

Oestreich went as far as bringing up the old accusations against Rocker, which dated back to Theodor Machner in 1896, concerning the mishandling of funds belonging to the German anarchists in London. Rocker’s friends publicly protested against Oestreich’s slanderous attack, and Rocker even felt compelled to answer these renewed accusations in an article in Der Syndikalist, where he recounted the thirty two year old affair. Contrary to Rocker’s expectations, the incident was far from being over. In an unprecedented move, Oestreich sued Rocker and Helmut Rüdiger, the editor of Der Syndikalist, for defamation. At the trial, which received unprecedented coverage in the anarchist press, both Rocker and Rüdiger refused to defend themselves, arguing that a state court was an ill suited place to resolve internal conflicts in the anarchist movement. As a consequence, they were found guilty, and fined one hundred Marks each. Oestreich and the trial he initiated became a source of ridicule in the anarchist press,
especially on the pages of **FANAL**, a journal published and edited by Erich Müsham. Müsham (1878-1934) was an anarchist poet and writer, who worked closely with Gustav Landauer. He took an active part in the short-lived Munich Soviet Republic, and had been arrested when the Republic collapsed. He collaborated with all sections of the German libertarian movement while fiercely maintaining his independence, and was a close neighbor and friend of the Rockers. Using the pages of **FANAL**, Müsham reported the details of the trial, branding Oestreich a "state anarchist."⁹⁰ Müsham, as well as most German anarchists could not comprehend the idea of an anarchist using a state institution, a symbol of the power of the state and its legitimacy, in order to further supposedly anarchist goals.⁹¹ One might add, however, that such resorting to courts in internal affairs fortunately remained an isolated incident in the history of anarchism.

After World War I, Berlin became a center for political exiles, most of them from Russia. The F.A.U.D. helped the exiles obtain residence visas, and also provided them with modest financial help. Every F.A.U.D. member paid a special levy which was devoted to support the exiles, who were prevented by law from working.⁹² Rocker maintained close contacts with several prominent figures in the Russian anarchist movement, in particular G. P. Maksimov and Vsevolod Mikhailovitch Eichenbaum, who became known under the assumed name Volin. Emma Goldman, Alexander Berkman and Alexander Shapiro also lived in Berlin for some years after managing to escape the Soviet Union. As a matter of fact, it was Rocker who arranged for their entering visas and staying permits, a task which was not a trivial one.
in view of their revolutionary notoriety, and the fact that the F.A.U.D. had to guarantee in writing their financial existence. During their Berlin days, Rocker befriended Goldman and Berkman, whom he had previously known only superficially. He even tried to persuade Emma Goldman to marry fictitiously a German citizen, so she could obtain permanent residence in Germany. In answer to her claim that this act would constitute a flagrant contradiction to her life-long beliefs, Rocker argued that under certain circumstances one could live in peace with one's principles and still compromise. After much consideration, Emma Goldman followed Rocker's advice, but decided to marry in England, where she felt she could act more freely.

The Rockers' home became a meeting place for the exiles, and their house was filled with manuscripts which had been smuggled out of Russia and handed over to Rocker for safekeeping until the authors would be able to personally claim them back. Berkman's notes for his future account of his experiences in the Soviet Union, The Bolshevik Myth, for instance, were retrieved by Rocker from the person who had smuggled them out of Russia prior to Berkman's departure. Rocker was also entrusted with Pyotr Arshinoff's manuscript on the history of Makhno's movement in the Ukraine. In 1923, Rocker met Makhno personally, when the later came to Berlin.

In the spring of 1922, Kropotkin's widow, Sophie, came to Berlin to visit the Rockers, on her way to England. The purpose of the trip was to transfer her husband's library and personal papers from England to Moscow, where she intended to establish a Kropotkin museum. Rocker expressed many reservations concerning Sophie's plan. First, he
claimed, the Bolshevik intolerance of the libertarian movement would cause foreign anarchists to be denied entrance to the Soviet Union, and they would thus not be able to use the library. Besides, he pointed out prophetically, there was no guarantee that under Bolshevik rule a Kropotkin museum would in fact be allowed to operate for a long time. In summary, Rocker advised Sophie to leave Kropotkin's letters and manuscripts in England, and wait for more encouraging signs from Russia. In the meantime, he asked Sophie Kropotkin to consider another location for the museum, preferably a neutral country in Western Europe. Sophie, however, proceeded with her plans, insisting on that the natural place for a museum dedicated to Peter Kropotkin was in Russia. Seven years later she visited Berlin again. This time she asked Rocker to accompany her back to Russia, and help her with sorting Kropotkin's notes. Rocker was doubtful that the Soviet authorities would even allow him to enter Russia, given his continuous criticism of its regime. And indeed, after a period of lengthy negotiations, the Soviet authorities agreed to his entrance, but would not guarantee his departure. Under such conditions, Rocker preferred to stay in Berlin.

During the first years of the 1920's Rocker wrote a biography of Johann Most. The members of Golos Truda (The Voice of Labor), the Russian Anarcho-Syndicalist newspaper asked Rocker to write a short treatise on the renowned anarchist. Rocker agreed, but instead of a brochure he produced a full length book. The biography is very sympathetic to Most, and especially to his struggle against centralism and the leaders of the German Social Democratic Party. The
importance of the biography is in the fact that it covers not only the
life and activities of Johann Most, but it also covers in considerable
factual detail the early history of the anarchist movement in Germany
and the United States. 97 To this day it remains Rocker's most cited
book.

In the second half of the 1920's, Rocker made several
lecture tours both within Germany and abroad. In the fall of 1925 he
went on a lecture tour of the United States and Canada, returning to
Germany at the end of May 1926. In January 1927 he embarked on a tour
of the Ruhr area, and in the summer of 1929 he lectured throughout
Scandinavia. He returned to the United States in the fall of 1929 for
a tour that lasted until May 1930. These lecture tours were important
to Rocker as a means to sustain himself and his family, and they
constituted probably his major source of income. Rocker even toyed
with the idea that his lectures might bring him enough money to start
working on his own as bookbinder, a prospect that obviously proved
overly optimistic. Rocker's economic difficulties were no secret, and
offers of help poured from all over the world. His former Jewish
comrades, now mostly in the United States, actually sustained the
continuation of his literary work with their contributions. 98

Rocker's uneasiness in Germany was not only due to his
chronic economic difficulties. His disillusionment with the German
libertarian movement, which he increasingly found stagnant and
authoritarian, also contributed to his dejection. When his friends
found out that he did not feel at home in Berlin anymore, they
suggested that he should emigrate. Already in 1928, Alfred Sanftleben,
suggested that Rocker should settle in the United States. Two years latter, while touring the United states, the members of the Freie Arbeiter Stimme offered Rocker the position of editor. Rocker declined the offer, writing to Nettlau that although the offer would have meant financial security, as a European he found it very difficult to live in the United States, where technology reigns and "people have more technology than soul." In her memoirs, Emma Goldman wrote that Rocker regarded his stay in London as the happiest period of his life, and would have returned to England, had he been granted permission.

In 1930 the F.A.U.D. accepted an invitation from Otto Strasser, an activist in the National Socialist Party, to a series of debates between a F.A.U.D. representative and Strasser. It was an interesting challenge for the syndicalists, and Fritz Kater suggested that Rocker should represent their camp. Otto Strasser belonged to a faction within the National Socialist Party that differed in many respects from Hitler's mainstream. Strasser's personal disagreements with Hitler caused his expulsion from the party in June 1930. After his expulsion, he founded the "Revolutionary National Socialists" organization, later known as the "Black Front." The debate was conducted, therefore, just before Strasser was driven out of the Nazi party. Three meetings were arranged, each dedicated to a different topic. In the first meeting, Rocker debated Strasser on the issue of race, and the role that race plays in the shaping of history. Rocker claimed that since nationality is not known to be an inherited trait, it follows that the idea of nationality is enforced on men by the
surroundings. The second session was dedicated to the meaning of socialism. Since Strasser could not attend the meeting on account of an illness, his part was played by Dr. Herbert Blank. Blank argued that the historical importance of the National Socialist Party was in that it discovered the true foundations of socialism, since what passed until then as socialism was only the Marxist interpretation of socialism. Rocker ridiculed the argument, pointing to the obvious fact that the Nazis have probably never heard of libertarian socialism and its many thinkers, who were not only in no way connected to Marx and his followers, but also rejected Marxism altogether. At the third session, Rocker was replaced by Erich Mühsam at the request of Strasser, who probably felt threatened by Rocker's rhetorical tactics. Rocker, however, was asked to deliver the closing remarks.

Although both camps knew that the differences between the two sides of the debate were too wide to be bridged over, and that no side was going to win over new converts from the other, the series of debates constituted an interesting experience. The debates were the only time that the anarchists aired their opinions freely in front of a Nazi audience. After the National Socialists ascended to Power, the anarchist movement was driven to extinction, its members scattered between exile, prisons and concentration camps.

Rocker felt a collective sense of guilt for the inactivity and indifference of the German working movement in face of rising German fascism. The movement had been, in his opinion, too preoccupied with internal disputes to pay due attention to the incredibly rapid rise of the Nazi machine. In his articles of that period, Rocker
frequently called for a united front of all sections of socialism against fascism, but he felt his was a voice in the wilderness. The syndicalists themselves were too busy with theoretical niceties, and at any rate they were too weak a movement to initiate any significant action. Rocker knew full well that theoretical disputes were not the appropriate tool to fight the growing reaction, and yet he was engaged in exactly such activities. Retrospectively, Rocker claimed that a general strike would have altered somehow the dreadful course of German history. He thought, however, that such a strike in the early thirties might not have been very efficient so late in the process of the Nazis' ascent to power. If a general strike had been declared, reasoned Rocker, the army would have suppressed it. The result would have probably been a return to monarchy, which had so many ardent supporters within the officer corps. For Germany, a return to monarchy would have spelled disaster, but still a lesser catastrophe than the Third Reich. In any case, claimed Rocker, echoing Sorelean mythology, a general strike would have at least saved the prestige of the German working movement. 105

One thing, however, was clear beyond doubt, and that was the fact that the Rockers could not safely remain in Germany under Nazi rule. After the burning of the Reichstag, on the night of February 27, 1933, Rocker decided that he should leave. Early in the morning of February 28, Erich Mühsam was arrested in his home. 106 A few hours later the Rockers fled to the house of their old friend, Wilhelm Werner, and from there via Magdeburg and Frankfurt to Switzerland, arriving in Basel on March 4. Rudolf and Milly Rocker managed to cross
the border on the last train from Germany that was not searched for political fugitives. Their only possession was the manuscript of *Nationalism and Culture*, which Rocker had completed a few days earlier.
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CHAPTER SIX: NATIONALISM AND CULTURE

By all standards, Rudolf Rocker's most important historiographical work, and possibly his most important overall accomplishment, is his book Nationalism and Culture. In this book Rocker methodically traces the development of nationalism from the dawn of history to modern times, and discusses the changes brought about by nationalist ideologies on human culture. The complete book was first published in its English translation in the United States by some of Rocker's friends who founded the "Rocker Publications Committee." After numerous difficulties, Nationalism and Culture appeared in 1937. In its original German, the book was published only in 1949 under the title Die Entscheidung des Abendlandes. In this book, Rocker analyses at length the effects of the emergence and development of nationalistic feelings on various facets of life, ranging from architecture, art, and literature, through tradition, manners and everyday life, to political philosophy. The most important part in Nationalism and Culture, however, is not his eloquent description and original interpretation of the history of nationalism. His main achievement is a point by point attack on the notions prevalent at the time regarding nation and nationalism as natural constructs stemming from a community of interests among people sharing a common race, language, and cultural heritage.

Nationalism and Culture was hailed as "important and illuminating" by Albert Einstein and as "an important contribution to
political philosophy" by Bertrand Russell. Thomas Mann referred to it as a "guide and helper to everyone who is concerned with the problems of our lives and yearns for enlightenment," and Will Durant regarded it as "a magnificent book written with profound understanding of man and history."¹

After briefly surveying ancient civilizations of both the East and the West, Rocker starts his historical journey in the Middle Ages, when the term "nation" was used to denote several different and sometimes ambiguous entities. Thus, for instance, one could use "nation" to specify a group of students in a particular university sharing a common geographical ancestry. The University of Prague, for example, used to be divided into four "nations," Bavarians, Bohemians, Poles and Saxons. The term "nation" was also used to define a specific professional affiliation. Hence, one also spoke of a "nation" of physicians, smiths or lawyers. By using the generic term "nation" Martin Luther, for one, referred to the nobility of a certain area, in clear contradistinction to the common inhabitants of that area, whom he referred to as "folk."²

Rocker traces the appearance of national consciousness to the time of the Renaissance when emerging states presented themselves for the first time as defenders of the interests of the society over which they ruled, rather than as defenders of merely dynastic interests.³ The process, according to Rocker, continued to develop throughout the Reformation, when the spirit of man was beginning to be liberated from the domination of the Church, only to be instantaneously re-subjugated by the yoke of the state.⁴ The national
idea reached its developmental climax in the nineteenth century when nationalism became an integral part of the ideology of the European bourgeois parties and national unity came to be regarded as a fundamental trait of civilization, a symbol of an advanced stage of cultural development. 5

National feelings, Rocker pointed out, are not innate traits, or for that matter, natural ones. According to Rocker, no individual is tied to a nation the way one belongs to a family or a tribe, and as a general rule, people in early modern Europe were not conscious of their national affiliation. Their loyalty remained restricted, in most cases, to their immediate or extended family and to their occupational group. In fact, since the nation, as opposed to the family, is an artificial construct, no naturally growing sentiment can bind a person to a nation. A person must be trained to think of himself as part of a particular nation, similarly to the way one is trained to believe oneself a member of a particular church. National consciousness, for Rocker, was an artificial construct, which could not have possibly emerged from the people, but had to be imposed on them from above. As Rocker saw it, it was simply a matter of convenience for the secular authorities to create national identities that subsequently could be exploited to shift the alliances of the populace from the clerical authorities to themselves. Nationalism at its inception was merely a weapon against the political dominance of the church and its interference in state affairs. According to Rocker, the shift from an authority whose legitimacy stems from divine mandate to a secular rule had been deliberate, a point also mentioned in Lugen
Lemberg's *Geschichte des Nationalismus in Europa*. In this respect, Rocker and Lemberg differ in emphasis only. While Rocker emphasizes the anti-clerical aspect of the process, Lemberg focuses more on the secularization itself.

In order to promote personal, or at best sectarian political ambitions, added Rocker, the leaders of the emerging national states set up differences between their own and foreign people. Then, by continuously dwelling on these imaginary differences and exaggerating the contrasts, they efficiently furthered their own interests. Nationalist philosophy and education, thus, deal in two separate and, in a sense, opposite falsehoods, although paradoxically these opposites are methodologically complementary. The first nationalist falsehood concerns disunity. Nationalism insists that peoples are different from each other, thus, erecting imaginary boundaries between them. The second falsehood deals in unity. It defines a certain population as having important denominators in common, thus, creating an equally fictitious feeling of uniqueness and community.

