



CHICAGO JOURNALS

The Anarchists and Education in Spain, 1868-1909

Author(s): Carolyn P. Boyd

Source: *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 48, No. 4, On Demand Supplement (Dec., 1976), pp. 125-170

Published by: [The University of Chicago Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1877306>

Accessed: 12/10/2014 11:55

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Modern History*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

The Anarchists and Education in Spain, 1868-1909*

Carolyn P. Boyd

University of Texas at Austin

In order to explain the enduring commitment to anarchism among the Spanish working classes well into the twentieth century, most historians have emphasized the structural, political, or cultural factors that, taken together, sustained the credibility of anarchism, as a social theory, in Spain long after it had become an anachronism in the more advanced industrial nations of Western Europe.¹ What has perhaps received less attention in accounting for the success of Spanish anarchism is the way in which the anarchists' revolutionary model suggested activities and programs that responded to the real or perceived needs of Spanish workers. Among the most critical, and at the same time, the least studied of these activities was the education of workers, an undertaking that was as politically effective as it was theoretically imperative.² Significantly, it was when the anarchists strayed furthest from their own theory and from the interests of the working class, that they compromised both their integrity and their popularity in Spain.

Anarchist Theory and Education

In the first instance, the anarchists' emphasis on education sprang from theoretical necessities independent of the availability or quality of public instruction. Some of these theoretical imperatives were basic to the central premises of anarchism; others emerged out of changing historical circumstances that forced anarchists to reformulate their theory of revolution. Thus, while doctrinal preoccupation with education as the revolutionary instrument par excellence remained constant, between 1868 and 1909 its intensity varied inversely with the strength of anarchist expectations of a more immediate overthrow of the existing social order.

At its most elementary level, the anarchist demand for educational reform was a cry against privilege. The restriction of education to those who could pay for it outraged democratic principles, a sentiment generally shared by political and social reformers in the nineteenth century. Like their contemporaries, the anarchists venerated education, especially scientific education, which promised to accelerate the forward progress of mankind. For these self-educated men, whose familiarity with the doctrines of Darwin, Spencer, and Lyell generally had been acquired through popularizations in the libertarian press, science and reason held the key to happiness, to dignity, to liberation--in a word, to revolution. "Do you want to be happy? Do you want to be free?... Do you want to be men?" wrote one contributor to the anarchist weekly La Solidaridad in

1870. "Then perfect your reason, refine in your brain elevated and civilizing modern ideas, ENLIGHTEN YOURSELVES, and you will have solved the problem...."³

Middle-class reformers would have settled for the democratization of educational opportunity, i.e., free (and generally, compulsory) public instruction for the working class. But for anarchists, free, compulsory State education was a remedy worse than the disease, since the State would transmit bourgeois values to the workers, thus delaying the birth of a revolutionary mentality. If public instruction had been extended to the working class elsewhere in Europe, it was only because of the need for "more perfect instruments of labor" in industry.⁴ Workers might be less ignorant as a result, but they were no less docile. Furthermore, official education was irretrievably elitist, fostering intellectual inequalities that were almost always "fictional, the historic products of an organization as false as it is wicked."⁵ The result was an unnatural and invidious dichotomy between intellectual and manual labor.

In addition, for libertarians compulsory education represented an unjustified intrusion of the State into the lives of individuals, who, if given the means to do so, would cooperatively and voluntarily educate themselves. In this respect, the anarchists differed from the socialists, who promoted whenever possible the extension of free public instruction. The socialists planned to take over the State, including its educational system; the anarchists insisted on the destruction of both.⁶

Anarchists were also committed to educational reform because they were necessarily behaviorists; behaviorism was their defense against charges that man was not intrinsically good enough to live in a society without constraints. By providing a degree of individual enlightenment sufficient to insure that men would act in their own best interest, education made plausible the successful realization of a totally free, totally cooperative society. This was a frankly instrumentalist view: education was the means to a revolutionary end.

This attitude, however, contained a contradiction that was never squarely faced. Like Marxism, anarchism claimed to be scientifically, or "objectively," derived, making the dissemination of knowledge the quintessential revolutionary act. In the words of Anselmo Lorenzo, the leading anarchist militant of his day, "Positivism and socialism are twin brothers...."⁷ But this view of "science" as an objective tool of analysis was at odds with the materialism that engendered a relativistic approach to all truth, scientific or otherwise. Knowledge in a social or moral vacuum had no meaning for anarchists; there was "bourgeois science and worker science."⁸ If this conclusion was reinforced by the example of confessional State education in nineteenth-century Spain, it did not bring any closer to resolution the anomaly of tential education in a theoretically libertarian society. Fortunately for their revolutionary vigor, the anarchists themselves perceived no conflict; for them, scientific truth and its revolutionary interpretation were the same thing. The unresolved contradiction, however, would ultimately undermine the

integrity of the anarchists' first major experiment with libertarian education as collaborators in the Modern School of Francisco Ferrer.

One reason the contradiction persisted was the endemic anti-intellectualism of the Spanish anarchists, mostly self-educated workers who were inveterately suspicious of anyone who did not work with his hands. Even as they stressed the importance of education, the theorists asserted that future society would have "fewer universities and more useful and profitable instruction."⁹ Although the anarchist press attracted intellectuals to the movement in the 1890s, most anarchists remained uneasy about the revolutionary potential of those who had developed their intellect to the neglect of their body.

Do you see that man of pure heart, clear intelligence, firm will and slender body? That man is educated. Do you see that other man, who reads like lightning, writes as if his hand were driven by a powerful machine, whose handwriting is neat and elegant? Be careful: he is a man of cold heart, insensitive to the sorrow of others, inconsequential. He is content with futile things, and has, apparently, a well-developed intelligence. That man is well instructed.¹⁰

To resolve the tension, anarchist theorists (many of whom were middle-class intellectuals) distinguished between instruction--the acquisition of knowledge or skills in a social vacuum--and education--the development of the body, mind, and personality in preparation for life. The instructed man was potentially reactionary; on the virtue and will of the educated man depended the ultimate success of anarchist society.

The favorite phrase of the anarchists to describe the ideal form of education was "integrated education," a term originated by Charles Fourier and transmitted to the Spanish working classes through the writings

of Pierre Joseph Proudhon and his Spanish interpreter, Francisco Pi y Margall.¹¹ Like Fourier (and like the anarchists after him), Proudhon reacted viscerally to the social dislocation that accompanied the nascent industrial revolution in France. Disturbed by the alienation of the factory worker from the product of his labor, Proudhon wanted to involve the worker in the total industrial process, "integrating" theory and practice to make each worker the equal in wisdom and skill of every other. His goal was not so much the spiritual liberation of the individual personality as the elimination of class differences based on gratuitous distinctions between manual and intellectual labor. In a just society, all men would be equally productive, equally independent, and yet equally integrated into the social fabric.¹²

More directly influential for Spanish anarchism was Michail Bakunin, the founder of modern anarchism, who had incorporated the concept of integrated education into the program of his International Alliance of Social Democracy.¹³ Like Proudhon, Bakunin advocated the education of the whole man. But Bakunin, who was temperamentally as well as in some ways philosophically the antithesis of Proudhon, argued that education must also liberate the individual personality of the child and encourage him to follow his vocation; in a truly anarchist society, free men were as essential as productive ones. Bakunin was also the first to identify the revolutionary potential of scientific knowledge. Yet in practice, Bakunin showed scant evidence of faith in the revolutionary impact of education. He devoted little time to the elaboration of his theory, and

even less to popular education. Instead he stressed repeatedly that the revolution must come first. "Improve working conditions, render to labor what is justly due to labor, and thereby give the people security, comfort, and leisure. Then believe me, they will educate themselves...."¹⁴

Like Bakunin, most Spanish anarchists in the 1870s and 1880s were less preoccupied with the exact configuration of society after the revolution than with the revolution itself. In the optimistic early years of the movement, the day of destruction seemed imminent; the most pressing tasks were those which brought that day to fruition. More energy was spent debating tactical and doctrinal differences than on refining the blueprint for the society of the future. To be sure, the proposal for integrated education was adopted along with the rest of Bakunin's revolutionary ideology by the embryonic Spanish sections of the First International at the general congress of Barcelona in June 1870,¹⁵ and was invoked ritualistically in manifestos and accords thereafter. At the Second Workers' Congress of the Spanish Region, held in Saragossa in April 1872, the delegates approved a rather detailed proposal for integrated education submitted by Trinidad Soriano, a mathematics professor from Seville.¹⁶ The "intellectual part, properly speaking" of the proposal was scientific education, considerately described by Soriano for the benefit of his working-class audience. Theoretical mastery of all the natural sciences was to be followed by technical training in one area chosen by the student. Thus, Soriano gave practical expression

to two essential points of Bakunin's doctrine: individual vocation and the integration of theory and practice.

