Problems of Anarchism.

The enlightened modern opponents of private property not only allege that they can demonstrate its abolition to be the certain outcome of evolution. — economic, industrial, mental, and historical; but also claim that this end is being furthered by the vast and ever growing productions of modern legislators, and that it is the ultimate goal of Democracy. With this purpose in view they exploit the theory of the social organism, accepting it as a little discrimination as they have displayed in adopting general evolutionary teaching on which to construct their pleasant theories of hopeful delusions. Society is an organism, they say; therefore the perfect development of each individual is not necessarily the highest cultivation of his own personality, but the filling of his humble function in the great social machine. Hence the co-ordination of functions through government regulation is a progressive and beneficient step in the organization of society, which, however, blinds men to the existence of the social organism. In the "Moral Basis of Socialism" we find nothing but a transposed and imperfect version of the evolutionary theory of ethics as worked out by Spencer in his "Forense Sociology." So also we have Sidney Webb declaring "that a society is something more than an aggregate of so many individual units, that it possesses existence distinguishable from those of any of its components. The community must be regarded as a single unity, as a community: its life transends that of any of its members; and the interests of the individual must often clash with those of the whole. Without the continuity of sound health of the social organism man can now live or thrive; and its persistence is accordingly its paramount end." (Fabian Essays, pp. 56, 37.)

All of which, except the final clause, is manifestly Spencerian. But, to show how little is really comprehended of the doctrine he attempts to exploit, I shall give one more quotation before proceeding to demonstrate the erroneous nature of the Fabian conception of the social organism. After giving examples of the necessity of certain qualities proper to the military type of society, which he evidently makes no attempt to distinguish from the industrial type; though his ideal society belongs exclusively to the latter, he informs us that "we must take even more care to improve the social organism, of which we form part, than to perfect our own individual development. Or, rather, the perfect and fitting development of each individual is not necessarily the utmost and highest elevation of his own personality, but the filling, in the best possible way, of his humble function in the great social machine. We must abandon the self-sufficient ideal of imagining that we are independent units, and bend our jealous minds, absorbed in their own cultivation, to this subjection to the higher end, the common weal." (P. 38, ibid.)

The italicized portion is the entire last sentence, full of evolutionary nonsense, the author never reached the true and scientific conception of the social organism. The above is utterly at variance with any sound theory of organic growth and development, even without noting the fundamental distinction between the hypothetical social organism and the actual organization of the living animal. In consideration of the intelligence and erudition of its propagator, I feel not a little diffident in characterizing it as it deserves. The argument is fitly crowned with the ultimatum that liberty is inconsistent with democracy, and that the latter in social science is more important than the former. (See p. 59, ibid.) A conclusion as impotent as it is reactionary.

One of the first principles of biological science is that organic evolution consists of a differentiation of functions. The lowest forms of life are almost homogeneous; there is no separation of parts for the purpose of life-sustaining acts. Complexity denotes advancement. When the organism evolves heart, lungs, brain, and so forth, it attains a higher form of life. And the highest of all manifestations of sentient existence yet evolved, a civilized man, shows the greatest specialization, the most complete separation of the functions which combine their work in the life of the perfect organism. Mark: the development of a living organism is characterized by the separation of each part, by its specialization for the performance of certain functions, each organism doing its own work and in the healthy state combining itself solely to the work it is fitted to perform. The greater the degree to which this physiological division of labor has attained, the more perfect is the animal. True, this implies a combination which arises naturally, without artificial or conscious arrangement; and life was of a lower form before differentiation and specialization set in; it is the separation and consequent heterogeneity, in distinction to the combined homogeneity, that denotes progress.

