

**THE ECONOMICS OF
ANARCHY: A STUDY OF
THE INDUSTRIAL TYPE**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649324293

The Economics of Anarchy: A Study of the Industrial Type by Dyer D. Lum

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

DYER D. LUM

**THE ECONOMICS OF
ANARCHY: A STUDY OF
THE INDUSTRIAL TYPE**

*With compliments of
The Author*

THE

199

ECONOMICS OF ANARCHY.

A STUDY OF

THE INDUSTRIAL TYPE.

BY DYER D. LUM.

*"According to the etymology of the word, Anarchy would mean absence of all government, of all political authority. *** Anarchy is nothing but self-government carried to its extreme limit, and the last step in the progress of human reason.*** Politics, as hitherto understood, would have no further raison d'être, and Anarchy, that is to say, the disappearance of all political authority, would be the result of this transformation of human society in which all questions to be solved would have a purely economic character. Long ago J. B. Say advanced the opinion that the functions of the State should be reduced to the performance of police duties. If so reduced there would be but one step to reach the Anarchy of M. Proudhon—suppression of the police power."—Lalor's Cyclopædia of Political Science.*

CHICAGO:

GEO. A. SCHILLING,

109 Washington Street, Room 5L

1890.

IN MEMORIAM.

Death of Dyer D. Lum.

A remarkable man died in New York on April 7th. A man with abilities that should have ranked him with the great men of the earth and insured him ease and comfort for his declining years. Yet he departed from this life in comparative obscurity and poverty. Those who know him best will mourn him deepest, for they had come in touch with his great, tender heart and gentle soul during his better moments. That very gentleness, refinement of feeling and instinctive honorableness, he endeavored to veil with a mask of recklessness and indifference, but often in vain. A beautiful sentiment would touch him; a pathetic incident would bring tears to his eyes and sorrow would choke his voice even while he cursed the emotion he could not withstand. His friends know how loyal and true a brother and friend he could be; the world may sometime recognize his true worth as a scholar. He has written more on economic subjects than any other one man in the present age. He gave up a good business to edit the "Alarm" at Parsons' request. He refused a pension from the government because he did not believe in it; he never claimed the right to be supported because of the work he had done or could do for the cause; indeed his nearest friends would never know from him whether he was in need or not. But for a certain uncouthness, wholly assumed more out of a detestation of the conventionalities and shams of society than any thing else, he would have been generally beloved and universally mourned. I bid him farewell with sorrowful regrets.

LIZZIE M. HOLMES.

LABADIE
COLLECTION

HX

844

.L96

- Lucifer, the Light-Bearer, April 21, 1893.

LABADIE
COLLECTION

CONTENTS.

I. INTRODUCTION	5
II. FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES.....	12
III. FREE LAND.....	15
IV. FREE LABOR.....	20
V. FREE CAPITAL.....	23
VI. FREE EXCHANGE.....	27
VII. MUTUAL CREDIT.....	31
VIII. EMANCIPATION OF CREDIT.....	38
IX. INDUSTRIAL ECONOMICS.....	41
X. INSURANCE, OR SECURITY.....	46
XI. DIGRESSION ON METHODS.....	57

I have been repeatedly asked to write a brief summary of the aims sought by Anarchists which could be read and discussed in the various clubs that are studying economic questions. With this end in view the following pages are submitted, trusting that they may be a help to those who are earnestly seeking the rationale of the Labor Question.

D. D. L.

Economics of Anarchy.

I. INTRODUCTION.

All sociologists claim that progress has consisted in departure from compulsory to voluntary co-operation; from the reign of militant measures to what is termed the industrial type, wherein self-reliance and free co-operation directs; from the inequalities of privileged and restricted classes to the equality of equal freedom to natural opportunities; in short, to use the concise statement of Herbert Spencer, "from a regime of *status* to a regime of *contract*." In the social order militancy and industrialism, therefore, represent past and future types; the first wherein war is the normal direction of human activity; the other where peace must prevail for healthful development. Following this guiding principle let us endeavor to group the salient points of progress from militant rule to industrial requirements in order to see more clearly not only in what direction we are tending, but also what methods are *not* conducive to that end. Starting with the fact that social evolution is chiefly characterized by a transition from warlike to peaceful pursuits, that from generation to generation activity has been turning from conquest over fellowmen to conquest over nature for men, we see at once that methods characterizing an outgrown phase of life are inappropriate to the end toward which progress has been made.

Before, however, applying to all schemes for reform the crucial test: Do they belong to the militant or industrial type? let us obtain a clearer view of their differences. The one being fixity, the other its abrogation, between the two there can be no golden mean without sacrifice of progress, for compromise in principles is ever incipient suicide. With a clear conception of the historical evolution of society we may be spared the folly everywhere attempted by would-be reformers of mixing incongruous principles; such may be compared with those who would seek a happy medium between daylight and darkness in twilight. Having attained this, to the great delight of sentimental lovers and fledgling poets, they flatter themselves in having solved the eternal contradiction in a state possessing none of the positive nor negative qualities of either, and which, consequently, can be but temporary in duration.