But the delegates at Saragossa approved Soriano's proposal only after attaching the caveat that the elaboration of new institutions belonged by right to society after the revolution.¹⁷ These libertarian sentiments were reinforced by the hardheaded recognition that the implementation of integrated education was impossible, at least on a scale large enough to make a difference, until society was reordered. Most anarchists agreed with Anselmo Lorenzo that "the instruction that is called for as a condition [of the revolution] should be an effect rather than a cause."¹⁸ As the moderate José Llunas argued in 1882, "All progress has first been a conspiracy and has not been realized without producing violent and more or less bloody conflicts with the legitimate government."¹⁹

It was not until a number of these "more or less bloody" conflicts had provoked an equal number of harsh retaliations from the State that the anarchists began to take a harder look at the revolutionary possibilities of education. By then, the topic had been fully explored by Peter Kropotkin, the third of the great anarchist theorists.²⁰ Like the movement itself, Kropotkin had devoted his energies to revolutionary agitation and conspiracy in the 1870s, anticipating the momentary collapse of the capitalist order. After a decade of repeated failure and imprisonment, however, Kropotkin began to develop an evolutionary theory of revolution and to meditate on the future organization of society.

Predictably, Kropotkin's attempt to describe a communistic, decentralized, yet plausible social organization led him directly to the problem of education.

Kropotkin argued that in nature, living creatures survived and progressed through mutual aid, an instinctual tendency that had been warped or buried in men by superstition and tyranny. The revolutionary role of the school was therefore to eliminate superstition and to cultivate in the child the spontaneous, natural morality of the free man. Once this had been achieved, evolution toward a more cooperative society was inevitable, making revolutionary agitation pointless, if not counterproductive. Everything pointed to a redirection of energies away from the terrorism that fascinated anarchists in the 1880s and 1890s and toward the construction of an alternative educational system.

The system that Kropotkin proposed resembled integrated education as described by Proudhon and Bakunin, with special emphasis on the development and inviolability of the individual personality. The task of the schools was clear:

...the formation of the moral being, the active individual, full of initiative, enterprising, brave, free from the timidity of thought that characterizes the educated man in our day--and at the same time, sociable, egalitarian, with communistic instincts, and capable of sensing his unity with all men in the entire universe, and thus, divested of the religious, strictly individualistic, and authoritarian preoccupations that the schools today instill in us.²¹

In the 1880s, however, Spanish anarchists remained generally ignorant of Kropotkin's insistence on a change in revolutionary tactics.²²

Although there were isolated experiments with integrated education²³ and the desire for self-improvement persisted, most anarchists still pinned their revolutionary hopes on direct action of a more or less violent nature. Their educational activities in this period were confined primarily to the extension of basic literacy.

Primary Education in Spain

In large measure, this emphasis on primary instruction reflected the anarchist sensitivity to the needs of the Spanish people. In 1877, 72 percent of the Spanish population was classified as illiterate; over thirty years later, in 1910, the fraction of illiterates still totaled over 59 percent, or 50 percent of the population over ten years of age.²⁴ Illiteracy rates were not uniform throughout the country; in 1910, they ranged from a low of 38 percent in the northern Basque provinces to 72 percent in the latifundia provinces of Andalusia. But rural-urban differences were not as great as might have been predicted; in 1910, nearly 50 percent of the population in cities over 100,000 could neither read nor write. In Western Europe, only Italy and Portugal shared such dismal statistics.²⁵

The appalling illiteracy rate could be directly traced to a lack of public schools, although the blueprint for a comprehensive system of public education had existed since the Ley Moyano of September 9, 1857, which established the principle of State responsibility for--and thus, control of--education. In practice, however, the State preferred the

control to the responsibility. The central government assumed only the limited financial burden of higher education, while secondary and primary education were entrusted to provincial and municipal government. Free compulsory instruction was guaranteed to all Spaniards until age nine; each town of over 500 inhabitants was required to provide one primary school each for boys and girls, with one additional school for each sex for each increment of 2,000 people. Although financial responsibility for the educational system was decentralized and the Church was given the right of moral supervision, the general tenor of the Law of 1857 was centralist and regalist. The Ley Moyano was designed to keep education from falling under the complete control of the Church, the avowed enemy of the liberal State in the nineteenth century.

Whatever the intention, the outcome was disastrous. Once the initial enthusiasm and the extremely limited financial resources of the municipalities had been exhausted, construction of public elementary schools slowed to an average of 56 schools per year. In 1909, two-thirds of this country's school districts (about 30,000 towns) had no government school.²⁶ Predictably, many of these were in the rural areas of the South and the Central Meseta, the areas of highest illiteracy; in the north, a relatively high literacy rate reflected the greater concentration of municipal schools, and ultimately, the fiscal solvency of the Basque provinces. The direct correlation between literacy and the number of public schools only disappeared in the largest urban centers, where private schools partially compensated for the absence of public

institutions. Despite regional variations, in no part of Spain were there a sufficient number of school places. For this reason, no attempt was made to enforce obligatory attendance, which was low in any case because students were required to pay fees.²⁷ As a temporary measure, many larger municipalities subsidized private schools, including tuition-free classes for workers.²⁸

To compound the problem, the municipal schools were notoriously bad--dilapidated, poorly equipped, and overcrowded.²⁹ The lack of qualified teachers meant that municipalities had to certify anyone who would take the job,³⁰ and the salaries offered attracted few of talent or ability. Set by the State according to the size of the town, salaries began at the sub-subsistence level of 125 pesetas a year, rising in stages to a modest maximum of 3,000.³¹ In practice, the inducements to teach were even less attractive, for salaries were usually in arrears, the housing was disreputable, and teachers were inevitably subjected to the bullying of local caciques. Under these conditions, the public primary schools usually provided little more than the rudiments of reading, ciphering, and religion, with emphasis on the latter.

The public instruction law of 1857 thus created an educational vacuum, especially at the elementary level. The Church, which sponsored nearly 80 percent of all private instruction,³² quickly stepped into the breach. By 1900 there were 294 masculine and 910 feminine teaching communities in Spain,³³ and in many urban areas, Catholic schools outnumbered public ones.³⁴ Prestigious secondary education was provided for the

well-to-do, while an extensive network of charity schools in urban neighborhoods provided free instruction for workers and their children.

Alarmed by the secularization of European culture and by the rapid growth of anticlericalism among the Spanish masses, the Church intransigently defended Catholic instruction in the schools, both public and private. For the Liberals, the issue was not religious--most orthodox Liberals were good Catholics--but political: the Catholic clergy remained hostile to most of the freedoms basic to constitutional government. As the impulse to "Europeanize" the nation swept through Spain after the defeat of 1898, the political and moral orientation provided by the Catholic schools seemed the most serious obstacle to modernization, and more importantly, to the creation of civic consciousness and patriotism in the nation as a whole.

The battle between the Liberals and the Church for the control of education began in 1900, with the creation of the first Ministry of Public Instruction.³⁵ On October 26, 1901, the first Liberal Minister, the Count of Romanones, signed a decree relieving the municipalities of the financial responsibility for teachers' salaries;³⁶ the following year, another decree affirmed the State's right to inspect both private and public schools.³⁷ Somewhat surprisingly, in the struggle between the State and the Church over school accreditation, the anarchists allied themselves with the Catholic right. "Liberty must come first," insisted Federico Urales, the editor of the influential anarchist journal, La Revista Blanca, in the Ateneo of Madrid in 1904.³⁸ Better to undo the

work of the teacher at night in the home than to restrict in any way his freedom to teach. Any extension of the power of the State was pernicious, even when the intended victim was an enemy of the revolution. Furthermore, the inspection decrees threatened the autonomy not only of Catholic schools, but of anarchist ones as well.

Early Anarchist Education

Like the Catholics, the anarchists had responded to the indifference of the State by establishing their own schools for workers. It was a commonplace among educational reformers that workers would not send their children to school, nor attend themselves, until wages were higher and hours, shorter. Until then, fatigue, and the need to augment family incomes with child labor, would make compulsory education a mockery. But the apparent success of the anarchist schools and of other private centers for worker instruction indicates that these deterrents might be overcome. At these centers, workers and their children could escape the religious indoctrination that permeated both Catholic and official education, as well as the paternalism and condescension of the charitable institutions. Moreover, the early anarchist schools offered workers what they wanted and needed--basic literacy.

