Problems of Anarchism.

INTRODUCTION.

Not only do ideas conform to existing conditions and opportunities for their realization, but they correspond to modes of life that have already been passed through. The idea arising out of the latest conditions of existence is frequently in variance with the conceptions covering the same ground which originated in more remote and distant times. As the various phases of human society are continually met with views that are most contradictory on questions of principle, about which there could be no dispute if the natural phenomena underlying the matter were in their order of development. What are the tendencies of the present political and economic growth and their relation to the individual? To these questions I believe a rational and not uncertain answer should be given, and that we should regard it as a most hopeful accomplishment of the professors.

It has been shown that the ideas of political and religious liberty have grown and continue to expand in a more natural way than the idea of individual freedom. The most fundamental principles of government are developed by the whole society, and the growth of the former hastens the extension of the latter, and conversely, till the aim is fully realized. Progress then moves more rapidly at every step as the idea grows.

If we are to accept the conclusions of the critics of capitalism,—that is, the existing economic condition of society,—we must believe that the spirit of capitalism is more important than in pre-capitalistic times. Wage slavery is natural to a capitalist economy. Individual freedom is violated by present economic arrangements even more than it was in previous states. These crises, while apparently agreeing with modern science as regards the order of man's development, nevertheless take away much of the same sort as J. J. Rousseau and the elder school of Communists, whose two or one another held that man began in a perfect state of natural liberty, equality, etc., and that he lost something from the stage of development. We must not lose if the belief in evolution together with the facts through which it works will warn us of classifying capitalism as an economic retrogression; determine whether personal freedom is advanced or retarded in the economic processes. A bugbear here meets us, about which something must be said before we proceed. Individualism, as it is made to appear in Socialistic writings, is a doctrine of the 19th century, the blackest dye. Now it is useless to pretend that this whole essay, dealing chiefly with individual sovereignty, is not open to all the objections which are commonly lodged to the door of the much-hated creature, in Socialism. Here we are tempted into a moral delusion, for in truth economics, unless looked at by the light which, natural ethics can shed upon the subject, remains barren and avails nothing.

The good angel opposing individualism is, we must infer, in general collectivist Socialism, in its narrower sense mutual aid, altruistically altruism. Therefore some kind of altruism is implied in individualism. They are two sides of the same thing, what grows according as the conditions are more or less favorable. Mutual aid, cooperation, collective effort, often contra to egoistic satisfaction, to individual welfare. Perfect individualism would be a state of anarchy, where every man has his origin in self-satisfaction. Moreover, it is inseparable from any form of social life, which could neither exist nor of any advantage without it. Altruism, unless it is spontaneous and voluntary, has no ethical value. Every kind of conduct, and more especially the ideas from which it springs, is determined by the conditions under which life is carried on. The mode of life is determined by the ideals that the individual has. Such conduct is altruistic. The individual freely pursuing his own welfare is led to act for the good of others, conduct which is altruistic. To whatever extent a man co-operates, determines the aim in the good of others or altruism, then individualism—the condition out of which it arises—must be given the fullest opportunity for development. The Socialist attack on individualism as an economic evil will be dealt with at more length later on. At present I desire to point out simply that, as I understand it, there is not necessarily antagonism between complete individualism and general happiness, because the one can be attained at the expense of the other. Neither do I deny that a knowledge of the laws which govern conduct, irrespective of the individual will, would prove of service to each in regulating his actions toward others; but conformity to such laws is not a matter of obligation, except in so far as consequences render it so. Natural law from a moral standpoint enjoins nothing, enforces nothing, carries no obligation. When stated and its consequences known, the individual is free to use, indeed, it is only temporarily, as a man may risk an injury or even his life to accomplish a greater end. It is impossible to traverse natural sequences continuously without suffering or some kind of injury. For the sake of certain of us might be derived from that conduct which is best. In this spirit alone do we formulate right and wrong, what is beneficial and what is injurious, and point out the laws of social health. Such a doctrine of the common of this inquiry. There remains but one remark to add to the above tale. The good and truly moral conduct or mode of life is that which is spontaneous and occurring in the world, free from feelings of obligation or conscience. And this spontaneous, unconditioned conduct under favorable conditions—this is, freedom—tends ever to become the best for self and others.
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On Picket Duty.

It is apparently with approval that the "Voice" quotes from Byron the following sentiment: "I wish men to be free, as much from mobs as kings,—from one as from another. This hardly seems to place in the columns of an organ of protest, whose real platform is: "I wish men to be free, from kings, but not from mobs, from you, but not from me."

