

**Anarchism Reconsidered:
Challenging the Assumptions
Behind the Western Necessity of
Government**

Justin Butler
02-01-2010
Capstone Proposal
Capstone Advisor: Alan Levine

Anarchism Reconsidered: Challenging the Assumptions Behind the Western Necessity of Government

Abstract:

Anarchism is categorized by mainstream political philosophers as either mere utopianism or as resulting in complete chaos. These misunderstandings of Anarchism have led to false stereotypes of the only philosophy that seriously challenges the core argument of all political philosophy: government is necessary. This project considers the key distinctions between Anarchism and Statism and posits that three beliefs separate anarchists from traditional statist philosophers: 1) Anarchists believe that all men are interconnected through the impact of their actions, 2) that each human is capable of complete self-regulation, at least to an extent which allows for a peaceful and active society, and 3) that human nature is not only fluid, but is profoundly malleable. Reviewing these claims in the body of anarchist literature, this project provides a systematic defense for Anarchism as a legitimate and coherent political philosophy.

Anarchism Reconsidered: Challenging the Assumptions Behind the Western Necessity of Government

“There is one lot of people who can see nothing in equality but the anarchical tendencies which it engenders. They are frightened of their own free will; they are afraid of themselves.”

- Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, 2000, 701

Introduction:

Since the time of Locke, liberty and equality have been the rallying cry of rebels, and since the birth of the American Republic, the guiding star of nations. The great scholar of democracy, Alexis de Tocqueville, claimed that the “progress of equality is something fated” (*Democracy in America* 2000, 12). In the eyes of J. S. Mill, liberty is in the “permanent interests of man as a progressive being” (*On Liberty* 2005, 10). The motto of the French Revolution, “Freedom! Equality! Brotherhood!” can still be found being espoused by democrats all over the world. But what happens when the cherished values of liberty and equality reach the point of no longer being compatible with a governmental structure? What happens when men are truly free to do what they will and all men are equal in all aspects of life, not just the political? The answer is anarchy.

Why do we need government? This is the fundamental question posed by Anarchism to modern political philosophy. The necessity of government, the position of the statist, is itself underlined by a deeper set of assumptions that directly stem from various conceptions of inherent human nature. These assumptions can be refined into three main pivot points: humans are self-interested and individualistic, negating the

possibility of humanity living in harmony without governmental institutions, humans are not capable of effective and just self-regulation, negating the possibility of humans peacefully coexisting without the threat of punishment for anti-social behavior, and human nature is fundamentally static, making the possibility of overcoming our own inherent flaws to the degree required for Anarchy impossible. These are the beliefs that make the necessity of governance obvious for liberals, and Anarchism's disagreement on these points is the reason anarchists refuse to accept what they deem to be the yoke of the State.

These contentions are not empirically provable, and such, have become articles of faith for Liberalism both Anarchism. A convincing argument can be made by both sides on each of the above 'pivot points,' however, determining the validity of these assumptions must ultimately be left to each individual to decide.

What Is Anarchism?

Before discussion of assumptions can commence, it is necessary to define Anarchism in order to correct the misconceptions currently held about the philosophy. Anarchism, as will be discussed, is not the "anarchy" of common usage. In modern society, anarchy is often equated with disorder, violence, and chaos, but these comparisons are the polar opposite of the meaning intended by the creator of the term, Pierre-Joseph Proudhon.¹ The term An-Archy, as it was first used, is derived from the

¹ Anarchist thinkers have consistently rejected the popular connotations attached to the word Anarchy, for, to the anarchist, these connotations derive from two false assumptions: "whenever there is no government there is disorder," and that "order, due to a strong government and a strong police, is always beneficial" (Kropotkin, 2002, 61-62). The second assumption is admittedly overstated, at least when discussing Liberalism, but it will surely be allowed that liberals would agree with this second statement in context of a properly functioning liberal democracy. Of course liberals would disagree with this statement if applied to monarchy, state communism, or totalitarianism, but I have yet to hear a liberal argument in favor of a weak

combination of two Greek words *An*, meaning without, and *Archos*, interpreted by Proudhon to mean rulers or masters (Proudhon 2008, 245).² Proudhon's basic definition of anarchy can be summarized as human existence with complete individual autonomy, equality, and liberty.³

Readers should, however, recognize the warning of French anarchist Emile Henry: "Beware of thinking that Anarchism is a dogma, an unassailable, incontrovertible doctrine, revered by its adepts the way Muslims venerate the Koran" ("Letter to the Governor of the Conciergerie Prison," in *No Gods No Masters*, Ed. Guerin, 2005. 397). It is admittedly difficult to summarize Anarchism in a coherent structure, since an infinite variety of idealized anarchic worlds exist. None the less it is possible to connect the thoughts of various anarchist thinkers in such a way to extract from them a systematic philosophy of Anarchism.

While almost every political theorist, from liberals to Marxists, proclaims their desire to see freedom and equality flourish, anarchists argue that this is empty rhetoric and void of any substantial meaning. Modern statist, say the anarchists, wish only to decrease the number of masters a man must obey, instead of eliminating the concept of

and ineffectual democratic government. If the government is functioning as it ought, by liberal standards, then one must wish for order through a strong government and strong police force. For under the liberal construct, these two factors are the core defenders of society, property, and humanity.

² By "masters," Proudhon seems to have meant any individual or collection thereof, who force another to act regardless of the will and well-being of the latter. In anarchist thought, any time a man is forced to act without thought of his own, he has lost his autonomy, and therefore his freedom. Anarchists believe that man cannot be ordered around, but must be persuaded that the order is in his best interest. If this were not the case, then Proudhon's classification of proprietors as masters and exploiters would lose logical coherency. This definition has remained the norm through the procession of Anarchist thinkers since Proudhon.

³ Proudhon was not the first thinker to argue for a human society without government. There are accounts of anarchist ideas being espoused by Aristippus and Zeno in ancient Greece, by the Hussites and Anabaptists in medieval Europe, and even amongst the roughly 36,000 communes which were formed in France during the French Revolution (Kropotkin, 2002, 288-289). Proudhon was simply the first to show the relationship between the anarchist critiques of the state and critiques of economic inequalities, and to combine them into a one philosophy.

mastery. Anarchists, on the other hand, claim that they seek to articulate and pursue the conditions under which complete freedom and equality can flourish. For, if there are no masters, and therefore every person is truly free, then true equality must exist, at least in human relations. It is clear how Proudhon's envisioned world without masters would allow for maximal, if not complete, autonomy and liberty, but it requires a more substantial inquiry to understand how such a world must ultimately lead to complete equality. Freedom's effects on political equality may be obvious, but what of the other social, economic, and natural sources of human inequality? To understand Proudhon's argument, it is necessary to understand what he views equality as including.

Proudhon's definition of equality is not the simple political equality for which modern political philosophy strives. Proudhon expressly rejects Rousseau's sentiment that true equality of conditions is only possible through slavery to the state⁴, and declares Tocqueville's claim in *Democracy in America* that "equality of conditions" has been or can be actualized in any capitalist society as a "satanic delusion" (Proudhon, 2008, 82).⁵ Man may not be exactly equal in terms of natural abilities of work or of the mind, but these inequalities are minuscule in comparison to the inequalities foisted upon society by the state and the state's defense of personal accumulations of wealth. For Proudhon,

⁴ As far as man is forced to abide by the "general will," without being convinced that his position is incorrect, this characterization of the Rousseauian state as slavery is accurate, if overstated. In forcing a man to be "free" through total subservience to the 'general will, as Rousseau attempts to persuade us to do, the man who does not agree loses his autonomy, and therefore, the foundation of his freedom.

⁵ This claim is clearly a biased exaggeration for rhetorical effect, but his main point, that some men in any capitalist society will always have substantially more material wealth than others is valid. In early America, the institution of slavery, which Proudhon found morally repulsive, is a clear indication that Tocqueville also overstated his own observations. Tocqueville claims that "equality of conditions" existed in America, but this clearly excludes the existence of slaves. Tocqueville may have been correct in this characterization of American economic life if only examining the equality of conditions among white Americans, but the existence of slavery inarguably made the American South a place of striking economic disparities.

reaching true equality includes reaching social, political, and economic equality, but also requires achieving complete liberty.

Unfettered liberty is the one ideal to which all anarchists ascribe, since Anarchism is the freedom from all human masters⁶, not just the type that would traditionally be named governments. For Proudhon, the two concepts of complete liberty and complete equality cannot exist exclusively. Mankind cannot be called truly equal until we have reached total liberty, and as long as inequality exists, mankind is not actually free. As long as some men have power over other men, then all men are neither equal nor completely free, even the oppressors.⁷ As Malatesta explains, Anarchism requires the liberation of humanity from both direct oppression, in the form of “brute force and physical violence,” (the state) and the indirect economic oppression of “being denied the means of subsistence, thereby reducing them to powerlessness” (Capitalism) (“Anarchy,” in *No Gods No Masters*, Ed. Guerin, 2005, 358). In Proudhon’s mind, complete equality, and therefore complete liberty, requires two “revolutions” in human thought and practice before it is achievable: the abandonment of the current property system and the extraction

⁶ To anarchists, democratic-republics are simply a lesser form of slavery than monarchies. Under a monarch, citizens have no say in the laws that govern their day-to-day lives. Under a democratic-republic, men have such a small share in the ruling of their country (1/300,000,000 in America today) that it amounts roughly to the same outcome. Liberal governments give their citizens more ‘rights,’ declaring parts of their citizens’ lives outside of the government’s control, which is a good thing and represents the progress of the human condition, but hardly affects the amount of control any single individual has over the laws which govern his life.

⁷ “I am truly free only when all human beings around me, men and women alike, are equally free. Far from being a limitation or negation of my freedom, the freedom of my neighbor is instead its precondition and confirmation. I only become truly free through the freedom of others, so that the greater numbers of free men around me, and the more extensive and comprehensive their freedom, the more extensive and profound my freedom becomes” (Bakunin, “God and the State,” in *No gods no masters*, Ed. Guerin, 2005, 151). I cannot interact with a man who does not have complete autonomy in such a wide variety of manners as I can with a man who is completely autonomous. Therefore, when all men are autonomous, I am only then truly free, since only then am I free to interact with them in all possible manners.

of coercive force from human relations.⁸ Anarchism is not a viable system unless it is possible to accomplish these two tasks and will not be desirable until these two goals are fulfilled.