Rocker's answers pertaining to the question of how nationalism came into being do not, however, explain why nationalism was so successful in its practical applications. It is one thing to explain away nationalism by simply assuming that it is an imaginary entity that has been imposed from above, and that people had been misled en masse through education into believing in its reality, and quite another thing is to provide an explanation of why common people so easily and seemingly willfully embraced the idea. On this issue Rocker could do no better than to rely on a prevalent notion of the
period, that human beings have a natural, although admittedly irrational, need for religion. Consequently, Rocker came to consider nationalism a form of religious belief, the national state being its object of worship. Elaborating on Bakunin's statement that when there is no God man must invent one, Rocker maintained that when accepted religious dogmas were shattered and the grip of the church on people weakened, people initially failed to satisfy their religious urges, but then they adopted the simplest of solutions, substituting an old dogma with a new one. In this case people replaced church with nation. A similar idea, of nationalism as religion, was put forward by Carlton Hayes, a scholar of nationalism and Rocker's contemporary. Hayes claimed in his book Essays on Nationalism (1926) that the "religious sense" was so deeply rooted in man that he had to express it in one way or another. When people did not worship God, they worshiped Nature, Science or Humanity instead. Nationalism was, thus, just another surrogate, one more fetish of adoration.

Nationalism, claimed Rocker, might have been more convenient than religion for the specific purposes of the secular leaders, but it was, nonetheless, as false, as reactionary and as stupefying as the religious beliefs it replaced. National feelings are presented by Rocker as misplaced expressions of affection, depleting the vital energies of the citizens and causing them to behave irrationally. By means of evoking national feelings, a ruler can rally his subjects behind national banners and can be assured of their blind obedience regardless of the degree of brutality and injustice that he perpetrates. "The idea of the nation," said the Indian poet and
philosopher, Rabindranath Tagore, "is one of the most powerful anaesthetics that man has ever invented." Rocker used two examples in his book to make this point. The first is Fascism, which turned nationalism into a bona fide religion complete with sanctified dogmas, established rituals, and an omnipotent God - the motherland. His second example is Bolshevism, which, according to Rocker, was also a religion in which the "collective state" served as both church and doctrine, with Lenin as its High Priest.

On the philosophical level, Rocker accuses Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) of not only providing legitimacy to the state, but also for elevating its status to that of a supreme being. Just as Hobbes bestowed legitimacy on the absolute state, embodied in the person of the monarch, so Rousseau, almost a century later, gave the state a divine character. For Rousseau, the nation was the sole creator and preserver of all that is natural, and therefore, moral. For Rocker, on the other hand, national sovereignty was as dangerous and as tyrannical a phenomenon as any other form of sovereignty, be it God or King. National sovereignty, according to Rocker, implies uniformity. On its path to achieving its goals all individual considerations and freedoms are cast aside and replaced by institutionalized "freedoms," such as the equality before the law. According to Rocker, Rousseau is largely responsible for the reification of the non-entity called the state. Rousseau accomplished this feat by inventing another logical phantom, the "general will," on which he bestowed absolute Hobbesian rights. The general will is regarded by Rousseau not as an external authority which the citizens
obey in spite of themselves, but rather as an objective embodiment of a citizen's moral nature, an expression on a larger scale of the individual's will. Each citizen shares in the general will even in cases where a citizen's particular will contradicts the common one. Rousseau's social contract, thus, implies that anyone who refuses to obey the general will shall be forced to do so for his own good. This logical monstrosity means, in fact, that a person can be forced against his will to obey his will. And in fact, Rousseau unambiguously expressed the belief that a man can be forced against his free will to be free.14 Rocker recognized the monstrosity for what it was, and he totally and unequivocally rejected Rousseau's ideas on the meaning of freedom. For Rocker, who considered freedom man's most valuable possession, Rousseau's definition was nothing but a "state power's strait jacket."15

Rocker detected other shortcomings in Rousseau's theory. For example, he correctly argued that the general will cannot exist in a nested or overlapping political system, that the proper functioning of the "general will" is hindered by the independent existence of separate, even partially subordinate, associations within the state. Each of these associations presumably possesses its own "general will," which, one might imagine, can clash with the general will of the state. Thus, taking Rousseau's view to an extreme, one must conclude that no free associations below the level of the state should be allowed to exist. The result of Rousseau's theory, if put into practice, would have been a system in which the existence of churches, political parties, and economic organizations, for instance, would
have been prohibited. Alternatively the state could deprive these
organizations of their independence and subordinate them to the state,
achieving de facto the same result. Rousseau's "general will," is in
Rocker's eyes the ideological foundation for all modern tyrannies
including Fascism and Bolshevism. Interestingly, Bertrand Russell
arrived at the same conclusion. Russell considered Hitler and the Nazi
regime to be Rousseau's ideological children. General will, according
to Russell, is the basis of the corporate or totalitarian state, in
which the individual is rendered powerless.

Rocker starts his analysis of nationalism by working out a
distinction between the concepts of nation and folk. The difference
between nation and folk (or people) amounted, according to Rocker, to
the difference between state and society. The unequivocal distinction
between state and society is not uniquely Rocker's, and a similar
observation can be traced back to Plato, who distinguished between the
"First City" and the "Ideal Polis." While the "First City" represented
an economic entity, the "Ideal Polis" stood for a political society.
The distinction was later dropped by political theoreticians like
Thomas Aquinas, Hobbes, Locke and Kant, and the terms political
society and civic society were used interchangeably. Hegel was the
first to resurrect Plato's demarcation. Civil society, according to
Hegel, represented a stage in the dialectical, and hence natural,
development of human affinities from the family to the state. Hegel
viewed the state as an organic, ethical community, in which a
specially designated class of rulers is charged with the task of
maintaining the independence and the integrity of the ethical whole.
Man reaches the height of ethical life not as a member of a cosmopolitan civil society, existing to promote one's private wants and interests, but as a member of a specific national community, i.e., an independent state, the existence of which is dedicated to promoting a shared concept of general welfare. Marx revised the Hegelian relation between civil society and the state, regarding the first as the foundation of political life and the source of all political change. Whereas Hegel considered civil society as an intermediary stage in the development of an ethical ideal, the state, Marx regarded civil society not only as a permanent fixture but also as the driving force behind the state. As such, civil society was a more fundamental entity than the state. Moreover, Marx simplified Hegel's complex notion of civil society to include only economic elements, thus stripping the entity of its original metaphysical attributes. In fact, Marx reduced "civil society" to what Hegel previously referred to as the "system of needs," i.e., production, exchange, division of labor, and class structure, all of which were essential but definitely not sufficient constituents of Hegel's civil society.

Marx actually democratized Hegel's concept of civil society, for according to him, the general interest is not the product of the activities of the state as an organization over and above the masses, but is determined by the individuals which constitute the state. According to both Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, the state was an oppressive, alienating entity, which emerges in a deterministic fashion whenever a society reaches a certain stage of historical development. Moreover, claimed Engels, the state as a political establishment arose as a means of keeping class
Beyond the trivial fact that states did in fact emerge several times in the course of history, Rocker agrees with almost no component in Marx and Engels's historical analysis. The state, claimed Rocker, did not come into being due to any deterministic processes. Rocker finds absolutely no merit in the Marxists' claim that historical events are the result of compulsory courses and that history contains elements which are both unavoidable and inescapably deterministic. According to Rocker, "there are in history no compulsory courses, but only conditions which men endure and which disappear as soon as men learn to perceive their causes and rebel against them." Throughout Nationalism and Culture Rocker argues again and again against the Marxist version of predestination, and in a sense anticipated many of the arguments which were later put forward by Karl Popper. On one crucial matter, Marx and Rocker do agree, albeit for different reasons. That is, that the state as an organization promotes the prerogatives and interests of the ruling minority. But while Marx and Engels believed that the inherent antagonism resulting from this state of affairs resides between the state and the class, Rocker believed that the breach occurs between the particularity of the ruling classes, which in effect constitute the state, and the wholeness of civil society, a natural social structure composed of free individuals.

Rocker described Hegel as a "reactionary from top to bottom," and he considered Hegel's theory of the state as the ultimate embodiment of authoritarianism. In Hegel's vision, the state is
invested with the role of being the ultimate expression of man's self-consciousness. The state enables everyone to realize his freedoms in conjunction with others, while within the civil society one's goals can be achieved only in complete disregard, or worse at the expense of everyone else's aims. Rocker held exactly the opposite opinion. According to Rocker, the Hegelian state contained little, if any, degrees of freedom for an individual to fulfill himself. A system, in which a person exists only as an expression of a higher collective spirit, contains by necessity very little room for individual expression.  

Furthermore, according to Hegel, civil society is insufficient for man's complete development, for within this loose framework a person's capacity for public action cannot be expressed. It follows that Hegel regarded civil society not as a self-subsisting entity, but as part of a greater whole, a mere aspect of a more concrete totality. Once again, Rocker's position is polar to Hegel's. For according to Rocker, society is the whole unit, there is nothing above it that is a natural construct. Thus, civil society contains all there is for one's fulfillment. Once again in a dispute between Hegel, on the one hand, and Marx and Engels, on the other, Rocker sides with Marx and Engels, agreeing that the state is an artificial part which had been raised above the whole, the society, achieving no other purpose than alienating people from their society.  

In fact, since the state is only a part disguised as a whole, man's potentials and self-consciousness are much more limited within its framework, than they would have been in a civil society. Consequently, statism stifles individuality, kills free enterprise and impedes cultural development.
The state is far from being the guardian of the collective spirit and communal interest. It is rather an ingenious tool by which rulers guard their own privileges, disguise their disingenuous motives, and legitimize their disinterest for communal needs. Rocker separates the Hegelian civil society, which he calls the free community, from the artificial burden of the state, and defines it as the highest legitimate social organization. The proper conditions for social progress and individual self-fulfillment are created within this free community, through voluntary and mutual agreements with other communities, and are never enforced by powers outside the community, such as laws and regulations. Rocker believed that society should be freed from political tutelage, and the folk should likewise be freed from national constraints. 26

Rocker distinguished not only between state and society, but also between their constituent human derivatives, nation and folk. A folk group was regarded by Rocker to be a "natural result of social union," an "association of men brought about by a certain similarity of external conditions of living, a common language and special characteristics due to climate and geographical environment." 27 As opposed to that, a nation is an artificial product resulting from the political manipulations of the heads of states. "The nation is not the cause, but the result of the state. The state creates the nation, not the nation the state." 28 Nations and national feelings are but tools exploited by the leaders of the state to create a new kind of religion, a political religion. Unlike the folk, the nation cannot exist independently of the state. A people, or folk, is a defined,
more or less homogeneous community existing within certain boundaries at a given time. A nation, in comparison, can be composed of different folk groups, which were previously forced into the frame of a common state mechanism by various means, mainly violent ones.

The distinction between state and nation, on the one hand, and society and folk, on the other, was not originally Rocker's. He was, to a great extent, influenced by a fellow German anarchist and personal friend, Gustav Landauer (1870-1919). Landauer outlined similar ideas in his *Dreissig Sozialistische Thesen* (1907) and other works. Gustav Landauer's analysis of nationalism is, comparatively, very vague and philosophically inconsistent. Furthermore, Rocker and Landauer use different terminologies. Rocker's "folk" is Landauer "nation," and Rocker's "nation" is Landauer's "state." Rocker uses "state" and "nation" to denote cause and effect, respectively. Landauer, on the other hand, much like Marx and Engels, does not clearly distinguish between the two, and in most cases the terms are used interchangeably.

Landauer, like Rocker after him, regarded the state as an artificial, fortuitous political structure born out of accidents of history, and not as a result of a common experience of a given people, as Hegel did. In line with the romantic tradition of historicism, Landauer viewed the nation or the "Volk," terms which he used interchangeably, as an organically developing community that had always existed beneath the cover of the state. The nation, sensu Landauer, unlike the state, is "an equality of individuals - a feeling and a reality - which is brought in free spirit to unity and to
The nation was the anti-authoritarian alternative to the state. Every nation, claimed Landauer, is basically anarchist, that is, based on free association. The state, on the other hand, is founded on violence and compulsion. One must remember that Gustav Landauer was more of an anti-materialist mystic than a rational political philosopher. Thus, while perceiving the "Volk" as an historically developing organism, a living creation of the human spirit, without which there could be no active existence, he also maintained that "Volk" was a mythical illusion, a non-entity. In fact, both the "Volk" and the State were illusions, according to Landauer, but while the former was a life giving organism which encouraged self-determination and promoted activism, the later encouraged enslavement and perpetrated passivity. In order to make a distinction between these two non-entities, one good, the other bad, Landauer simply invents one more non-entity. The new introduction is "Spirit" (Geist). While the state lacks Spirit, the nation has a disembodied spirit through which each individual is tied to the rest of humanity.

Rocker agreed with Landauer in denying the material reality of the nation. Unlike Landauer, however, who regarded himself as a nationalist and believed one's nationality to be an essential part of one's being, Rocker adhered to the socialist idea of universalism. Folkness, for Rocker, was something that one has to live with, a natural phenomenon which had to be practically dealt with within the framework of the universalist society. Rocker, in contrast to Rousseau, is careful not to make the classical logical error of
equating natural with good or moral.

The second part of Rocker's monumental work deals with what used to be regarded as the fundamental components that make up a nation. This part is, in my opinion, the main contribution of *Nationalism and Culture* to political thinking. In Rocker's time it was customary to define nations as communities of individuals sharing various material and intellectual characteristics in common. These common characteristics were, in turn, thought to be bound together by means of commonly shared morals, traditions, and interests. *Nationalism and Culture* deals a fatal blow to these notions by exposing their intrinsic vagueness and inconsistency, and their disregard of factual historical realities. A nation, shows Rocker, is by no means a unified, homogeneous body. It consists of different castes, classes, and parties, which not only pursue a variety of different interests, but frequently clash with each other.

The first point Rocker challenges is the existence of a national interest, be it material or spiritual. He shows that it is meaningless to talk about a community of national interests, when the true meaning of these national interests amounts to nothing more than the special and narrow aspirations of a privileged minority. In its contemporary implementation, a nation is not a system designed to satisfy the mutual social and economic interests of all its members or even the majority of them. As Rocker points out, one is simply not free to either join or disassociate himself from a nation. In every state the power is in the hands of the few, who act in complete disregard of collective responsibilities. The ruling minority does not
represent the interests of the masses, although it pretends to do so. The mere existence of different political parties serves, in Rocker's opinion, to prove that national interests and national unity are but an illusion. This illusion becomes evident not only in pluralistic democracies where all parties claim that their platform is guarding best the interests of the nation, but is also evident within one-party systems where a conflict of ideas and interests exists among opposing factions. In fact wherever the goals or means to achieve these goals are disputed, the fallacy of common national interests and national unity becomes evident. In setting forth these ideas, Rocker effectively makes his points by using the example of the continuous fight among the various socialist factions.