What is biologically true of individual life in this respect is observed to hold good in the life of society. Not only is the sociological differentiation a measure of human development, but it is equally so in all other gregarious creatures. Yet we are asked to believe that a process the reverse of this, the return from differentiated functions exercised by highly specialized parts of the social organism, individual and groups spontaneously combined, to the homogeneous structure in which all social, economic, and regulative functions converge toward one point, collective ownership, is the certain tendency of social evolution; we are to accept this phase of a transient stage as the true goal and highest aim of civilized society. Moreover, in so far as such a tendency does exist, it is quite possible to furnish a rational and satisfactory explanation of its import and origin without recourse to the system adopted by Mr. Webb. Believing, as he does, that collectivism is the way toward which social evolution tends, he is quite consistent in working to hasten such a consummation. But when he endeavors to bolster up his conception with principles culled from evolutionary data and Spencerian philosophy, the resulting inconsistency becomes grotesque.

We have seen how the common weal is set up to be the paramount end of individual action, and now it is required of each to subordinate his interests and his conduct to society. Now, this line of argument is possible only when ignoring the vital distinction between the social and individual organism. As Spencer says: "Society exists for the benefit of its members, not its members for the benefit of society. It has ever to be remembered that, great as may be the efforts made for the prosperity of the body politic, yet the claims of the body politic are nothing in themselves, and become something only in so far as they embody the claims of its component individuals." (Sociology, vol. I, third ed., p. 480.)

Another distinction, equally important, is lost sight (Continued on page 2.)
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A Plea for Honesty in Terminology.

It is not always safe to apply a given rule to cases superficially similar. J. Wm. Lloyd makes this mistake in justifying the use of the word "duty" in a new sense by the example of the Anarchists in giving new meanings to the words "Anarchism" and "government." One who looks only at the surface will say that Mr. Lloyd is right. But let us look deeper. What are the points of likeness between the instances, and what the points of unlikeness?

One point of likeness is that in all three cases there is danger of more or less confusion. This clearly is an evil, and can only be put up with if at the same time there is a gain in precision of statement—that is, in scientific accuracy—when we are discussing with persons who are willing to receive them, the conclusions which the opponents give to the terms which their opponents use. Can Mr. Lloyd give any reasons for affirming that such a gain is acquired by his new use of the word "duty"? If so, I am ready to listen. Meanwhile I am of the opinion that, instead of a gain, there is a decided loss. In a moment I will explain why. On the other hand, I am sure I do not need to explain to Mr. Lloyd the gain in precision achieved by the new uses of the words "Anarchism" and "government." Already then we have one distinction which tells against Mr. Lloyd's analogy. Now for another.

Worse than any danger of confusion is the tint of cowardice and concealment and hypocrisy which sometimes attaches to a new use of old words. No such taint, but quite the opposite, affects the Anarchistic definitions of "Anarchism" and "government." By their use of the word "Anarchism" the Anarchists give an unpopular and repulsive name (a name which has stood in the public mind for an unpopular and repulsive thing,—disorder) to the philosophy which they offer to the world. Thereby, at the same time that they invite the world to consider, they warn it to beware. This may be honesty carried to a needless extreme, but it is unquestionably honesty. There is no attempt to entice to the acceptance of an idea without thorough examination.

The same honesty, in a reverse sense, appears in the Anarchistic use of the term "government." Here the old use of the term is not denied, but is extended to cover something else. A popular and respected name (government) is given to an unpopular thing (invasion of individuals by individuals) in order to identify with a popular thing (invasion of individuals by the effective majority) in the hope that unpopularity will thereby attach to both and cause both to be destroyed. It is a striking and very honest way of saying to the world: "See! the criminal is a governor just as the so-called governor is. Each is an invader; each imposes his will by force upon the non-invasive individual. Down with them both!"

Now, there is no such honesty in Mr. Lloyd's use of the term "duty." I do not mean of course that there is any dishonesty in Mr. Lloyd's motive; I only claim that the act itself is dishonest in its tendency. It is the giving of a popular name (duty) to an unpopular thing (self-gratification) in the hope (unconscious, no doubt, in Mr. Lloyd) that it may thus be mistaken for a popular thing (altruism) and hastily swallowed as such without examination or comprehension. I class this method of agitation with that of "propaganda by deed." The only difference between them is that, whereas the latter, before the intelligent acceptance of a new idea, attempts to realize it by force, the former attempts to gain an acceptance of a new idea by fraud, a form of trickery. The result in each case is equally fleeting, equally certain to be followed by reaction.