We know almost nothing about these schools, which in the 1870s and 1880s seem to have been primarily makeshift classes operating in urban workers' centers and rural villages. The traveling anarchist apostles who brought simple literature to avid potential readers met a

real need while recruiting support for the impending revolution. Their unsystematic approach was partly the consequence of frequent periods of underground activity and repression; partly the result of the libertarian aversion to bureaucratization of any kind. But the modest scope of these anarchist schools, which rarely attempted to implement a plan of integrated education, was determined by revolutionary theory as well as by financial and organizational constraints.³⁹ As long as the revolution seemed imminent, the anarchist school was perceived as a "nursery of revolutionaries" in a given locality rather than as the instrument by which the working class--and eventually, society as a whole--would be transformed.⁴⁰

Another reason for these limited goals was worker preference; ordinary workers never mustered as much enthusiasm as the theorists for integrated education. Instead, they favored practical instruction in reading, writing and arithmetic, and training in skills that might lead to social or economic advancement--mechanical drawing, bookkeeping or dressmaking. Even the occasional anarchist school that attempted to implement a program of integrated education stressed "instruction of immediate and general application."⁴¹ Extensive evidence of this preference could be found in the successful centers created by workers themselves or primarily for workers by the republicans, who retained the allegiance of the Spanish working classes for half a century. One of the earliest known schools of this type was founded in Madrid in 1851 by Antonio Ignacio Cervera, a journalist whose Escuela del Trabajador

eventually taught 1,500 working-class students.⁴² Another school, La Velada de Artistas, Artesanos, Jornaleros y Labradores, established by workers in 1847, added political and cultural activities in the 1860s, when it became known as the Fomento de las Artes. In 1861, workers' cooperatives in Barcelona founded a similar school and cultural center, the Ateneo de la Clase Obrera, which thrived and expanded past the turn of the century, when well over a thousand adults and children attended classes.⁴³ In 1904, nineteen centers in Catalonia offered courses in primary instruction, drawing, French, bookkeeping, dressmaking, piano, solfeggio, and gymnastics to both children and adults.⁴⁴ Dependent on subsidies from the city⁴⁵ and on contributions from middle-class patrons,⁴⁶ the Ateneo Obrero of Barcelona, like those that proliferated elsewhere in Spain, was steadfastly reformist and pragmatic in its orientation. Only slightly more radical in their politics, and equally pragmatic in their instruction, were the schools for workers in the Casas del Pueblo of the Radical Republicans of Alejandro Lerroux in Barcelona, which competed vigorously (and for a while, successfully) with the anarchists for the allegiance of Barcelona workers after 1900. Like the Ateneos Obreros and the charitable schools of the teaching orders, the republican centers often received stipends from the municipal and provincial governments in Catalonia,⁴⁷ in tacit recognition both of the failure of official education and of the potential threat posed by private schools whose views were less moderate.

Workers also attended the lay schools sponsored by the free-thought movement. Denied subsidies because of clerical opposition, there were

nonetheless 124 such schools in the province of Barcelona in 1909,⁴⁸ some of which had a reputation for academic soundness among the progressive middle class and skilled workers, whose children attended tuition free.⁴⁹ The lay teachers were primarily political and religious dissidents, ranging from Protestants, moderate republicans, and Catalan nationalists to an occasional anarchist;⁵⁰ the schools were stridently anticlerical, but pedagogically conservative and politically moderate, a fact they were careful to advertise. The anticlerical press emphasized the patriotism and civic conscience of the lay master, and paid ostentatious homage to the liberal State.⁵¹ For this reason, lay schools usually escaped the repressions frequently directed against the anarchists, despite a violent campaign unleashed against them by the Church and the clerical press.⁵²

Although the anarchists were suspicious of the moderate orientation of most other private schools for workers, they recognized that the success of their programs was an indication of worker preference. Furthermore, all contributed to the extension of basic literacy, a revolutionary act in the anarchists' political lexicon. For this reason, during the first decades of the movement, when the revolution still seemed imminent, these schools and centers provided an institutional framework for anarchist educators, who thus happily combined the cause of popular education with their need to earn a living.

The Anarchist Press

The extension of basic literacy was intended to provide a wider audience for the anarchist press, whose revolutionary potential as an instrument of education and mobilization was an article of faith for Spanish anarchism throughout its history.⁵³ The anarchist press was prolific, irrepressible, and on the whole well-written, attracting readers who had no other connection with the movement. From the first moment, the International published a weekly newspaper, La Solidaridad, founded in Madrid in 1870; in Barcelona, the original nucleus of organizers attempted to proselytize "prudently" through the organ of the labor federation, La Federación.⁵⁴ Even during the clandestine period from 1874 to 1881 anarchists in Madrid and Barcelona managed to publish sporadically.

These early newspapers set the pattern for those that followed, although techniques were refined and the writing grew more sophisticated as the movement matured. Their mission, as evidenced by their content, was to prepare the revolutionary consciousness of the masses by means of exhortations to action, imprecations against the established order, and revelations of scientific truth. The strictly educational material was on the inside pages--reviews of lectures, debates and meetings, and articles on science and culture. Conspicuously absent were notices of anarchist associations and activities and commentary on contemporary politics. Even in their press, the anarchists were resolutely apolitical and anti-organizational.

The anarchist press did raise revolutionary expectations among landless day laborers in the rural South, where anarchism reigned undisputed until well into the twentieth century.⁵⁵ Through the press, anarchist ideas were carried where the organizers and proselytizers never went--the articles were read aloud to those who could not read, then committed to memory.⁵⁶ Many peasants learned to read from the local anarchist or "man of ideas," using these newspapers and journals as texts. Through the simplified articles on science and art, rudimentary ideas of modern culture filtered down to the Spanish masses. No other group, political or religious, showed as much concern for the intellectual and moral welfare of their countrymen, who returned the compliment with loyalty and revolutionary ardor.

But revolutionary enthusiasm in Andalusia died out as quickly as it was kindled, and the draconian tactics employed by the State against the anarchists after the wave of terrorist bombings in Barcelona in the 1880s effectively dampened revolutionary expectations there as well. After two decades of propaganda and agitation, capitalist society seemed stronger than ever; the constancy of the masses, disappointingly fragile. Anarchists in Spain, like Kropotkin in England a decade earlier, began to take the long view and to reconsider the role of integrated education in the transformation of society.

This strand of anarchist educational theory had, of course, never been completely neglected; the appearance in 1886 of the journal Acracia, edited by Anselmo Lorenzo, Rafael Farga Pellicer, and Fernando Tarrida

del Mármol, reflected an awareness of the contemporary theories of Kropotkin on the subject. But it was only in the mid-90s that Spanish anarchists published a large number of "sociological" and literary journals whose mission was to initiate and consolidate the revolution in the hearts and minds of men. The most successful of these journals were Ciencia Social, a short-lived but highly regarded review of "sociology, arts, and letters" published in Barcelona from October 1895 to June 1896; Natura, a similar magazine published biweekly in Barcelona from 1903 to 1905; and especially, La Revista Blanca, which appeared biweekly from 1898 to 1906. The editor, Juan Montseny, better known as Federico Urales, had been active in the anarchist movement first as a lay teacher, then as a publicist. Imprisoned and exiled along with hundreds of other anarchists in 1896, in the aftermath of the terrorist bombings of 1893 and the infamous Montjuich trials, he returned to Spain in 1898 to publish La Revista Blanca in Madrid with his compañera Soledad Gustavo (Teresa Mañé).⁵⁷

The abandonment of direct revolutionary tactics for the relatively indirect one of evolutionary change did not mean the abandonment of the revolution itself. As one writer put it in 1904:

...there is no work more praiseworthy, more correct, more efficacious, or more revolutionary than to bring to the popular masses, to all individuals, Science, demonstrated truth, love of natural law and enjoyment of nature, since Nature is Science, Science is Nature and it is Truth, Beauty, Art and the sublimity of Life.⁵⁸

With the goal of promoting the evolution of a society of free, educated, and socially conscious individuals, the sociological reviews focused on

educational reform, popular science, literary criticism, health, and women's rights, in addition to anarchist ideology. In pursuit of quality and wide readership, they solicited contributions from middle-class progressives as well as from anarchist theoreticians; La Revista Blanca carried articles by Francisco Giner de los Ríos, Manuel B. Cossío, and the young writers Miguel de Unamuno and Clarín. The same publishing houses printed cheap editions of books popular with Spanish workers. Among the most widely read were works by Kropotkin, County Volney, and the French anarchist Sebastian Faure.⁵⁹ Another favorite was El botón de fuego by José López Montenegro, a 300-page volume of essays and poetry that included a didactic poem about evolution entitled "La Naturaleza." With a cavalier disregard for metre and rhyme, López Montenegro combined a jumble of scientific terms with the moral lesson that society, like the physical and biological world, must and will continue to evolve.⁶⁰ The poem illustrated clearly the anarchist conviction that science was on the side of the revolution.