And if the unity of political interests is fallacious, the more so is the unity of national spiritual interests, a vague idea also claimed to be a component of what makes a nation. Oswald Spengler in his book *The Decline of the West* denies the existence of unifying physical forces. In this sense, Spengler agrees with Rocker, that peoples cannot easily be classified by shared features, such as specific linguistical, political or morphological characteristics. On the other hand, Spengler introduces a novel unifying factor into the analysis of nationalism, that of spiritual unity, a much more obscure and indefinable concept than the unifying factors which had been previously discarded by both Rocker and Spengler. According to Spengler, what underlies the nation is an idea, an inwardly lived experience of the *We*. Traces of Spengler's idea of the nation as a spiritual unit can also be found in Stalin's definition of a nation.
Among the four necessary components, which according to Stalin must be satisfied for a community to deserve the status of a nation, there is the notion of a psychological makeup which is manifested in a community of cultural interests.

Rocker vehemently opposes these notions. History teaches us, claims Rocker, that religious, philosophical, and metaphysical questions serve more often than not as means of splitting people into hostile camps than of bringing them together. The same is true of tradition. A community does not share a common national tradition. Rather, traditions vary among social groups and economic classes. Rocker uses as an example the different traditions pertaining to the Paris Commune that exist within France. Whereas the privileged classes refer to the Commune as an outrageous rebellion against law and order, in the traditions of the working classes the Commune is cherished as a "glorious episode in the proletarian fight for freedom." As long as different classes coexist within a "nation," it is ridiculous to talk about a community of interests and traditions, and all attempts to bridge over the marked antagonism is bound to be ultimately unsuccessful even after enjoying temporary success.

Nationalist ideologues like Johann Gottlieb Fichte and Friedrich Schleiermacher, and nationalist political leaders like Giuseppe Mazzini, all treated language as the main trait defining a nation. Language was considered as a collective characteristic of a nation by means of which the mental and spiritual power of a people are expressed. Historians of nationalism, however, do not agree on the importance of language in defining a nation. Thus, Carlton J. H.
Hayes considered language as pre-eminent among national cultural characteristics, comparing the rise and decline of nationalities to a similar process occurring to their languages. Ernest Gellner, too, regards language as a fundamental aspect of nationality, claiming that only those who understand the same language consider themselves to be part of a moral and economic community. Hans Kohn, on the other hand, in his classic book The Idea of Nationalism, expresses his conviction that language is not at all essential to the existence or definition of a nationality. He backs his argument with examples of nations composed of individuals which do not share a common language, or nations which share with others a common language, and yet are considered different national entities. Anthony D. Smith, likewise, rejects the link between language and nationality. He agrees, however, that language is an important factor for nationalist ideologues, who use it as a unifying force that can be employed to promote nationalistic goals. This opinion is also expressed by Joshua A. Fishman. Fishman states that throughout history there have been numerous examples of nationalists using language as a propagandistic tool in their argument for national continuity. Language is used both to provide a link between the present, usually a difficult one, with the past, often a glorious past and in many cases a glorified one, and to provide authenticity to historical claims which cannot be easily supported by historical facts. Language, then, serves both as a unifying force between different classes of the same "nationality" and as a means of self identification, through which one can feel part of something politically bigger and historically more significant than
one's present station.

Rocker identifies himself with those scholarly attitudes that reject language as a necessary pre-requisite to make a nation. Rocker points out that although language is not an individual attribute but a communal creation, it does not follow that language fits into the nationalistic ideological paradigm. This only seems to fit into the nationalistic framework because of simplistic assumptions and logical errors. The fact is, points out Rocker, that none of the extant languages can be traced back to a certain nationality. Rather, any given language is a mixture of different influences. Languages are changing rapidly and continuously both by absorbing foreign elements and by internal renewal. Every language is influenced by foreign elements, which manifest alien intellectual traditions and cultures. For example, the Normans, who settled in Northern France in the ninth and tenth centuries, ceased to use their own language and shifted to French instead. The same thing happened to the Norman conquerors of England who abandoned French for the language of the natives. 42 And not only foreign influences and historical shifts affect the evolution of language. Every significant event in the life of a people leaves deep marks on its language. The French Revolution, for instance, legitimized popular language by getting rid of court jargon and introducing vernacular French. Each war, invasion, revolution, new philosophy, technological achievement and scientific discovery brings linguistic changes by infusing new words and expressions. To trace the "essence of the nation" to its language is, therefore, not only practically difficult but also theoretically
unreasonable.

Rocker is most certainly dismissing language as an important contributor to nationality too easily. In particular, he pays absolutely no attention to the unifying effects of language, such as in education and in economy. Interestingly, he also ignores the psychological effects of language in daily life, whereby the ability to communicate in a commonly understood language, determines to a great extent the types and choices of one's political and social associations. This is in particular odd, for Rocker spend most of his life as an exile, and had first hand experiences with political associations, such as the German and Jewish anarchists in London, the most important common denominator of their members being place of origin and language.

Of all the alleged components contributing to national identity, Rocker mostly abhorred the notion of a "community of blood," the idea of race. Rocker points out that a "pure race" is as valid an idea as the notion of a "pure language." They are both nonexistent. Race cannot be described as a fixed recognizable entity for the simple reason that the perpetual state of change experienced by humans defies rigorous static definitions. Pure races, says Rocker, are nowhere to be found, and in all probability they had never existed. Europeans, for instance, are a mixture of every possible racial element.43 The majority of race theoreticians, like Count Arthur Gobineau (1816-1882) and Houston Stewart Chamberlain (1855-1927), maintained that race characteristics are a heritage created by nature itself and transferred to the next generation by racially related parents. By
race characteristics they referred to what now is termed morphological or phenotypical characters. Obviously, the characters considered most important by these theoreticians were the most trivial ones, e.g. color of skin, hair and eyes, and shape of body and skull. Rocker correctly argued that some external traits are acquired not only through heredity but also as physiological responses to external impositions from one's environment. He provides numerous examples in humans, animals and plants to the effect that different environmental factors, such as temperature, availability of food, exposure to light and humidity, can result in alterations of many bodily characteristics. In particular, he refers to the experiments of American entomologist, W. Tower, with the Colorado beetle. Dr. Tower exposed his coleopterans to cold temperatures and succeeded in obtaining changes in certain morphological characteristics which were then found to be transmitted to the progeny. Even if the Lamarckian conclusions of Tower are known today to be mistaken, given the wisdom of more than half a century after the fact, Rocker's conclusions are correct, namely that there is not a one-to-one correspondence between the genetic endowment of the individual and his external morphology. Another example used by Rocker is the findings of anthropologist Frank Boas, the founder of the very influential cultural school of anthropology which, among others, included Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict. Boas found that certain skull parameters showed a marked change between immigrants to America and their descendants. Rocker regarded this to be quite unexplainable if one is to believe in immutable racial characteristics. It is, therefore, quite difficult to
attribute characteristic traits to races and ranking races by these
traits is almost impossible. In fact, the most repugnant feature of
racial nationalism, which Rocker attacks with particular fervor, is
the idea that races can be ranked as superior or inferior according to
bodily characteristics.

Houston Stewart Chamberlain, in his book Die Grundlagen des
19. Jahrhunderts (1899), which had a tremendous influence on the
development of German suprematism, expressed the belief that the
nation as a political entity creates the conditions for the formation
of a race, or at least for the highest expression of the attributes of
a race. Chamberlain did not regard external features or even
language as sufficient to determine a race. Only the awareness of
racial identity, the instinctive feeling of cohesiveness which reveals
itself through the "voice of blood" were determinative of race.
Chamberlain believed in the possibility of breeding a noble race, and
he further believed that the Aryan race, as embodied in the German
nation, was the best fitted to that assignment. Rocker ridicules the
idea by pointing out that in the long line of German geniuses who
deserve credit for the intellectual culture of Germany there was
hardly one whose appearance would correspond to what was perceived to
be the ideal "Nordic man." "We need but to think of Luther, Goethe,
Beethoven, who lacked almost completely the external marks of the
Nordic race, and whom even the most outstanding exponents of the race
theory characterize as hybrids with Oriental, Levantine and Negro-
Malayan strains in them." 48

In the context of race and Rudolf Rocker's attitudes towards
race and racism, one can hardly ignore the Jewish issue. All race theorists, with the exception of Max Nordau who was Jewish, feared Jews and their influence, and the fear turned in time into a race panic. Chamberlain even spoke of the "inner Jew," a person who is not a Jew by descent, but is penetrated by the "Jewish idea." Jewishness could be inherited as an acquired trait, a process denoted as "Jewification." Jewification was, according to Chamberlain, a very contagious trait. One could contract it by having intercourse with a Jew or simply by reading newspapers with Jewish leanings.49

Jews, according to German racists, were not only a race, but a counter-race. They possessed racial traits that were exactly the opposite of Arian characteristics. The myth of the Jews as an anti-type to the Arians was created. Rocker was quick to pinpoint out the absurdities and the inconsistencies of the anti-Semitic theories. Jews, for instance, were blamed for both socialism and capitalism. They were accused of promoting liberal ideas in disregard of authority while at the same time they were said to be obeying religious scriptures proscribing strict adherence to authority. Rocker also sarcastically dissects the view that Jews negatively influence their gentile neighbors. It is very difficult to imagine, says Rocker, the process by which an "inferior race" could possibly alter the morals of a "superior" one, if ideas are nothing but the end results of hereditary factors inherent in one's blood.50

Rocker denies the very existence of a Jewish race, adding that Jews are not different from any other group in the Western culture.51 He especially argues against the division into oriental and
occidental peoples. Jews were said to be an oriental race. The point was raised by Rocker in a rebuttal on two articles in The Atlantic Monthly written during World War II by Albert Jay Nock, an American journalist. Nock claimed that the Jewish problem had its roots in the fact that Jews were an oriental race, and could never adapt to occidental standards, thus constantly remaining alien to occidental culture, alienated for ever from their neighbors.\textsuperscript{52} This theory, says Rocker, is based on two falsehoods. First, it assumes that orientals are inferior to Westerners, and, second, it is based on naive racial fatalism, for the exact geographical and temporal lines between the people of the east and those of the west are unidentifiable. Besides, Rocker points out, Asia is regarded by most anthropologists to be the cradle of western civilization, hence Europeans are in a sense also of oriental origin. Thus, it is exceedingly difficult to understand why there could be no common ground for peaceful coexistence between people sharing the same origin.\textsuperscript{53} Rocker, also shows that people everywhere are subject to changes, and contemporary people are the product of generations of humans trying to adapt to their natural environment and to changing cultural and social needs. Thus, the Scandinavians, whose ancestors were famous as bellicose pirates, changed with time to become one of the most peaceful people in Europe. Jews probably underwent similar adaptations to their constantly changing destiny, and it is nonsensical to maintain that they retained so much of their oriental innate instincts as to impede their integration into contemporary western styles and societies.\textsuperscript{54}

Rocker believes that all racial theories are by definition
and with no exception dangerous and degrading. Racial theories first appeared as an historical justification to absolutism. Henri de Boulaunvilliers (1658-1722), for instance, used racial arguments to legitimize the privileges of the French nobility. de Boulaunvilliers maintained that the French nobles were descendant from the Germanic conquerors, the Franks, while the bourgeoisie and the peasants were descendants of the conquered Celts and Romans, the Gauls. Count Arthur de Gobineau, in his *Essai sur l'Inégalité des Races Humaines* (1853-1855) advocated the creation of an international aristocracy of blood to which the purest elements of all nations would belong. When racial theories sought to change and influence political realities they became particularly dangerous, for out of the divinely ordained superiority of the noble race, logically followed the belief in its historical mission. The question of race became a question of destiny, usually the renewal of the world. Since it was unlikely that all the people would regard this "mission" from the same point of view and submit to its dicta, war became an inevitable consequence.55 Rocker was especially alarmed by the wide acceptance of race theories by the Germans. He regarded the process as a sure sign of mental degradation of a nation left without moral strength, and feared the inevitable consequences. History, unfortunately, proved this piece of historicist determinism correct.

One of the issues that Rocker identifies as a misleading indicator of nationality is the so-called national character. He charges social thinkers and race theoreticians, like Gobineau and Chamberlain, with creating stereotypes of nations and national
characteristics by attributing traits otherwise restricted to the description of individuals to entire nations. Thus, the Frenchmen came to represent "frivolous vanity," the Germans became a "people of poets and thinkers," and the Englishmen were a nation devoid of sentimental considerations. Moreover, particular individuals became symbols of the assumed national character by being thought to embody the soul of their people. Thus, Dostoevski became the representative of the Slavs and Goethe of the Germans. 56 Rocker argues that peoples are made up of individuals with different peculiarities and inclinations, hence, the existence of a representative national type is an unwarranted assumption.

Rocker also denies the existence of national cultures. It is not the nation which shapes the thought of its people, he says, but the other way around. Were it true that a nation determines or even affects culture, it would effectively mean that a surrogate of the state, an artificial construct, imposes its cultural norms on the truer version of social cohesion that naturally grows out of the folk. This in turn would have meant that no culture could develop. Rocker maintains that nation and national sentiments are irrelevant to cultural development. It is the narrow cultural circle to which one belongs that stimulates him, and brings maturity to one's intellectual potentials. Artistic achievements and new realms of knowledge stand above national or political boundaries, and are never brought about or inspired by the state. On the contrary, the state can only hinder creativity, and there is nothing like state intervention to stifle artistic manifestations. Poet and philosopher of art, Herbert Read
(1893-1968), who was also an anarchist, agrees with Rocker. Elaborating on the place of the artist in society, Read brings forward as examples Fascist Germany and Communist Russia and their attempts to shape and dictate the development of art. The results are usually "devoid of invention, deficient in imagination, renouncing subtlety and emphasizing the obvious." Moreover, the artist is driven to despair, and in extreme cases, like Mayakovsky, even to suicide. 57

Different trends in art, maintains Rocker, derive their inspiration from existing social conditions and historical circumstances, and can draw neither spiritual nor material impetus from abstract concepts like "nation" or the dictates of a certain political order. Thus, classicism and romanticism, expressionism and impressionism, cubism and futurism are all time-related phenomena on which nationality had no influence. The close similarity between artists belonging to the same school of art is easily recognizable, while artists belonging to the same nation produce quite dissimilar works. Thus, between Zola and the naturalists of all other countries there exists an unmistakable kinship, which cannot be traced between Zola and most other French writers. 58 Rocker's treatment of culture is untypically paternalistic, for he ignores all forms of mass culture, which may have nationalistic constraints, and deals exclusively with the internationalism of art, science and literature, which are all elite arenas.