I think I have overthrown Mr. Lloyd's analogy.

In conclusion, I fulfill my promise to explain why there is a sacrifice of precision in giving the name "duty" to self-gratification. The name and the thing have nothing in common. The community of idea between governing and forcible imposing of one will upon another needs but a slight extension to cover the imposture which the opponents give to the terms which their opponents use. Can Mr. Lloyd give any reasons for affirming that such a gain is acquired by his new use of the word "duty"? If so, I am ready to

is no precision save that of expressing an idea in terms of its precise opposite. Duty implies obligation; obligation implies duality; duty to self does not imply duality, and is therefore an absurdity.

Let us be rational; let us be honest.

I publish this week as a 64-page pamphlet a work by Zola, which has never before appeared other than serially, even in French. It is entitled "Modern Marriage." The mere announcement is sufficient, I am sure, to awaken the interest of Liberty's readers. The author takes four typical marriages,—one from the nobility, one from the bourgeoisie, one from the small shop-keeping class, and one from the working people,—and shows each originates, where each is consummated, and how each results. With all the power of his wonderful art Zola exhibits in this story the almost purely commercial character of the marriage institution. The price of the book is fifteen cents, on receipt of which sum it will be mailed post-paid.

"It seems that the clipping from 'Lucifer,' giving some notice of Mr. Van Ornum's book (News-Letter, February 2) embodied a covert allusion to the work of another writer. Had I detected the purpose of the oblique words, Mr. Van Ornum would have cut them out. As it is, I regret having, even inadvertently, distressed the gentleman whose sensibilities they have wounded," J. W. Sullivan having made this declaration in the "Twentieth Century," it remains now for William Holmes to declare in "Lucifer" that, had he detected the purport of the offensive words, he would not have written them. One statement would be as credible as the other.

I am sorry to say that "Instead of a Book" cannot be published till March 15, or perhaps a few days later. It has proved impossible to have the index to the volume in readiness for earlier publication, and I am sure that the subscribers would rather wait than lose this valuable feature, which doubles the usefulness of the work. The fault does not lie with Comrades Tandy and Cohen, of Denver, who have gladly given a great amount of time to this task. But their distance from the scene and a combination of untoward circumstances have led to the delay.

One of Liberty's subscribers desires a set of the numbers of Liberty constituting the fourth volume, in order to complete his file. He prefers a bound volume, especially if it was bound before the publication of Liberty. If any one has what this subscriber needs, and desires to sell, let him inform me, and I will put him in communication with the would-be purchaser.

"The Rag-Picker of Paris" and "What's To Be Done?" which lately went out of print, can now be had again at fifty cents a copy. If the various persons whose orders for these books I have been obliged to reject will repeat their orders, I will fill them.

A Practice Not Exclusively Athenian.

(Polye's "Greek Wars."

Anathemas once ironically advised the Athenians to pass a vote that asses were horses. "Because," said he, "you make men generals by a public vote, who have no military qualities."
Problems of Anarchism. (Continued from page 1.)

by the Fabian philosophers. I refer to the difference between the needs of a military form of social organization and the needs of a system of temporary, imperfect, and undesirable stage of social evolution, the latter a permanent, necessary, and wholly desirable condition. The one necessitates a highly centralized, regulating system and the subordination of the individual members, and the degree to which this is carried is the measure of its perfection. Judged by temporary requirements, it becomes the highest type. But the other, the industrial form of organization which is desired, requires quite the opposite conditions. The industrial regulating system evolves as a separate and independent function from the central or political authority. This kind of society is to be judged by great functions of voluntary interdependence and the freedom from all authority and enforced regulation which its members, both individually and collectively, attain. And, to again quote Spencer's words, "the estimate of the collective activities become high in proportion to the evolution of their industrial systems, and not in proportion to the evolution of their centralizing regulating systems fitting them for carrying on war." (196, 376.)