The first Proudhonian “revolution” that must take place before an anarchist system would be viable and desirable is the dismissal of coercive power as a tool of human relations. The idea to dispense with coercive power has existed in the modern anarchist movement since before Proudhon had even named the school of thought Anarchism. The theory’s developer, William Godwin, was an English radical whose 1793 work, *Enquiry Concerning Political Justice*, has influenced almost all subsequent anarchist theoreticians and philosophers (Kramnick 1972). Godwin defined coercive power as any force outside of a man’s own free will that makes him undertake any action, and since Godwin classifies government as “regulated force,” the need of demolishing government in order to reach the anarchist ideal of total liberty is clear⁹ (Godwin 1985).

The lack of choice inherent in the use of coercive power is the main philosophical issue that leads anarchists to reject all state power. Since men are reasoning creatures, and therefore have the capability to possess autonomy, commanding men to undertake any action is asking him to act against his own nature, unless they are convinced that

⁸ These “revolutions” are not political in nature. Proudhon defines “revolution” as a “movement of the mind,” or a true change in the human mindset (Proudhon 2008, 53). For Proudhon, “revolution” is too often confused with mere “progress,” when “ideas are simply extended or modified” (Proudhon 2008, 53). Anarchy, then, which is the destruction of the rule of man over man, is a revolution, while a democratic revolution, or a change in how man rules man, would be considered only progress.

⁹ Godwin, as an English philosopher, was mainly concerned with the constitutional monarchy of England. He viewed this system as an alliance between the king, who was concerned with keeping his monopoly of force, and the aristocracy, who were mainly concerned with maintaining their material wealth. This system, in his opinion, operated principally for the benefit of these two groups through the government’s use of force to defend the aristocracy’s monopoly on land and capital, and the monarch’s monopoly on coercive power. Thus, the main job of the government was to maintain the status quo through its defining characteristic, its monopoly on “regulated force.” For Godwin, eliminating this perceived racket was necessary for the development of a just society, although he did not outline the specifics of what form this just society would take.

following the order is the proper course of action. Anarchists reason that “an Authoritative command must also be distinguished from a persuasive argument. When I am commanded to do something. I may choose to comply even though I am not being threatened, because I am brought to believe that it is something which I ought to do. If that is the case, then I am not, strictly speaking, obeying a command, but rather acknowledging the force of an argument or the rightness of a prescription” (Wolff, 1998, 6). When a government commands obedience from its subjects, and then punishes them for not acting against the course which the individual believes is justified, the government is attempting to remove from the individual a part of their autonomy.

Since all governments attempt to do this, through the passing of laws, the anarchists believe that they are justified in declaring that, “all forms of government tried to date have been only so many forms of oppression¹⁰ and ought to be replaced by some new form of association” (Kropotkin, *No Gods No Master*, 312). Under this ‘new form of association,’ men would not be forced into false societies based on geographic regions. Instead, men would be free to choose with whom they associate with in all matters, from the commercial to the fraternal.¹¹ These associations would be the foundation for society

¹⁰ In the sense that all governments create and enforce laws, therefore limiting the actions man is allowed to undertake.

¹¹ This may seem similar to the liberals’ enshrined freedom of association, but certain major differences exist. The first difference between the anarchist and liberal view of freedom of association is that liberals accept that grouping people together under state structures is legitimate. Anarchists, on the other hand, view this lumping together of humanity on the basis ‘nationality’ as a restriction of freedom. Men cannot help where they are born and cannot escape being forced to live under the rule of a state. Because of this, men are forced to pay taxes to a state with which they may not support, are forced to live together with their fellow ‘citizens,’ who they may share nothing in common with, and can even be sent off to die in the name of a cause in which they do not believe. Socio-economic disparities also separate men into groups which they have no control over, but that affect their entire lives. A child that is forced to attend an inner-city school because of a lack of a better option has already been doomed, in nine cases out of ten, to a life in the lower classes. This child will not be able to attend the best colleges, not necessarily because of a lack of motivation, but because of the unequal education which they have received. In a society where school budgets are determined by the economic prosperity of the community around it, poor communities are forced to deal with an ineffectual education system. Without the influence of capitalism, which restricts the

under Anarchism by allowing men to combine their powers to accomplish positive goals and yet retain their means of subsistence without the need for coercion. Any man who failed to take part in these associations, however, would not be forced into society, as Rousseau and Kant proposed, but would be left to discover his own folly. By this way, associations would take the place of government in terms of acts for human welfare, but would actually leave each man free to follow his own conscience. Anarchism “seeks to establish a certain harmonious compatibility in its midst – not by subjecting all [society’s] members to an authority that is fictitiously supposed to represent society, not by trying to establish uniformity, but by urging all men to develop free initiative, free action, free association” (Kropotkin, 2002, 123). This is currently impossible, both philosophically and realistically, due to the state’s ability to force its members to participate in false societies. The possibility of this new form of association, and this system’s desirability, relies upon the dismissal of the use of coercive force as an acceptable tool in human relations.

The second revolution that must take place for Proudhon’s conception of anarchy to be possible is the destruction of the concept of property, specifically in the forms of ownership of land and of the means of production. As long as one man can sit around doing nothing while he pays another man to do the work of both men, then equality will never exist. In this way, Proudhon, and most other Leftist Anarchists, agrees with the Marxian usage of the term “wage-slavery,” wherein “the workman is compelled to accept the feudal conditions which we call ‘free contract,’ because nowhere will he find better

choices available to disadvantaged people and often damns them to remain in the steel cycle of poverty, men could be provided with actual opportunity to pursue their interests, instead of settling for a minimum wage job just so they can survive. In conclusion, liberalism claims to have freedom of association, but as long as the actions of men are ruled based on where they live and economic inequalities, as defended by the state, this freedom of association will never be realized.

conditions. Everything has been appropriated by somebody; he *must* accept the bargain, or starve” (Kropotkin, 2002, 55). To anarchists, believing otherwise would be delusional and would be condoning the theft that exists when one man steals the product of another’s labor.

Under Capitalism, equal members of a company, or associates, receive their even split of profit based on their original investment. Yet the worker, who produces the company’s product, the company’s true source of profit, is cut out of this loop. The worker, who according to Proudhon, deserves to profit from his labor more than the Capitalist, is forced to allow his product to be sold by someone else for the latter’s benefit because of the lack of a better alternative. Hence Proudhon’s famous slogan, “Property is THEFT” (Proudhon, 2008, 38).

If protecting the results of one’s labor from theft is the goal of dumping the liberal conception of property, then abandoning the concept of property may seem dangerous and even counter-productive. The concept of protecting one’s product appears to be a ridiculous concept if no ownership rights exist. Proudhon, however, addresses this challenge by clarifying that there are two types of property, “domain” and “possession” (Proudhon 2008, 62). The first, which condones the right to do anything with a piece of property, such as destroying it or renting it for use to another in order to make a continuous profit, must be demolished. Possession, however, which is the active use of property, must remain, for, “to satisfy the husbandman, it was sufficient to guarantee him possession of his crop; admit even that he should have been protected in his right of occupation of land, as long as he remained its cultivator. That was all that he had a right to expect; that was all that the advance of civilization demanded,” and still demands

(Proudhon, 2008, 86). According to Proudhon, man, therefore, has a right to enjoy the results of his own labor, but never has the right to take from another man what the latter worked to create. As Bakunin explains: “The land, nature’s free gift to one and all, cannot and ought not to be owned by anyone. But that its fruits, being the products of labor, ought to go solely to those who cultivate it with their own hands” (“The International Society or Brotherhood,” in *No Gods No Masters*, 157, 2005).¹² This principle extends itself to all other occupations as well.

Property laws in modern societies, on the other hand, serve only to enrich the wealthy by allowing them to profit through almost no physical work of their own.¹³ Instead, the rich pay less wealthy members of society to produce goods for them. Anarchists contend that this system has created a human condition wherein men live as beggars and barons, with the former being forced to plead with the latter for the right to make the latter a fortune, for nothing but a pittance in return. Anarchists scoff at the “equality” in any nation where such extremes in economic conditions still exist. Anarchism’s “true equality,” requires that all men must labor equally for themselves.¹⁴

¹² This does not exclude mass-production from human industry. Bakunin, as a philosopher in 19th Century Russia, was protesting against the serf system. This can also be applied to our current industrial society if read as intended, meaning that men must contribute to the work of society in order to be able to lay claim to the goods produced, instead of being able to profit off of the work of others through ownership of the means of production. This should not be interpreted as a statement of the illegitimacy of academic, managerial, or other non-“physical” occupations. This sort of work still must be completed, even in an anarchist economy. After all, Bakunin himself was a professional philosopher and revolutionary, and it should not be assumed that he viewed his own undertakings as exploitation.

¹³ As in profiting off of interest or investments, which involve nothing more than the movement of money.

¹⁴ Men should be expected to labor equally, but not necessarily to produce the same amount of product. Natural ability does not, in the anarchist mindset, entitle men to reap greater benefits from their labor, although they may produce more. The act of labor is rewarded equally. So if one man works harder than another then he deserves greater reward, but if two men work the same amount, yet one produces more, it should be the responsibility of the one who is better at his task to educate his associate on the most efficient means of accomplishing the task in order to make the operation of all of society more efficient. Without the capitalist drive to put the less efficient man out of business, thereby making more profit for the more efficient man, the efficient man can actually produce more for society by spreading his superior knowledge of method.

Economic domination by the proprietor, landlord, and industrialist must cease, and be replaced with some new form of industrial organization, such as syndicalism.¹⁵ Only through these means will all people truly be able to call each other equal.

The destruction of “domain” property, i.e., ownership (as opposed to possession) is not a settled point amongst anarchist thinkers. Some of the so-called “individualist anarchists,” whose ideas were first and most completely developed by the German Young Hegelian, Max Stirner, do not share Proudhon’s contempt for property. Others disagree with the importance that Leftist anarchists place on the Marxian interpretation of economics in relation to the fundamental problem of humanity’s subjugation by the state. As was convincingly shown by Robert Nozick, however, it does not appear that property, and therefore Capitalism, can exist in a true anarchic society, one wherein complete equality and liberty exist (*Anarchy, State, and Utopia*, 1974).¹⁶ Without a State to force compliance with ownership rights, individuals would be forced to physically defend their means of production, whether large tracts of land, factories, or multiple homes, ultimately resulting in the creation of Locke’s liberal state.

Individual attempts at enforcing “domain” rights in anarchy, however, would amount to nothing more than making war on society. Any attempt to force someone to

¹⁵ Any concept of the future economic system under Anarchism can only be loosely defined, however, because “the economic change that the social Revolution will bring will be so immense and far-reaching and will have to work such a change in all relationships currently based upon property and exchange that it will not be feasible for one individual or several to devise the social forms which must take shape in the society of the future” (Kropotkin, *No Gods No Masters*, Ed. Guerin, 2005, 321).