The same applies with equal vigor to science. One cannot justifiably speak of a national science, more than one can speak of a "national system of the universe or a national theory of
earthquakes. In fact, Rocker points out that science and nationalism are antithetical, for while science is one of the most effective factors that unite men and binds them to one another, nationalism estranges them. Moreover, there exists no nation of scientific geniuses or inventors. Every idea, every technological advancement is a result of a long line of forerunners and pioneers from all over the world, and will, no doubt, become foundations for new ideas and technological achievements in the future. And, as all scientific discoveries are based on previous ones made by people all over the world, all scientific discoveries belong to all mankind. To quote Goethe "there is no patriotic art and no patriotic science. Both belong, like every exalted good, to the whole world."60

From dealing with the abstractions that either make (according to nationalist thinkers) or break (according to Rudolf Rocker) nationalistic philosophies, Rocker formulated definite practical opinions on the nationalist movements in Europe and elsewhere. The aspirations of small peoples for national liberation endowed nationalism with a sanctity of a revolutionary struggle which, in turn, caused many people to forget all that is reactionary in national motivation. Thus, the German unification, which was considered as a revolutionary act by many Germans, brought, in fact, a reaction that culminated in the Prussianization of all Germany. In developing countries with national aspirations, the danger of nationalism lies in the fact that the bearers of the national banner are often tied with the interests of a specific minority, and in order to promote the interests of this group they are ready to plunge into
all kinds of political adventurism directed more often than not by the
interests of the global powers. Rocker was among the first to point
out in 1952 that the Soviet Union was only toying with the Arab
nationalist movement, trying to divert its activities in the direction
of the Soviet Union's own interests. National liberation, claims
Rocker, is neither a political nor an economic solution for the
masses. National unity brings no security, and national sovereignty
does not protect small states from the imperialistic encroachment of
the large powers. The new national states in Europe, created at the
end of World War I were not ready for an independent economic
existence, and, therefore, had to give in to the demands of the larger
states. Besides, the dream of political and social betterment soon
proved to be a tragic illusion. The moment self-rule replaced foreign-
rule the dream was shattered. In fact, observes Rocker, the Polish
masses under the dictatorial rule of Joseph Pilsudski did not fare
better than under the oppressive rule of the Russians, the Prussians
or the Austrians.

Rocker, who was active among Jewish circles, both anarchists
and non-anarchists, could not neglect referring to Jewish national
aspirations, as embodied in the different branches of Zionism.
Rejecting the notion that the Jews are a separate nation, he fought
the mix-up of anarchism with Jewish nationalism at meetings and on the
pages of the newspapers he edited. According to his testimony, Zionism
did not enjoy massive popular support among the Jewish working classes
of England in the last decades of the nineteenth century. Its small
following, however, was largely due to the fact that the Zionist
movement was in its infancy. In addition, none of the Zionist leaders could match Rocker's charisma and influence in London's East End in the years preceding World War I. The situation changed in the years following the war, when the Zionists gained in strength and popularity, especially as a result of the Balfour declaration in 1917, which promised the Jews a homeland in Palestine. By 1920, the Zionists possessed branches in every sizable community in Britain. Although Rocker does not mention Zionism as a cause, Zionism along with Communism and Jewish religious orthodoxy were the main forces responsible for the decline of the anarchist movement in England.  

Rocker viewed political Zionism with the same hostility he regarded all other nationalist movements. He rejected the idea that a Jewish state would solve the Jewish problem, and after the State of Israel was founded, he warned in a letter to a friend that the new state would only serve to destroy and distort the work and the achievements of the pioneers, i.e. the communal settlements with which the anarchists sympathized. Instead of a political solution, Rocker favored some of the suggestions made by cultural Zionist, Ahad Ha'am (One of the People). Ahad Ha'am, whose real name was Asher Tsvi Ginzberg (1856-1927), suggested the establishment of a cultural center for the Jews that would serve as a unifying nucleus for Jewish cultural life and would strive for spiritual excellence and scientific accomplishments. Rocker expressed his agreement with Ahad Ha'am's ideas of cultural fulfillment for the Jews, but he objected to the notion that the center must be a geographically well defined one. Geographical centralization, according to Rocker, implies a measure of
political sovereignty, of which he did not approve. These stands of Rocker on certain legitimate means of national expression are paralleled by the Austro-Marxist doctrines concerning nationality expressed by Otto Bauer and Karl Renner. Both Bauer and Renner advocated the creations of cultural autonomies for all nations in divorce of geographical affinities. One must emphasize that Rocker's acceptance of a limited form of national self-determination is very restricted and strictly delimited in scope so as not to infringe on the liberties of the individual. Rocker was true to anarchist philosophy in that every individual, district and higher aggregations will be free to determine their own fates voluntarily. The unity Rocker strives for is cultural, not political.

Rocker's ideas were not restricted to theoretical attacks on nationalism. Following the premises of his anti-nationalist philosophies he came up with a practical idea - the establishment of a unified Europe along federalist lines. This was not, in fact, an entirely new concept. Proudhon, in his book Du Principe Fédératif (1863) presented a federalist alternative to nationalistic Europe. According to Proudhon, the nation would be replaced by a geographical confederation of smaller regions, and Europe would become a confederation of confederations. All affairs in this super-confederation would, according to Proudhon be settled by mutual agreement, contract and arbitration.67 Rocker's original contribution to the federalist scheme was to provide an historiographical basis for Europe's cultural unity, and to show that the differences were basically minor regional nuances.68 Europe, according to Rocker,
became a spiritual unity after the Roman conquest and remained one ever since. The differences among the European nations are in degree, not substance. In fact, all social, philosophical, religious, and political ideas have found expression in each and every country in Europe. Humanism, liberalism, democracy, and socialism are but few examples of trends that spread all over the continent. The power of the political states and the national ambitions of the rulers could only temporarily divide Europe and create political boundaries, but in the long run all these forces are powerless in influencing the course of history, which moves towards the realization of the unified spiritual aspirations and common economic fundamentals of a European existence. 69 In effect, Rocker's description of the inevitability of a common European political, cultural and economic unity, is not only untypically Marxist in its invocation of determinist historicism, but also regressive. For what Rocker advocates is in fact a return to a state that existed, or he thought to have existed, in Europe in the Middle Ages. According to Rocker, all European nations have their roots in many small peoples whose communal and intercommunal institutions were destroyed by the emergence of the modern state. These peoples were unified by force in order to promote dynastic and sectarian economic interests. 70 Like Kropotkin before him, Rocker perceived the medieval communities in an idealized form, and regarded them as desirable prototypes for a future federated society.

Rocker's opposition to nationalism and national aspirations was unequivocal, yet considering the prevailing conditions in Europe in the period between the two World Wars, Rocker was faced with a very
difficult dilemma. On the one hand, true to his anarchist beliefs, he regarded as folly the wishes of national minorities to self national determination. On the other hand, as a pragmatist, he could hardly ignore the only other existing practical alternative at the time, i.e., being swallowed by a multinational state. In particular, Rocker abhorred the practices of the Soviet Union in regard to national minorities, its hypocrisy in theoretically advocating national self-determination, while at the same time pursuing opposite practical goals within its own territory. It is in reference to this situation that Rocker's somewhat inconsistent visions on nationalism as expressed in connection to Europe must be understood.

Rocker was a great admirer of Heinrich Heine, to whom he refers as the "good European." 71 He was influenced by Heine's rejection of nationalism and his view of Europe as a cultural entity. Out of Rocker's rejection of any kind of nationalism emerges his wish for a unified and federated Europe, which should in time serve as an example for the entire world to follow. Interestingly, Rocker regarded the creation of the British Commonwealth as a model to be followed by the future federation of Europe. He regarded the British Commonwealth as a cultural union defying state boundaries, a union guided by the principle of providing its members with economic and military security. 72 Moreover, he believed that the members of the Commonwealth were enjoying a higher degree of independence in their internal affairs than any of the states which constitute the United States of America. Historically, Rocker regarded the British Commonwealth as a successful example of an empire that found the right way to
disintegrate, while at the same time keeping its former colonies within a federated framework. The only shortcoming that Rocker identified was the exclusion of India. But he claimed that this was only a temporary setback, and that in time India would join the other members of this "confederation of independent states" and enjoy a similar political and social development within the British Commonwealth as all the other former English colonies. 73 Oddly for Rocker, who was otherwise a careful thinker, he failed to mention all former African colonies of the British empire, perhaps out of a justifiable fear that his entire model federation would collapse. It is very difficult to justify why Rocker would suddenly become so enthusiastic and philosophically inconsistent when dealing with the British Commonwealth. He may had let himself be so carried away with the idea of a federated civilization or was desperate to provide an example of the practical feasibility of his ideas that he failed to use his critical faculties. At any rate, the idea of a federated Europe was so appealing and the example of the British Commonwealth was so outlandish, that the editors of the Freie Arbeiter Stimme, while publishing Rocker's article in its entirety, felt compelled to add an editorial postscript to it, in which they politely but firmly pointed out that the British Commonwealth model might not faithfully reflect the dreams of the anarchists for a better Europe.

Interestingly, recent economic, if not political, developments concerning the European Common market point to the fact that part of Rocker's dream on the unification of Europe may, despite numerous setbacks, temporary impediments, and practical difficulties,
essentially become a reality.
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CHAPTER SEVEN: DEMISE OF A MOVEMENT

Rudolf and Milly Rocker reached the safety of Basel on March 4, 1933. Four days later they arrived in Zürich, where they spent two weeks waiting for a message from Germany to inform them about the situation of their elder son, Rudolf, and his wife, who remained behind. Only in November 1933 did the young couple manage to obtain the necessary papers and to leave the country. Upon receiving the news of Rudolf and Milly's flight, Emma Goldman invited the Rockers to stay with her in St. Tropez, where they would be able to rest and calmly plan their future. The Rockers accepted her invitation and spend six weeks in Emma Goldman's house. There, Rudolf Rocker wrote a pamphlet entitled Der Weg ins Dritte Reich. The pamphlet summarized the history of the German working movement, the rise of communism and fascism, and the reasons for the subsequent ascent of fascism to power. Rocker was not surprised by the appeal of fascist ideology to the German masses. On the contrary, he regarded it as a logical outcome of a long historical development, which had its roots in Prussian militarism, and had been spiritually nourished in recent times by the authoritarian dogmatism of Bolshevism.

During their stay in the south of France, Rocker received an invitation for a lecture tour in the United States and Canada. He accepted willingly, happy to renew his contacts with the libertarian movement in North America, and happier still to have the opportunity to reunite with his younger son, Fermin, who was at the time working
in New York as a commercial artist. The Rockers, however, would not consider the United States as a permanent home. They were too rooted in European culture and politics to think of any non-European alternative. The European options, however, were closing up one after the other. Rocker would have stayed in France given a choice, but there were serious obstacles in his way of becoming a political expatriate in France. As mentioned previously, the French police issued a deportation order against Rocker in 1894, and in 1907, when visiting France, he was actually served the warrant and deported. Rocker found out that his chances of revoking the forty year old deportation order were slim, and he had to decide on settling in another European country. His options narrowed considerably, however, after considering the political situation in Europe. Switzerland was flooded with refugees, Austria was rapidly and enthusiastically embracing fascist doctrines, and Holland, where they expected no bureaucratic obstacles to their stay proper, would not grant them a working permit. In addition, the Rockers were informed that there was very little ground for political activities in the Netherlands. The only two realistic options that were left were Spain and England. Spain had a strong anarcho-syndicalist movement into which Rocker could have easily been integrated. In the initial period Rocker could have also relied on financial aid from the community of German exiles in Spain, among which they counted at least one very close friend, Helmut Rüdiger. Rocker's choice, however, fell on England, which he grew to like and respect during his twenty years of residence there. England was for him a terra cognita, where he knew all the political
nuances of its labor movement, and where he felt he could continue his activities unobstructed.

From St. Tropez the Rockers traveled to Paris, where they stayed ten days. From there they intended to go to London. Their plans, however, changed as they received a notice that the international committee of the I.A.A. would meet in Amsterdam at the end of April, 1933. Being a member of the committee, Rocker proceeded to Amsterdam, where it was decided to transfer the funds and the organization of the I.A.A. from Berlin to the Netherlands.

In the first week of May, Rudolf and Milly arrived in London, where they were received with great warmth and enthusiasm by the remnants of the Jewish anarchist movement in the East End. Rocker soon started addressing meetings all over London, thus renewing his contacts with members of the English labor movement. As elsewhere in Europe, with the notable exception of Spain, so too the libertarians in England were losing ground, and Rocker had to admit that not much had been left from the illustrious Jewish anarchist movement, which he had nurtured for twenty years. Yet, the Jewish movement was still in a better shape than the German anarchist groups in London, which had disintegrated completely after World War I.6

In July, Rocker had to attend yet another special conference of the I.A.A., this time in Paris. The meeting dealt basically with existential problems, namely how to survive the growing crisis in Europe. The conference decided to publish a journal in the German language, Die Internationale, meant mainly to be smuggled into Germany. In addition, an international fund would be set up to help
the victims of fascism and their families. 7

In the middle of July, Rudolf and Milly returned to London, where they remained for another six weeks. On August 27, 1933, the Rockers sailed to New York, arriving on September 2, 1933. After resting for a while in Towanda with Milly's family, Rocker embarked on a six month lecture tour of the United States and Canada.

During his stay in Chicago, the Jewish comrades offered Rocker to find a translator for his book Nationalism and Culture, and have it published by an American house. Rocker pointed to them the expected difficulties in undertaking a project of such magnitude, in particular finding a suitable translator and financing the venture. The comrades would not give up, however, and a Rocker Publishing Committee was founded, its main task being to collect the necessary funds. Similar committees sprang up in Los Angeles and New York. Despite these promising initiatives, the project did not get off to a good start. Following Emma Goldman's advice, Alexander Berkman was chosen to translate the manuscript into English. It was an unfortunate choice. Although Rocker did not even mention the episode in his memoirs, he was extremely unhappy with the pace and quality of his friend's work. Finally, Alexander Berkman dropped the translation, and the entire project was postponed until a more suitable person with whom to entrust the translation, Professor Ray E. Chase, was found. The first edition of the book finally appeared in 1937. However, soon afterwards, the publishing house, Covici-Freide, declared bankruptcy, and the English translation could no longer be distributed. 8 Nationalism and Culture was translated into Dutch and
published in Amsterdam in 1939. The Nazi invasion, however, prevented the book from being distributed. The Spanish edition of Nationalism and Culture, published in three volumes in Barcelona from 1935 to 1937, enjoyed significant success, but a second edition could not be printed due to Franco's ascent to power following the Spanish Civil War. In its original German version Nationalism and Culture was published only in 1949.

The North American lecture tour proved a strain on the 61 year old Rocker. In the summer of 1934, he returned to Towanda to rest and start writing his memoirs. Rocker's friend, Max Nettlau, had urged him numerous times to write his life story, and in particular to document the history of the Jewish anarchist movement in England.\(^9\) Rocker's mental journey into the past was abruptly interrupted on July 29, 1934, when he received a letter in cipher from Berlin, informing him about the fate of his close associate, Erich Mühsam. The news on Mühsam's death disturbed Rocker profoundly, and he could no longer concentrate on writing his memoirs. A month later, he moved to New York, from where he embarked on yet another lecture tour of the United States.

Rocker's travels throughout the United States enabled him to acquaint himself with the situation of the American libertarian movement at first hand. Indigenous American anarchism was based mostly on individualist philosophies, as opposed to the predominant communist and syndicalist orientations of its European counterparts. The early apostles of individualist anarchism in America were Josiah Warren, Lysander Spooner, and Henry David Thoreau. Towards the end of
the nineteenth century, the movement centered mainly around Benjamin R. Tucker and his disciples.

