Problems of Anarchism.

INTRODUCTION.

6. — Liberty and Its Law.

In tracing the economic effects of capitalism my purpose was to bring out the fact that the conditions favorable to the growth of individual liberty have unmistakably improved. And as every phase of progress, including moral, religious, and political freedom, is dependent on economic ideas, the conditions and aspirations expanding in proportion to the opportunity for growth which these conditions afford, it required but a short time to sum up the results of our inquiry in order to see that they converge toward the same result.

Setting out with the axiomatic principle that free individual development is a primary need of man, we saw that his progress in the social state has been from the negation of freedom toward individual liberty in all its aspects,—that in this path ever more surely moves the trend of civilization. Then, after tracing the lines of economic development prior to modern times, we came to the question as to whether liberty had advanced commensurately with industrial progress. The general recognition of existing evils was pointed out, and also the universal disregard as to their cause.

Next was discussed the relation between political authority and personal freedom, the origin and growth of the former, using as a basis the prevalent confusion of ideas on the subject. After which the nature of capitalism was ethically considered preparatory to the question of how far and in what way capitalism has evolved the conditions which give individual liberty fuller opportunity for development. We have already seen that ideas grow in accordance with the extension of opportunities for their fulfillment. Hence it becomes clear that modern economic conditions are those in which liberty has advanced, in theory and in fact, by reason of the wider scope and freer field they afford it. Such I claim to be the effects of the capitalist system. Let us demonstrate this point more plainly. Where this system has grown to the greatest extent is where progress and liberty have made the biggest strides. And where it is least developed or has not yet arisen is where they are most backward.

According to Herbert Spencer, liberty increases with the growth of industrialism, which brings peace and progress. The point I wish to establish is quite different. I believe that this theory can be proved only of that form of capitalism which is modern capitalism. In England and the United States today we see the latter in its most evolved form. But alongside of it we also observe individual liberty in its highest state. On the other hand, we find in Russia that capitalism yet in its most elementary stage, that industrialism has not yet left the stage of communal or non-capitalistic agriculture. The position of liberty and progress there is needful to be studied. Now if between these extreme or range of civilized nations classified in relation to the development in each of the capitalist system of industry, we shall find that the advance of liberty is directly proportional to the stage of economic progress. Then the extraordinary civilization of ancient Peru rested on a most perfect system, according to some modern Socialists, of differentiated industrialism. It was, however, non-capitalistic. Supply and demand did not operate and money was not required. Patrimonialism was the point scarcely to be paralleled even in a utopian romance. Individualism had no place in that system. But with the absence of capitalism there was also the absence of all liberty. Personal freedom and property were everywhere.

China today shows us another stagnant civilization. Industrialism there was in a forward stage before any existing European nation had emerged from savagery. But it stopped there, and it never reached as the economic state of modern capitalism and has remained there ever since. Here again have we industrialism, but not liberty.

Next, I wish to emphasize is more special in its application than Spencer's theory upon the relations between militaryism and individualism as social types, which is a broad generalization. But my position is in no way opposed to it, though I believe the considerations which I have pointed out show cause for restricting the application of that theory. I will now put the result of this discussion into a principle which will render it both clearer and more useful.

The modern capitalist system is the only industrial type which has established the predominance of individualism—man's economic activities—over all other factors of society.

This formula explains why liberty in all directions has followed the growth of capitalism; because personal freedom, the prime condition to individualism, is preserved and maintained. But it stops there. For it begins and results as it does in the economic state of modern capitalism and has remained there ever since. Here again have we industrialism, but not liberty.

The study of natural phenomena in the light of Evolution teaching is the investigation of Man in relation to life in general,—to the scientific study of all the forces, internal and external, by which he is conditioned and in accordance with which he exists, develops, and continues to have a larger and larger amount of actualization out of life, both for each individual and for the race,—this method has disclosed an order or continuity in the phenomena which our reason is able to sift and classify, and from the seeming chaos we can formulate principles which guide us both in comprehending the nature of things and in further extending our knowledge. More than this, such formulated experience helps us to understand the nature and further his welfare, and guides him in his social relations.

Principles thus established we term scientific laws. They are simply descriptions, easily intelligible to the common mind, of the relations which observation makes known to us. This very trust I hold that at once make clear what is conveyed by the phrases natural law and scientific formula and indicate precisely their value.