To be confined in prison seems to have produced much the same effect upon Moses Harman as that to be noticed in Hugh O. Pentecost since the latter has confined himself to the practice of law. Mr. Pentecost has become a Tammany Democrat and Mr. Harman is espousing Single-Taxism. "These two men, who formerly held progressive ideas, should congratulate themselves upon being so nearly together in retrogression."

Egoistic and altruistic are, properly, antithetical adjectives which, in philosophy, characterize, not the nature or the consequences of the secondary motive of conduct, but the fundamental motive. To wrest the word altruistic from this usage and make it characterize conduct in itself or its immediate motive is mischievous. The needless use of a word in two meanings tends to develop the habit of reasoning from correct premises in which the word is used in one sense to false conclusions in which it is used in the other sense,—a practice which is unscientific, confusing, and, in the present instance, Spencerian.

How fond some people are of whipping the devil round the stump! Here is the editor of the Keokuk "Chronicle," for instance, who champions the cause of labor and, in a eulogy of General Butler, tells us that his hero was "a wealthy, not by exploiting the poor, but by catering to the vanity of the rich." As if it were possible to grow wealthy otherwise than by exploiting the poor! I am not afflicted with Butlerphobia and have no desire to denounce the unique character that has just disappeared for unscrupulous practices in which nearly all, myself included, are participants; but I seriously object to an abandonment of the fundamental principle of the labor movement in an effort to make it appear that this highly successful plunder was less a thief than the rest of us. To say that General Butler got rich by catering to the vanity of the rich is simply another way of saying that the rich are thieves and that General Butler was their "fence."
The Nude in Artists.

In "Seriber's" for December Will H. Low and Kenyon Cox devote several pages to a discussion of "The Nude in Art." However far above ordinary mortals the artist may be, the former is entitled to the enjoyment of the beautiful, and should not be deprived of that pleasure merely because there are some people—albeit artists—who believe that the veil of secrecy should be securely drawn around certain things in nature, who believe that there are, in this respect, privileges which artists enjoy that should not be granted to the general public. It is because of the evident existence of such beliefs, and their palpably delusive effects, and only because of them, that I am constrained to criticize the utterances of persons upon a subject of which they, it is to be presumed, know everything and I know nothing.

Mr. Low does admirably in claiming for artists the right to draw and model the nude form in all its aspects and in the most realistic manner; but in his concluding paragraph he strangely contradicts what he previously says, and, indeed, renders much of it absolutely meaningless. He gravely informs the public that there are "manifestations" of the study of the nude with which it has no right to deal; and the exhibition outside of a school of an analyzed study from the nude is a mistake." I shall not risk making myself ridiculous, even in the eyes of the goody-goodies, by asking why; that question is answered before I asked it. The reason is that the nude is "grotesque." By implication we are reminded that the public has no business with the physician's dissecting table; but the fact that, when the public requires the services of a surgeon, it is brought into intimate contact with an abstract "manifestation" of the dissecting table seems to be lost sight of. When, in the minds of at least Mr. Low's "juries of painters," the nude is no longer gross, the managers of art exhibitions will not have to be careful that what they admit to their walls is beyond censure or disparage from any point of view of morality. Comstockism or other.

In Kenyon Cox's contribution there is more to praise and less to criticise. Such utterances as his cannot fail to elevate art—if art need elevation—and what he denominates—to assist people to form a clear and pure conception of the nude human form.

But Mr. Cox deals, in part, with a subject which Mr. Low does not discuss—drapery; and sundry observations of his thereupon cause several very pertinent questions to arise. He remarks that drapery may be used for ornament, but not for covering; that in ideal art it is used, or dispensed with, for purely artistic reasons, and has nothing to do with the propriety of clothing. If this be true, why does art in that drapery is when employed at all, almost invariably used in such a manner as to suggest covering? And, in the absence of drapery, why are positions and attitudes chosen which are clearly and plainly indicative of concealment or an attempt at it? Even when the "drapery" consists of but a leaf, do "ideal art" and the requirements of ornament demand that it be devoted exclusively to one certain and peculiar part of the human figure?

There seems to be something radically inconsistent between Mr. Cox's theory and the universal use of painters and sculptors of course there are a few exceptions to this practice, but these exceptions, where they exist, are rarely to be found among the works of modern artists; the old masters must be accorded that honor.

There is another thing,—and Mr. Cox recognises it and indirectly alludes to, the fact that the nude form of a woman is very rarely, and that of a man but little more frequently, either in marble or on canvas, comes to nature. Mr. Cox enthusiastically praises realism, tempered, of course, with a necessary amount of idealism; he says that every artist takes from nature all that he can get; does an artist do this when he misrepresents the human form or reproduces it in a mutilated condition? To be sure, Mr. Cox maintains, and with reason, that realism is not necessarily truth to nature, and I can readily conceive how and why his "alteration or arrangement" would be justifiable, as a matter of art; but that certain parts of the human form should be omitted from a representation is as utterly incomprehensible as would be the absence of grass from a picture of a meadow.

