Problems of Anarchism.

INTRODUCTION.

2. Economic Development Prior to Capitalism.

Let us return to the dawn of history, taking a rapid view of man's economic development. Self-preservation, the need for food, urged him in common with other animals to exertion. But, like those, he exercised himself when he needed food to fill the empty to the brim. Naturally a lazy animal, he got such knowledge by degrees, and, growing as cunning in wisdom as in strength, he discovered the use of slaves. Fighting through the human demigods of the primitive ages, they took the wealth inherited, first for existence, then for supremacy, he was driven to herd with others of his species. Mutual aid in some degree was a condition essential to survival. Among the indi-vidually weaker and physically inferior to many of his competitors. But from struggling with these he got to battling with his own race. Perhaps it was first among the remnants of the herd contesting over the carcass of some common for they had slain that human struggles began. Any way it became habitual for herd of men to fight. Prisoners captured would be slain in the earliest stages. At lengths some skill in obtaining food was developed. As soon as a man could procure more sustenance in a day than he could consume, it was more prudent to keep the captives and exploit their labor. But this idea could be the result only of very slow growth. Primitive man would take a long time to reason out the point, though he were spurred on to thought both by his desire for food and by his aversion to labor. Whether he first made slaves of the children, the females, or the captives brought to him, the human race fell into a new and enduring form of society. The feudal system, a machina, of wheels within wheels, from the highest to the lowest; the place of each fixed by status and everyone having power over those next below him and being strictly bound by those immedi-ately above, from the king who was absolute in theory at any rate, down to the chattlel of the family, considered the same kind of property as the soil they labored upon. The operation of this system accomplished one thing—consistent with that modern subsistence, the unemployed, was in effective operation as late as the end of the sixteenth century both in England and on the continent.

Out of the feudal system grew the towns, the inhabi-tants of which worked out their freedom, increasing in numbers largely through the continual addition of escaped serfs from the land. I am not pre-tending to give a history either of the birth, growth, or decay of feudalism, but merely in general terms of the lines of economic change. Now, there are some learned writers of the present day who aver that the working classes enjoyed a very considerable measure of liberty, peace, and prosperity under the latter stages of this system. In short, they tell us that if the serfs were better situated than the masses today under the system of capital-ism. Nobody, however, can doubt, I think, that in the other freedoms, and to a far less extent in favor of the to-morrow than the now and is vast. Nor is it comparison even from a purely economic point of view between former states and the unprecedented developments of modern times likely to prove favorable to the past. Any dis-union arises which in any case demands our best attention. Has the economic side of individual freedom kept pace with its growth in other directions, and with the gigantic enlargements of productive power and growing economic development?

It is admitted on all sides, not only by Socialistic reformers, but by the ablest of independent thinkers, that the evils of the prevailing economic system are wide-ly known, and that they must be changed if we are to make no means commensurate with the revolution which has taken place in the industrial world. Scarcely anyone can be found who denies that improvement is desirable, and few who would say it is not necessary. The growing belief in the theory of evolution is of necessity attended by the hope, nay, the certainty, of better-ment in the condition of the industrial classes, of the diminution of the glaring economic and social evils that exist, and of a higher form of society than has yet ap-peared on the planet.

Unfortunately agreement ends here. If one wishes to trace the bottom causes that produce these evils and to know the true method which ought to be pursued in order to eliminate them, a thousand answers, confusing and contradictory, are given in reply.

On this rock all ships of social reform are dashed upon. Hopes are susteined and theories built sky-high, but owing to the instability of the foundations are one after another undermined, topple over, and are finally dashed to pieces. An inadequate grasp of causes seems to me to be the root of all evil. The method of most Socialists in the course of this inquiry I hope to examine the leading ideas of the more prominent among them as well as the teachings of economists generally upon the cause of the evils that press so persistently for solu-tion. But before starting on a task of such magnitude, the tenet of which can be excused only by the hope that, if it be not well performed, if the errors still remain, the facts will not be obscured by the very work of its authors to the subject of inquiry.

With Cleveland In.

With Cleveland in, no more shall we complain!—An end, an end is come in James G. Blaine, The Anglophile must state his rage:
The Irish Vote its valorous assurance:
The very Mugwump hath not lived in vain! McKinley — now, O, now to free from stain Columbia's sport! Now, per special train.
The Solid South masts back the Golden Age—With Cleveland in!