¹⁶ In his work, Nozick outlines how a system that begins in true freedom and equality, but includes natural property rights, will result in the creation of a “legitimate” State for the protection of those rights. His logic, while not flawless, creates a compelling argument. Nozick, due to his acceptance of property, ultimately concludes that man should live in a limited, libertarian state. The fundamental problem with Nozick’s analysis, however, is his acceptance of statist assumptions on all three of the pivot points that separate Statism and Anarchism, resulting in a supposed state of anarchy that does not follow the system proposed under true Anarchism. Even anarchists would be convinced of the necessity of the state if Nozick’s premises, which are consistent with those of other statist philosophers, were accepted as valid. Of course, anarchists do not accept his premises and Nozick’s philosophical endeavor is ultimately an argument against his own misconception of anarchy.

pay for the use of a means of production, while not also granting them “possession” of the products of their labor, is an infringement on personal freedom and personal autonomy. A farmer is free to lend his neighbor a tractor and afterwards charge for any necessary repairs or incurred costs, but lending his neighbor his tractor does not entitle the tractor’s owner to take thirty percent of his neighbor’s harvest. The tractor’s owner is not in the wrong if he refuses to lend out his tractor, but he makes war on the species if he resorts to extortion as a condition of its use.¹⁷ To extend equality to reach its ideal, and, therefore, to present a true comparison between Anarchism and Statism, it seems necessary to embrace economic equality as one aspect of complete equality. To ignore the economic tyranny of Capitalism in a discussion of Anarchism would only result in leaving the concept of anarchy underdeveloped.

It should not be falsely assumed that all idealist visions of the future that do not contain government necessarily qualify as Anarchism for the purpose of this study. It is true that a lack of government is a constant in all philosophies of Anarchism, but it is not the sole factor. A true anarchist society is one without any masters, not simply one without government. As long as one man can force another man to undertake any action, Anarchism, in its purest and originally intended form, will not exist. For this reason, it is usually assumed by leftist anarchists that the state and Capitalism must be devoured together. If either condition survived alone, then true equality and liberty cannot exist.¹⁸

¹⁷ By resorting to extortion, the tractor owner attempts to dominate through the seizure of a product he has no right to. As will be explained in the section “Man Can Be Self-Regulating,” by introducing this coercive power into an established anarchist society, he threatens the entire system and the well-being of the entire society, hence placing himself at war with all of society.

¹⁸ State Communism, or the existence of the State without Capitalism, was most vehemently criticized by the Russian anarchist thinker Mikhail Bakunin. For his most scathing critique of Marxism, see his 1872 letter to the Belgian newspaper *La Liberté*, which he published following the ejection of the Anarchists from the 1872 meeting of the International at The Hague (“The Excommunication of the Hague,” in *No Gods No Masters*, Guerin, 2005, 189-197). Anarcho-Capitalism, or the hypothesized existence of

It is for this reason that anarchists not only accept the difficulty of implementing their system, but also accept the state's presence as, while illegitimate, also necessary for the current state of human affairs. As Bakunin explains, "the State is an evil, albeit a historically necessary evil" (*No Gods No Master*, 2005, 151). Government will be necessary to protect society from the excesses of Capitalism until humanity can be convinced of the validity of the anarchist's claims. An early conversion of the state system into Anarchism would result in the sorts of chaos so often imagined as anarchy by most people.

The concept of anarchists supporting the state may seem counter-intuitive, but it actually stems from an acknowledgement of the problems in the current system. Man, as he currently lives, is both selfish and power hungry. But Anarchism believes that these traits are caused by the societal mores which have developed alongside the growth of Capitalism and the Statism. Hence, these traits are not permanent, and can be changed through the directed effort of society. "The ideal of the anarchist is thus a mere summing-up of what he considers to be the next phase of evolution" (Kropotkin, 2002, 47). This next phase of evolution is not to even possible, "until the great source of moral depravity – capitalism, religion, justice, government – shall have ceased to exist" (Kropotkin, 2002, 106). As long as these institutions continue to force men to act as individualists, in the Tocquevillian sense, then Anarchism will not be viable.

Capitalism without a State, contains inherent logical fallacies. Under such a system, property and profit must still be protected from those who wish to acquire it for themselves. These rules would foreseeably need to be enforced by someone, presumably, corporations. Just because there would exist nothing explicitly called a State, does not mean that Anarchism exists. If corporations assumed the task of enforcing property rights, then the corporation has effectively transformed itself into a state entity. If corporations did not assume the ability to enforce their property rights, the system would require total human acceptance of material inequality and economic tyranny, which would only increase over time without a State of the current type to regulate these excesses. This society, while it may be the Capitalist's ideal, does nothing to fix the inequalities inherent in Capitalism, and as such, is shunned by the anarchists of the Left.

To the anarchist, the two factors of liberty and equality form, in their complete realization, the most perfect justice. As Bakunin explains anarchist justice: “He [the true Anarchist] must understand that there is no liberty in the absence of equality and that attainment of the widest liberty amid the most perfect (*de jure* and *de facto*) political, economic, and social equality, conjoined, is justice” (“The Internatioanl Revolutionary Society or Brotherhood,” in *No Gods No Masters*, Ed. Guerin, 2005, 155). It is towards this ‘justice’ that the Anarchism spoken of in this study attempts to make its path. In the mind of the anarchist, the struggle for freedom, equality, and justice is comparable to attempting to correct the faulty ideas of the “bound man who, having managed to survive despite his bonds, regards them as a necessary circumstance of his existence” (Malatesta, “Anarchy,” in *No Gods No Master*, 2005, 361). Achieving justice is man’s purpose, according to Anarchism, and anarchist justice is viewed as fundamentally incompatible with the state system because of the state’s inherent reliance on coercive power.

Modern Perceptions of Anarchism

Since Western philosophy has existed, it has viewed government as the only effective means of protecting us from one another and ensuring that our lives are not ‘nasty, brutish, and short.’ In order to prevent this violent fate, Hobbes’ social contract theory says that men came together out of the state of nature to establish a government, giving up the total freedom and equality of nature to gain collective security from each other. Accordingly, one of the main liberal arguments against Anarchism is that, in a state of anarchy, nobody will be provided protection against the more predatory among us. As Vanderschraaf explains this, “in anarchy some *moderate* individuals will most

desire mutual cooperation while other *dominators* will most desire to exploit others' cooperation" (Vanderschraaf 2006, 243). If humans could be trusted not to exploit this cooperation, then there would not be a reason to hedge against this possibility through the creation of a liberal state. In Vanderschraaf's opinion, and in the opinion of most political philosophers, society will always contain 'bad apples,' and it is to protect us from those social deviants that the government must exist. In this view, it is the government's threat of coercive force that ultimately protects us from wholesale slaughter at the hands of those strong willed, self-interested few and from the weak who seek the acquisition of our property.

Other more modern scholars often categorize Anarchism as mere utopianism, or as outdated and no longer relevant to modern society. Some of these modern critics, like Charles A. Madison, believe that anarchists are not "wholly realistic in their conception of a society fostering at once unrestricted liberty and a limited, simplified economy in a civilization as complex as ours" (Madison 1945, 66). This view that Anarchism may have been feasible in an agrarian society, but is ill-suited for our complex industrial society, has been widely accepted as commonsense among academics. This line of reasoning typically asks, how can individuals possibly deal with national or international issues, such as the global economy, without a governmental structure to make and enforce public policy? The short answer, in the minds of such critics, is that it is impossible.

Other critics, like D. Novak, view Anarchism negatively because they believe in the capability of democracy to govern the social relations of humanity more effectively than any anarchic system (Novak, 1958). Novak explains that although anarchists

contributed greatly to the cause of expanding liberty in our modern culture, “Anarchism was a protest against the evils of the growing industrial society – poverty, disease, ignorance, oppression... However, as the economic, social and cultural conditions of the people gradually improved, and as the exercise of political power broadened, it became clear that Anarchism misjudged the nature of social forces,” such as the perceived ability of liberal governments to combat the growing problems of Capitalism (Novak 1958, 328). In this view, it is liberal democracy, not anarchy, which is best suited to combat the problems of modern society.

Novak even goes so far as to say that the violent Anarchism of the late 19th and early 20th centuries was born, not from a belief that revolution was the only way to bring about utopia, but from Anarchism’s “impotence and inability to face and solve social problems” (Novak 1958, 328). In Novak’s opinion, it was this “inability,” not the Wilson administration’s imprisonment and/or deportation of the leaders of America’s radical Left for “conspiracy to induce persons not to register for the draft,” which led the American working class to ‘abandon’ the goals of Anarchism in favor of working within the liberal democratic framework (Lucas & Palmer, 2008, 47; Freeberg, 2008). This view is typical of the opponents of anarchy who believe that the liberal democratic framework is perfectly capable of dealing with the material and spiritual (when they are acknowledged) problems of society. These critics, however, often reject or blatantly ignore one core tenet of Anarchism, that all coercive power, and therefore all political power, is illegitimate. For these critics, the need for coercive power in governing social affairs is self evident

Even when modern thinkers view the anarchist dream as a beautiful one, most find such a system to be incompatible with inherent human nature. The idea that people need government to survive and thrive as a species dates back to the beginnings of civilization. As is shown from the goal of political science to create an ideal form of government, whether in the form of Socrates' "philosopher-king," or in the comparatively modern divine right theory, most political philosophers throughout time have seen the need for government as inherent and unquestionable because of the faults of human nature. This argument has only changed in relation to which traits of human nature are emphasized to legitimize government as the apparent requirement for civilization.

However, a small number of modern, liberal (non-anarchist) thinkers have begun to rethink the utility and inherent value of anarchist ideologies, driven mainly by the recent resurgence of Anarchism caused by the forces of globalization (Gordon, 2007, 29). Many of these thinkers have sought a reexamination of Anarchism, specifically its ideals and tactics, to escape what one writer deemed the international trend towards "friendly fascism" (Weiss 1975, 2). Although these thinkers do not believe anarchy to be a workable system, they do believe that Anarchism contains yet unconsidered, and valuable, social ideals. As Reichert states, "the philosophy of Anarchism [is] a rich and fertile area of imaginative social perception which political science has not yet discovered" (Reichert 1969, 148). In particular, social scientists have pointed to Anarchism's rejection of coercive power (Weiss 1975), reliance on community organizations (Hueglin 1985), and emphasis on individuality (Gordon 2007) as some of the many traits of Anarchism that society would be wise to absorb if we wish to preserve

any semblance of individual autonomy. At the core of all of these arguments, however, is the implicit assumption that anarchy is not a viable societal system in and of itself. If these writers believed otherwise, then the obvious action would be to propose the destruction of the nation state, instead of choosing certain principles of Anarchism to apply to the current system.