Despite the fact that Mr. Cox takes a broader view of the subject than does Mr. Low, he agrees with the latter in the allegation that there are reasons for the use of the nude nude in preliminary study, but not for the depiction of the naked figure as a subject of completed art, thereby virtually annihilating the larger part of what he says in behalf of a wider appreciation of the nude as a subject for painting and sculpture. Surely we have in these artists' "manifestations" of the nude, the barest of naked hypocrisy in the unclothed minds of embryonic tyrants. When will mankind in general, and artists in particular, discover the ethics of art? C. L. S.

Corollaries.

"In his first book," writes Henry George, the well-known plagiarist, referring to Herbert Spencer, the great philosopher and reformer, "when he believed in God, in a divine order, in a moral sense, and which he has now encompassed, he does appear as an honest and fearless man, though sometimes too careless a thinker. But that part of our estimation which crosses what is now his distinctive philosophy shows him to be, as a philosopher ridiculous, as a man contemptible,—a faulting View of Bray, clothing in pompous phrasology and arrogant assumption logical confusion so absurd as to be comical." This passage more than justifies my prediction. George has written himself down an ass,—not an immoral ass, but just simply an ass, who will not even be remembered for his asinity. Asses come and asses go; but the fame and influence of such towering personalities as Spencer remain and abide with us forever. I wonder what the sentiments are of those Single-Taxers who are not hypnotized by this clown and pigmy, George, who has so long posed as a leader and thinker. It is high time to end the farce.

Edward Atkinson is one of the contributors to a symposium on the question of land tenure in the "Voice." This is the way he starts out: "The indefensible possession of land is admitted to be essential to its productive use both by the advocates of the single tax upon land as well as by all others, except Anarchists and Communists, who are too insignificant to be counted or considered." Ordinarily such arrogant and ignorant assumptions as this find no impediment in their mistake path and breed of selfish unchecked. But in the present instance a curious coincidence deprives the Atkinsonian falsehood of its sting and force, and places the presumptuous guide in a very unfavorable light. To the same symposium the writer of these lines contributes a statement of the Anarchistic solution of the land problem, from which it is of course clearly appears that Anarchists are among the firmest upholders of the principle of private property in land. The reader's feeling after escaping the two utterances may be imagined; and it is safe to say that he will never again be tempted to bank on Atkinson's representations. But will the lesson be treasured up by the disgraced pretender?

"Nothing is better established," says the New York "Evening Posi," "than that crime is intimately related to the conditions of life in any country, so that it increases in hard times and diminishes in prosperous years" I reproduce this for the benefit of two different and indeed antagonistic schools of reform. There are some firm adherents of the principle of equal liberty who question the scientific value of the statistical analyses of Anarchists with regard to the disappearance of crime under a régime of equal opportunities and freedom. That justice will tend to diminish crime is by these regarded as merely a "pious opinion." It is therefore pertinent and pleasing to call their attention to the fact that the Anarchist and pessimism spring from ignorance of well-established truths. The other school I have in mind is composed of those who are so puzzled and dismayed by the cold and sober statement that an Anarchistic society is not necessarily insured against crime and pe-
it is stated in " Lucifer " that the Anarchists of Topeka are " with " the Populists of Kansas in their efforts to organize the House of Representatives of that State, when a majority of the members of that body are Republicans. If this statement be true, what I have said here, and I think is suspected to be true, that there are no Anarchists in Topeka.

" I am no Anarchist," writes Kate Field; "I realize that when mercant men make contracts they should be fulfilled." Why, Kate, you are as ignorant as a -- as a -- as a political economist.

Poetry for the Counting-Room.

Friend Tozer: I send you herewith some verses I have lately perpetrated, -- the first, I believe, that I ever allowed to be published. Pray do not print them unless you can truly say that you would rather do so than not: for it is a fact, I believe, that few ethnographers are capable of saying nothing which the rest of the world wants.

The prosecution (aside from the fact that I have lately bought a new type-writer) is this. In a certain corporation's room that I know of, there hangs, well displayed, upon the wall, and doubtless in a kind of case (presumably for the cheering of the young men there employed, who have been known to express dissatisfaction with their wages) the following quatrain, supposed to be by J. G. Whittier:

Do well thy work: It shall succeed
In thine or in another's day.
And if denied thy victor's need,
Thou shalt not lack the toiler's pay.