According to the above method and in the sense just indicated has the law of equal freedom been laid down. When Herbert Spencer defines Justice to mean the liberty of each limited only by the like liberties of all and expresses it in the formula known as the law of equal freedom: "Every man is free to do that which he wills," qualified thus, "provided he infringes not the equal freedom of any other man," we are not, I apprehend, expected to find a new doctrine, but that the facts and solutions scientifically and philosophically interpreted justify us in accepting this brief description (law) as a necessary condition of social growth. Hence to observe it is to be guided by natural law.

The same principle, it is needless to remark, has often been laid down by apostles of liberty and other advanced thinkers, both from intuitive reasoning and empirical generalizations, but it has been left to the builders of scientific evolution to give it the force it now commands when established as a scientific demonstration.

Our inquiry up to this point has been to exhibit the tendency of civilization, and especially in its relation to economic development, as a movement toward individual liberty. It needed but the above conclusion from the philosophy of evolution to complete this part of the light of which this inquiry can go on with the inquiry in the belief that we shall be the more able to unravel the difficulties and overcome the obstacles which so thickly beset our path.

W.M. BAILIE.

Democratic Sincerity.

[New York Nat.]

The Legislature of North Carolina has gone to work to pass a law for fixing the rate of State bank-notes as though Congress had already repealed the ten per cent. tax. The idea has got abroad, especially in the South, that the next Congress will repeal the tax, and hence that it is only necessary to pass some kind of a law to regulate such issues, in order to be ready when the door is thrown open. There is no very good reason for supposing that Congress will repeal that tax. There is still a good idea that the people of the North will resist it unconditionally. Although the Democratic national platform contains a plank in favor of the repeal, it was not a real issue in the campaign except in a few places, and in these it did the party more harm than good, since it introduced a new subject for discussion and put the Democratic speakers and newspapers on the defensive. It is safe to say that Congress will not pass any bill to repeal the ten per cent. tax until it has a pretty clear idea of the probable consequences, and it is equally safe to predict that the President-elect will not sign any such bill without absolute assurance against the kind of wild-cutting and red-dogging that was rife before the war.

The Law Denounced from the Bench.

[New York Nat.]

PITTSBURGH, Jan. 21.—Two hundred and fifty-two oleomargarine dealers were each sentenced in the Criminal Court here this morning to pay $100 fine and costs, a total of more than $25,000. Judge Stone, in passing sentence, said:

"This law has been in force eight years, and only three years ago the United States Supreme Court affirmed its constitutionality. Since it is on our statute book, it must be lived up to, and I will say that I think it an outrageous law, and it should never have been passed. It should not be permitted longer to disgrace the State, and the people should see that it is amended."
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"Solidarity's" Sins Against Reason.

"Solidarity" has an article in which it attempts to wind up the controversy with Liberty. It may not be amiss to animadvert upon the principal points of the writer.

The beginning is far from auspicious. As long as we are told, as we demanded the abolition of government, law, police, taxation, and political machinery, we were entitled to call ourselves Anarchists. Now, however, that it appears that we merely propose to substitute "voluntary government" for compulsory government, voluntary taxation for compulsory taxation, and so forth, we have no claim on the title Anarchists, though we may properly denominate ourselves Individualists. The reader, I hope, is not so bewildered in the beginning, I say, is not so bewildered, the extreme subtlety of the observation showing that the writer deals with words simply, and does not concern himself about the idea behind the words. Were we Anarchists because we expressed detestation of the words police, government, etc., or because of the general principle which we sought to convey by means of words? Will "Solidarity" make a mental effort and try to grasp the fact that we oppose government, law, police, etc., solely on the ground that they are inconsistent with equal freedom, which is the sum and substance of Anarchism? Such an effort, if successful, would enable it to draw theuous corollary that we do not cease to be Anarchists when we declare for "voluntary government," which means cooperation for defense against aggressors, and voluntary taxation, which means contributions to defray the cost of such protective institutions. How can it be inconsistent for those who desire equal freedom to recognize any institution or thing which is perfectly consistent with equal freedom,—which, indeed, may be needed as a means of maintaining equal freedom? A "law" which denies equal freedom is not to be approved, and an agency for the enforcement of such a "law" is not to be sustained or supported, in accordance with a right definition of Anarchism. But when this is said, all is said. The rest is chimera, confusion, and mere sophistry.