W. MAHLIE.

Mazzini: Duties of Man.

Mazzini's address to workmenmen (Duties of Man: Funk & Wagnalls Co.) has been reprinted for the edification of the workmen of the present. It is a book of a long time style, with occasional true and vigorous thoughts curiously confused with the lame logic and absurdities of theology. Not that Mazzini's theology, considered as such, is of the worst. Indeed, he appears to have evolved enough to be classed as a Unitarian of large and liberal type.

But his tone is that of a father to children: of a priest to his flock. This is significant. The book is paternalistic.

It is perhaps fortunate that the book falls into my hands for review, for, as I am old-fashioned enough to believe that the terminology of morality is not necessarily out of date, I shall not quarrel with its title. Not that I differ in any way or at all, perhaps, with the basic thought of my fellow-egolists, but I am convinced that the terms rights and duties, good and evil, moral and immoral, represent facts in the life of man, facts always present, which may be experienced in some form; and the vocabulary of morality appears (with an occasional slight explanation) convenient, and as good as any to express the most advanced views of these facts. If we use the terms rights and duties in an egotistic sense, we are municipalities, the sense in which the terms are used in the book, more akin to the thought of a free, liberty is in all things and for all men. Had liberty been really conquered, we anarchists would have had no contention, for we exist because we have no contention. But the .

In brief, this book is hopelessly out of date. Four of its pages would contain all that it has to say of value to the modern workman, and that, even, has been better said elsewhere. Why has it been reprinted?

J. W. LLOYD.

Comrade Most: A Condensation of Works.

(Preface)

As long as we cannot succeed in converting four or five English-speaking native workmen in every large city of the country to the cause of Anarchy, it is an insignificant thing to think of an American author of thought to think of an American author of thought to think of an American author of thought. An Italian is imported from England that he may publish an English newspaper here in America — that is read (?) only by German and Italian comrades. Such undertaking are mere child's play. Every cent that is detracted from them is thrown out of the window. The German comrades are to be virtually raped into endearing our own undertakings to vitalize such fantastic visionary schemes. Because we could not yield to such demands, we have been denounced and denounced in the most shamefaced manner.
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"This principle is Duty. We must convince men that they are all sons of one sole God, and bound to fulfill and execute one sole law here on earth; that each of them is bound to live, not for himself, but for others; that the aim of existence is not to be more or less happy, but to make ourselves and others more virtuous."

On page 87 I find: "How could you call yourselves free men if the reader of your paper does not dare to command you without your consent? The Republic is, then, the only logical and truly legitimate form of Government. You have no master save God in heaven, and God's laws when you are free men."

This would be astonishingly were it not, today, even, repeated on every side around us. Men see that monarchs govern without their consent, but they cannot see that that majority rules men over them, who rule in just as positive a manner without their consent. Names make such a difference that one clearly sees how the old German woman was enabled to distinguish her re-enacting twines by christening one Max and the other Peter.

On page 106 he denies the right of secret association. On page 101 he looks forward to a time when the people "may ask — say, exact — the foundation of a system of gratuitous National Education, obligatory upon all.

Nevertheless, in spite of blows direct or indirect at liberty, in spite of errors fundamental and incident, the truth remains true and unshaken. I have already given one of these: here are others: "There is no true association except among equals."

"Woman is the cares of existence."

"Without liberty there is no true society, because as society is the result of the individual, and that individual is impossible; there can only exist the rule of the one over the others."

"Liberty is but a means."

Among the essential elements of human life.

Program is one.

In the chapter on the economical question his criticism of Communism is keen and good, and the remedy he finally proposes for theills of the workmen's, their voluntary association in cooperative groups, with particular liberty of withdrawal, for the purpose of retaining capital and labor in their own hands, is, in many respects one of our own ideas, and, had he not added the State and super-added God, would have left little to find fault with.

In brief, then, this book is hopelessly out of date. Four of its pages would contain all that it has to say of value to the modern workman, and that, even, has been better said elsewhere. Why has it been reprinted?

J. W. LLOYD.
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