And yet — and yet! Perchance it is in vain
(If such things have been, such things may be again!)
That Harrison (the late) withholds his gage,
And Ford and Eggn both go up the stage!
How if, in fact, the Status Quo remain?
With Cleveland in?
Liberty.

Issued Weekly at Two Dollars a Year; Single Copies, Four Cents.

DENN. P. TUCKER, Editor and Publisher.

405 Main Street, New York.

Subscribe to the Weekly Liberty.

NEW YORK, N. Y., JANUARY 14, 1890.

"In establishing a new label, the last vestiges of old-time dye-
ning. The rebellion we find as the cause of the criticism.
ness, the effusion of the, the pus of the polemic, the goss.
se of the author, the consciousness of the department clerk, all thy.
itches of polemic, which goes lively through her half.

Tolerance and Intolerance.

One man's meat is another's poison. A fore.
ible illustration of this came to me the other day in.
ly way of two documents, both of which are documen-
t of Anarchism, one a censure on the au.
merit of my writings and the other declaring.
ns of my writings ought to be for.

The former is a letter from J. H. Levy of

London, the famous "D" of Bradlough's "Na.
ional Reformer," the editor of the "Personal
 Rights Journal," the secretary of the Political
Counse of the National Liberal Club, and
man whose mental acumen and thorough.
ness of scholarly command for his utteranc.
ons on social questions the careful considera.

My Dear Mr. Tucker:

Will you be so kind as to put me down for two cop.
your new book? I will remit the price directly.
find from Liberty that you are prepared to is.
the new publication. I am ready to ch
in the states that you will be at least in a
one vital point of political principle, and
 se some on several minor points; but all students of
litical philosophy must be grateful to you for
human, for now, I am at liberty to s
your for the New Year, believe me always faithfully yours,

LONDON, DECEMBER 28, 1892.

The following is a catalogue of the important articles relat.
ning to social science appearing during the
week in the world's periodical press, and in offer-
 to regularly supply these articles, in the for.
 of clippings, at a low price (considering the work and expense involved), Liberty vastly adds to its value to students of sociology, of whatever school. It hopes, therefore, to receive for this new department a generous support.

The subscribers to Liberty cannot better add.
advantages than by purchasing clippings regularly and by bringing the Index to the at.
ention of all people whom it can interest. If, after a period of experiment, the result is suffi.
ently encouraging, the scope of the Index will be
larged, and especial attention will be given to
 the contents of the European press. To do
this, the paper must be increased in size. If
every subscriber to Liberty regularly buy at.
least one clipping a week, the number of pages could be increased to eight without an in.
crease of price, two pages more could be given
to the Index, and two or three extra pages of
reading matter could be added. Moreover, the paper would at once command an attention that in its present form cannot be secured, and it would become a power. What say you, rev-

cers? Will you do it?

Corollaries.