Benjamin Tucker (1854-1939) founded the *Radical Review* in 1878, and three years later he started publishing *Liberty*, which lasted until Tucker's printing shop burned down in 1907. Tucker's social philosophy contained little original thought, but was a synthesis of the works of Warren, Proudhon and Stirner. His importance, however, is due more to the fact that his journal, *Liberty*, became the main forum for native American radicalism. With the demise of *Liberty*, the American school of individualist anarchism practically ceased to exist. By the time Rocker was writing his memoirs, only two journals propagating anarchist ideas were published in the English language, the monthly *Resistance*, and the quarterly *Retort*. Rocker commented sadly that the English speaking anarchist movement in the United States had already become a chapter in the history books.10

Notwithstanding Tucker's brand of anarchism, the bulk of the American anarchist movement adhered to Kropotkin's anarcho-communist teachings. The majority of the members of the anarchist groups were immigrants, who had either been radicalized in their countries of origin and continued in the same path in the United States, or people, who upon arrival, found themselves uprooted, alienated, exploited and disillusioned. "Anarchism for them," says Paul Avrich, "was part of the immigrant experience, the revulsion against America, in which they could not find a place."11 Although it greatly diminished its overall strength, the anarchist movement naturally divided itself along
national lines, each group centered around a newspaper published in its native tongue, each group struggling for limited, and mostly local improvements in its social and working conditions. Interactions between the groups were restricted and inconsequential.

The First World War, the Russian Revolution, and the anti-radical repression pursued by the government of the United States greatly decimated the ranks of the various anarchist groups. Following the October Revolution, many anarchists returned voluntarily to Russia to partake in the historical events. Many others were deported against their will by the American authorities to their lands of origin. One such voyage was that of Emma Goldman and 247 other anarchists, who were placed aboard the "Buford," and sent back to Russia. In addition, the anarchist movement was losing its young activists to the more active Communist Party, and as the waves of immigration into the United States slowed down after the war it also lost the population from which it used to recruit its new members. As a result, the membership in the anarchist groups declined sharply. The remaining circles dramatically changed their character, turning away from revolutionary militancy, and becoming mainly social and educational clubs.

When Rocker toured the United States in 1934, he observed that the German movement, which originated with Johann Most and used to be the strongest and most influential of all anarchist groups in America, had completely disintegrated. The same fate befell the once active Czech and French anarchist groups. The Italian movement, which already in 1888 published a journal, L'Anarchico, was also in a state
of deep crisis, and from its numerous newspapers and publications, only L'Adunata dei Refrattari was left. The Spanish and Russian groups were also close to dissolution. According to Rocker, the only remaining movement that was still active in 1934 was the Jewish one, but it too suffered from stagnation and lack of new blood. In a letter to Nettlau, Rocker described the older generation as lacking the strength and energy to continue its fight for "the cause," while their children, who were born in the United States, were educated exclusively in English and could not respond to propaganda in foreign languages. Even the Freie Arbeiter Stimme (Free Voice of Labor), which was one of the main centers around which Jewish anarchists organized, and which used to enjoy a wide circulation and an even greater intellectual influence, was on the decline. From its peak of 15,000 subscribers, a mere 4000 were left in 1934. The mutual fund organizations, to which some wealthy people used to contribute, were also in deep financial troubles, and some ceased functioning altogether.

The picture that emerges is one of an aging movement, dying of natural causes, with no future whatsoever. What is more, what little remained of the movement became infested with factionalism and pettiness. It is an extremely disappointed Rocker, who wrote the following in a letter to his friend Boris Yelensky:

"It seems to me that our whole movement has become a hotbed for personal quarrels, not only here in America, but almost in every country... There is so much bitterness, self-glorification and continual readiness to belittle or to abuse the good work of others, that we must not wonder that our movement has entered the most critical period of its existence since the time of the First International. The essential ideas
of anarchism will never die and will always remain an inspiration for the future; but I doubt very much whether a revival of the libertarian spirit will come from the ranks of the present movement."

Rocker was in the last stages of preparing the first English edition of *Nationalism and Culture* when the news about the outbreak of Civil War in Spain reached him. On July 17, 1936, a group of right-wing officers rose against the center-left coalition government. In the major cities the state apparatus crumbled as garrisons surrendered and the police disintegrated. In the reigning chaos, the anarchists managed to assume control in many areas, most notably Barcelona and several urban and rural districts in Catalonia and Valencia. In these places, the actions taken by the anarchist trade unions prevented the insurrectionists from taking power locally, and these places remained Republican.

Spain had always been a stronghold of the libertarian movement, inspired mainly by Bakunin's brand of activism and pathos. Libertarians did not become a major political force until the founding in 1910 of the Confederacion Nacional de Trabajo, C.N.T. From its inception, the C.N.T. adopted a syndicalist organizational structure. At its core were the workers' "sindicatos únicos," each of which represented the workers in a certain community or place of work regardless of craft. These syndicates were loosely tied to a regional federation, which in turn maintained ties to the national organization. Rocker claimed that there were about one million C.N.T. members. He, on the other hand, estimated the actual membership to be 350,000, but he also admits that the Confederation could count on the sympathy and support of a million more.
The C.N.T. took an active part in labor struggles until May 1924, when it was declared illegal by the dictatorship of Miguel Primo de Rivera. Primo de Rivera, who ruled Spain between 1923 and 1930, banned all anarchist publications and suppressed the movement's syndicates. The C.N.T. virtually ceased to function until the fall of the dictatorship in 1930. The anarchists, however, continued their activities in the underground. In July 1927, in a secret meeting in Valencia, the representatives of the scattered anarchist groups established the Federacion Anarquista Iberica, F.A.I. The F.A.I. was a closely knit body of anarchists, a revolutionary vanguard dedicated to the pursuit of revolution and the purity of anarchist principles. It consisted of "affinity groups," small cells of not more than a dozen members. It maintained a secretive organization, its members being selected carefully according to stringent criteria. Among its members were many aggressive and charismatic leaders, like García Oliver and Buenaventura Durruti. It is estimated that the F.A.I.'s following reached approximately 39,000 members before the outbreak of the Civil War. Interestingly, the F.A.I. adopted an ideology and a type of organization that were essentially Bakuninist, i.e., a secretive, elitist body of conspirators, dedicated body and soul to the advancement of a socio-political disposition conductive to their revolutionary goals. F.A.I. members joined the C.N.T. as soon as the Confederation became legal again in 1930. Although they joined as individuals, they retained their independent parallel association with their respective F.A.I. cells, and remained a distinctive entity within the C.N.T., working towards assuring the adherence of the
C.N.T. to anarchist purism.

The C.N.T. emerged into the open in 1930, quickly regaining its former strength and influence among the Spanish workers. The F.A.I., which was fanatically fighting any moderate tendency evident within the ranks of the C.N.T., was also busy organizing local insurrections as a prelude to the great revolution, and its members actively engaged in "expropriations" of banks and jewelry stores.

For some months prior to the events of July 1936, there was evidence that the military brass was planning a pronunciamiento. While the central government did not take any preemptive measures, the C.N.T.-F.A.I. members prepared for the worst. For instance, in Barcelona, the stronghold of the anarchist movement, serious preparations were made to cope with the upcoming rebellion. The C.N.T and F.A.I. placed the entire city on alert and armed the workers. When the army rose on July 17, 1936, Barcelona was ready to fight back. In his *Homage to Catalonia*, George Orwell depicted the revolutionary atmosphere he had experienced in Barcelona during the first stages of the Civil War as follows: "It was the first time that I had ever been in a town where the working class was in the saddle."21 "There was a belief in the revolution and in the future, a feeling of having suddenly emerged into an era of equality and freedom."22

The military coup of July 1936 created the chaotic situation for which the members of the F.A.I. had been preparing themselves. And indeed, they excelled both on the battle fields and in political organization. For several months the Republican armed forces in Catalonia, Levante and parts of Aragón were mostly anarchist
controlled militia units. Factories in these areas were taken over by the workers, and several villages collectivized their land and attempts were made to set up libertarian communes. It is estimated that in the winter of 1936-1937 there were over 1000 agricultural collectives in Republican Spain, the majority of which were organized by an alliance of the C.N.T. and the Unión General de Trabajadores, U.G.T., the trade union federation of the Socialist Party.²³

The collaboration of the anarchists with the other parties on the Republican side took an unexpected turn when the anarchists considered the possibility of joining the parliament. In late autumn 1936 it became clear to the anarchists that in order to carry out effectively the struggle against fascism and to preserve some of their social achievements, they had to renounce their uncompromising anti-parliamentarism, and collaborate with the Republican government and the Communist Party within the framework of a Popular Front. Political participation, which was accepted after great misgivings and hesitation, was construed, however, to be the only means of survival in the extraordinary circumstances of the Civil War. Federica Montseny, who later became the Minister of Health, argued that while the government could not do without the anarchists, the anarchists could not do without the government either.²⁴ Diego Abad de Santillan, who was the F.A.I. delegate to the Catalan Economic Council, argued that collaboration simply bought time to develop a capacity to protect anarchist gains from communist attacks.²⁵ The paradox of the Spanish anarchist movement is manifested in the example of Abad de Santillan and others who continued to regard themselves avowed anti-statists and
anarchists even while serving as officials in the government.²⁶

The C.N.T.-F.A.I. entered the Catalan government in September 1936, and on November 4, they joined the central government headed by left-socialist Francisco Largo Caballero, also known as the "Spanish Lenin." Besides Federica Montseny, three other anarchists joined the cabinet. López Sanchez became Minister of Commerce, Juan Peiro, Minister of Labor, and García Oliver, Minister of Justice. The spectacle of an anarchist becoming the master of Law and Order in Spain served to unleash Ilya Ehrenburg's vitriolic pen. Of all the paradoxical situations that he had encountered in his life, claimed Ehrenburg, Oliver's was the most grotesque.²⁷

Although their four ministers resigned in May 1937, the anarchists continued to collaborate with the government until the end of the war. The acceptance of political power which split and weakened the ranks of the anarchist movement in Spain, became a dilemma for the international libertarian community as well.

At the beginning the I.A.A. reluctantly accepted anarchist participation in governmental bodies as part of the struggle against fascism. It soon revoked its approval when the anarchists accepted ministerial positions in the Popular Front Cabinet. Alexander Shapiro, one of the secretaries of the I.A.A., pointed out that the C.N.T.-F.A.I. politics was a denial of all that anarchism ever represented. Augustin Souchy, who was the I.A.A. representative in Spain, came under sharp attack for tolerating even a much milder proposal calling for the creation of advisory boards attached to each ministry and staffed with anarchists. As a consequence, at the end of 1936, Souchy
was replaced by Frenchman Pierre Bresnard, an ardent supporter of syndicalism.  

Augustin Souchy was not the only non-Spanish anarchist to have supported the ministerial heresy of the Spanish comrades. Max Nettlau, for instance, who lived at the time in Barcelona, also supported unequivocally the policies of the C.N.T.-F.A.I. Emma Goldman, who visited Spain twice during the Civil War, wrote to Rocker that the libertarian movement was "plunging to its death" through the continuous controversy over the anarchist participation in the Republican government. She herself maintained an ambivalent attitude towards the ideological wisdom of the Spanish anarchists assuming ministerial responsibilities. On the one hand, it was impossible for Emma Goldman to refute that easily a principle, i.e. the illegitimacy of government, for which she fought her whole life. In a letter to Rocker, dated November 1936, she complained about the opportunism of the Spanish anarchists, for whom it seemed the end justified all means. These means contradicted, according to Goldman, "the glorious past of Spanish anarchism." Yet, only two months later, she acknowledged that the Spanish anarchists really did not have any other alternative, but to join the government. "Our comrades did not choose [to enter the government], circumstances chose for them. If they had not submitted to the inevitable, Franco would now be in possession of Spain and there would be no Spanish anarchists for the libertarians of the world to find fault with."  

Rocker's attitude towards the policies of the C.N.T.-F.A.I. reflected both the theoretical dilemmas of an anarchist and the
practical considerations of a politically aware thinker. His convictions, however, mostly gave way to leniency and pragmatism. In a letter to Emma Goldman, Rocker also used the "special circumstances" and "lack of choice" arguments to justify the political decisions of the Spanish anarchists. When the anarchists were forced to cooperate with elements that they had previously fought, wrote Rocker referring mainly to the Communists, it was not the logic of a theory that dictated this unison, but the logic of uncontrollable circumstances.\(^{32}\) Rocker was not oblivious to the ideological and practical mistakes committed by the anarchists in Spain, yet he maintained that they should be encouraged in their heroic fight against fascism, rather than criticized by the international libertarian community. In critical times, pointed out Rocker, ideological purity was not the most important resource.\(^{33}\) After the Republic was defeated, Emma Goldman wrote to Rocker that he was proven right in claiming that for the Spanish anarchists to have remained consistent to the word and letter of anarchist theory would have only meant a much sooner Nationalist ascent to power than it actually happened.\(^{34}\)

During the Spanish Civil War Rocker was kept informed through his copious and frequent correspondence with Helmut Rüdiger, Abad de Santillan and Emma Goldman. At one point he even expressed his wish to travel to Spain and partake in the events. He was persuaded by Emma Goldman to stay in the United States, from where he could contribute more significantly to the Spanish effort, through writing and propagating the Republican cause.\(^{35}\) Taking Goldman's advice, Rocker started a campaign designed to inform and enlighten the
American public opinion about the real events in Spain, events, he believed, that were presented in an extremely distorted form in the American media. He lectured all over the United States, wrote innumerable articles and published two major pamphlets, entitled *The Truth about Spain* and *The Tragedy of Spain*. The anarchist movement in the United States even published a fortnightly periodical called *The Spanish Revolution*. 36 Rocker, however, believed that his most significant contribution to the Republican cause could have been winning over the solidarity of the American trade unions. He believed that with the support of the trade unions, the libertarian movement in the United States would stand a better chance of convincing the American public in that the Spanish Civil War was not a faraway and irrelevant crisis that did not affect American interests. On the contrary, he wanted to make it clear that the events in Spain might influence the entire cause of history, that surrendering to fascism would not end in Spain but would sooner or later engulf all nations, leading ultimately to a new World War. It was Rocker's hope that pressure from the trade unions on the American administration would lead to a reevaluation of its arms embargo policy on Spain. 37

In the long run, Rocker's efforts, as well as those of many other Western radicals and intellectuals on other fronts, proved futile. 38 For Rocker, as well as for numerous others who fought for Spain with their pens or their bodies, the Spanish Civil War became the last cause for which they could and would fight. Not since the Russian Revolution was there such enthusiasm, such belief in the justness of a cause and such a revolutionary atmosphere to bask in.
For Arthur Koestler, Spain was the last twitch of Europe's dying conscience. For the English poet, Cecil Day Lewis, the Civil War was simply the "battle between light and darkness."