"Spencer," continues "Solidarity," "is certainly not an Anarchist; Auburn Herbert, who maintains—and quite logically from the Individualist standpoint—that private property is an essential derivation of [deivative from] liberty, does not call himself an Anarchist. And we fail to see in what important respect the actual views of Tarros and Tucker differ from those of Auburn Herbert and Spencer." Naturally enough, you "fail to see," not knowing what Anarchism is. Spencer is not really an Anarchist, because he does not accept the principle of equal freedom unreservedly and unqualifiedly. He believes in coercion of non-invasive individuals to the extent necessitated by the maintenance of a government for protection against other trespassers than itself. In other words, Spencer favors compulsory taxation and compulsory military service, and therefore is not an Anarchist. As to Auburn Herbert, the question of what he calls himself is irrelevant. The fact that he follows Logical deductions from the general principle he professes. Parenthetically, a self-contradiction on the part of "Solidarity" may be noted. In saying that Herbert is logical in maintaining, from the Individualist standpoint, that private property is an essential derivative from liberty, it implies that the same conclusion could not logically be drawn from the Anarchist postulate,—that, in other words, Anarchism involves a denial of private property. Yet in the opening sentence of its article "Solidarity" distinctly intimates that those who demand the abolition of government, law, police, taxation, and political machinery, are entitled to call themselves Anarchists. Here no declaration of private property is required to qualify one for Anarchism.

"Liberty, we have said, is no solution. Individual liberty, free will, is a metaphysical conception which modern science has discarded, man being the creature of circumstances. After all is an Anarchist, although he is not altogether logical in the deductions he draws from the general principle he professes. Similarly, the self-contradiction on the part of "Solidarity" from further trouble on behalf of "modern science." What has "freewill" to do with liberty? Is the attempt to use the former as a synonym of the latter a manifestation of stupidity, or of something less pardonable? If liberty is a metaphysical conception, then why are those who demand the abolition of government and law and taxation Anarchists? To demand the abolition of these is to demand individual liberty; and if liberty has been discarded by science, Anarchism has been discarded by science. "Solidarity" claims that it alone represents genuine Anarchism; the implication is that it alone represents, in its purity, a metaphysical conception discarded by science. Towards the end of its article "Solidarity" remarks that "nobody disputes" that "the liberty of the individuals must be allowed as free scope as possible." What? Allow the individual as much as possible of a metaphysical conception discarded by science? Oh, poor "Solidarity"! Its state of mind beggars description.

"The Individualist's only standard of conduct is absence of coercion. Provided an individual consents to do something, that thing is right." The expression here is decidedly imperfect, but the meaning is plain enough: and the statement may be admitted as correct, not indeed with reference to Individualists, who are not at all satisfied with mere abstinence, but with reference to Anarchists. "Now a man's consent may be got by indirect coercion," "Consent to what? Consent to deprivation of rights and freedoms? Then why do governments and private aggressors resort very generally to indirect coercion?" "Solidarity" should not be quite so reckless in question-begging. We contend that indirect coercion will never answer the designs of invaders, official or unofficial. "Aubon Herbert says indirect coercion is unavoidable and unsociable," "Solidarity" quotes the case of the violinist on the character of orfence from the capitalistic exploitation. Certainly; if the workmen are pleased to part with surplus value in favor of the capitalists, no wrong is done; they are no longer any victims. But do they acquire? And, whether they do or not, we do not; hence the capitalistic system, based on direct coercion so far at least as we are concerned, is invested with the character of offence. He who uses direct force to combat indirect force indefinitely delays the development of those moral influences to which we can alone look as the solvent of that temper that makes men use hardly the indirect power resting in their hands." Fine talk, which proves what as well against indirect as against direct force. The consequence would be to strengthen indirect force by our forbearing to use that kind of force (direct) which alone may be opposed to it," Question-begging again. Not only is it not true that direct force alone "may [can successfully?] be opposed to indirect force, but the principal point is that indirect force is legitimate, while direct force is never legitimate when applied to the non-aggressive. "Solidarity's" progress in imbecility is truly extraordinary.