—I am taken to task by the associate editor of "Lucifer," Lillie D. White, and by her cor.
respondent, Lizzie M. Holmes, for my needlessly cruel and harsh verdict upon the alleged book on government from the pens of Mr. and Mrs. Kelso. These kind-hearted fellow-victims (I
fer that they have passed through the ordeal of reading the book) do not directly challenge the
truth of my affirmations or the correctness of my conclusions. Mrs. Holmes, in fact, seems
to concede that my case is perfectly good, and only deplores the manner in which I chose to
 deliver my arraignment. Mrs. White is not quite so careful and prudent; she not only ven-
tures to intimate that I am unjust and that I err on the side of intolerance and dogmatic partisan-
ship, but reprints as a set-off some passages of solid imbecility from something somebody has
written somewhere in extravagant laudation of the book. The reader is hereby implica-
tion asked to believe that the fact that my un-
qualified condemnation is far from being shared by everybody and is contradicted by an estimate amounting to a panegyric somewhere proves that I was too extreme and so far wrong. It is
hardly necessary to point out that no weak reader can possibly be caught in the trap. Even if I had not given incontestable proof of the truth of my charges and had contented myself with the purchase of unsupported accusations, the citation of a mysterious unknown against me
would have been totally inadequate and incon-
clusive. In the republic of letters all may be
free (the appearance of the Kelso production and the estimate of Mrs. White's stranger cer-
tainly dispels all doubt as to the existence of perfect freedom), but all are not equal. The
unsupported opinion of one may have a certain value and weight where another's bare asser-
tions are resented as impudent. But I did not confound myself with mere and bare assertions; I
proved every point I made. Does the mysteri-
ous stranger follow the same method? Far from it. Yet be prepared to recommend and welcome the book to the world in a way which should be tolerated only when coming from those who can speak with authority. Mrs. White's stranger may be good-looking, good-natured, and very worthy; but, to use a Hibernianism, the little knowledge he has of Anarchism he has yet to learn from those critics of Mr. Keble's book who are so radically opposed to him. If I have been in the slightest degree unjust to the author of "Government Anarchists," I am ready to retract and humble myself. Will my kind friends specify my sin or sins? But if no injustice can be shown, then I am perfectly willing to plead guilty to the charges of crudity and harshness. But crudity is sometimes only kind- ness in disguise. Is it not more than cruel to confuse and misinform people, to misrepresent and pervert and distort truths? The Kebleans are guilty of these offenses; there was no mate aforesaying, perhaps, in their case, but there were criminal negligence and recklessness. Such a case calls for punishment. Readers have claims as well as authors, and it is to be remembered that the readers are "passive and inoffensive, splendid, while the author challenges criticism and invites frank judgment. I agree with the critic who says better hit him than too softly.

—Our amusing friend Guntan has perpetrated another droll joke. During the recent canvass he pressed as the self-styled professor of economics to the Republican class. Even the sudden desertion of his "scientific protection" by his able assistant, Nichols, was not allowed to disturb his equanimity. The professor delivered his lectures to empty benches; nobody paid him the slightest attention. But he knew that his vindication was at hand, and he was imperturbable. Now that the contest is known to have gone against the professor's truant pupils and the latter are in a repentant mood, there is a fine opportunity for a dignified rebuke; and our professor has improved it. In the "Social Economist," he publishes an article on the economic significance of the election, in which he explains the defeat of his pupils and points out the way by which they may regain supremacy. The Republican party, he says, has totally failed to prove that the national prosperity is due to protection. They have been empirical in their defence of protection and have not given it any scientific standing. In their ignorance they have been led to indulge in preposterous claims and transparent absurdities. Indeed, the protectionists have attempted to rest their plea in everything except free trade, their doctrines are the same as those of the free traders. It is this which makes their reasoning weak, and makes it impossible for them to meet the most telling points of the free traders. Hence it is not surprising that the public should lose faith in protection and its advo- cates. But the protectionists have now received notice that empirical treatment of great questions will no longer pass for statesmanship. They must not expect to be floated back to power on a reaction created by the inevitable blunders and sins of the Democrats. The people may become disgusted with both parties and flock toward the Socialist party. To secure a new lease of life the Republicans must take a step forward and formulate a scientific pro-

gramme. They must understand that we have reached a state of intelligence where nothing but economic philosophy can be made the basis of public policy: not the narrow economics of the English school, but the social economics of the American school, which belong to the complex conditions of modern industry: not the economics of low wages and foreign markets, but the economics of high wages and home markets. Modern American economics would enable them to reproduce a scientific basis for protection. Do you catch the drift of the cunning professor's remarks. To appreciate the richness of all this it is necessary to know that by the "American school" our professor means—himself, and by American economics his own economy. Guntan has written some books which have failed, I presume, to create a demand (this, I infer, is why he is so bitterly opposed to the law of supply and demand). What sort of a law is it which fails to create a demand after a supply has been produced? And has he organized a college of American economics which is not as well attended as he earnestly believes it ought to be. The Republicans pretend to favor everything American, and why should they not buy Guntan's works? Regarded as an advertisement of certain of his books and the college, Guntan's article is a great success. To start out with a discussion of the election and wind up with American economics, abe C. Guntanian, is very shrewd.