To state in briefest form the essential distinction between militancy and industrialism, it may be said that the one is a scheme of compulsory co-operation, the other the natural outgrowth of voluntary co-operation. If we look at those States where the militant spirit dominates most largely we find the organization essential to an army extended to the concerns of private life. The whole nation virtually becomes a camp under military discipline; industrial life is subordinated to regulation; the individual exists for the State and a regimental uniformity pervades all social relations. The individual is a subject and with his condition, his residence, his family, enregistered. Of ancient Peru we read that officers "minutely inspected the houses, to see that the man, as well as his wife, kept the household in perfect order, and preserved a due state of discipline among their children." Ancient Egypt furnishes ample evidence of a like regimentation of its inhabitants, who had to report at fixed intervals to account for the most trivial action. How fully the every-day life of the Hebrews was regulated in the most petty matter the pentateuch illustrates. The iron laws of Sparta are not exceptional illustrations. In every State where activities are chiefly military, even now, we see a greater or lesser degree of enforced discipline; patriotism becomes the highest virtue and disloyalty the deepest crime; no domestic tie is valid against the Frankenstein of the State; the assertion of common rights is hardly known. The State dominates the unit, pervades the household, is present at birth, presides at marriages, buries the dead, and the mass of the population endure life for work, instead of working to enjoy life. In every sphere of social co-operation the motive power is compulsion, not naturally evolved, but artificially instituted. Herbert Spencer says, and it cannot be disputed: "It is the law of all organization that as it becomes complete it becomes rigid," a remark of profound significance which is earnestly commended to the thoughtful attention of Socialist and semi-Socialist reformers who would institute liberty and still preserve plasticity!

Let us beware the militant assumption that man exists for the State, and trust to theoretical brakes to check the momentum of a body moving with increasing velocity. The social aggregate is not something over and above the units which constitute it. When these units are moral, are intelligent, are secure, only then is social life moral, intelligent and secure. The condition of the units is mirrored in the social reflector. To subordinate the parts to the whole is to destroy that individuality by which the social unity has been attained; to place in the whole that which resides in none of its parts; to make an effect a generative cause and bestow upon a shadow the qualities of a substance. An illustration will make this clearer. College classes frequently have composite photographs taken in which the features of each is superimposed upon the others. The result is a face representing the striking characteristics of all, but in which angularities of character are merged into one. Though the class face represents no living original, yet each has contributed to form it. So in social life individual peculiarities are merged into the composite social life, and the survival of the fittest determines what remains or sinks. In the class face the stronger the

individuality the greater the effect upon the composite whole. As social life is but a composite representation of individual characteristics, how idle to hold that the unit is subordinate to the requirements of the composite whole; that self must be abridged to suit the requirements of the composite reflection in which self has been an integral factor. Yet this is the logic of state-socialism and communism, for both rely upon direction from composite reflection, and directly violate the law of progress in seeking to establish a social structure upon uniformity rather than individuality, upon tendency to similarity rather than increasing variance of parts.

The whole course of modern history has been a perpetual struggle against direction in social relations. Motley calls the Fourteenth century an "Age of Revolt." Europe everywhere displayed social life under paternal guidance. The very clothes that a man must wear, hours of work and of repose, the time for which a mechanic should be retained, the number of sheep a tenant might keep, limitations upon travel, restrictions upon diet, the hierarchy of ranks, rules regulating social intercourse, the very thoughts one must think,—were all matters for legislative direction in Merrie England. In philosophy, religion, politics and industry law established the standard for belief and action. The crusades by changing vast bodies of men from the narrow boundaries which had heretofore confined their vision, by opening to them new scenes and civilizations, by emancipating multitudes of serfs; by introducing Eastern arts and luxuries; all of which may be summed up in Sismondi's phrase; "the geography of the pilgrims;" and above all by sowing broadcast the seeds of unbelief;—led to an awakening of intellect that shook the old foundations of social life to their center. Jack Cade and Wickliffe in England, the Artaveldes in Holland, Marcel and the *jacquerie* in France, the risings of the Swiss cantons, Rienzi at Rome, the Hanseatic League in Germany, and countless sporadic insurrections against authority in philosophy, in religion, in political and economic relations, all testify to the opening of a new era wherein individual sovereignty was posited against collective control. Industry felt the new breath and became arrayed against oppression. The communal struggles in France and the alliance of the Hanse Towns in Germany illustrated the new spirit wherein arms were only resorted to for defence against aggression, a contest wherein feudalism was wounded unto death and its history henceforth but the record of its dying struggles. The *renaissance* in thought and art, the Protestant revolution in religion, the English, American and French revolutions in State policies, logically led to the extension of the assertion of the sovereignty of the individual to economic relations, a struggle which essentially characterizes the Nineteenth century. Every step forward has been at the expense of authority by increasing the area of voluntary actions; voluntary co-operation has invariably risen to supply needs as compulsory co-operation was removed. Authority has been shorn of its strength in philosophy and religion and Anarchy therein admitted to be in the line of progress; in the State its sphere has been continually narrowed by the growth of freedom to contract to achieve given ends. Nor have we yet reached the term