"Men," philosophizes "Solidarity," "are social beings, live a social life, and must needs organize their social relations for the common advantage, or else some will be victims of others." The bearing of these wise remarks lies in their application. Does it follow that private property and free competition must be ruthlessly suppressed? "Solidarity" quotes certain remarks of Spencer's on the relation between individual and social welfare, and supplements them as follows: "He might have added [as if he hadn't!] that whatever increases their happiness concerns him, for he actually suffers from the sight of their misery, and shares in their enjoyment. The life of the individual is made of numberless influences from the surrounding joys and sorrows, knowledge and prejudices, accumulated wealth, habits and feelings. The sentiment is beautiful, but what in the world has compulsory communism to do with it? "How these principles may be reconciled [reconciled!] with the 'atomistic' view taken of society by the individualists is a puzzle to us." It is a puzzle to see how "Solidarity" has persuaded itself that we take an "atomistic" view of society. Or rather, it is no puzzle at all. Not enjoying any knowledge of our real view of society, "Solidarity" d'apriori imparts to us a view which it thinks objectionable enough to
harmonize with the rest of its misconceptions of our position. Having already exerted so much "solidarity" to make our mental effort, I cannot now urge it to make another and try to comprehend our view of society. Not satisfied with Spencer, "solidarity" presses another authority into service. "Cooperation" (says Metchnikoff) is the main feature of social life. If, in the province of biology, the more or less individualized beings, from cell to man, struggle for life or for some egoistic or personal aim, in the province of sociology, on the contrary, they unite for a common interest." Bravo! We hope they will grow wiser as time passes and learn to cooperate more and more; in fact, we are convinced that they will do so. But what, again, has all this to do with the denial of all freedom and the violation of the fundamental conditions of social cooperation? "Solidarity" argues against its own position. No compulsion is necessary to induce men to unite their efforts for a common interest. Men must have liberty to cooperate when cooperation is advantageous, and purposely set up institutions (indirect cooperation is inseparable from civilization) when pulling apart seems more expedient. The sociology of "Communist Anarchism" is miserable enough; the bad biology and wretched psychology which "solidarity" can call to its support had better not be raked up. As for modern science, the less "solidarity" says of it, the better for its cause. I have only dealt with "solidarity"'s ethics and politics. As to its political economy, I may have occasion to refer to it, and I may not.

The Devils' Kingdom

That sanguine worshipper of the majority, J. W. Sullivan, concludes an article, maintaining that the people are in advance of the laws and that the Referendum would abolish capital punishment, with these words: "I believe that when the people are the lawgivers, they will heed the injunction of humanity: 'Thou shalt not kill.'" The words had hardly flowed from his pen when a Texas mob, composed of all classes and thoroughly representative of a modern civilized community, burned a negro at the stake, preserving his bones with great torture which for plunder ingenuity was never surpassed by any government that ever existed. If this negro is now in hell, he probably fails to see the difference between the flames that envelop him by order of His Satanic Majesty, monarch by divine right, and those that were lit about his feet on earth by the Direct Government of the People, who, becoming for the moment lawgivers through initiative, and heeding presumably the injunction of humanity, had previously bored his eyes out with red-hot irons. I lately had occasion to say, criticizing the Referendum, in an article entitled "The Fools' Kingdom," that there is no such fool as the average man. Recent events justify me in declaring further that there is no such devil as the average man. And Frank Foster, if he chooses, may take this as another "definite implication" that the editor of Liberty does by no means consider himself as an average man. T.

It is pleasant to be able to announce that "Egoism" has resumed regular publication. It is a four-page fortnightly at fifty cents a year.

Address: Box 366, Oakland, California.

Candor compels me to admit that the Democrats did better in the vote in the Senate on the anti-option bill than I expected them to. True, the division did not take place on party lines by any means; nevertheless the proportion of Republicans who voted for the paternalistic measure was much larger than the proportion of Democrats. I had looked for the reverse of this; not, of course, that I thought the Republicans less paternalistic than the Democrats, but that I supposed them less willing to interfere with gambling on the stock exchange. If the votes were recorded in the public rooms, then I should have expected the Democrats to oppose interference. If an anti-option bill should come before the new congress, the vote would probably differ somewhat from the vote just taken. In that body there will be many Democrats from the West, and, as section rather than party seems now to determine political opinions, many of these new members will bow to the Western demand for paternalism.

Free Trade and Brotherhood.

Although, in the traditions of the "Post," I have had a Foote on me, I do not feel in the least hurt. And I ought to say why I think that Foote can do no great service to the rescue of "American Ethics," as regarded by the man who desires moral and intellectual progress. It is apparent that Mr. Foote, like his coadjutor, misses the main point in dispute. If I could get the editor to submit this as a simply talking politics, I would feel that the discussion is consistent if not glorious. But as he persists in calling his politics ethics, and then declines to submit his ethical code to the only tribunal which has the authority to pass judgment upon it, I am brought back to a real poverty and have no qualms about destroying his rope of sand.