V. Y.

Speaking of Keble's book, Merlino says in "Solidarity": "This book reeks to our minds [By the way, how many minds has Merlino?] a smaller one, which we discovered, as it were, in a little country library some time ago, and would gladly see reprinted,—Engels' "Abolition of the State," a little volume containing a brilliant exposition of the theories which have capped the foundations of the State. The two chapters on Proudhon would be specially instructive for Individualists and Anarchists. Here's the richness! So you discovered this book, Mr. Bright Man, did you?—as it were? And you advise us Individualist-Anarchists to read it, do you?—especially the chapters on Proudhon? And you would like to see it reprinted, would you? Well, let me inform you, my ignorant friend, that I discovered Dr. Engels' book when it was first published in English by Truth in 1875, many years before I started Liberty; that it has ever since been a cherished volume in my library, that the chapters on Proudhon are my especial delight; that your wish has already been gratified, since a large portion of the book, including the chapters on Proudhon, has been reprinted serially in Liberty within two years; and that I own a set of plates of the matter thus reprinted serially, from which I have only been prevented from printing a pamphlet edition by lack of time and means. The truth is that Dr. Engels' book is in the main a brilliant exposition of the doctrines of Proudhon and a scathing condemnation of the doctrines of Merlino and "Solidarity." But Merlino does not know this, for he is so feeble-minded that, like Colonel Keble and his wife, he is enabled by no statement of a doctrine, however clear, to recognize, identify, or distinguish it. Does the reader think I speak extravagantly? Then let us test my assertion. In saying that the chapters on Proudhon would be specially instructive for Individualist-Anarchists, Merlino virtually says that these chapters contain some fact which we do not know or some doctrine from which we dissent. Now I challenge him to quote from the chapters in question such fact or such doctrine. He cannot do so. I, on the other hand, stand ready, if he desires it, to give him quotation after quotation from Dr. Engels' book. I am not at variance with the Communist solution of the social problem. There is no more resemblance between Keble's book and Engels's than there is between "Solidarity" and Liberty.

At a recent meeting of the House of Representatives committee on currency and banking, mainly Democrats, of course, a motion of Mr. Cox of Tennessee that a bill be introduced in the House to carry out the State-bank plan in the Democratic platform was defeated by a vote of three to one. Then, by a considerable majority, the committee voted to introduce a bill reducing the tax on national banks and giving them power to issue notes to the full extent of their collateral. In other words, this Demo- cratic committee not only refuses to weaken the existing money monopoly, but proposes to strengthen it. All of which is respectfully submitted to Commodores Yarros and Walker, and to voting Anarchists generally, with the assurance of my most distinguished consideration.

The editor of the London "Freethinker" in- fers from the success of the subscription-list to my forthcoming book that "there are evidently some admirers of individual thought and hard hitting in America."

J. Fenimore Cooper on J. Whidden Graham.

The following passage from "The Two Admirals"—a book which, if at the age of ten, prompted presuma- bly by the Eroticistic virus that had already tainted my blood, pronounced the best of Cooper's novels—is re- commendned to the attention of Mr. J. Whidden Gra- ham, Mr. F. F. Cook, and those "stanch friends" of mine to whom "Liberty can never again be what it once was":

Sir Gervase Oakes stopped in his walk, and gazed at his friend with manifest interest, as he perceived that Blue-water was running over his letter for the third time. . . .

"A set of precious rascals they are, Gervase!" at length the Rear-admiral exclaimed. "If the whole court were called, I question if enough honesty could be found to coroner one Puritan scoundrel. Tell me if you know this hand, Oakes? I question if you ever saw it before."

His proscription of the letter was held out to Sir Gervase, who, after a close examination, declared him self unacquainted with the writing.

"I thought as much," resumed Blue-water, carefully tearing the signature from the bottom of the page, and burning it in a candle; "let this portion of the secret die, at least. The fellow who wrote this has put confidentially in the head of his miserable scroll; and a most confident fellow he is, for no man at all has a right to thrust himself, in this rude manner, between me and my oldest friend; and least of all will I consent to keep this piece of treachery from your knowledge." He then burned more than the rascal merits in concealing his name; nevertheless, I shall not deny my self the pleasure of sending him such an answer as he deserve.

Read that, Oakes, and then say if keel- hooking would be too good for the writer."

His masterly move is intended to secure me, by creat- ing a confidence that they think no good-natured man would betray. It is a book, delicately tailed to catch a gudgeon.
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