For Rocker, the Spanish Civil War served as a historical omen. "The fate of Spain will be the fate of Europe," he said. 39 "If the Spaniards lose their battle, it will be the beginning of a new Holy Alliance, the beginning of a reign of terror and barbarism all the world over." 40

Spain was for Rocker the "last cause" of anarchism, the last opportunity of establishing a society based on anarchist principles. Spain, one must remember, was the only place where anarchists actually assumed power, taking over factories and agricultural communities, and proceeded to create an egalitarian, libertarian society. In this light it is possible to understand not only Rocker's readiness to accept the parliamentarian heresies of the Spanish anarchists, but also his extreme ferocity against whoever stood in the anarchists' way. Thus, Rocker blamed everyone except the anarchists for the failure of the Spanish experiment. He divided the shares of blame equally between the fascists and the democratic powers. For him, both sides were "fighting out their differences on the back of the Spanish people." 41 His optimism and high hopes for the Spanish experiment caused Rocker to misread the qualitative balance of power between the nationalists and the republican forces. In his view, without the interference of the foreign powers "the revolt of the fascist brigades would have been disposed [off] in a few weeks." 42 Although the republicans enjoyed numerical superiority over the nationalists in the initial stages of
the war, they soon lost this advantage due to several factors. The republican army became torn by ideological strife and consequently spent too much of its time and energy engaging in theoretical disputes. In addition, the creation of revolutionary militia units destroyed whatever hierarchy and efficiency that was left from the regular army forces. All these factors, and the fact that the military leadership lacked both talent and consistent strategy, caused the anarchists not to be able to take advantage of the numerical superiority. After losing one battle after the other, by Summer 1936, the anarchists effectively lost the first stage of the war.43

From mid 1937 both the C.N.T. and the F.A.I. retreated slowly in every field of action. The internal struggles among the anarchists, the growing influence of the Communist Party, and the adoption of a policy of fighting for democracy rather than socialism, weakened the movement considerably. The conduct of the war fell more and more under the control of the Communist Party and its Soviet military advisers, who turned the anarchist military trend around and reestablished a centralized military body. Soon economic changes followed, when the collectivized factories were nationalized and many agricultural communes were simply destroyed.

When dealing with the internal affairs of the Republican camp, Rocker's criticism is conspicuously devoid of references to the anarchists' tactical mistakes, organizational inefficiency and political ineptness. Instead, he blamed the communists, Russia and Stalin. In particular, he accused the communists of deliberately ignoring a political constellation conducive to revolutionary goals
and postponing the realization of socialism in Spain because somehow this eventuality did not fit into Stalin's global policies. On the practical level, Rocker accused the communists of using terrorist methods of intimidation, assassinating opponents and subjecting the population to a reign of fear and consternation. For Rocker, the communists were cynically restaging their second betrayal of the social revolution, second in its seriousness only to their 1917 treason. According to Rocker, the communists' behavior was a straightforward case of unclear conscience. "What the Russian autocrats and their supporters fear most is that the success of libertarian socialism in Spain might prove... that the much vaunted necessity of a dictatorship is nothing but one vast fraud."

With the fall of Republican Spain, Rocker retired from active work, dedicating the rest of his life to writing his memoirs. Due to severe urinary problems and a prostate operation which took several months to heal, Rocker had to cancel all his lecture tours, which had been his main source of income. Consequently, the Rockers' economic situation worsened even beyond their previous hardships. Already in 1937 in a letter to Emma Goldman, Rocker voiced his economic difficulties. Goldman advised him to ask his comrades for help, but when he declined, she told him that if necessary she would not be ashamed to ask for help in his name. Finally, Rocker had no other choice but to overlook his pride and accept financial aid from the Jewish anarchists so as to be able to continue his literary work.

In September 1937 the Rockers settled down in Mohigan
Colony, Crompond. The Colony, located about forty-five miles from New York City, was originally a tree nursery that has been bought in 1923 by a group of anarchists headed by Harry Kelly, Rocker's old friend from his London years. Each family bought one acre on which to build its house. During the early days of the settlement the vast majority of Mohigan Colony's inhabitants were Jewish anarchists. In contrast to other anarchist communes in the United States, such as Clarion Colony in Utah and the Sunrise Colony in Michigan which were founded as experimental agricultural communes, Mohigan Colony was an urban community, most of its members working in New York. The main purpose of the inhabitants of Mohigan Colony was to establish a Free School, modeled after a similar institution in Stelton, New Jersey. During the Depression of the 1930's, many of the original members of the Colony had to leave the place in their search for work, and a growing number among the newcomers were communists and socialists. Rocker took little part in the social or administrative life of the community, but he was widely regarded as its dominant intellectual leader.

When Rudolf and his wife arrived in the United States, they had a tourist visa valid for a year, since they originally intended to return to Britain. When the year came to its end, having probably decided to remain in the States, the Rockers had to prolong their residence permit. This procedure repeated itself every six months, and there were difficulties with each renewal. In addition, the Rockers could not leave the United States even to neighboring Canada for fear of being denied reentry on account of being anarchists. With each renewal of the visa, Rocker's friends had to lobby on his behalf, and
in 1934 they even managed to enlist Albert Einstein to write a letter to the immigration authorities on Rocker's behalf. In a letter to Professor Chase, Rocker expressed his fears that if the Republicans were to win the 1936 elections, they could easily prove that he was distributing "foreign" ideas, and as such they could deport him under the Anarchist Exclusion Act of 1903. Luckily for Rocker and all other German political exiles, Roosevelt was elected to a second term. It was only after the Crystal Night of November 9, 1938, however, that the visa harassments came to an end. The events in Berlin shook President Roosevelt to such an extent that he declared all 12,000 - 15,000 German refugees which were living in the United States with visitors' visas should have their residence permits renewed automatically every six months, without being subjected to bureaucratic hassle. Bureaucratic apparati are always stronger than good intentions, however, and following the outbreak of World War II, Rocker and his wife were required to register as "enemy aliens," despite the fact that they were deprived of their German citizenship by the Nazi regime.

During World War II, Rocker became involved in a controversy similar in character yet smaller in scope to the one which involved Kropotkin's support of France in World War I. Rocker, who twenty years previously dared to contradict his teacher, to the point of accusing him of killing the spirit of internationalism, effectively adopted Kropotkin's views in 1939. Eclosing Kropotkin's arguments, Rocker claimed that World War II was justifiable in terms of the ultimate preservation of libertarian values. Although Rocker did not go so far
as to view the Allies as carrying the banner of social revolution, the way Kropotkin regarded France, he still believed, much like his mentor in 1914, that the contemporary world struggle was essentially a clash between two opposing forces. On the one side stood Germany, the embodiment of absolutism, racism and reaction, and on the other side were the Allied forces, whom Rocker regarded as more or less progressive forces. Rocker's views did not stem from any sudden sympathy towards the capitalist system. Rather it followed a pragmatic realization by an anarchist that World War II was not even an ambiguous matter of a lesser evil. Germany had to be defeated because life in England, France or any other capitalist country was infinitely preferable to the German concentration camps. Kropotkin's and Bakunin's voices came clearly through Rocker's pronunciation that a German victory would mean a victory for a particularly vicious and menacing form of barbarism.

Back in 1914, Rocker claimed that it really did not matter what country was the aggressor, since the anarchists should equally fight both sides. In 1939, Rocker plainly preferred one side over the other. Unlike the case of World War I, where the blame for the bloodshed was shared by all involved and could not be apportioned fairly between countries, Rocker maintained that the case of World War II was a clear and undisputed case of German aggression. On the contrary, the Powers' main error was their futile efforts to appease Hitler and not to stand up and protect the first victims of Nazi aggressiveness. The anarchists were forbidden this time to regard the outcome of the struggle as irrelevant to their case. Such an
argument, wrote Rocker in 1941, "means to aid the cowardly murderers and to prepare the world for the 'blessing' of Hitler's 'New Order'. The struggle against totalitarian slavery and its bestial achievements is the first duty of our time." 57

Not all anarchists shared Rocker's convictions. For instance, Marcus Graham, the former editor of the San Francisco anarchist monthly Man, wrote a pamphlet in which he sharply attacked Rocker, calling him a "pro-war anarchist," and claiming that his opinions were contemptuous of anarchist principles. It was lucky for the movement, added Graham, that Rocker's views were shared by only few people. 58 The London based Freedom group supported Graham's attack and expressed its regret to the fact that such prominent an anarchist like Rocker should hold such heretic views. The charge of abandoning anarchist principles did not, however, affect Rocker's charisma and special standing within the anarchist movement. He enjoyed the backing of both the Freie Arbeiter Stimme in New York and the Workers Friend in London, as well as that of many old and prominent anarchists, such as Abad de Santillan and Gregory Maximoff. It was only several years after the end of World War II, that Rocker dared to analyze his views on the war in a historical perspective, comparing them with those of Bakunin and Kropotkin concerning previous armed struggles. In a letter to Boris Yelenski, Rocker argued that the practical and ideological problematics of war were too complicated to be solved by throwing cheap slogans around, the way it was done during World War II. Moreover, argued Rocker, if the attitudes of many of the comrades were to be considered as axioms of anarchist ideology, then "neither
Proudhon nor Bakunin or Kropotkin could be called anarchists.⁵⁹

During the war, Rocker was commissioned by both the Freie Arbeiter Stimme in New York and La Protesta in Buenos Aires to write articles about issues related to the war. These articles were subsequently collected in a book, entitled La Segunda Guerra Mondial, published in Argentina in 1943. In these articles Rocker covered a wide range of problems concerning the global crisis. Of special interest are a series of articles in this collection, entitled "Examinations of the Jewish Problem." In this series Rocker tried to show that antisemitism was never a grass-root ideology of the working classes, but rather a tool in the hands of reactionary governments, who wanted to divert the attention of the masses from their social and economic exploitation. This policy was not restricted to Germany, but was employed in other countries as well. The Jews were but a convenient scapegoat. Such was, for instance, the case of the Tsarist authorities financing the notorious Black Hundreds organization, and, according to Rocker, the direct involvement of the Russian government in the organization of pogroms against the Jews.⁶⁰

In "From Bismarck to Hitler," which he wrote in January 1942, Rocker argued that it was erroneous to view Hitler as the founder of Germany's "New Order." Rather, Hitler was the climax of a lengthy process, which started and developed under Prussian authoritarian rule. According to Rocker, the original plan of the Prussian Junkers had been to use the Nazi movement to further their own political and economic interests. The plan was thwarted, however, when the golem rebelled against its creator, and the resulting order was even more
monstrous than the original intentions. Hitler, maintained Rocker, was no more than a vulgar caricature of Bismarck, a caricature that was nevertheless a lot more dangerous than the model of emulation. 61

In "Collective Responsibility," Rocker struggled with the difficult ethical question of whether a people may be held collectively responsible for its government's policies and practices. The question was particularly difficult for Rocker to tackle, since at least formally, as a German, any answer to such a question could not be judged from the vantage point of impersonal detachment. Rocker claimed that the term "collective responsibility" and its implications could only be consistent with fascist ideology, whereby a person owes his existence to the country and lives through it. Theoretically, at least, Rocker admitted that such collective responsibility might be applicable in cases where a certain nation decides in a collective manner to adopt a specific policy. This could be done, for instance, in a direct democracy. Practically, however, collective responsibility is an inapplicable concept in other forms of government. Since direct democracy is nonexistent, and modern governments are always ruled by a privileged minority that does not represent the interests of the people, apportioning collective blame rationally is both practically impossible and morally unjustified. 62

Philosophically, the most interesting series of articles by Rocker was one dealing with the choices mankind would have to make after the war was over. In "Which Way should We Choose," Rocker claimed that civilization was at a crucial crossroad, and that the decisions that would shape the future social order in the world were
critical. The decisions, according to Rocker, should be reached freely by the people themselves and not be dictated from above by any kind of political or moral authority. At this point, Rocker confronted an intriguing dilemma; should the principles of free choice and self determination be applied equally to all peoples, regardless of the ultimate consequences of their decision? What if a certain nation decided to adopt a fascist way of life, thus endangering the very existence of other peoples? Rocker correctly sensed that this question is also the central problem of democracy. Interestingly, the principle adopted by Rocker to solve this dilemma is a Hobbesian one, i.e., the principle of a self-contained, self-imposed authority, the rule of which cannot be extended to persons who were not part of the relevant social covenant.

Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), unlike most defenders of despotic government, believed that all men were created equal. In addition, Hobbes argued, man is a social animal, and if deprived of society his life would be "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short." Thus, the need to cooperate is just an aspect of man's desire to shun death. The ideal mode of social cooperation, according to Hobbes, would be that of "ants and bees," which neither compete with each other, nor have a desire for honor. This "natural agreement," however, cannot be achieved by men, so an artificial "covenant" is needed. Furthermore, Hobbes' social covenant is not, as with Locke and Rousseau, between the citizens and a ruling power, it is a covenant made by the citizens with each other to obey such rules as the majority shall chose, a definition that practically, at least, agrees with our understanding
of the modern term "democracy." However, for the social covenant to be also moral, one must restrict its jurisdiction to those who put themselves under it by consent. Without this reservation, a paradoxical situation might arise whereby a decision by one free-associating group, say an association of murderers, to cause harm to another group, not bound a priori by the decisions of the first group, would have to be considered philosophically moral. Rocker adopted this Hobbesian claim, and according to him, a decision by one nation can be considered neither valid nor democratic if it affects people that were excluded from the decision process, i.e., belonging to another nation. Consequently, adopting a fascist philosophy, which by definition includes expansionist goals towards people who did not take part in the initial process that resulted in fascist rule, could only be regarded as an immoral act.

Towards the end of the war in Europe, Rocker became more and more concerned with promoting his idea of a federated Europe, a model federation that should in time be emulated by the rest of the world. Germany's defeat in the battle field would serve no purpose, claimed Rocker, if the pre-war national divisions and political orders were allowed to remain unchanged. Only a federation of all European countries could put an end to the continent's artificial divisions and the resultant wars, which plagued it throughout its history. Europe, argued Rocker, was for all intents and purposes a cultural and economic entity, artificially divided only by the emergence of the national states. The apparent differences between the European countries were far from being rooted in the history of the European
people. They were rather small nuances intentionally intensified from above to serve the purposes of the ruling classes. Rocker's most obvious misjudgment in the European context seems to be his underplaying the intensity of the national aspirations of the European people. He claimed, for instance, that such national aspirations could only create political borders for a short period of time, but could not alter the spiritual foundation of a unified European culture. In contrast to the Marxists, who considered the national countries as a catalyst for finding a new path for economic development, Rocker blamed nationalism for ruining Europe's "natural economy" by paving the way for the capitalist system. It is unclear what Rocker was referring to in the vague term "natural economy," but it is obvious that like his mentor, Kropotkin, he idealized the autonomous social and economic units of medieval Europe, blaming the emergence of the national state for their disintegration. The industrial revolution, added Rocker, extended beyond national borders. Yet, the national states hindered the development of the industrial revolution and its potential benefits to the masses by imposing economic regulations and restrictions, which had no other purpose but impeding the economic development of other countries, thus emphasizing territorial boundaries over economic development. As an alternative to the European political and economic Tower of Babylon, Rocker presented the American federalist system, which by reducing contradicting economic and social imperatives, created a state of security for its members, consequently reducing the danger of an armed conflict among them.65

Although to the end of his life Rocker considered himself in
spirit as belonging to the European culture, he nonetheless learned to appreciate many facets of American society, in which he lived for over twenty years. He valued in particular the American federative constitution, American individualist traditions and practices, and the people's obstinate rejection of all kinds of political centralist tendencies. In his early childhood, Rocker used to read and reread every available book depicting the wondrous adventures of Indians and American pioneers in the wild west.\textsuperscript{66} It seems that something of these romantic fascinations remained with him to his old age. In his views, the pioneers were an idealized group pursuing an almost abstract idea of freedom and individualism. He even developed a quite interesting theory, according to which the pioneers of the American West were the main cause for the fact that there never developed a serious, deep-rooted revolutionary movement in the United States. In a way, the pioneer substituted in America for the social revolutionary in Europe. The universal need to either improve or change social conditions could in the United States be expressed without recourse to revolution. A pioneer could always move to a new, uninhabited area, where he could establish economic, social and cultural institutions according to his preferences.\textsuperscript{67} Unknowingly, according to Rocker, the American pioneers practiced an anarchist way of life, for they had little or no connection with the federal authorities. Instead, they relied mainly on voluntary associations within the community for security and mutual help.\textsuperscript{68} In his descriptions of the "pioneer" Rocker engaged in unfounded idealizations, particularly in interpreting the religious commitment, individualist spirit, and even the idiosyncratic
tendencies of the pioneers as a genuine expression of communal trends.