These authors, however, who have stopped to consider the merits of Anarchism, are greatly outnumbered by those who have not. Political science, as a field, is the study of political power and the state system. Most modern political philosophers argue about the role that the state should play in the lives of its citizens, not if the state should play any role at all. That point is simply assumed by all schools of political philosophy, except Anarchism. The basic assumption of statist is that there must be a government, in some form, to have political power at their disposal to insure their ability to manage and control both “the mob,” and the power-hungry few.

Modern anarchists, however, are used to these critiques. With the exception of a few notable additions, the points made by these critics have remained relatively static since the decline in the need to defend the state that coincided with the disintegration of the revolutionary anarchist movement in the early years of the 20th century. Anarchism has not been seriously discussed by statist political thinkers since the 1920's (Redding, 1995). Today, Anarchism is defended by a few prominent academics, including Noam Chomsky, Robert Paul Wolff, and the late Murray Bookchin. In the minds of these academics, and following the anarchist tradition, the liberal democratic state is consistently deemed illegitimate. The opinions of these scholars, however well founded and well thought through, are usually brushed aside by members of the traditional, i.e.

statist, philosophical establishment. A survey of the index of Strauss & Cropsey's monumental work, *History of Political Philosophy*, yielded no results for "Anarchism," "Anarchy," or "Anarchist" (Strauss & Cropsey, 1987). Anarchy is simply not a topic of deep thought within mainstream political philosophy.

The critiques made by anarchists, however, should not be brushed aside so casually. For if they are correct, and humanity has reached a point where laws are nothing except an impediment to our individual and societal growth, then the implications for society are profound.

The Assumptions of Anarchism and Statism

To accurately compare Anarchism and Statism, we must determine their underlying assumptions. It should already be apparent that anarchists reject as superficial the view of liberty and equality that liberals put forward, but why? This divergence can ultimately be traced back to conflicting views of the nature of humanity. Clearly, anarchists and liberals differ in the extent to which each believes that liberty is possible while retaining desirability. Anarchists believe that humanity is capable of living in harmony under complete liberty, while liberals believe that unregulated liberty leads to a "state of war" as Hobbes put it or to major "inconveniences" as Locke did, and, thus, places limits on liberty through the sanctioning of political and economic coercion.

Why does humanity need these limits, though? What is in human nature that, according to statist, leads to this "state of war" when left unregulated? A comparison of anarchist and statist philosophers reveal three main points of disagreement on the subject of human nature. Most anarchists assume that humans are "social-beings," while most

statists assume that humans are inherently, or at least predominantly, self-interested. This point leads to the statist argument wherein society requires laws in order to prevent the abuse of some members of society by others, in the latter's pursuit of self-interest.

Anarchists, however, believe that anything that is truly in one person's best interests will ultimately be beneficial to all because of the effects of one man's action on the lives of all others. If the anarchists are correct, then it is our political, economic, education, and moral systems that leads to our abusing of each other, not an innate drive to exploit.

The anarchist argument requires a second assumption that is disputed by all statists, that all able-minded men have the capacity to justly self-regulate without the need for laws and the specter of coercion that must always follow from them. Without this assumption, anarchy would be in no way desirable due to the turmoil that would develop from men partaking in all of the anti-social behavior currently outlawed. Even if humanity is composed of social-beings, this would be of little consequence in an anarchic society if men are not capable of refraining from their anti-social desires without the threat of punishment that states present. Statists, however, operate on the assumption that society requires laws to retain order, and that physical punishment is the most effective method of preventing and correcting social ills.

These two factors are overshadowed, however, by the disagreement between statists and anarchists on the topic of the malleability of human nature. Modern anarchists have, almost entirely, sworn off the idea of a violent and bloody revolution for bringing about Anarchism.¹⁹ Instead, anarchists focus on education and as an extension,

¹⁹ This does not mean that anarchists are pacifists. Anarchists have no problem with violence when it is used to defend against coercion. While self-defense is acceptable and necessary, the indiscriminate use of violence as propaganda of the deed has been recognized as at least useless, if not harmful to the cause. One caveat should be made on this statement, however. Anarchists do not view the destruction of 'domain'

political theater, as the best means of bringing about their ideal world. As previously noted, however, Anarchism does require certain “revolutions” to take place, revolutions that would fundamentally alter how humanity lives. This raises the question: Are such grand changes to the human condition possible? Furthermore, can the required changes to our nature be directed by human will? If human nature is not static and can be consciously decided upon, then there appears to be nothing restricting the anarchist’s dream except for the human race’s current lack of understanding. Once these aspects of life are corrected and men see themselves as part of a great web of association, where the actions of one affect the quality of life of all, anarchists contend, there will be no need for government, since humans will be able to self-regulate their actions for the good of themselves and for the good of all. If human nature is static, however, it is clear that man will never be separated from their currently exhibited selfishness and that Anarchism is, as statist contend, mere utopianism.

These philosophical disagreements leave us in a position wherein it is necessary to question the validity of both sides’ arguments. For Anarchism, it seems necessary to defend its conception of man against the historical view of man held by the statist. If ‘An-Archy’ is indeed desirable, then the three major philosophical claims made by anarchists, that man is not purely individualistic, that man is capable of self-regulation, and that human nature is not an unmovable blockade to progress, must be proved to be possible, if not undeniably true. Statists, in return, must be capable of defending at least one of its various definitions of man, which are required if government is to be defended against Anarchism’s charges of illegitimacy.

property as violent. Violence is only discussed as including the violence of man on man. Since anarchists do not believe that anyone has the right to own property, damaging property is not violence, and hence, is a legitimate form of protest.

Man Is A Social Being

In the most famous liberal theories postulated for why government originally came into existence, there appears to be one underlying feature: that man, at his core, is motivated principally by self-interest, regardless of whether our self-determined self-interest is actually in our best interests or if we incorrectly believe it to be so. This concept of man as first and foremost an individualist births the most obvious hypothetical problem with Anarchism, that without government, men have no protection from exploitation except their own strength.

This theory has had a place in liberal philosophy from the very beginning. Man, according to Thomas Hobbes, is principally guided by two conflicting motivations: the desire for power, since power allows for men to gain the materials that allow him to live, and the fear of violent (and painful) death. This debasement of humanity to the level of mere beasts is not surprising coming from a man who defines good as “whatsoever is the object of any man’s appetite,” and evil as “the object of (man’s) hate and aversion” (*Leviathan*, 1962, 38). Under such a simplistic and morally relativistic system, it seems perfectly logical that man needs government to ensure that human existence is not “always [a] war of everyone against everyone” (Hobbes, 94). When man is described in this manner, it should be obvious why “man is not by nature social; on the contrary, nature dissociates man” (Berns, Lawrence, “Thomas Hobbes” in Strauss & Cropsey, 1987, 400). Men would not have any reason to live in society if society consists simply of people who continually contrive new ways of exploitation in their quest to satisfy their pleasures and need for security, without a government to stop the worst exploitative

behavior. If there is no *summum bonum*²⁰, and every man regards his own desires as all-important, then society could not possibly exist without a powerful and terrifying government capable of convincing people not to pursue their individual desires out of fear that they will receive a heavy penalty from the state if they do. “Amongst masterless men, there is perpetual war” (Hobbes, 166). Without a government present to force men to make cost-benefit analyses prior to acting against the law, the life of man would be “solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short” (*Leviathan*, 95).

If Hobbes is correct, and man is ruled purely by passion and self-interest, which only fear can control, then it is obvious why Anarchism is a fatally flawed system. Hobbes’ view, luckily for humanity’s existence, is no longer accepted as valid even in mainstream democratic theory. Hobbes’ pessimistic view of human nature was dispensed with its refutation by John Locke, just 40 years later. With the publication of Locke’s *Second Treatise on Government*, Hobbes’ dream of a terrifying Leviathan capable of awing its subjects into submission was replaced with the much preferable liberal conception of limited government. Unlike Hobbes’s dismal view of human nature as bestial, selfish, and incapable of self-rule, Locke’s man is actually a relatively peaceful and friendly animal. According to Locke, the state of nature is not necessarily a state of war. In fact, man’s existence without government is characterized in Locke’s mind as a “state of peace, good-will, mutual assistance, and preservation” (Locke, 1993, ¶19). This should not, however, be misinterpreted to suggest that Locke believes that man is a true social-being.

Locke’s man may be more peaceful, but he is only slightly less self-interested than Hobbes’ vision. For Locke, the major “inconvenience” in a society without

²⁰ Greatest Good

government is the lack of a neutral arbiter in dispute settlement. Without a judge to turn to, men would supposedly be left with “no appeal but to heaven,” and one or the other of the participants in any dispute is likely to end up there since, in the state of nature, all men have the power to enforce the laws of nature (Locke, 1993, ¶20). For this belief to be true, it can rationally be assumed that men must be primarily self-interested. If not, then men would be capable of listening to a neutral party and agreeing to abide by its decision without the need for that arbiter to have its own police department with which to enforce its decision. “It ought to be in principle possible for a society of rational men of good will to eliminate the domination of society and subdue it to their wills in a manner that is impossible in the case of nature” (Wolff, 1998, 76). Anarchism does not require men to be perfect in their reasoning, but demands that they are reasonable enough to be able to admit when they are wrong, even if this requires persuasion. Anarchists do not assume that all men have infinite ability to judge which action is correct in all circumstances, but they do assume that no educated man is so stubborn as to refuse to correct his own opinions and actions when they are proven to be blatantly false.

Furthermore, Locke’s idea that men require a referee is viewed by anarchists as true utopianism. As Malatesta stated this belief: “The government, or, as it is called, the referee “State,” arbitrating in social struggles, impartial administrator of public interests, is a lie, and illusion, a utopia never attained and never attainable” (*No Gods No Master*, 2005, 360). From the anarchist point of view, the referee role which the state plays under the liberal framework contains two main flaws: 1) It assumes that a man can truly be neutral when attempting to decide the case of another, even when they are judging solely based on a specific written law, and 2) That the laws which the state enforces ‘equally’

legitimately demand the respect of the citizenry. On the first assumption, anarchists believe that no man is infallible and that the actions of all men are influenced by their past experiences. This results, under the principles of Anarchism, in the outcome that no judge, no matter how hard they may try, can ever effectively be neutral in dispute settlement. The effects of this are only multiplied due to the structure of the liberal system. Judges are expected to be unbiased, but their decisions impact every member of society, and judges, as members of society, are not immune from the effects of their decisions. This creates a system wherein men are expected to rule fairly, although they too have a stake in the outcome of their decisions. This fundamental and inherent conflict of interests is accepted in the liberal system because there is no way around it. Even the judges' predisposition towards the rule of law itself biases their judgment in the cases on which they are asked to judge. Most judges do not agree about the proper role of government in society, so how can they be expected to rule in a uniform, that is fair, manner?