Accompanying this new emphasis on evolutionary tactics was the desire to implement the often-evoked demand for integrated education. As a first step, the journals devoted a generous amount of editorial space to modern pedagogical theories, labelled either "progressive" or, more usual in Catholic countries, "rational education." The basic premises of rational education were not new, having been formulated by Rousseau in the eighteenth century and subsequently developed by educational philosophers like Pestalozzi, Froebel, and Spencer. By 1900, the American John Dewey

was the best known and the most successful proponent of the new methods, while in Spain, a model of progressive education existed in the *Institución Libre de Enseñanza* of Francisco Giner de los Ríos.⁶¹ The work of these reformers was publicized in the anarchist press by the anarchists who took the deepest interest in education--Anselmo Lorenzo, Federico Urales, José Prat, Ricardo Mella, and the high priest of anarchist education in Spain, Francisco Ferrer Guardia.

Rational education provided a critique of existing approaches as well as a blueprint for reform. In Catholic countries, this criticism was principally directed at clerical education, but in theory at least, rational educators abhorred indoctrination by any institution, secular or religious. The goal of rational education was the creation of spontaneous, self-determining individuals. Imitation and memorization, the staples of formal classical education, perverted or inhibited the natural development of the child. If left to himself, the child would learn new skills as humankind itself had learned them, from the primitive to the complex, in the spirit of the dictum, "Ontogeny repeats phylogeny." In a natural fashion, he would come to grasp the reason for things, deriving knowledge from experience with the practical and concrete. The school must be responsible for both the physical and the intellectual development of the child; health instruction, games, nature walks, and gymnastics were an integral part of the program, as was coeducation. The intent was to eliminate from the school the artificial dualisms--between the body and the mind, between men and women--that were not present in adult life. School was not preparation for life, but life itself.

Because it responded to their demand for integrated education, the anarchists found both the critique and the program of rational education congenial. But they expanded the critique to include all of capitalist society, not just its educational system. Thus, State education, however "neutral" or "progressive," was no improvement over Church-supported education. In the lay schools of the French Third Republic, "God was replaced by the State; Christian virtue by civic duty; religion by patriotism; and submission and obedience to the king, the aristocrat, and the clergy, by reverence for the bureaucrat, the proprietor, and the employer."⁶² Secular private education was also insufficient; it was possible to conceive of "a people without religion and also without freedom."⁶³ Rational education for anarchists was to assume the additional duty of destroying ancient prejudices in favor of private property, the nation-State, and the family--in short, of all forms of authority--and of encouraging the formation of a "scientific-physiological morality."⁶⁴ With the aid of the school, the revolution would triumph "first among individuals and finally in society."⁶⁵

The Modern School

By 1900, circumstances were favorable for the implementation of a complete program of rational education in an anarchist school. The impulse toward national regeneration after the defeat of 1898 had given educational reformers a new audience, while a decade of terrorism and repression had weakened revolutionary enthusiasm among anarchist militants. At this

moment, Francisco Ferrer Guardia wrote from Paris to José Prat, the editor of the anarchist journal Natura, of his intention to establish a rational school in Barcelona to combat "religion, false concept of property, nationalism, family...."⁶⁶ A year later, on September 8, 1901, La Escuela Moderna, Científica y Racional--or simply, the Modern School--commenced classes with twelve girls and eighteen boys.

An anticlerical republican in exile in Paris since the abortive coup of General Villacampa in Madrid in 1886, in the 1890s Ferrer had drifted towards anarchism. During these years, his diffuse revolutionary impulses were given direction both by the trend toward libertarian education that followed the failure of "propaganda by the deed," and by the famous Prévost Orphanage at Cempuis, whose director, the libertarian Paul Robin, was an enthusiastic proponent of rational education. When in 1900 Ferrer inherited an estimated 1,300,000 francs from an elderly spinster, he decided to establish a school that would combine his enthusiasms for rational pedagogy and for the revolution.⁶⁷

Barcelona was the obvious location for Ferrer's new school. From 1890 on, the failure of moderate trade union tactics and the immigration of unskilled workers from impoverished rural areas of the East and South⁶⁸ had radicalized the Catalan working class and had made Barcelona the urban stronghold of anarchism. Furthermore, public instruction was even more deficient in Barcelona than elsewhere in Spain.⁶⁹ In 1902, the city provided 94 elementary schools and subsidized 43 more, accommodating only 20,000 children out of an estimated school-age population of 60,000.⁷⁰

In contrast, there were 489 officially registered private schools, nearly all of them maintained by the religious orders. The children of Barcelona workers could choose between overcrowded State schools, clerical charity schools, or no school at all.

Once in Barcelona, Ferrer consistently denied his anarchist connections in order to avoid government interference and to encourage as much non-anarchist support as possible.⁷¹ Instead, he advertised the progressive and anticlerical aspects of his program, a tactic that disarmed his opponents and won him the support of the middle-class left in Barcelona. The respectability of the prominent Catalan intellectuals who delivered his Sunday lecture series (or "scientific masses," as Ferrer liked to call them) won the school additional friends.⁷² Other sympathizers among the Spanish left intelligentsia sent books to the school library and contributed articles to Ferrer's monthly publication, the Boletín de la Escuela Moderna, which first appeared in October 1901.⁷³

In fact, however, Ferrer worked closely with the Barcelona anarchists in organizing and operating the Modern School. The administrator, José Prat, was a leading militant, the veteran Anselmo Lorenzo did some translating, and Federico Urales wrote several of the texts. Other anarchists and onetime lay teachers became professors in the school. Most important, despite Ferrer's official propaganda, the Modern School did not offer rational education, but indoctrination in anarchism and revolution.

Although the anarchist origins and minimal preparation of many of the teaching staff would probably have ensured the perversion of the system in any case, the real source of the deception was Ferrer himself. His

disregard of the principles of rational education soon drove away the first director of the Modern School, Clementine Jacquinet, a passionate atheist with considerable previous experience with rational education. In 1903, Jacquinet broke with Ferrer and subsequently denounced his work in a pamphlet entitled "El socialismo en la escuela."⁷⁴ Ferrer's well-publicized commitment to spontaneous development was essentially a public relations ploy that masked a much more cynical attitude toward the spirit of inquiry. In 1905, Ferrer privately admitted his lack of interest in pedagogy per se in a letter to a former mistress and collaborator in the school, Leopoldina Bonnard:

For polemical purposes I can give you an argument against those who ask us for schools with great advantages--integrated education, manual labor, skills, multiple course offerings, etc. We cannot do more now than make the children think about social injustice, about religious, governmental, patriotic, judicial, political, or militaristic lies, etc., in order to prepare minds ready to carry out a social revolution. We are not interested today in forming good workers, good employees, good shopkeepers: we want to destroy present society down to the bottom.... It does not matter that class hours, or the material taught, or the school rules resemble those in other schools. All that is secondary for us; we have neither the time nor the means to change everything. Today we are content to introduce minds to revolutionary ideas; later we shall see.⁷⁵

Thus, despite Ferrer's propaganda, the Modern School was in effect little more than a well-financed and organized version of the "nurseries of revolutionaries" established by anarchists in the early decades of the movement; as a consequence, it represented a betrayal of current anarchist revolutionary tactics as well as a perversion of rational education. His anarchist collaborators supported it because of their own blindness to the contradictions in their revolutionary theory of education. The contradiction was further obscured by a flaw in the theory of rational

education itself. While arguing that the school should encourage the natural development of the individual in preparation for life, rational education failed to recognize the impossibility of establishing value-free definitions of "natural" and "life." The very act of definition implied a commitment by the school to a system of values. Although the anarchists clearly identified the ideological orientation of the so-called "neutral" schools of the liberal State, they were unable to perceive that their own school was no less doctrinaire and intolerant of free thought.