But more than anything else, Rocker held in deep respect the social and political thinking of America's prominent leaders and philosophers, a subject to which he dedicated a book. In *Pioneers of American Freedom*, which was published in 1949, Rocker traced the origins of liberal and radical thought in the United States in the writings of Thomas Paine, Thomas Jefferson, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry David Thoreau, Abraham Lincoln and others. The book's main purpose was to show that anarchism and libertarian ideas in America had not been imported from Europe, but were a product of the unique social conditions of the country and its historical traditions. Anarchism, claimed Rocker, had existed in the United States at a time when no indication of a similar movement could be found in Europe. Already in 1833, Josiah Warren had published in Cincinnati a four-page weekly, *The Peaceful Revolutionist*, which was the first anarchist newspaper to appear anywhere in the world. When anarchism had developed in Europe, it proceeded mainly along communist lines. In contrast, in the United States, native anarchism had been almost exclusively individualist. According to Rocker, this fundamental difference in the history of the two libertarian movements could be entirely ascribed to the differences between the prevailing social conditions and attitudes in Europe and the United States. Communist anarchism in the United States started as an import from Europe much later in the developmental history of American libertarianism.

American anarchists, continued Rocker, could trace their natural origins to thinkers like Paine, Jefferson, Warren and others,
and did not need to import ideas from Europe. In Thomas Paine (1737-1809), Rocker saw a pioneer in advocating the gradual withering away of state authority. Paine considered government an almost intolerable artifact to be disposed off when conditions are ripe. In his essay, *Common Sense*, written in 1776, Paine cast severe doubts upon the necessity of a complex governmental body needed to rule the Leviathan state. Paine maintained that when society was in a healthy condition, it needed little or no government at all. "Society in every state is a blessing," wrote Paine, "but government even in its best state is but a necessary evil, in its worst state an intolerable one." The alternative offered by Paine was a society regulated by the law of nature, in which he as well as many anarchists later on, saw the source for man's happiness. Paine shared with the anarchists a basic anti-elitist philosophy. He did not fear popular rule, since he believed in the intrinsic fairness of humans and in their ability to deal rationally with even the most complex problems of society, provided they had access to information.

Like his contemporary Paine, Thomas Jefferson (1743-1826) too was not very fond of the political state, yet he did not advocate its abolition. The greater the power of the government, the greater its danger to the rights of men. Accordingly, Jefferson preached the principle "that government is best which governs least," a dictum frequently quoted by Rocker in his speeches and writings. An ardent fighter against political centralization, Jefferson strove to reduce the authority of the centralized government to the absolute minimum.

"Generalizing and concentrating all cares and powers into one body..."
has destroyed the liberty and the rights of men in every government which has ever existed under the sun."71 In Jefferson's opinion, the small community, rather than the centralized state, was the unit within which political and social questions could be dealt with most effectively, since it was easier for the individuals within a community to become acquainted and involved with issues that were closer to home. In particular, Rocker admired Jefferson's unremitting criticism of every interference of a government in the affairs of its citizens. Jefferson, who declared any such imposition as despotic and destructive, left no doubt that he was ready to go even so far as to support local uprisings, whenever in his judgement the precarious balance between the citizens and the state had been tipped too much in the direction of the government. "I hold it, that a little rebellion now and then, is a good thing, and as necessary in the political world as storms are in the physical."72

It is an interesting phenomenon in American history, that two of the most important thinkers exhibiting anti-centralist tendencies were in practice heads of the central government. In addition to Jefferson, Rocker regarded Abraham Lincoln (1809-1865) as another proponent of libertarian ideas. Lincoln neither wished to abolish the state nor negated the necessity of a governing body. Nevertheless, he believed in the right of the people to publicly contradict and ultimately change the government according to their needs. Lincoln maintained that whenever a people should grow weary of its government, it could exercise its constitutional right of amending it, or its revolutionary right of dismembering or overthrowing it.73
When discussing Ralph Waldo Emerson (1803-1882) and his contribution to Libertarian thought, Rocker concluded that he too was hostile to the state. In Emerson's eyes, the state and the law were always antithetical to liberty. "Every actual state is corrupt," stated Emerson. "Good men must not obey the laws too well." The state, according to Emerson, was a poor substitute to self rule, but one that was nevertheless necessary at least temporarily, until such time that education and individual development would produce the "wise man," who would be able to rule himself. Rocker emphasized Emerson's uncompromising individualism more than any other component in his philosophy. In particular, Rocker valued Emerson's enmity towards those types of government which require conformity and forfeiture of individual autonomy. "Wild liberty develops iron conscience. Want of liberty by strengthening law and decorum stupefies conscience." Moreover, Emerson believed that the tendencies of his times favored the idea of self-government and that each individual should be left to the rewards and penalties of his or her own constitution, without interference from the state.

Henry David Thoreau (1817-1862) was probably the most consummate, and undoubtedly the most adroit advocate of personal freedom in the broadest possible sense of the word. For him, as for Rocker, political freedom had no existence on its own, but was one of the many epiphenomena derived from a more deeper moral aptitude, the "freedom to be free." In his influential essay On the Duty of Civil Disobedience (1849), Thoreau preached passive as well as active resistance to authority. In the opening lines of his thesis, Thoreau
rejected the necessity for any form of government to exist at all. Thus, he brought Jefferson's maxim on "that government is best which governs least" to its logical conclusion, and stated "that government is best which governs not at all". Moreover, according to Thoreau, "government is at best but an expedient; but most governments are usually, and all governments are sometimes, inexpedient." Even this limited task of governments, however, was ridiculed by Thoreau, when he declared that governments had never furthered any human enterprise "but by the alacrity with which it got out of its way." On practical lines, however, Thoreau did not preach the immediate abolition of government. Instead, he wished that each man decide on a better form of government that would suit his needs, an action which, according to Thoreau, would mean one step toward obtaining it. If Thoreau's vision did not entail the abolition of the state, it did seek the substitution of one "which can afford to be just to all men, and to treat the individual with respect as a neighbor." Like the anarchists, Thoreau recognized that the voluntary association of men was the foundation of every social structure. Yet, he distrusted all collective actions, even collective protests against the existent social order. True to the purity of individualism, Thoreau believed that one's conscience should be the only guide to one's behavior, regardless of law, tradition or considerations of majority rule. A person's conscience is the ultimate judge of this person's actions. The laws of the government were for Thoreau morally irrelevant. Thoreau's individualism received an enormous practical impetus by the ideas and actions of his contemporary, Josiah Warren
(1798?-1874). Warren, an inventor, thinker and social experimentalist, is considered by many to be the first American anarchist. His main philosophical thrust is advocating the primacy of individual authority over that of the people. "Everyone must feel that he is the supreme arbiter of his own, that no power on earth shall rise over him, that he is and always shall be the sovereign of himself and all relating to his individuality." The mere idea that an individual should adjust to society was absurd, according to Warren. On the contrary, society should adjust itself to the needs of the individual. Warren, a somewhat neglected originator of social ideas, preceded both Proudhon and Marx in proposing the reductionist view, nowadays associated with Marxism, whereby social relations are but an economic exchange of products of man's labor. As a result of this perception, Warren created a theory of value according to which the price of a commodity should be determined not by its usefulness or ubiquity, but by the amount of labor and time required for its production. Moreover, Warren was one of a rare breed of thinkers who not only penned his ideas on paper, but also tried them experimentally. A former member of Owen's New Harmony in Indiana, Warren founded a so-called "time store" in Cincinnati in 1827. In this store all goods were purchased or sold at the exact cost price, which in turn was determined in time units. The time required for the production was marked on each item in the store, and the customers paid with "labor notes," again calibrated against working hours. The "time store" had lasted for three years, after which Warren became convinced that the ideas could be put to practical use. Consequently, he moved on in pursuit of other goals. In 1834,
Warren founded the Village of Equity in Ohio, where he and about a
dozen families operated a cooperative sawmill on a labor-for-labor
exchange basis. The village, which was run by mutual agreements, is
considered the first ever anarchist community. In 1846, Warren founded
yet another colony, Utopia, which was also run according to his ideas
on labor exchange, individualism, and mutual agreements.

In *Pioneers in American Freedom* Rocker sought to deal with
as many personalities and ideas as possible. The result is unavoidably
laconic and superficial. On the other hand, the book achieves quite a
wide coverage of the roots of anti-statism in the United States, even
if Rocker tended from time to time to overestimate the extent,
commitment and following of American libertarianism. Most American
libertarians did not intend to abolish the state, instead they
advocated some form or another of change in the geographical
distribution of power, mainly in the direction of more power to the
individual states and less to the central government. Rocker, in his
overzealousness to unearth the American roots of anarchism, tended to
overlook such crucial details. In particular, Rocker's interpretation
of Paine, Jefferson, Emerson and Lincoln is extremely loose,
attributing to these individuals intentions they in fact did not hold.
Somehow, Rocker managed to transform traditional American
individualism and democratic philosophies into precursors of
libertarianism. Lincoln's case is particularly illuminating since,
Lincoln's centralist practices were disregarded by Rocker, while at
the same time several widely separated statements by Lincoln that
could be interpreted as anti-statist were given undue prominence.
Regardless of his zealosity in uncovering much too many libertarian seeds throughout the intellectual history of the United States, Rocker did manage to compile quite a respectable list of ideas in the writings of American thinkers, most notably in those by Thoreau, Warren and Lysander Spooner, to impress upon the reader the parallels between American individualist philosophies and the basic tenets of anarchism. In dealing with these writers, Rocker succeeded in proving the main thesis of his book, that anarchism was not a foreign idea in America that had been imported from Europe, but that as an undercurrent it runs deep throughout America’s intellectual history.

After the end of World War II, Rocker renewed his correspondence with anarchists all over Europe. Most of his old friends were already dead. Alexander Berkman committed suicide in France in 1936, and Emma Goldman died in Canada in 1940. Max Nettlau died in Amsterdam in 1944, and Alexander Schapiro in 1946 in New York. Wilhelm Werner died shortly before the start of World War II, and Fritz Kater immediately in its aftermath. In Germany, many of Rocker’s comrades had died in concentration camps, and those who survived the war were plagued by day-to-day hardships, especially hunger. Rocker decided that the best he could do was to appeal to his American friends to help ease the plight of the German comrades. In a letter published in the Freie Arbeiter Stimme, Rocker begged the American anarchist movement to help the Germans, many of whom had been active against Hitler’s regime and spent many years in Nazi concentration camps. For this purpose, Rocker enlisted the help of Boris Yelensky, who at the time served as secretary of the Anarchist Red Cross, to
head the salvation project. Yelensky received from Rocker lists of addresses of people who wrote Rocker asking for help. Yelensky in turn organized the transport of food and clothing packages to Germany and other European countries. Rocker estimated that 90% of the salvation aid was received from the Jewish movement in the United States, their contribution in food and other commodities amounting to more than 100,000 dollars. This episode aptly demonstrates that through the years Rocker had achieved a remarkable standing among the anarchists. It was natural for anarchists all over Europe to appeal to Rocker in their hour of need, despite his lack of official function. He was again the "Rabbi" as he had been in his London years.

The remnants of the anarchist movement in Germany were not only suffering from material want, but were also in urgent need of spiritual guidance and orientation concerning the future of the movement. Following a request from Helmut Rüdiger and a number of other friends to write down a prospectus for the anarchist movement in Germany, Rocker wrote his last major pamphlet Zur Betrachtung der Lage in Deutschland. The work was published in 1947 by a Swedish anarchist group based in Stockholm. In the pamphlet, Rocker focused on two main problems. The first concerned the future of libertarianism in Germany, in particular, whether or not there was a need for a separate anarchist movement. The second problem dealt with the more general issue of the building of a new society in post-war Europe, with special emphasis on Germany. Along which political, economic and social premises should these new societies be built.

As to the first problem, Rocker argued that reviving the
anarcho-syndicalist movement in its pre-war organizational lines was both impractical and undesirable. The old F.A.U.D. disintegrated completely during the Nazi era, and Rocker doubted the sensibility of reviving it as an independent entity. The F.A.U.D., admitted Rocker, failed in achieving its main goal, capturing the attention of the millions of Germans belonging to the socialist unions, even at the peak of its power, during the first years of the Weimar Republic. Even then, the F.A.U.D. was but a minority in comparison with the other left-wing parties, which although larger, also failed in impeding Hitler's ascent to power. Nevertheless, Rocker objected strongly to the alternative chosen by many German anarchists, who in their search for novel means of becoming politically active again, decided to join either the Social Democratic Party or the Communists. Both parties, claimed Rocker, exhibited no real political rejuvenation, but were merely proceeding with their old methods of party bureaucracy, centralism and authoritarian philosophy as if nothing had happened since they last had a voice in German politics.

According to Rocker, the anarchists do need a movement of their own, so as to be able to spread their ideals and beliefs. But such a movement could no longer be an isolated, purist sect as it had been prior to World War II. Instead, Rocker suggested establishing a broad coalition of similarly minded individuals, a union of "Freiheitlicher Föderalisten," who would carry the basic message of libertarianism to as many people as possible. According to Rocker's vision, such an organization should be similar to the Russian Federalist League in the days following the October Revolution. The
main goal of the Federalist League, in which Kropotkin was a member, had been to encourage various communities throughout Russia to attempt their own industrial and agricultural recovery without receiving aid from the central authorities. In addition to decentralist aspects, Rocker's suggestion contained a new element, that had never before been favored by him. For the first time, Rocker seemed to have abandoned his populist propensities in favor of an elitist system. His model of emulation was Bakunin's "revolutionary elite." In the union of "Freiheitlicher Föderalisten" Rocker proposed the creation of an ideological elite, a sort of spiritual vanguard of libertarians. In a sense, Rocker's pamphlet contains the concept of leadership. Rocker's recommendations were a revision not only of his own beliefs, but also of some of the traditional anarchist concepts. In post-war Germany, the circumstances were such, according to Rocker, that anarchists could no longer operate in isolation, but had to cooperate with other movements at any given opportunity. The new circumstances cried for new methods. Alliances with other branches of the working movement were not only desirable but imperative, and the claim that all compromises are errors was wrong. Life itself is but a compromise with circumstances.86

Rocker was afraid that the German working movement, which already missed its biggest opportunity to change the social structure of Germany after World War I, was about to forfeit its second chance by succumbing to old tactics and repeating its errors. Therefore, according to Rocker, the anarchist had to take an active part in the practical facets of rebuilding. The anarchists should partake in the
administration of communities, regardless of their intuitive dislike of organizations. In these communities the anarchists would be able to put into practice their ideas of libertarian and federative socialism. Rocker replaced his previous notion of syndicalist communism with "community socialism," although nowhere in the pamphlet are there any details on what these communities might be. There are absolutely no clues as to whether these communities are agricultural or industrial, or are these entities based on professional divisions or geographical ones, i.e., existing municipalities. Rocker is also extremely vague concerning the role of the anarchists in these communities, and more importantly, the extent of the cooperation between the anarchists and non-socialist parties is not delineated besides specifying that a cooperation should indeed exist.