But what of the rule of law, liberals should retort. One of the touted advantages of Liberalism is the removal of arbitrariness from judicial proceedings by standardizing law and punishments. In application, however, it is clear that these goals are not entirely met. Sentences are subject to mitigating circumstances, which anarchists would actually claim is a fairer system than truly blind application of the law, but this introduces a certain amount arbitrariness into the system and is likely to be misapplied, at least occasionally. Furthermore, in America at least, Capitalism allows men of higher socio-economic status to receive more competent representation in court, and receive lighter sentences as a result of their economic status. It is clear that the rule of law is fairer than

the application of justice under monarchism, but the system is not perfect, nor can it ever be perfect as a result of how our own world-view is currently constructed.

The second problem with the state's role as referee, from the anarchist perspective, is the liberal trust and belief in the law itself. The liberal system requires that 'no man is above the law,' but what of men that disagree with the law? In a system of majority rule, this situation arises almost every time a law is passed, but it is an accepted part of the system. As a referee, the state rules on cases based on the rule of the game, *i.e.* the laws. We are told that if we don't like the rules of the game, that democracy allows us to attempt to convince our fellow citizens to change them. This is not a short, easy, or cheap task in modern society, and how many men are punished under absurd laws every day? Anarchism refuses to accept that 'justice' allow men to lose their liberty daily because of the absurd rules of the majority. To the anarchist, it does not matter whether one man creates and enforces unjust laws, or whether it is done by 535 men and women on Capitol Hill and a cadre of police enforcers: the results are the same and the loss of autonomy is not diminished in the slightest.²¹ If men are truly 'free' under the liberal system, then why is it acceptable that half of a country can force the other half to abide by its rules? Freedom will continue to be a sham, or at least a long distance away from our ideal, as long as men are restricted from certain actions, not because individuals understand why such actions are wrong and therefore choose not to undertake them, but because they understand that they do not have the ability to match the brute

²¹ Not all laws that are made are unjust in and of themselves, but it is the coercive power which the state uses in their enforcement which renders all laws illegitimate. Furthermore, anarchists are firm believers in the theory that power corrupts. "We have not two measures for the virtues of the governed and those of the governors; we know that we ourselves would soon be corrupted by the exercise of power. We take men for what they are worth, and that is why we hate the government of man by man, and why we work with all our might – perhaps not strong enough – to put an end to it" (Kropotkin, 2002, 136). Laws are made by men, so anarchists view all government as technically the 'government of man by man.'

force of police and the state while standing up for the actions they believe are just. The referee is appointed by the enforcer with the consent of the rule-makers. Refusing to play the game is not only impossible, but is actually against the rules. Men do not have a choice in what government, and therefore set of laws, will govern them from birth. After birth, men can only choose which majority, aristocracy, or dictator they wish to live under. Having a 1/300,000,000th share in government is better than having none at all, but anarchists refuse to accept that this qualifies as true freedom. There is no option available for retaining one's autonomy since every hospitable location in the world is now governed.

Locke's largest mistake from the anarchist perspective, however, is that he failed to recognize man as a true social-being. Society itself is nothing if not "an aggregation of organisms trying to find out the best ways of combining the wants of the individual with those of cooperation for the welfare of the species" (Kropotkin, 2002, 47). Locke decided that the 'best way' of accomplishing this task was the development of the liberal state to remove man from the state of nature in order to minimize the chance and effects of the state of war. Anarchists contend, however, that Locke's system does not actually remove man from the state of war, but institutionalizes and diminishes it. Giving a state the ability to make and enforce laws transforms the state of nature into a permanent state of war, pitting the collective force which governments represent against the far inferior force of dissenting individuals. This system, because it is supported by the will and power of the majority, along with the tax dollars of both the majority and minority, only appears to transform the state of nature into a state of peace. Anarchists claim that in reality, liberalism extends the state of war onto every member of society. To utilize

Locke in a critique of his own system: “For wherever violence is used, and injury done, though by hands appointed to administer justice, it is still violence and injury, however coloured with the name” (Locke, 2003, ¶20). Locke would claim that the use of violence by a liberal state is legitimate and necessary, based on his social contract, and that man is only put into a state of war when others use illegitimate force against him, *i.e.* force he has not previously consented to. For the anarchist, however, this all rings hollow since the anarchist consents to no laws and yet is ruled by the same laws as the consenting members of society. The concept of implicit consent holds no legitimacy, and certainly should not qualify as governance with the consent of the governed, if the individual does not have another option.

It would indeed be an unpleasurable existence if men were forced to exchange blows whenever a disagreement arose, as Locke certainly imagined men did before they were chained to the court system. Anarchists, however, reject this viewpoint. From the anarchist’s perspective, liberals fail to recognize man’s inter-connectedness with the rest of society. Human nature, the anarchists claim, cannot be examined without viewing it in the context of society, because humanity and society are inseparable. To look at the characteristics of an individual and to attempt to mold a form of governance around that vision is to remove from that individual the obligation to the rest of humanity, to which all men are indebted. Every man needs other men for his own survival. One man cannot build a house, or if he somehow can, he is wasting his time by doing so alone. When more people work on a project, less time and energy is required from each individual, hence making the production process more efficient. Letting one member of society die from starvation ultimately decreases the social output of society as a whole, negatively

affecting all. In Kropotkin's theory of mutual-aid, it is cooperation, not competition, that has allowed us to reach the heights and complexity of modern society (*Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution*, n.d). The individual cannot be a society, and most individuals physically could not, or would not desire to, live outside of society. Anarchists enshrine the individual too much for them to consider society to be man's defining characteristic, as Marx contended, but this does not mean that man can ever exist, or should ever be viewed, as a solitary individual. As Aristotle correctly observed, "Human beings, like certain kinds of animals, everywhere congregate in groups larger than the household, and 'strive to live together even when they have no need of assistance from one another'" (Lord, Cernes, "Aristotle" in Strauss & Cropsey, 1987, 136). Anarchists merely ask that society recognize that mankind requires cooperation for survival, and that it is in every man's self-interest to work towards a more cooperative and equitable world.

In the view of the anarchist, the state system fails to achieve this end because of its emphasis on an individual's rights, obligations, and desires. All of these are important in Anarchism, but Anarchism requires a new way of framing these problems. Instead of viewing individual men as needing protection from government, as the combined forces of society, anarchists claim that we should pursue the option of removing from government the powers which make the safeguards of Liberalism necessary. If governments cannot interrogate, fine, jail, and execute people, then there is no reason to fear government. Of course, a government without these powers is not truly a government, but this is exactly the transformation which anarchists seek to accomplish. Anarchism does not seek to remove organization from society, but to ensure that this organization is organic, instead of imposed.

Anarchism has no problem with the positive functions that many of today's governments accomplish. Public education, socialized medicine, roads, and welfare programs are all viewed by anarchists as positive consequences of the state system. The organization and administration of these programs can be improved, but even in an anarchist system these tasks would have to be handled by a public body of some sort. The difference here between the anarchists and statist is that the anarchists wish to socialize these benefits by convincing men that these services are necessary, instead of imposing taxes onto citizens who have no desire to pay them and threatening them with force if they refuse. In an anarchic system this task would no longer even be necessary because of the new property relations which would come about from the dismissal of 'domain' property. All of this assumes, however, that man is not condemned to forever bear the burden of the inner economic drive to hoard wealth, as was Ebenezer Scrooge.

The idea that man is not primarily driven by selfishness is not only found in Anarchism. To support this argument, we need not look into the pages of obscure anarchist texts, but only into the works of Jean-Jacques Rousseau. According to Rousseau, man has one redeeming natural trait: pity (*Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*, 2004). As Rousseau explains, "...men, in spite of all their morality, would never have been better than monsters, if nature had not given them pity to assist reason" (*Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*, 20).²² It is pity that allows us to live in a society with other individuals without descending into the Hobbesian nightmare; by "moderating in every individual the activity of self-love, [pity] contributes to the mutual preservation of the whole species" (*Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*, 21). It is not a stretch to

²² Rousseau actually goes even further than this, claiming that all of man's social virtue flows from our possession of pity. This view, however, fails to take into account self-interest entirely, stretching the importance of pity to an utopian extreme so radical that not even anarchists accept it as valid.

give Rousseau credit for originally promulgating the theory of man as a social being. Marx's concept of the species-being and Kant's adoration for the universally applicable categorical imperative can both be traced back to the Rousseauian idea of the existence of a "general will," as can Kropotkin's theory of mutual aid.²³ The presence of empathy in today's man, whether inherent or as a result of Nietzsche's transubstantiation of values, cannot be denied.

For the anarchists, however, pity is not the only cause of men's compassion and aid for one another. In an anarchist society, empathy is combined with self-interest to create a new version of self-interest. As previously noted, pure self-interest leads men, in the minds of liberals, to an existence disposed towards inter-personal conflict, requiring government to check this human condition. Without a government to enforce the 'peace,' society would see itself descend into chaos due to greed and retaliatory 'justice.' Anarchist self-interest, on the other hand, is based on an enlightened view of long term self-interest, as compared to the relatively short term self-interest as is spoken of in modern usage.²⁴ To the anarchist, following the golden rule in everyday instances is the obvious way that humans should live. Self-interest comes into play because of the mutual web of dependency in the relationship of each individual to all others. In other

²³ A deeper discussion of the procession of ideas from Rousseau to both Kant and Marx can be found in Strauss & Cropsey's monumental work, *The History of Political Philosophy*. This philosophical progression, while extremely fascinating, is not germane to the topic of this paper and will not be dwelled upon further.

²⁴ The liberal view of enlightened self-interest has man giving up certain 'natural rights' when he enters society, in order to protect his possessions, which, for Locke, include life and liberty. Anarchists counter this by declaring that liberals have sacrificed man's autonomy for the illusion of security. After all, governments are not very accomplished at stopping common crimes before they happen. Instead, liberal governments punish the criminal and attempt to gain retribution for the victim, in which the government sometimes succeeds. It should be obvious, however, that this accepted method of societal revenge is little use to the victim of a murder. Liberalism fails to accomplish its own goal, *i.e.* to protect our property. Protection usually involves preventing harm, not simply exacting revenge after the harm has occurred.

words, Anarchism requires every man to treat all others as he would wish to be treated, because if he does not, then no other person has any reason to treat him as such.