Methodologically, the Modern School was somewhat more progressive than official education. Coeducation was still a novel--and in the eyes of the Church--scandalous experiment,⁷⁶ and Ferrer possessed the financial resources to purchase modern scientific equipment and teaching aids.⁷⁷ But many of the more innovative methods were marred by a tendential orientation. Using newspaper articles as sources, academic subjects were explored for their revolutionary potential: math problems, for example, illustrated principles of economic distribution, and history plumbed the origins of such aberrations as Christianity, militarism, and nationalism. A field trip in 1904 to a chemical factory in Badalona was followed by a lecture on the evils of capitalism by Anselmo Lorenzo.⁷⁸ At the annual literary contest, young essayists denounced capitalist exploitation and religious superstition before an audience of proud parents and even prouder anarchist militants.⁷⁹

Given the markedly revolutionary orientation of the Modern School, it was ironic that the working class was largely excluded by the high tuition--15 pesetas a month. When confronted with this anomaly, Ferrer

pointed out that workers could attend the Ateneos Obreros and Radical Republican schools, which he provided with cheap books and pedagogical materials. More tenuously, he argued that the middle-class children who attended the Modern School would later teach in other rational schools, own school thus operating as a kind of normal school for revolutionaries. In fact, Ferrer's devotion to the children of the middle-class left probably reflected his own awareness that his school did not provide the kind of instruction that most workers wanted. For them, the revolution was something to be lived in the street or invoked in the press; in school, they wanted instruction of the most practical kind. The revolutionary implications of integrated education were of little interest to the average worker, as one of Ferrer's followers recognized in 1911:

The man--young or old--who is poorly fed, who lives meanly and un-comfortably, who works too much and is badly treated, that man is not interested in great sociological or philosophical problems. Ferrer left those men to the emancipating activity of radical politics, of militant revolutionism, of meetings, newspapers, journals, and lectures.⁸¹

As a result, during the decade in which Ferrer dominated anarchist education in Barcelona, the anarchists found their popularity among the working classes sharply contested by the Radical Republicans, whose schools in the Casas del Pueblo welcomed the pupils excluded from the Modern School. Yet despite his neglect of the Barcelona proletariat, Ferrer was generally considered to be the champion of popular as well as of rational education.

For Ferrer's program, existing textbooks were obviously inappropriate. Using funds from his inheritance, Ferrer established a publishing house and sent out a call to aspiring authors through the Boletín,

explaining that the "only road that can lead to the redemption of those that suffer, and to a true social state, is the instruction of the working class."⁸² Eventually the Publications of the Modern School offered nearly fifty titles, in addition to the monthly Boletín and miscellaneous educational material. The catalog included a few frankly revolutionary pamphlets, but the majority were textbooks or popular introductions to the natural and social sciences.⁸³ Among the earliest publications were the readers for the Modern School: Cartilla filológica española; Las aventuras de Nono, by Jean Grave (translated by Anselmo Lorenzo); Sembrando flores, by Federico Urales; and El origen del cristianismo, by Malvert.

A brief look at several of these texts will illuminate the general orientation of Ferrer's publishing house. In Las aventuras de Nono, the second reader for the Modern School, Nono, the son of poor but worthy laborers, is led in a dream by the beautiful Solidaria to an anarchist paradise named Autonomía, whose neighbor, the grim kingdom of Argirocracia, is inhabited by brutes whose motto is "Money is superior to right." Comparing the two, Nono awakens and resolves to make this a better world."⁸⁴ Sembrando flores, the third reader, is an anarchist version of Emile, whose hero, Floreal, receives a rational education, outwits the Jesuits, and in time produces four lovely children named Sol, Vida, Placer and Amor with a beautiful young woman named Armonia. From their father, the children learn to shun religion, resist authority and to work for a just society. Both texts contain lyrical descriptions of the rational school, where children receive useful knowledge that will prepare them for "healthy, socially complex, multi-faceted labor."⁸⁵

El origen del cristianismo (originally Science et religion) had been recommended to Ferrer in Paris by Georges Petit, the inspector of primary education, as the only existing suitable text for a rational school.⁸⁶ Available in two editions ("The Cult of the Phallus" was deleted from the children's version), the book traced the evolution of Christianity from the Vedic myths to the present transition from the Metaphysical into the Scientific Age. Highly positivistic and anti-clerical, the text concluded with an homage to Science, "the liberator of humanity."⁸⁷

Editions of the Modern School cost two pesetas each; the basic reader, intended for wide distribution, cost only a peseta.⁸⁸ At this nominal price, the editions could be purchased even by institutions with limited budgets; by 1904, thirty-two schools in the province of Barcelona were using texts from the Modern School in their classrooms. Not all, not even most, of these schools were anarchist; Ateneos Obreros, lay schools, and the Casas del Pueblo of the Radical Republicans also purchased the texts.⁸⁹

The extensive circulation of publications from the school was only part of the general expansion of Ferrer's activities between 1901 and 1906. The Modern School itself grew steadily, from 70 boys and girls in 1901 to 126 in 1905, when a branch was opened in Villanueva y Geltrú under the direction of Samuel Torner, the son-in-law of Anselmo Lorenzo. The branch schools were generally one-room classes with no equipment or trained personnel, but by the end of the year, there were fourteen such schools in

Barcelona and thirty-four in Catalonia, Valencia, and Andalusia.⁹⁰ The peak of Ferrer's pedagogical empire-building was April 12, 1906--Good Friday--when 1,700 children from anarchist and lay schools all over Barcelona were assembled at Tibidabo for secular commemorative exercises.⁹¹

That empire collapsed little more than a month later, when an employee in Ferrer's publishing house, Mateo Morral, threw a bomb at the wedding carriage of Alfonso XIII and his bride as they passed through the Calle Mayor in Madrid. A few days later Morral committed suicide, and Ferrer was arrested as the instigator of the crime, in which he seems in fact to have been implicated.⁹² Simultaneously, under the provisions of the inspection law of 1902, the Modern School was closed, to the delight of the conservative and clerical right, who considered the school itself to be the true perpetrator of the crime against the king. In Bilbao, El Corazón de Jesús editorialized that "these crimes will continue as long as Spaniards maintain the freedom to read, to teach, and to think, from which come all these antisocial monsters,"⁹³ and in the Cortes, six Conservative deputies petitioned the Congreso to close both lay and anarchist schools as sources of subversive propaganda. The Liberal government of the Marqués de la Vega de Armijo, however, was committed to the defense of secular education against clerical attacks and refused to take action. The branches of the Modern School and all of the lay schools remained open, even after the Conservatives took office in February 1907.

Steadfastly denying his guilt, Ferrer turned the venomous attacks of the right against his schools to his own advantage, encouraging an

international campaign for his release that emphasized his role as an educational reformer. The rhetoric of this campaign, supported by free-thinking, republican, and anticlerical organizations all over Europe, converted Ferrer into a martyr of priest-ridden Spain. To a certain extent this was justified; Ferrer had been detained because the right desperate wanted to find him guilty. Less convincing, however, was the foreign exaltation of Ferrer as "one of the glories of contemporary Spain."⁹⁴ Nevertheless, partly in response to this international outcry, a civil tribunal released Ferrer on June 12, 1907, admitting it could find no evidence of his direct implication nor of "the teaching and publicizing of a baneful doctrine... and its natural and terrible consequences in the present case."⁹⁵

A few months after his release from prison, Ferrer embarked on a tour of the European capitals to exploit his image as the persecuted pedagogue. The following year he organized the International League for the Rational Education of Children, an organization of freethinkers and reformers, whose honorary president was Anatole France. On April 15, 1907 the first issue of the League's journal, L'Ecole Renovée, appeared in Brussels, while an Italian edition was published in Rome. On May 1, 1907 the Spanish version, the Boletín de la Escuela Moderna, reappeared in Barcelona. The magazine was subsidized entirely by Ferrer, who also commissioned the articles on pedagogical reform written by European educators.