Notwithstanding the ambiguity in detail, Rocker envisioned a federation of free communities throughout Germany, eventually becoming part of a federated Europe, which in turn would become part of a federated world.

It seems that Rocker's grand scheme for a federated Europe and a federated world involved the abandonment of basic anarchist principles. Understandably, few anarchists sided with him. The reactions to Zur Betrachtung der Lage in Deutschland were mixed. Helmut Rüdiger and other of Rocker's disciples in Germany decided to accept his recommendations. The "Föderation Freiheitlicher Sozialisten Deutschland" was founded in Darmstadt in 1947, its declaration of principles essentially following Rocker's chart. The group produced a typewritten newspaper, Die Internationale, which appeared until 1949.
In November 1949, the Föderation started a monthly publication, Die Freie Gesellschaft. Not all anarchists, however, accepted Rocker's positions without criticism. Some, like his old foe, Rudolf Oestreich, regarded the suggestions as revisionist in content and certainly inapplicable to the prevailing political situation in Germany. A certain John Olday wrote in Freedom that Rocker's advice to work within the communities amounted to an attempt to harness the German anarchists to the wagon of military service. Rocker's ideas, he claimed, were opportunist and constituted a revision of classical anarchist tactics. 89

A few years later, Rocker found himself in the midst of a new controversy within the ranks of the anarchists very similar to the one which had started with the publication of Zur Betrachtung der Lage in Deutschland. In 1952, Rocker wrote an article in the Freie Arbeiter Stimme, in which he dismissed the idea that anarchism was in any way endangered or thrown into ideological turmoil by the mere consideration of ideological changes. Crises do not occur only because old principles are replaced by new ones. On the contrary, a vital political movement should constantly rethink its principles and consider new options. A political movement must develop and change through the incorporation of new ideas, claimed Rocker, otherwise it was bound to degenerate into spiritual stagnation and ideological doctrinairism. 90 Absolute truth does not exist, added Rocker, but when people start believing that it does, the road is opened to despotism of thought, and from there to despotism of action. 91 The ideas of anarchism should not be regarded as immutable dogmas; rather the
continuous development of anarchist thought required a constant revision of its concepts and tactics. All the spiritual leaders of the anarchist movement, including Bakunin and Kropotkin, revised their attitudes whenever new developments created the need for such a revision. Rocker, in particular took offense of the practice started by the Social Democrats and later adopted by some anarchists, of branding all who dared express a different opinion as "revisionists." "I think the worst evil in our present movement is the intolerance against any independent thinking," wrote Rocker to Yelensky in 1951. Every thinking person is in fact a revisionist, because he understands that it is impossible for human thought to be fixed.

In the last years of his life, Rocker continued to be active, despite the fact that his advanced age impaired his physical faculties. His hearing and eyesight deteriorated considerably towards the end, and he needed electrical light to be able to read and write even during daytime. His main activities during his last years were writing articles for anarchist newspapers and maintaining a worldwide correspondence with fellow comrades. The volume of his correspondence had been so large, in fact, that Rocker had to dedicate a whole day each week for letters alone. In addition, he supervised over the publication of his memoirs, first in Spanish, then in Yiddish, and also the publication of an abridged version in English.

Little of what Rocker wrote during this period concerns ideology or polemics. Considering Rocker's age and the age of his acquaintances, many of his articles in this period are obituaries. The death of close personal friends and family members was in particular
painful. His elder son, Rudolf, died in London in 1948 following a stomach surgery. A year later, his brother in law, Morris Pokrass, with whom Rudolf and Milly Rocker used to spend long periods of time in Towanda, passed away. In 1954, Helmut Rüdiger informed Rocker about the death of his younger brother, Fritz. But the biggest blow of all, was the death of Milly, his companion for more than half a century, on November 23, 1955. "I lived with her for fifty eight years. We knew bitter privations and experienced many hardships, but none of them could destroy our quiet happiness. There was something in our life that can hardly be described, a hidden temple which we alone could enter." "It was inevitable that some day the hour should come when one of us would have to go. But this is sober logic which cannot lessen the pain of the bereaved. I only know that, with this wonderful woman, something was taken from me that no eternity can bring back." Rocker accepted the inevitable blows with dignity, without bitterness. "Any decent person, man or woman, should take his or her lot with dignity and without useless lamentations." After Milly's death, Rocker spent more and more time, especially in the winter, with his son Fermin and his family in New York, where he especially enjoyed the company of his young grandchild, Philip.

Rudolf Rocker died on September 10, 1958, at the age of 85.
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CONCLUSION

Rudolf Rocker's life reflects with amazing accuracy the development of the anarchist movement and its various nuances. He witnessed anarchism at its height, but he also saw its decline and ultimate disintegration. During his long years of activity within the ranks of the anarchist movement, Rocker took part in most of the major stages in its history. He took part in the formation of the anarchist movement in Germany after the Bismarckian anti-socialist laws were abolished. He shared in the notoriety of the "Propaganda by Deed" era while in exile in France. He led the immigrants in London's East End in their attempt to fight the "sweating system," and was among the founders of the anarcho-syndicalist trend in Germany during the Weimar Republic. Rudolf Rocker grew with the anarchist movement, matured as it matured, aged as it aged, shared its few ups and many downs, and finally died as anarchism everywhere was rapidly becoming a historical anachronism.

In 1891, Rocker left the German Social Democratic Party, and joined the ranks of the yet insignificant and disunited German anarchists. He was one of the first political activists to become deeply disappointed with the dogmatism and nationalist militancy of the German Socialists, and in a sense signaled the trend many would follow, albeit much later and in different directions. Much like the movement he joined, Rocker took his first steps in the arena of social activity, trying to sort out his principles and to chose among
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alternatives the ones that best suited his personality and innate beliefs.

Rocker lived in Paris during the heydays of anarchist terrorism there. He never took part in the atrocities committed under the banner of anarchism, but he did adopt theoretical positions that can be viewed as sympathetic to "Propaganda by Deed." He participated in many discussions on the morality of violence, its legitimacy and efficacy in achieving social change. Rocker's positions were a compromise between extremist views regarding terror as an efficient weapon for creating the right atmosphere for the social revolution and the views of moderates who abhorred all forms of violence. Although Rocker defended his sympathetic positions towards violent means by rationalizing that terror was an act of despair by people who could no longer bear the personal burden of the unjust social system, his philosophical compromise can also be viewed as a reflection of an inner struggle between two sides of his personality, a juvenile enthusiasm for action and the more mature rationality of a social thinker. The social thinker in Rocker eventually overpowered his youthful infatuations. Rocker abandoned his support for "Propaganda by Deed" after a very brief period and chose, together with the vast majority of anarchists, to continue the struggle by more peaceful means.

Rocker spent the two decades preceding World War I in London among the Jewish anarchists of the East End. During this period both Rocker and the anarchist movement peaked. It is during this period that Rudolf Rocker's greatness emerged. A gentile knowing nothing
about Jewish history, tradition and language, and an outsider who did not share in the Jewish anxieties and hopes, Rocker soon emerged as the soul of the Jewish anarchist movement, its spiritual teacher, and a subject of admiration and imitation. A contemporary of Rocker, when recalling the London years, portrayed Rocker as a rare breed of philosopher, one that not only preaches but also obeys his own dicta, "a good Rabbi, a man that not only talks but also acts according to his beliefs." If there was ever a group of people on whom Rocker left his mark, it was the Jewish immigrants in the East End of London. Rocker managed to built a well organized anarchist group which was both unified and dedicated to the cause as well as to Rocker himself. For these immigrants, Rocker transformed anarchism into a meaningful, all engulfing, and above all practical way of life, instead of a remote ideology preached to the masses by detached intellectuals. Rocker's success is evident in his far reaching influence over these people, and the fact that they continued to adhere to anarchism even after arriving to their ultimate destinations, mainly the United States and South America. In their new countries they continued to take part in mutual aid organizations and political groupings, just as they were taught by Rocker in London. It is illuminating to see that even today, the only remaining anarchist publication in Yiddish, Problemen, is supported by small donations from Canada, United States and Argentina.

The specific conditions which prevailed in the East End enabled Rocker for the first time to put anarchist principles to the test. His application of anarchist principles was by no means
restricted to strike tactics and timing of industrial action. He applied Francisco Ferrer's system of free schools in his attempt to educate the Jewish immigrants, and tried Kropotkin's method of mutual aid in fighting strike hardships. The mutual aid network proved especially successful during the strikes of 1912. The ultimate aim of the "big tailors' strike" in 1912, headed by Rocker and the Arbeter Freint group, was irreversibly to alter the inhuman sweating system. Its immediate aims, however, were more limited: to improve wages and working conditions and to unionize the sector. But for Rocker, as for others in the anarchist movement, the strike was much more than simply a response to intolerable conditions. The use of industrial action showed clearly that by 1912 Rocker had already abandoned his belief in the exclusiveness of the all encompassing social revolution, a notion to which communists as well as many within the anarchist movement still adhered. In Rocker's political perception, more and more emphasis was placed on gradualist means, whereby a series of small local accomplishments eventually sum up to major sociopolitical changes. The labor struggles in London's East End introduced Rocker and the anarchist movement to the practical possibilities of Anarcho-syndicalism.

After Rocker's return to Germany in 1918, he became an eminent figure in the German libertarian movement. Despite the fact that he never occupied an official position, Rocker was regarded by his peers as the leader and theorist of German Anarcho-syndicalism. All agreed Rocker was the one to write the declaration of principles for the "Freie Arbeiter Union Deutschlands" (FAUD), and likewise he
was the man, to whom the remains of the anarchist movement in post-
Hitler Germany turned to for advice and guidance concerning future
activity and organization. Rocker's leadership role within the
Anarcho-syndicalist movement was not confined to its German branch.
After organizing the Anarcho-syndicalist International and attempting
to challenge the hegemony of the Communists in the worker's
organizations, he became known literally around the world. It was in
his synthesis of anarchism and syndicalism, and the development of
anarcho-syndicalism, that Rocker made his greatest contribution to the
development of the workers' ideology. His importance lies in combining
the theoretical aspects of anarchism with the practical tactics of
syndicalism. Rocker provided syndicalism with a theoretical foundation
which it previously lacked, and without which it was incomplete.

The mature Rocker witnessed two world wars, both of which
disrupted the unity of the international anarchist community, and
shattered both its physical existence and ideological legitimacy.
Interestingly, Rocker found himself in each war in a different
ideological camp. During World War I Rocker vehemently opposed the
positions of his revered teacher, Peter Kropotkin. In opposition to
Kropotkin's views that the anarchists should support France, the
cradle of revolution, against Germany, the bastion of reaction, Rocker
and the majority of anarchists preached a neutral position,
maintaining that both fighting camps were equally culpable, and that
the anarchists should not, in principle, be part of any war. Twenty
years later, during World War II, the situation reversed. This time it
was Rocker in the minority, when he abandoned his life long pacifism
and adopted Kropotkin's arguments in preaching the need to fight Nazi Germany.

Despite the fact that Rocker witnessed the accelerated disintegration of the anarchist movement, he retained an optimistic outlook to the end of his life. He never lost his faith in the validity of anarchist ideas, nor in the power of these ideas to influence the world. It never occurred to him that his life work might have been in vain. Even in the aftermath of World War II, when it was evident that the anarchist movement was on its way to become a chapter in the history books, Rocker did not despair. Knowing that no social movement would be able to work by itself, he proposed to cooperate with other left wing organizations to achieve essentially libertarian goals. Rocker's optimism may have been based on the conscious or instinctive realization that although the international anarchist movement had been politically inconsequential, many of its truths became, even in Rocker's time, pillars of mainstream politics.

Nowhere is Rocker's optimism more evident than in the final section of his utopian work, The Six. There, at the feet of the Sphinx, the six wanderers awake from their sleep, discuss their antagonisms and manage to reach a modus vivendi through mutual understanding. As a consequence the Sphinx crumbles, and a new bright world dawns. In his romantic, almost religious, metaphor of death and resurrection, Rocker, the atheist, conveys his deeply held populist convictions on that the choices lie in the hands of the people, and that they, the people, can shape their own future regardless of outside religious or secular intervention. Rocker had an almost blind
faith in the masses and in their capability to liberate themselves and establish a new social order. He resented the Bolshevik paternalistic recipe of an intellectual, elitist leadership guiding the masses towards the social revolution. He never accepted Alexander Herzen's sociological analysis that the masses "are indifferent to individual freedom," and that "to govern themselves, does not enter their heads." Furthermore, at no time did Rocker despair of the masses as Emma Goldman did after Hitler's ascendance to power in Germany. The masses, she wrote to Rocker, "hug their chains, the deeper it eats into their flesh, the better they admire their masters." Without sharing the same messianic beliefs, Rocker followed in the steps of the Russian populists, who kept repeating that ends were chosen by men, not imposed on them. Rocker believed that man's will alone could build a happy and honorable life, and that the masses could and should be allowed to decide on their own in matters of their future. Rocker's populism infused his articles and brochures, many of which he wrote for popular consumption. These were not works of propaganda in the usual sense, in which a superior explains to his inferiors the means and ends of political activity. Instead, these were candid attempts to clarify anarchist principles to readers who might not have benefited from proper education. His use of simple terminology and colloquial language only made the works humane and accessible, not trivialized and condescending. Rocker's importance in the history of anarchism can be measured by his success as educator and propagator of anarchist ideas among the masses. Rocker's articles and brochures enjoyed a large audience, and his works were translated into many
languages, including Swedish, Chinese, Dutch and Japanese.

In his last years, Rocker was regarded as the uncrowned leader of the anarchist movement, inheriting a "position" that was vacant since Kropotkin's death. Among the dwindling community of anarchists, Rocker was considered the last Mahican, someone whose life embodied the ideas and spirit of anarchism. In a world that was rapidly running out of causes to fight for, Rocker was one of the lucky ones who dedicated a life-time to fighting for a worthwhile cause. He probably considered himself lucky too, for in the end he withstood the final test, when declaring that given a second chance, he would have lived his life the same way as the first time around. 5

In the final analysis, even if anarchism did not bring the socialist millennium, Rocker's was not a wasted life. He was a mirror to a century that publicly shunned his ideas, but which brought on itself unimaginable catastrophes by following opposite ideologies. Today, Rocker's gospel of personal freedom and social justice sounds tame and moderate, perhaps because pioneers of social change, like Rocker and his friends in the anarchist movement, stubbornly dedicated their lives to spreading its message.
NOTES
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