Anarchism's conception of self-interest is surprisingly similar to Alexis de Tocqueville's "self-interest properly understood" that he observed in Jacksonian America and described in *Democracy In America*. Americans seemed to Tocqueville to act more virtuously than Europeans, but they did not practice this virtue for virtue's sake. Instead, Tocqueville determined that Americans constantly aid one another in the struggles of daily life because of an "enlightened self-love [that] continually leads them to help one another and disposes them freely to give part of their time and wealth" to the cause of aiding their fellow men so that they may also be the recipient of such help at a future time (*Democracy In America*, 2000, 526). This version of self-interest is a stark departure from the liberal view of enlightened self-interest, which requires abstention from certain rights in order to protect the rest. Anarchist self-interest, on the other hand, does not require these limitations on liberty, opting instead for a vision of self-interest that does not require the negation of any of humanity's inherent rights.

Tocqueville claims that Americans were not the first people to practice this phenomenon, but that they were the first to adopt the principle universally. To the Americans of the early Nineteenth Century, this seemingly radical concept was not only seen as valid, but it was "at the root of all actions. It [was] interwoven in all they say. You [heard] it as much from the poor as from the rich" (Tocqueville, 526). Furthermore, this system predates the advent of 'police departments,' dismissing the critics who claim that this system is only possible because of the level of security provided by law enforcement, which, at this time, was not much. This system was based in a time when

collective justice was truly collective, instead of justice being the sole domain of police. If we are to believe Tocqueville's observations, then there is no choice but to admit the possibility of anarchist self-interest as a coherent philosophy, or at least not to reject it out of hand as mere utopianism.

In a system ruled by anarchist self-interest, every free rider is a threat to the system. It is obvious that the system could easily be abused, and while it may appear to be in an individual's immediate self-interest to force his will on another, anarchists deny that it actually is. By abusing the system, an exploiter actually weakens the system. By introducing mistrust and coercive power back into the daily relations of humanity, the selfish man single-handedly destroys the system and forces humanity back into the lesser evolutionary stage of Statism. Under Statism, power is seen as necessary, and every man is open to abuse from anyone who wishes to do him harm with only a promise of state retaliation to ease the injury. Hence, without this threat of retaliation, it may seem like a great idea to steal an unguarded car, but by doing so, you actually harm yourself by destroying the grounding principles of the new social values, and open yourself up to further crimes at the hands of men who see no reason to follow the social mores now that they have been proven to be useless. In other words, by exploiting or cheating your fellow man, your own ability to live a life of safety and peace is diminished. This system, like the state system, is not without flaws, but anarchists believe that it corrects many of the above problems inherent in Statism, while not requiring limits on liberty imposed through a state's coercive power.

Man Can Be Self-Regulating

If this anarchist self-interest is possible, and man is not destined to be predominantly self-interested in the traditional sense, then how does Anarchism account for the existence of crime? Anarchists acknowledge the role which criminal statutes claim to play in modern society; “if law enjoys a certain amount of considerations, it is in consequence of the belief that this law is absolutely indispensable to the maintenance of [physical] security in our societies” (Kropotkin, 2002, 214). Anarchists do not support criminal activities, but they are also not in favor of laws intended to prevent crime. To most statist, this position seems naïve and unrealistic. If men are meant to live in a condition of mutual aid, then what has caused men to act so violently towards each other throughout history? If Anarchism cannot validly answer this question, then a fatal logical gap opens itself into Anarchism’s view of human nature. To understand Anarchism’s explanation for crime, it is first necessary to be more specific in defining crime.

Anarchists categorize existing crimes into three groups: crimes of economic gain, crimes against the government, and crimes of passion.²⁵ Under the progressive economic system of Anarchism, it is assumed by anarchists that property crimes, which make up the majority of crimes committed under the current system would disappear from human behavior. While this may appear to be utopian, the reader should be reminded that the anarchist notion of self-interest excludes stealing someone else’s material goods because of the ultimate harm that would reach the thief in the long-run. Furthermore, by doing

²⁵ These three categories are not uniformly defined in anarchist thought. The anarchist-terrorist Emile Henry only included crimes against property and crimes of passion in his description of the types of existing crimes (*No Gods No Master*, 2005, 401). Peter Kropotkin added the second category of crimes in his essay *Law and Authority*, seeing them as distinct from the two other categories because of the emphasis they place not on commercial power, as property laws do, but on protecting the State’s monopoly on coercive power itself (Kropotkin, 2002). Crimes against governments will not be considered here because this point is non-negotiable amongst anarchists and statist. Since anarchists believe all government is tyranny, they see it as their right to ignore unjust or absurd laws. Statist, it will undoubtedly be admitted, support these laws, as they are the foundations for the security of all society. Statist may argue as to what these laws should include, but they all believe these laws to be necessary.

away with the concept of ownership (as opposed to mere possession and use), the utility of larceny is greatly diminished since a man can, in most circumstances, simply ask his neighbor to use the needed item, or will have access to such items through other means as provided by society. Under Capitalism, however, crime, if executed without detection, is not viewed as a true threat to society because of the role which the state plays in crime prevention in modern society. “The State has the care of all questions of public interest; the State alone has the function of seeing that we do not harm the interests of our neighbor, and, if it fails in this, of punishing us in order to repair the evil.” (Kropotkin, 2002, 140). Robberies are an inconvenience or business cost at worst. The cost of stolen items is merely passed to the consumer. In Capitalism, undetected crime really does pay. But if anarchists are correct in their first assumption, then it should follow that most crimes would disappear under Anarchism.

These characterizations of the types of ‘crimes’ that occur under the present system can be verified through an examination of FBI crime data. In 2008, 10.2 million property crimes were reported within the United States, 1.7 million drug-related arrests were made (for possession, distribution, or trafficking), while only 941,000 ‘violent’ crimes occurred during the same time period.²⁶ Even the majority of these violent crimes were more than likely undertaken with the hope of gaining material goods. Gang related violence, which is included in the above number, is almost always conducted in order to increase the profitability of a gang’s economic activities. Even more of those violent

²⁶ All crime information was retrieved from the FBI’s Uniform Crime Reporting Program’s (UCR) survey, *2008 Crime in the United States*. I have reorganized the FBI’s categories concerning “violent crime” and “property crime.” I recoded “robbery” as a “violent crime,” which I believe more correctly characterizes the motive of the crime, which is not physical violence, but the acquisition of another’s material goods. I have placed robbery into the “property crime” category due to robbery’s inherent requirement of property theft. The “violent crimes” numbers include reported murders, rapes, and aggravated assaults. The ‘property crime’ category includes burglary, motor vehicle theft, arson, larceny, and the added category of robbery. <http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/cius2008/index.html>

crimes were probably committed over some dispute concerning the ownership of material items. While the data is not conclusive, it does appear that anarchists are not being unfair when they declare that the majority of crimes would, theoretically, no longer occur under a system of Anarchism that eschews ownership rights and is guided by anarchist self-interest instead of capitalist self-interest.

Now all of this ‘utopian’ rhetoric is fine and good, but in order to pass an ancient validity test, let us now submit Anarchism to the test of “Gyges Ring.” In Plato’s *The Republic*, Socrates is urged to accept the premise that all men, given the power to do whatever they desire, and to get away with it, would abuse such powers to no end (Plato, 1991, 359-361). Socrates fends off this criticism by showing that it is not in any man’s best interest to act immorally, even if he could get away with his crimes, because that man would not be truly happy due to the unbalance created in his soul by committing such actions.

Anarchists, while they agree with Socrates’ conclusion, have a much simpler explanation for the non-property crimes that occur today, the so-called crimes of passion: “Society itself is responsible for the anti-social deeds perpetrated in its midst, and that no punishment, no prisons, and no hangman can diminish the number of such deeds; nothing short of a reorganization of society itself” (Kropotkin, 2002, 71). As the anarchists present their argument, humanity is not destined to remain enslaved to the state. There is another way that we can live, wherein most crimes would not occur, people would need not live in paranoia of their fellow man, and humanity would respect itself.

Society needs to be reorganized if the anarchists are to make true freedom and equality possible. Under the current system, coercion is an effective method of getting

your will and is inherent in the political structure. As Machiavelli explained, “the main foundations of all States, whether old, new, or mixed, are good laws and good arms... You cannot have the former without the latter” (*The Prince*, 1992, 31).

Democracy relies just as heavily on force as do all other regimes. Democracy just sugar coats this coercion through arms in the pretty pill of the ‘sovereignty of the people.’ If this notion seems counterintuitive or blatantly false, let it be remembered that the United States, with less than five percent of the world’s population, incarcerates almost a quarter of the world’s prisoners.²⁷ Are Americans simply worse human beings than those in all other nations? Whether the answer to either question is yes or no, it is obvious either that something is very wrong with the current state of the American “democratic” justice system, or that America has the most unruly population in the world.

Anarchists disagree with this description. They point to numerous causes for how the American justice discrepancy can be explained. Their first and most obvious explanation would be that America has been fundamentally corrupted by the influence of Capitalism. Capitalism, for the individual, is about securing one’s own happiness through the collection of the material goods necessary to achieve such goals. The problem inherent in this system is that the most effective way for individuals to gain such material wealth is the exploitation of poorer members of society by paying the ‘unskilled’ workers for the ‘value of their labor,’ while keeping excess ‘profits’ for themselves. Capitalism gives no incentive for men to treat one another with respect or dignity, except in the pursuit of a larger profit, so it should be unsurprising that men living under

²⁷ Liptak, Adam, *U.S. Prison Population Dwarfs that of Other Nations*. New York Times, April 23, 2008. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/04/23/world/americas/23iht-23prison.12253738.html> on 3-22-10.

Capitalism would have no reason to cooperate with one another or to truly care about the needs of others.

This theory also finds support in the pages of *Democracy in America*. In Tocqueville's introduction, he says that, "No novelty in the United States struck me more vividly during my stay there than the equality of conditions. It was easy to see the immense influence of this basic fact on the whole course of society. It gives a particular turn to the public opinion and a particular twist to the laws, new maxims to those who govern and particular habits to the governed" (*Democracy in America*, 1969, 9). Tocqueville's observation of "self-interest properly understood" is one of the above mentioned "particular habits."

It is only logical, therefore, since America is no longer a place with "equality of conditions," that the mores²⁸ engendered by this condition will change as well. In 2006, income disparity in America reached all time highs,²⁹ with the top 20 percent of wage earners bringing in 55.7 percent of the nation's income, while the nation's poorest 40 percent only earns 12.3 percent of the nation's total pretax income.³⁰ There can be no doubt that this income disparity is to blame for a large chunk, if not a large majority, of the crimes that occur under the current system. No man should be expected to live peaceably under such conditions of inequality, at least no man who recognizes the

²⁸ "I here mean the "mores" to have its original Latin meaning; I mean it to apply not only to "*moeurs*" in the strict sense, which might be called the habits of the heart, but also to the different notions possessed by men, the various opinions current among them, and the sum of ideas that shape mental habits...the whole moral and intellectual state of a people" (Tocqueville, 2000, 287).