Despite this activity, since his imprisonment Ferrer had lost control over the educational movement in Barcelona, which had faltered

after the bombing of 1906. Ferrer himself was often abroad. Some of his anarchist associates had been dismissed from lay schools and workers' centers for their extreme views, and the Radical Republicans, now entering a moderate phase, were unwilling to renew their former ties with Ferrer. Lay and republican schools that had formerly adopted texts published by the Modern School now returned to the standard anticlerical tracts.⁹⁶ While the branch schools struggled to survive, the original Modern School remained closed. Its replacement was the Colegio de la Place, whose director, José Casasola, was also president of the Barcelona section of the International League for the Rational Education of Children, an organization that never prospered.⁹⁷

Thus, when Ferrer was arrested, convicted (this time, by a military tribunal), and finally, on October 13, 1909, executed, as the "author and chief" of the Tragic Week of July 1909, his attorney was able to argue convincingly--if futilely--that he was being punished because of his activities in Barcelona before 1906. The Tragic Week, which began as an organized protest against the Moroccan war, quickly degenerated into spontaneous popular riots, in which 80 religious foundations, including 33 schools for the poor, were burned or destroyed.⁹⁸ Although Ferrer had little direct influence over the course of events in Barcelona in 1909, through the Modern School and its publications, he had contributed to the revolutionary tensions that made the Tragic Week possible. His flair for publicity, and especially, his substantial fortune, had made him a potent enemy of the established order. Furthermore, suspicion lingered that

Ferrer had unjustly escaped punishment for the bombing of 1906. Thus, in the absence of another convenient scapegoat, Ferrer and the Modern School--the enemies of "all social foundation: Religion, Family, Property, Authority, and Army"⁹⁹--were saddled with ultimate responsibility.

Although the anticlerical left in Europe duplicated the outcry of 1906, within Spain, Ferrer's execution aroused little passion. Moderate leftists found little to defend in a man who had proven himself both arrogant and intellectually dishonest, and even the extreme left found Ferrer more useful dead than alive. The Radical Republicans, undoubtedly more deeply implicated in the events of July 1909 than Ferrer, maintained a discreet silence; the socialists and anarchists reserved their protest until after the execution, when they were able to exploit Ferrer as a victim of priests and reactionaries.

In fact, much of the enthusiasm that Ferrer had initially aroused had dissipated even before the arrests of 1906 and 1909. Middle-class progressives had shared the anarchists' critique of contemporary education and had been attracted by the apparent sincerity of their proposals for a genuinely liberating academic program. The national crisis that followed the defeat of 1898 had thrust educational issues into the foreground after decades of neglect. "Who doubts by now," wrote Manuel B. Cossío in 1898, "that the most immediate cause of our catastrophe has been ignorance? Because we are ignorant, we are poor and immoral, and because we are ignorant, we have given and we are still giving to the world one of the most shameful spectacles in history."¹⁰⁰ The inauguration of the Modern

School had thus opportunely coincided both with changing anarchist theory and with national interest in pedagogic reform.

As the details of Ferrer's program emerged, the middle-class intellectuals who had initially applauded the concept began to regret their support. One early enthusiast, Miguel de Unamuno, called the Modern School "indefensible in scientific pedagogy,"¹⁰¹ in 1909, while another, Pfo Baroja, denounced its textbooks as "vulgar and insipid."¹⁰² The minds formed in the Modern School were as rigidly doctrinaire as those the reformers had deplored. Only the dogmatic content had been altered: anarchism replaced capitalism; atheism, Christianity; antimilitarism and internationalism, patriotic nationalism. Only abroad, where the details of the curriculum in the Modern School were known exclusively through Ferrer's own publications, did he retain his reputation as a great pedagogical reformer.

Even the anarchists, who were not dismayed by Ferrer's enthusiasm for rational education put to revolutionary ends, had by 1909 lost some of their initial ardor. Even at the height of their enthusiasm for evolutionary tactics, anarchists in Barcelona had been distracted by the immediate revolutionary potential of syndicalism and the general strike.¹⁰³ In doing so, they had demonstrated their usual sensitivity to the needs and interests of workers, who were not, as we have seen, invited to or attracted by Ferrer's school. After 1909, the evolutionary approach implicit in educational reform had less appeal than ever for the Barcelona working class, and with the formation of the Confederación Nacional del

Trabajo in 1911, the majority of anarchists committed themselves wholeheartedly to anarchosyndicalism. The impulse--and the philosophical imperatives--to educate workers remained, but did not resurface strongly until the movement had acquired self-confidence, from about 1918 on.¹⁰⁴

The events of the Tragic Week damaged the cause of secular education in Spain. Although only anarchist schools remained closed after the initial government repression of August 1909, when over a hundred lay schools were shut down, Ferrer's conviction as the leader of the Tragic Week had linked secular education to subversion and rebellion in the minds of the timid. In future years, when new proposals for neutral public or private education were advanced, the right could raise the spectre of social revolution to defeat them.¹⁰⁵ Even more unfortunately, the failure of the Modern School had discredited popular education, now confused in the public mind with indoctrination and social disorder. Conservatives cited the Modern School and the Tragic Week to support their contention that education in the hands of the socially and culturally disadvantaged could be a dangerous weapon.¹⁰⁶

The anarchists' betrayal of the cause that had moved them for so long was quite unwitting. In the name of the revolution, they had tolerated, even applauded, a stifling and rigid program of studies that violated every principle of libertarian education. Their failure sprang in part from the inherent contradiction in the anarchist attitude toward education itself, an attitude that was fundamentally anti-intellectual and pragmatic. Never distinguishing clearly between education as a means to revolution

and integrated education as a revolutionary end in itself, they failed to see the connection between the two. The result was Ferrer's school, avowedly revolutionary in its goals, appallingly repressive in its methods.

NOTES

*A shorter version of this paper was read at the meetings of the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association, August 21, 1975. Research for the paper was partially supported by grants from the Fulbright-Hays Fellowship Foundation in 1966-67 and from the University of Texas Research Institute in 1975. Professors Frank D. Bean, Joan C. Ullman, Vicente Pilapil, and Standish Meacham made helpful comments and suggestions. Any remaining errors of fact or interpretation are of course my own.

¹There is a large and growing bibliography on Spanish anarchism. A partial list must include George Woodcock, Anarchism. A History of Libertarian Ideas and Movements (New York, 1962); Josep Termes Ardévol, Anarquismo y sindicalismo en España. La Primera Internacional (1864-1881) (Barcelona, 1971); Clara E. Lida, Anarquismo y revolución en la España del XIX (Madrid, 1972); Manuel Tuñón de Lara, El movimiento obrero en la historia de España (Madrid, 1972); Maximiano García Venero, Historia de las Internacionales en España, 3 vols. (Madrid, 1956-57); James Joll, The Anarchists (New York, 1966); and Joaquín Romero Maura, "The Spanish Case," in David Apter and James Joll, ed., Anarchism Today (Garden City, 1971): 60-83.

²General discussions of anarchist education may be found in Gabriel Jackson, "Origins of Spanish Anarchism," The Southwestern Social Science Quarterly 36 (September 1955): 135-47; Clara E. Lida, "Educación anarquista en la España del ochocientos," Revista de Occidente 97 (1971): 33-47; Yvonne Turin, La educación y la escuela en España de 1874 a 1902. Liberalismo y tradición, trans. Josefa Hernández Alfonso (Madrid, 1967); and Joan Connelly Ullman, La Semana Trágica. Estudio sobre las causas socioeconómicas del anticlericalismo en España (1898-1912), trans. Gonzalo Pontón (Barcelona, 1972).

³La Solidaridad (Madrid), 25 June 1870, p. 2.

⁴Francisco Ferrer Guardia, La Escuela Moderna. Póstuma explicación y alcance de la enseñanza racionalista (Valencia, n.d.), p. 65.

⁵Point II of the program of Michail Bakunin's International Alliance of Social Democracy, founded in 1868. Quoted in Anselmo Lorenzo, El proletariado militante. (Memorias de un internacional) (Madrid, 1974), p. 49.

⁶Ullman, Semana Trágica, p. 61.

⁷Natura. Revista Quincenal de Ciencia, Sociología, Literatura y Arte (Barcelona) 1 (15 June 1904): 277.

⁸The title of a speech by Anselmo Lorenzo at the opening of a Center for Social Studies in Barcelona in 1887. Natura 1 (15 June 1904): 277.

⁹La Solidaridad, 15 October 1870, p. 3.

¹⁰Francisco Navés, "Educación e instrucción," La Revista Blanca. Publicación Quincenal de Sociología, Ciencia y Arte (Madrid) 3 (15 November 1900): 319.

¹¹Proudhon's ideas were introduced into Spain with the publication in 1854 of Pi y Margall's La reacción y la revolución, but translations of Proudhon's writings were only available after 1868.