Perhaps Mr. Foote is less subject to this criticism than the editor. After all, he avoids the assertion of a creed in which his colossus has made so much. And yet his very discussion of the problem with this avowal so evident opens him to my question and my charges. What I have desired from the first has been to learn how ethics, "American" or other, could be turned into a sword of evil intent or of destruction. I have asked to be informed why I should ethically and humanly be less concerned for the individual than he is; why he lives in Europe than of Podge after he boards ship and crosses the sea and takes out his papers here. I have wondered by what paradox of reasoning American "ethics" could dismiss the earliest principles and begin a system of ethics. The editor of this "moonshine." Meanwhile, he has not answered my questions. You all talk of the "destiny" and "purpose" of America. America's habit must be to be decent. America's destiny must be to achieve such status as decency will encourage and assure. Violate decency, and what is your destiny worth? The fate of a nation is complicated with its moral growth and achievement. No success can arise but on this true principle. A nation needs to be careful of its morals. It rises or falls as it answers the questions of right or wrong. The man who is an individual player is an equal part in the career of a nation. It may prove that, while your goods are protected, your morals are defenseless. If honesty is required upon you; if it is your part to accept a moral code at all, — by what reasoning does your fault point at the sea's edge? The big man is prodigal of his power. He gives, he accepts; he declares no competitions. The big nation is as much right as the small nation. The big nation does not drag at the heels of virtue. It becomes virtuous. It fills the cup again and again, and receives no guest. Brotherhood allows no diminution in the measure of its love. It tells no tale of a "destiny," but builds on separation and destruction. Before all else it sets "American ethics."

Now, what do I ask from the "Post"? An answer to such questions. If the editor lives next door and thinks his life's end achieved when by subterfuges and terrors he is persuaded upon his professions while I starve, then I say that, while he may be "wise" after the average motion of his or his community, he has no call for self-congratulation over the quality of his work. Until these considerations are disposed of, all else must stand aside. Bring in whatever "practical" workers you may, it is not possible to go intelligently about the labor even of government men as long as the "dreamer" has not divested his dream.

An "American" ethical code which erects "American" right above human right is both curious and cruel. And it proceeds to ignore the question as if it merely concerned him, or one party to an international transaction. I claim that there is another party to the experience, the principle, the result. That other party, for those who are humanly and ethically as near to us as are neighbors and kindred. If you say that we are not supposed to have any concern for the alien,—that always and at whatever cost,—I say you have closed the door on your ethics and given the household over to expediency. And there are, besides, prior claims of liberty to be accounted for. Privilege destroys the individual. Liberty could long exist where the claims of joy are so freely created by the general labor. All obstructions to free intercourse, whether between individuals or nations, are bad. Restriction always sets injustice somewhere. Somewhere resists a harvest of thieves. Someone starves. Someone is denied. America cannot really prosper, however she appears to prosper, if Bohemia must starve for her. Reasons attach a fanciful importance to "destiny" as they imagine to "beats" aside means for ends. Those who expect to pluck triumph out of the supremacy of injustice have little conception of that law of social life which decrees death for any claim upon the other individual. Mr. Foote speaks of "natural" protection. It may be "natural" for some men to wish to curtail the righteous opportunities of other men. It may be "natural" for some men to be jealous of their rights and duties. Each side may have its argument. But in the end the only "natural" course is that which freedom opens. Hands off. Let the individual alone. As long as the individual respects the property of other individuals, do not interrupt the sacred privacy. The individual is primate. He is self-arbitier. "Protected" at another's expense, he is not protected at all. Harass the individual in his service of international hospitality: not allowed to wander over earth, recognizing everywhere the same human nature, entitled to the same hopes and chances, — how can we call him "free"? America, with a "destiny" to teach the children of other social conditions than his own the finer lessons of democracy?

Let me then ask the editor and his friends to meet the question fairly. The editor tells him on his platform.

"American ethics." Let him justify his platform. He cannot do that by any attempt to picture America as a chosen nation to whose destiny all other nations must defer. I do argue for the abandonment of anybody, but for the inclusion of all. The laws of virtue cannot be evaded. Injustice contains the germ of its own destruction. The old rules by which states may have been built do not operate today. As man's sense of right enlarges, the provincial areas of its demonstration do not satisfy the spirit. What I plend for is that the world may realize its common interests and common destiny. It may be that we may only be the one that that sense of compact and universality are in the nature of things evil and suicidal. As Walt Whitman has splendidly said, we are aboard one ship, and what is port for one is port for all. I ask for ethical reasons. For I may again recall for the editor that he has presented a brief for "American" ethics, that such eloquence justified. Therefore and finally I still maintain that what is port for one is port for all.

HORACE L. TRAVERUL.
The Sociological Index.