²⁹ Of course, during Tocqueville's time, the nation's poorest were slaves and owned nothing, but people in a condition of slavery were not included when Tocqueville discussed his "equality of conditions," since they had no political representation or rights. Since they were themselves property, slaves were not included when calculating income disparity during the pre-bellum period.

³⁰ Dubay, Curtis. "The Rich Pay More Taxes: Top 20 Percent Pay Record Share of Income Taxes," The Heritage Foundation. Published May 4, 2009. Retrieved from <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2009/05/The-Rich-Pay-More-Taxes-Top-20-Percent-Pay-Record-Share-of-Income-Taxes>

injustice of living under a system that is blatantly unequal. The construction worker works at least as hard to build the skyscraper as the does corporate lawyer who handled the original land sale documents, but one receives substantially less money for labor that was no less necessary to the completion of the product. This feeling of inequality is only exacerbated by America's cultural inclination towards materialism and the equating one's value as a person to one's net worth.

Man cannot be said to be unable to live peacefully with each other, for, due to the historical progression of economics, man has never been presented with the opportunity to live under a system where such an existence is possible. We have reached a point in this progression, however, where it finally seems possible to relegate poverty to the history books. No reasonable explanation can be made for why humanity has not ended the starvation, malnutrition, and lack of modern healthcare we see today in various impoverished parts of the world except because of economic selfishness. The United States has enough resources to single-handedly eliminate starvation in at least the Western Hemisphere, but we do not. Instead, Americans purchase advanced consumer goods and other supplements to our already incredible standard of living. This is not only viewed as acceptable, but is characterized as the "American Dream." Anarchists envision a world where people are put before wealth, and hence the reason for limiting the amount of personal wealth any man can personally accumulate through the abolishment of "domain property." If men cannot earn large amounts of wealth, then this should, as Murray Bookchin describes, free up most of society's wealth to raise the standard of living throughout all of society through a redistribution of wealth, not only among individuals, but through entire industries (Bookchin, 2005).

Statism is pointed to as another reason why society is faced with its current levels of crime. To the anarchist, the use of coercive power by a state to restrain members of society institutionalizes coercive power as the norm, without correcting the problems cause crime in the slightest. The government enforces its monopoly on force, but even the most uneducated people in the current system will admit that giving one group of people privileges excluded from the rest is unequal and unjust, regardless of any common good it may seek to achieve. Statists are truly the utopians if they believe that the use of coercive power among the members of society can be eliminated through the use of greater coercive power on society by the state.³¹ “Not only has coercive power contributed and powerfully aided to create all the present economic, political, and social evils, but it has given proof of its absolute impotence to raise the moral level of society” (Kropotkin, 2002, 137). On this point, Kant agrees with the anarchists that, “a good will cannot be introduced into us by an external command” (Hassner, Pierre, “Immanuel Kant” in Strauss & Cropsey, 1987, 617). Anarchists agree with the principle, but extend it to support their theory: laws have proved over thousands of years to be incapable to deter and prevent crimes. Laws in a democratic system are a reflection, often an outdated one, of societal values, not the creator of these values. Forcing men to be moral is useless, for, as soon as they can get away with their unjust actions, the morality that has been forced upon them will be shed.

Rousseau’s ‘law-giver’ may be able to give men a just moral code in the form of law, but for the rest of us mere humans, we rely on our own observations, education,

³¹ Further explanation of the ill effects of the government’s monopoly on coercive power on society can be located in *State Socialism and Anarchism*, by American anarchist Benjamin Tucker. This short pamphlet, while directly critiquing Marxism, is also a critique of all monopolies of power, and therefore all governments.

opinions, and prejudices to create our sense of morality. It is only after understanding how morals are internalized that we can seek to change those morals. Telling someone that something is wrong is one thing, but they must be made to believe it themselves if they are going to follow through with refraining from the action. This is why anarchists claim that the state cannot wipe out crime, at least not through the creation of new laws. Only through the spread of belief in anarchist self-interest can humanity create a future free from the anti-social behaviors we currently consider to be crimes.

Since anarchists believe that laws and punishment are incapable of preventing man from harming and exploiting his fellow man, it must be asked: Is mankind capable of self-regulation based on a principle alone? The anarchists unhesitatingly answer in the affirmative. Man, in the anarchist mindset, is his own master, and is not bound by the whims of his passions. Anarchism places one's own reason as master of each human being, and along with this reason comes the responsibility to follow its dictates. If these dictates go against the will of the majority, the responsibility to follow one's own reason is not diminished in the slightest. Under Anarchism, man's autonomy as a rational being demands nothing less. This responsibility must extend to the keeping of promises. "The obligation to take responsibility for one's actions [including the making of promises and contracts] does not derive from man's freedom of will alone, for more is required in taking responsibility than freedom of choice. Only because man has the capacity to reason about his choices can he be said to stand under a continuing obligation to take responsibility for them" (Wolff, 1998, 12). This is why anarchists proclaim that "we do not see the necessity of force for enforcing agreements freely entered upon," because

each man is already under a moral obligation to follow through on the promises he has made due to his nature as a rational being (Kropotkin, 2002, 69).

If man is not capable of trusting his fellow man, then Anarchism is impossible, but Anarchism does not rely on trust alone. Just as “according to Hobbes, intelligent calculation of self-interest is all that is required to make a man just,” the capability of intelligent calculation of anarchist self-interest is all that is required to make Anarchism possible (Berns, Lawrence, “Thomas Hobbes” in Strauss & Cropsey, 1987, 403).³² It is clear to anarchists that it is time for humanity to realize that Spinoza’s proposition that “to reach the heights [of freedom], reason must regulate passions” can be applied to society, as well to the individual (Rosen, Stanley, “Benedict Spinoza” in Strauss & Cropsey, 1987, 458). Anarchism is a fatally flawed system if men are not almost entirely capable of regulating their anti-social passions through the use of reason.

Since men are not infallible in their judgment, however, Anarchism is still open to the valid question of, as Kropotkin frames it, “‘But,’ it will be said, ‘there will always be brutes who will attempt the lives of their fellow citizens, who lay their hands to a knife in every quarrel, and revenge the slightest offense by murder, if there are no laws to restrain and punishments to withhold them.’ This refrain is repeated every time the right of society to *punish* is called into question” (Kropotkin, 2002, 215). So in a society without the common institutions of ‘justice,’ liberals will undoubtedly ask, how would humanity deal with the above-mentioned “brutes?” Anarchists have an answer to this commonly assumed practical problem with their system: “Criminals being now [under Anarchism]

³² Hobbes’ self-regulation relies on coercive power as a deterrence. If a man can get away with his misdeeds under Hobbes’ system, he has no reason not to since he will not be punished. Anarchism’s self-regulation, however, is based on the positive benefits of such a process, giving men a reason to self-regulate outside of their chances of being physically caught and punished.

only aberrations, they are to be regarded as sick and demented; the issue of crime, which today occupies so many judges, lawyers, and jailers, will diminish in social significance and become simply an entry in the philosophy of medicine” (Guillaume, James, “Ideas on Social Organizing,” in *No Gods No Masters*, Ed. Guerin, 2005, 261). For anarchists, there is no other way to characterize these anti-social actions under Anarchism. These ‘brutes’ are either sick or ill-educated. Sick people should be treated as such, instead of being incarcerated. Society must protect its members from those who wish to harm them, but these sick members of society have not lost their rights to live as men. No man should lose his rights as a man because of his natural disadvantages. Anarchists demand empathy in treating the mentally-ill. Throwing them into a prison cell to rot is simply unacceptable. If the latter is the case, and men are abusing the system because of a lack of understanding of the system, then society has no one to blame but itself. Anarchism does not allow for the notion that men are naturally drawn to exploit one another. If Anarchism is wrong on this point, and exploitation and abuse are the natural and unchangeable conditions of the human existence, then Anarchism is impossible.

Fluidity of Human Nature

To modern minds, Anarchism’s vision for how humanity could live without government, as so far outlined, may still seem utopian. Modern society appears not to be composed of social beings, but of rabid individualists who heed no sense of empathy in their quest for economic and political power. Inner cities are racked with drug-associated violence. Wall Street moguls bring our economy to its knees in the search for a quick profit. Even if Anarchism is a beautiful dream, a reasonable man cannot be blamed for

having certain reservations based on current events and human actions. As anarchists have themselves realized, “our minds have been so nurtured in prejudices as to the providential functions of government that anarchist ideas *must* be received with distrust” (Kropotkin, 2002, 63). If man is destined to remain in the state of brutality and exploitation which we currently live under, then Anarchism is correctly viewed by mainstream political philosophy as impractical and utopian.

It should be obvious by this point, however, that anarchists refuse to accept that man’s basic nature is incompatible with a system without government. To the anarchists, the observation that “our society seems no longer able to understand that it is possible to exist otherwise than under the reign of law,” is not a reason to relinquish their goal of attaining a more humane existence for humanity (Kropotkin, 2002, 197). It is because of the current state and capitalist institutions, maintained through the use of coercive power, which hold men back from being able to view the world in such a way that Anarchism is no longer utopian, but possible and desirable.

So how are these institutions to be done away with? How can humanity gain Malatesta’s liberty, which is not “that absolute, abstract, metaphysical liberty which, in practice, inevitably translates into oppression of the weak, but rather, real liberty, the achievable liberty represented by conscious community of interests and willing solidarity?” (*No Gods No Master*, 2005, 363). The anarchist answer is simple: Education. For, if men can be taught that respecting their fellow men is in their best interest, then Anarchism is possible if it is accepted that only a fool would act against his own self-interest. As Malatesta explains the anarchist’s duty; “Do but change minds and persuade the public that not only is government not a necessity, but that it is extremely

dangerous and harmful, and the word Anarchy, precisely because it signifies absence of government, would imply, as far as everyone is concerned: natural order, harmony of everyone's needs and interests, utter freedom in solidarity" (*No Gods No Master*, 2005, 355).

Is such a change in human morals possible, however? If we accept Rousseau's premise, and Kant's defense of that premise, which states that "man is radically characterized by his freedom or, better still, by his perfectibility," then it would appear that such a transformation is possible (Hassner, Pierre, "Immanuel Kant" in Strauss & Cropsey, 1987, 601).³³ "Among all the peoples of the world, it is not nature but opinion which governs the choice of their pleasures. Reform the opinions of men, and their morals will be purified of themselves. Men always love what is good or what they think is good, but it is in their judgment that they err" (*The Social Contract*, 1962, 174). It is through education that the anarchists believe that we can correct most of the errors of judgment men make. Education, it must be admitted, has the definite effect of changing men's opinions and prejudices. Anarchists believe that through education we can fundamentally correct the traditional 'vices' of man by stopping them at their root: the evolving concept of power that has been passed down from one generation to the next since the beginning of history.