Now three times, in their way, are excellent; one can hardly find any fault with them, except that "the toiler's pay" so securely promised is a somewhat indefinite quantity, and not warranted large enough to bring up a family of any particular size. And yet, as I looked at them (as I did pretty often), I could not help thinking that the directors might be, and probably were, in need of some advice, in brief and easily-comprehended form, on the other side of the question. Hence these lines, which I ventured to suggest, would not be wholly inappropriate for the decoration of their place of meeting.

To EMPLOYERS.

"What's mine for the grace I owe for the gander."

Pay well your help:

so shall you fill

Them and their children with content.

Though dividends may dwindle, still

You May, perhaps, get one cent.

But though your profits all should flee,

Can trifles thus your peace destroy?

Have they who've paid all bids, and see

Their "nest-egg" safe, no cause for joy?

Then cease to prey on others' need

To succeed at their own

Small matter if the wolf should feed

A few rods nearer to your door!

T. P. PERRIN.

LYNN, MASS., JANUARY 20, 1885.

A Jury Locked Up for Disobedience.

[New York Sun.]

COMBAT, Miss., Jan. 21. -- The case of Marion Jone against the Minneapolis and Charleston Railroad Company, for damages, is pending in the Circuit Court here for several days. Judge Houston charged the jury to find for the railroad, but the jury gave judgment for Jone for $500. The jury was ordered by the court to retire and consider the case. After being out as hour, they still declared for Jone. They were ordered out four times, but were immovable. They were finally ordered locked up, and there they are.

Present-Day Individualism.

(H. W. Vees as in November II o'clock.)

It is quite true, as Mr. Chamberlain says, that the doctrine of individualism was once the stock in trade of the Liberal party, though now somewhat discredited by them, and entirely by Governmentalists of the progressive type, engaged in tearing down the very councils of which we hear so much. If I had to say in a word what was the difference between them and the present-day individualists, I should say that they believe in revolution, in social and political revolution, in no monopoly and protection, we individualists in free trade and competition. They believe in restricting contract, we in freedom of it. This is our economical position. Our historical position is that it is the divine right of the king and then that of the nobles had to go, so the divine right of the majority to rule their fellows will have to go, being based on no more reason than the others, and the sovereigns of this himself and over no one else will have to succeed. The rule of man over man will have to come to an end, and in its place we shall have to have a voluntary association for suppressing the criminal tendencies in some people to govern others. -- that is, to use violence to them. To people who refrain from this, no one has any right to use any weapon but persuasion. We do not propose to destroy government by violence, but by subjecting all the functions to a more or less complete control as long as it survives under this condition, it will be because it is the fittest, and when it is shelved on one side, it will be because we are better served by private enterprise, and then need be no regret at its disappearance.

Anarchism in Scotland and Ireland.

Mr. Tozer: Enclosed is a two-dollar note. One dollar is for Liberty's receipts; the other is half payment for two copies of your prospective book, for which you will please to enter me. It may interest you to know that there are many men and women in both Scotland and Ireland -- the latter place I have been in for some months past -- who are taking more than a passing interest in the philosophy of Individualism.

Personally I was never pleased, or so were the few other Anarchists of Glasgow, with the open way in which you dealt with the convivial Democrat, Mr. Graham, by at once exposing his double dealing and striking death blows to the Populist idea of observing a one-sided secrecy where crime is involved.

Our friend, Albert Tarn, was in Glasgow last sum near a few weeks. He delivered several lectures, and addressed a number of meetings. With the exception of a few "abridging" expressions by our frater al funny things, the Communists, his utterances were very well received. Yours truly,

STEPHEN DOWNIE,
Glasgow, Scotland, January 1, 1885.

Too Independent for a Juror.

[New York Sun.]

The trial of Antonio Morell was justly indicted with his wife, Constanza, for the killing of Francesco Mele, a one-arm organ-grinder, in Mulberry Street on the evening of December 4, was begun yesterday in the General Sessions before Recorder Smyth. Joseph Stern of 240 Broadway was sworn as a witness. Recorder Smyth asked him:

"Would you accept the law relating to this case, as laid down by the Court, without attempting to quarrel the correctness of the Court's statement of the law?"

"Well," responded Stern, "I would listen to what the Court would say, and then I would accept it."

"What did you say your business was?" asked Recorder Smyth.

"Wholesale clothing," answered Stern.

"And Recorder Smyth," said Recorder Smyth, "you had better go and attend to your clothing business. I will excuse you for the term."

Well, I Should Hope Not.

[Boston Labor Leader.]

Benjamin F. [sic] Tucker says that the average man is the biggest of all fools. Which may be regarded as a delicate implication that our Anarchist friend does by no means consider himself as an average man.
BELLEROSE.