¹²The educational theories of Proudhon are discussed in Georges Duveau, La pensée ouvrière sur l'éducation pendant le Seconde République et le Seconde Empire (Paris, 1948), pp. 145-59.

¹³Bakunin's theory of education is described in Jean Maitron, Histoire du mouvement anarchiste en France (1880-1914) (Paris, 1951), pp. 325-26.

¹⁴From "Federalism, Socialism, Anti-Theologism" (1867) in Sam Dolgoff, ed., Bakunin on Anarchy: Selected Works by the Activist Founder of World Anarchism (New York, 1971).

¹⁵La Solidaridad, 25 June 1870, p. 2.

¹⁶In Lorenzo, El proletariado militante, pp. 251-53.

¹⁷In ibid., p. 253.

¹⁸Anselmo Lorenzo, "Del problema social," Ciencia Social. Revista mensual de Sociología, Artes y Letras (Barcelona) 1 (October 1895): 5.

¹⁹José Llunas y Prat, Estudios filosófico-sociales (Barcelona, 1882), p. 108.

²⁰For the theories of Kropotkin, see George Woodcock and Ivan Avakumovic, The Anarchist Prince. A Biographical Study of Peter Kropotkin (London, 1950), pp. 305-41.

²¹Letter of Kropotkin to Francisco Ferrer in Boletín de la Escuela Moderna (Barcelona), Segunda época, 1 (1 May 1908): 19.

²²The earliest Spanish translation of Kropotkin's Fields, Factories and Workshops is dated 1902; none of his writings seem to have been generally available before the turn of the century.

²³Lida, "Educación anarquista," p. 40.

²⁴The data in this paragraph is from Lorenzo Luzuriaga, El analfabetismo en España (Madrid, 1919). See also Walter A. Montgomery, Educational Conditions in Spain, Bulletin No. 17, U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education (1919); María Dolores Samaniego, "El problema del analfabetismo en España (1900-1930)," Hispania (Madrid) 33 (May-August 1975): 375-401; and Antoni Jutglar Bernaus, "Notas para el estudio de la enseñanza en Barcelona hasta 1900," Materiales para la historia institucional de la ciudad, Vol. 16 (Barcelona, 1966), pp. 238-419.

²⁵Samaniego, "Problema del analfabetismo," p. 376.

²⁶Rafael Shaw, Spain from Within (London, 1932), p. 270.

²⁷Mariano Batlles Bertrán de Lis, Memoria presentada al Excmo. Sr. Ministro de Instrucción Pública y Bellas Artes. Año 1906-1911 (Barcelona, 1912), p. 32. Student fees, ranging from 50 céntimos to 2 pesetas, made up one-third of teachers' salaries. Students had to be officially registered on the town's poor rolls to qualify for a fee-exemption.

²⁸Luzuriaga, Analfabetismo, pp. 26-63; Anuario estadístico de la ciudad de Barcelona. 1905 (Barcelona, 1905), pp. 234-35; Batlles Bertrán de Lis, Memoria, p. 8.

²⁹See Luis Bello, Viaje por las escuelas de España, 3 vols. (Madrid, 1926-27); José Andrés Gallego, "Una escuela rural castellana del siglo XIX: Fuencaliente del Burgo, 1847-1901," Revista Española de Pedagogía 120 (1972): 401-15; the report of the Institución Libre de Enseñanza to the Comisión de Reformas Sociales in 1890 in La clase obrera española a finales del siglo XIX, Biblioteca Promoción del Pueblo, Serie P, Núm. 18 (Madrid, 1973), pp. 80-81, note 43; and Batlles Bertrán de Lis, Memoria.

³⁰In 1890, the ILE alleged that 7,701 teachers possessed only an "aptitude" certificate or none at all. La clase obrera, p. 84.

³¹Gallego, "Una escuela rural," pp. 410-11; Montgomery, Educational Conditions in Spain, pp. 18-19.

³²Turin, Educación y escuela, p. 157.

³³Ullman, Semana Trágica, p. 41.

³⁴In Barcelona in 1900, there were 190 public schools and 518 private ones. Batlle Bertrán de Lis, Memoria, p. 8.

³⁵R. D. of April 18, 1900.

³⁶The State assumed the obligation to pay two-thirds of the teachers' salaries; the remaining third was still to be paid by the students. Turin, Educación y escuela, p. 333.

³⁷R. D. of July 1, 1902.

³⁸Federico Urales [Juan Montseny], "La enseñanza en España," La Revista Blanca 6 (1 April 1904): 581.

³⁹See Diego Abad de Santillán, Contribución a la historia del movimiento obrero español, 2 vols. (Puebla, Mexico, 1962-65), 1:285.

⁴⁰Memoria of Pedro Esteve at the Conferéncia Internacional Anarquista in Chicago in 1893. I am grateful to Professor Joan Connelly Ullman for this citation.

⁴¹A school for girls sponsored by the Barcelona Federation of the AIT in 1872 advertised a program of "integrated education" that included basic literacy, domestic economy, drawing, geography, geometry, embroidery, ironing, and handiwork. Lida, "Educación anarquista," p. 40.

⁴²Abad de Santillán, Movimiento obrero español, 1:69-70; Práxedes Zancada, El obrero en España. Notas para su historia política y social (Barcelona, 1902), p. 130; Lida, "Educación anarquista," p. 34.

⁴³Jutglar, "Enseñanza en Barcelona hasta 1900," p. 373.

⁴⁴Ateneos Obreros y Asociaciones de Enseñanza Popular de la Provincia de Barcelona Exposición que eleven al Excmo. Sr. Ministro de Instrucción Pública y Bellas Artes, solicitando una subvención (Barcelona, 1904), p. 9.

⁴⁵The municipal subsidy ranged from 1,000 to 2,000 pesetas a year, depending on whether the government was Conservative or Liberal. Anuario estadístico de Barcelona, 1905, pp. 236-37; Jutglar, "Enseñanza en Barcelona hasta 1900," p. 373.

⁴⁶The annual income of the Ateneo Obrero de Gracia in 1904 included 600 pesetas from the city administration; 350 from the provincial Diputación; 1,248 from patrons; 1,200 from members; and 1,200 from voluntary tuition. Boletín del Ateneo Obrero de Gracia 2 (30 October 1904): 4-5.

⁴⁷Anuario estadístico de Barcelona, 1905, pp. 236-37.

⁴⁸Joaquín Romero Maura, "La Rosa de Fuego." Republicanos y anarquistas: La política de los obreros barceloneses entre el desastre colonial y la Semana Trágica, 1899-1909 (Barcelona, 1975), p. 417.

⁴⁹See the views of the Bishop of Barcelona in Turin, Educación y escuela, p. 270. For other testimony, see Romero Maura, Rosa de Fuego, pp. 417-18, note 243, and Claudi Ametlla, Memòries Polítiques: 1890-1917 (Barcelona, 1963), p. 138.

⁵⁰Ametlla, Memòries, p. 138.

⁵¹See, for example, El Eco de la Enseñanza Laica (Barcelona), 15 April 1882, p. 2.

⁵²See Turin, Educación y escuela, p. 271.

⁵³In February 1873, the Boletín de la FRE de la AIT called for "revolutionary socialist instruction," advising "the worker who knows a little to teach the one who knows less, using FRE centers as schools and books, newspapers and pamphlets published by the International as texts." Quoted in Lida, "Educación anarquista," p. 41.

⁵⁴Casimiro Martí, Orígenes del anarquismo en Barcelona (Barcelona, 1959), p. 88. See also Appendix 2, "Prensa obrera e internacionalista," in Termes Ardévol, Anarquismo y sindicalismo, pp. 281-85.

⁵⁵Newspapers popular in Andalusia included La Anarquía (Madrid, 1890-93), El Productor (Barcelona, 1889-1893), and Tierra y Libertad (Madrid, 1904-). Juan Díaz del Moral, Historia de las agitaciones campesinas andaluzas--Córdoba. (Antecedentes para una reforma agraria) (Madrid, 1973), p. 188.

⁵⁶Ibid.

⁵⁷The first series of La Revista Blanca appeared between 1898 and 1906; a second series, also edited by Montseny, was published between 1923 and 1935. See the autobiography of Federico Urales, Mi vida, 3 vols. (Barcelona, n.d.).

⁵⁸"Pellico" [Antonio Pellicer Paraire], "Ciencia y naturaleza," Natura 1 (1 February 1904): 139.

⁵⁹Díaz del Moral, Agitaciones campesinas andaluzas, pp. 188. For other works popular with anarchists at the turn of the century, see Rudolf Rocker, En la borrasca. (Años de destierro), trans. Diego Abad de Santillán (Buenos Aires, 1949), p. 214.

⁶⁰ José López Montenegro, El botón de fuego (Barcelona, 1902).

⁶¹ For the ideas of Giner de los Ríos, see his Obras completas, especially vol. 7, Estudios sobre educación (Madrid, 1922) and vol. 12, Educación y enseñanza (Madrid, 1925). See also María Dolores Gómez Molleda, Los reformadores de la España contemporánea (Madrid, 1966), and Antonio Jiménez-Landi Martínez, La Institución Libre de Enseñanza y su ambiente (Madrid, 1973).

⁶² Ferrer, La Escuela Moderna, p. 77.

⁶³ Letter from Francisco Ferrer to Anselmo Lorenzo, quoted in Lorenzo, Hacia la emancipación. Táctica de avance obrera en la lucha por el ideal (Mahón, 1914), p. 149.

⁶⁴ Francisco Ferrer, "Principios de moral científico" (unpublished manuscript), quoted in Sol Ferrer y Sanmartí, La vie et l'oeuvre de Francisco Ferrer: Un martyr au XX^e siècle (Paris, 1962), p. 90.

⁶⁵ Anselmo Lorenzo, "Sin escuelas," Boletín de la Escuela Moderna, Segunda época, 1 (1 February 1909): 41.

⁶⁶ Quoted in Abad de Santillán, Movimiento obrero español, 1:508.

⁶⁷ Ullman, Semana Trágica, pp. 164, 168.

⁶⁸ See the immigration statistics in the Anuario estadístico de Barcelona, 1902, pp. 108-9.

⁶⁹ For the following discussion, see ibid., pp. 275-89.

⁷⁰ Jutglar, "Enseñanza en Barcelona hasta 1900," p. 353.

⁷¹ See Sol Ferrer, La vie de Ferrer, p. 231, and Pedro Sangró y Ros de Olano, La sombra de Ferrer. De la "Semana Trágica" a la guerra europea (Madrid, 1917), p. 82.

⁷² Sol Ferrer, La vie de Ferrer, p. 98; Salvador Canals, Los sucesos de España en 1909. Crónica documentada, 2 vols. (Madrid, 1910-11), 2:10-11; Ferrer, La Escuela Moderna, p. 94; Ametlla, Memòries, p. 144.

⁷³ Unfortunately, there are no known collections of this important journal for the years 1901-1906, which could shed more light on the Modern School. A collection of the "second period" of the Boletín, from 1908 to 1909, may be consulted at the Instituto Municipal de Historia in Barcelona.

⁷⁴ Canals, Sucesos de 1909, 2:73.

⁷⁵Canals, Sucesos de 1909, 2:60.

⁷⁶For the views of the Church on coeducation, see the Carta pastoral del Emmo. y Rdmo. Sr. Cardenal Casañas, Obispo de Barcelona, sobre las escuelas de estudios populares que proyecta el Excmo. Ayuntamiento de esta ciudad: 24 febrero 1908 (Barcelona, 1908).

⁷⁷Pere Solà, "Francesc Ferrer i Guardia i la Escuela Moderna," Cuadernos de Pedagogía. Revista mensual de educación, no. 2 (February 1975), p. 20.

⁷⁸José Casasola, "Excursión de la Escuela Moderna a Badalona," La Revista Blanca 7 (15 July 1904): 46-48.

⁷⁹Ibid., p. 47; Sangró, Sombra de Ferrer, pp. 107ff.; Canals, Sucesos de 1909, 2:92.

⁸⁰For the subsequent history of some of the alumni of the Modern School, see Domingo Escofet, La Escuela Moderna. La obra de su fundador. Francisco Ferrer Guardia y sus alumnos. Ante el momento actual (Barcelona, 1931).

⁸¹Luis Bertrán, "Yo acuso." El testamento de Ferrer (Barcelona, 1911), pp. 10-11.

⁸²Canals, Sucesos de 1909, 2:59.

⁸³See the Appendix for a list of these publications. See also Joan Senent Josa, "La enseñanza de las ciencias naturales en la Escuela Moderna de Ferrer i Guardia," Cuadernos de Pedagogía, no. 2 (February 1975), pp. 21-24.

⁸⁴Jean Grave, Las aventuras de Nono, trans. Anselmo Lorenzo (Barcelona, 1902).

⁸⁵Federico Urales, Sembrando flores. Novela de una vida ideal (Barcelona, n.d.).

⁸⁶Sol Ferrer, La vie de Ferrer, p. 86.

⁸⁷Malvert, El origen del cristianismo (Barcelona, 1902).

⁸⁸See the advertisement on the last page of Nicolás Estévez, Resumen de la historia de España (Barcelona, 1904).

⁸⁹Ferrer, La Escuela Moderna, pp. 111-12. Ferrer and Lerroix had been frequent collaborators since their first meeting in republican circles in Paris in 1892. See Ullman, Semana Trágica, pp. 150-51.

⁹⁰Canals, Sucesos de 1909, 2:123-24.

⁹¹Le Comité de Défense des Victimes de la Répression Espagnole, Un martyr des prêtres. Francisco Ferrer. Sa vie. Son oeuvre (Paris, n.d.), p. 23.

⁹²This is the well-documented contention of Joaquín Romero Maura, "Terrorism in Barcelona and its Impact on Spanish Politics, 1904-1909," Past and Present: A Journal of Historical Studies 41 (December 1968): 130-84.

⁹³Quoted in Martyr des prêtres, p. 24.

⁹⁴Charles Laisant, quoted in Sol Ferrer, La vie de Ferrer, pp. 106-7.

⁹⁵Ullman, Semana Trágica, p. 172.

⁹⁶Canals, Sucesos de 1909, 2:128; Romero Maura, Rosa de Fuego, p. 417, note 243.

⁹⁷The other officers were also close associates of Ferrer. Vice President was José Robles Layas, director of a rational school in Pueblo Nuevo; Secretary, Cristóbal Litrán, director of the publishing firm; and Treasurer was Ferrer's mistress, Soledad Villafranca. Boletín de la Escuela Moderna, Segunda época, 2 (1 April 1909); Spain, Ministerio de la Guerra, Causa contra Francisco Ferrer Guardia, instruída y fallada por la jurisdicción de Guerra en Barcelona. Año 1909 (Madrid, 1911), p. 464.

⁹⁸Ullman, Semana Trágica, p. 589. This book provides a definitive account of the events of the Tragic Week. The first edition, in English, is The Tragic Week. A Study of Anticlericalism in Spain, 1875-1912 (Cambridge, Mass., 1968).

⁹⁹El Universo (Madrid), 30 August 1909, quoted in Luis Simarro, El proceso Ferrer y la opinión europea, Vol. 1, El proceso (Madrid, 1910), pp. 193-94.

¹⁰⁰Turin, Educación y escuela, pp. 43-44.

¹⁰¹Quoted in Canals, Sucesos de 1909, 2:183.

¹⁰²Pfo Baroja, La dama errante (Paris, n.d.), pp. 90-91. Ferrer appears in the novel as Sr. Suñer.

103 Ferrer himself had published La Huelga General in Barcelona from 1901 to 1903; after 1907, he had subsidized the activities of Solidaridad Obrera.

104 Anarchist education after 1909 is the subject of an unpublished doctoral dissertation by Pere Solà, "Raíces y desarrollo de la pedagogía racionalista en Cataluña" (University of Barcelona, 1975).

105 This had already occurred in 1906 when the Bishop of Barcelona, Cardinal Casañas, successfully opposed the creation of neutral, coeducational primary schools by the municipality. See Ramón Albó y Martí, El pressupost extraordinari de cultura del Ajuntament y les escoles d'ensenyansa primària que en el mateix es proposa. Conferència donada al Ateneo barcelonès el 28 de mars de 1908 (Barcelona, 1908); Salvador, Cardenal Casañas, Carta pastoral: 24 febrero 1908.

106 In this vein, the Diario de Barcelona had editorialized after the bombing of 1906: "The poor man is no longer contented with a heavenly reward. He knows how to read and he reads. What reading does he prefer? That which speaks of his earthly redemption. And since he is not ready to digest this, lacking an idea of God and of true culture, it gives him indigestion and he acts unwisely." Gonzalo de Reparaz, "Por qué arrojan bombas los anarquistas," Diario de Barcelona, 15 June 1906.