This moral progression, based on anarchist self-interest, should not be rushed. As the American anarchist, Benjamin Tucker, understands, "education is a slow process, and for this reason we must hope that the day of readjustment may not come too quickly"

³³ This premise is required for Anarchism to be viable. Leftist anarchists must agree with Chomsky's proclamation that "man is fundamentally a creative, searching, self-perfecting being" (Chomsky, 2004, 109). If the concept of perfectibility is not accepted, then Anarchism would result in the lawless anarchy which society fears.

(*State Socialism and Anarchism*, 1972, 25). Charging headlong into a violent revolution would almost certainly end with humanity being under an even stronger state yoke, and Anarchism, as occurred with Marxism, fading into the category of ‘failed’ ideas.³⁴ “An anarchist may grant the necessity of *complying* with the law under certain circumstances or for the time being. He may even doubt that there is any real prospect of eliminating the state as a human institution. But he will never view the commands of the state as *legitimate*, as having a binding moral force” (Wolff, 1998, 18).

Anarchism will only be achievable if men can be convinced of their long-term self-interest. With time, and under the restraint of the State, “our manner of acting towards others [will] tend to become habitual. To treat others as he would wish to be treated himself becomes with men and all sociable animals, simply a habit...It will be still more efficient when there is no longer judge or priest in society, when moral principles have lost their obligatory character and are considered merely as relations between equals” (Kropotkin, 2002, 101, 105). Once this habit is practiced in human society, then government will be only a bureaucratic hindrance to human development, and Anarchism will be the only rational way forward.

³⁴ Not all historical anarchists have believed in the effectiveness of non-violence, most notably the anarchist revolutionary Mikhail Bakunin, but state power today is even stronger than in the 19th Century, and declaring open revolution against a State today is akin to suicide. People cannot be forced to break free from their chains, as Rousseau, Kant, Hegel, and Bakunin recommended. This process must be voluntary, if it is to last. Since Anarchism rests, at its core, on the changing of human values, declaring war on society is useless. Force can be met with force, but the Proudhonian Revolutions cannot be imposed through force. This is the defining difference between Marxism and Anarchism. Marxists believe in achieving complete freedom and equality through the dictatorship of the proletariat, but as Communism as applied by Lenin and especially Stalin shows, as long as some men retain political power, freedom and equality will continue to be an illusion. Anarchists reject state power as a means to the ultimate end of liberty. Men cannot be freed by first enslaving them. In fact, removing all of man’s liberty, only to give it back in its entirety, is societal suicide. Men who have forgotten the responsibilities of liberty can be expected to use freedom anti- socially. If men are enslaved, and convinced that this slavery is beneficial, then immediate freedom can only result in rape, robbery, and murder. “By denying the instinct for freedom, we will only prove that humans are a lethal mutation, an evolutionary dead end; by nurturing it, if it is real, we may find ways to deal with dreadful human tragedies and problems that are awesome in scale” (Chomsky, 2004, 172).

If Mill was correct, and anarchists believe he was, in his declaring that man is a “progressive being,” then it seems at least possible that we can progress towards a more harmonious existence through changing men’s opinions concerning coercive power (Mill, 2005, 10). True progress requires that progression to be moving towards a better existence for all. If not, then the changing nature of society should be accurately characterized as regression. Anarchists’ belief in our progressive nature is arguably the most radical aspect of Anarchism. When the principles of the progressive nature of man, the ability to self-regulate, and man’s inherent interconnectedness with all other men are combined into one philosophy, as they are in Anarchism, the results are extraordinary: Anarchists believe that just as individuals are self-determining, so is society. This beautiful claim, that we are a species with almost unlimited ability to restructure our very existence and method of living, is an article of faith in Anarchism. For anarchists, the question is not whether or not men can live in complete freedom, but whether humanity will realize that they can.

Anarchists are anarchists because they believe that it has not been proven that Anarchism is impossible. Anarchy should not be considered utopian, but an end to pursue, and the only end truly worthy of the autonomous man.

Conclusion

Anarchism, as a philosophy, has been misunderstood by traditional political philosophers mostly because of willful ignorance and distortion (Redding, 2008, 1-5). “It is often said that anarchists live in a world of dreams to come, and do not see the things which happen today. We see them only too well, and in their true colors, and that is what

makes us carry the hatchet into the forest of prejudices that besets us” (Kropotkin, 2002, 135). Anarchists are not a group of utopians, but a collection of thoughtful men and women who seek a better existence for all of mankind through a collective change in values. Anarchism is not a breakdown of society, but, to the anarchist, a revitalization of society through liberty. Anarchists do not advocate chaos, but seek to proclaim that the peaceful man of Locke’s state of nature can be reclaimed while removing from Locke’s savage the need for a government to act as an arbiter, freeing humanity from the human masters under which we have placed ourselves. To be an anarchist, one does not have to be a revolutionary, but a believer in Anarchism’s end goals.

Anarchism only requires the belief in three principles: Anarchist self-interest, that man is capable of self-regulation through reason, and that ‘human nature’ is not only fluid, but is malleable. If one believes in these principles, then Anarchism should be the obvious philosophy to follow. If any of these three principles seem unfounded after serious contemplation, however, then the individual cannot be faulted for seeking to maintain the status quo of state governance. Anarchism requires that each individual decide for themselves whether Anarchism is possible. These views cannot be imposed onto individuals, but must be internalized through individual decision if Anarchism is possible. In fact, anyone who does not believe that these principles are valid should not be an anarchist. If the three principles above are not correct, then Anarchism is utopian, and unless one is a Nietzschean who assumes that their will-to-power is strong enough to conquer the world while protecting themselves from millions of men with the same goal, then Anarchism would devolve into the characterization of anarchy which is so common in the modern mind. If this is the case, however, “the burden of proof has to be

placed on authority, and it [authority] should be dismantled if that burden cannot be met” (Chomsky, 2005, 178).

Anarchists are not “afraid to say, ‘Do what you will; act as you will’; because we are persuaded that the great majority of mankind, in proportion to their degree of enlightenment and the completeness with which they free themselves from existing fetters will behave and act in a direction useful to society just as we are persuaded beforehand that a child will one day walk on its two feet and not on all fours, simply because it is born of parents belonging to the genus *homo*” (Kropotkin, 2002, 102). If human progression is taken seriously, then political philosophers should take the theory of Anarchism seriously. Anarchists do not assume that humanity will live under democracy forever, just as monarchy came and passed. If this is not the case, and society has truly reached the climax of the progression in human governance, then it is time that political philosophy disregards its false platitudes of freedom and equality.

According to the anarchist, the liberty and equality we have obtained today are hollow terms, useless except to those in power who can find utility in the terms so far as they engender acquiescence from the masses. Anarchism may not necessarily be the best system for society, but, for the sake of the species, Anarchism should not be brushed aside without further contemplation by those who defend the state. To refute a philosophy, that philosophy must be understood. Humanity deserves nothing less than a fair debate between statist and anarchists, but this will remain impossible as long as anarchists remain estranged from, and continue to be viewed with undeserved prejudice by, mainstream political philosophy.

Works Cited

- Bakunin, Michael. *God and the State*. Trans Paul Avrich. New York: Dover Publications, 1970.
- Bookchin, Murray. *The Ecology of Freedom: The Emergence and Dissolution of Hierarchy*. Oakland: AK Press, 2005.
- Chomsky, Noam. *Chomsky on Anarchism*. Edinburgh: AK Press, 2004.
- For Anarchism: History, Theory, and Practice*, ed. David Goodway. London: Routledge, 1989.
- Freeberg, Ernest. *Democracy's Prisoner: Eugene V. Debs, the Great War, and the Right to Dissent*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008.
- Guerin, Daniel. *Anarchism*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1970.
- Godwin, William. *Enquiry Concerning Political Justice*. London: Penguin Books, 1985.
- Gordon, Uri. (2007). Anarchism Reloaded. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 12(1), 29-48. Retrieved from the EBSCO online database.
- Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*, ed. Michael Oakeshott. New York: Touchstone, 1962.
- Hueglin, T. O. (1985). Yet the Age of Anarchism? *Publius*, 15(2), 101-112. Retrieved from the JSTOR online database.
- Kramnick, I. (1972). On Anarchism and the Real World: William Godwin and Radical England. *The American Political Science Review*, 66(1), 114-128. Retrieved from the JSTOR online database.
- Kropotkin, Peter. *Anarchism: A Collection of Revolutionary Writings*. Trans. Roger N.

- Baldwin. New York: Dover Publications, 2002.
- Kropotkin, Peter. *Mutual aid: A Factor of Evolution*. Trans Kent Bromley. London: Dodo Press, n.d.
- Lucas, K. & Palmer, S.E., "On Trial: Conglicting Versions of Emma Goldman's Address to the Jury," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*. Vol. 11, No. 1, 2008, pp. 47–88.
- Locke, John. *Political Writings*. Ed. David Wooton. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 2003.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo. *The Prince*. Trans N. H. Thomson. New York: Dover Publications, 1992.
- Madison, C. A. (1945). Anarchism in the United States. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 6(1), 46-66. Retrieved from the JSTOR online database.
- Marx, Karl. Manifesto of the Communist Party in *The Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker, New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1978. 469-500.
- Marx, Karl, On the Jewish Question in *The Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1978. 26-52.
- Mill, John Stuart. *On Liberty*. Stilwell, KS: Digireads.com Publishing, 2005.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *On the Genealogy of Morals*. Trans. Walter Kaufmann. New York: Random House, 1967.
- No Gods No Masters: An Anthology of Anarchism*. Ed. Daniel Guerin. Trans. Paul Sharkey. Edinburgh: AK Press, 2005.
- Nozick, Robert. *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*. New York: Basic Books, 1974.
- Novak, D. (1958). The Place of Anarchism in the History of Political Thought. *The Review of Politics*, 20(3), 307-329. Retrieved from the JSTOR online database.

- Plato. *The Republic of Plato*, Ed. Allan Bloom. Basic Books, 1991.
- Redding, Authur. (1995). "The Dream Life of Political Violence: Georges Sorel, Emma Goldman, and the Modern Imagination," *Modernism/Modernity*, 2(2), 1-16.
- Reichert, W. O. (1969). Anarchism, Freedom, and Power. *Ethics*, 79(2), 139-149.
- Retrieved from the JSTOR online database.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*. New York: Dover Publications, 2004.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *The Social Contract*. Trans. Maurice Cranston. London: Penguin Books, 1968.
- Stirner, Max. *The Ego and Its Own*. Trans. Steven T. Byington. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Strauss, Leo & Joseph Cropsey. *History of Political Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Thucydides. *History of the Peloponnesian War*. Trans. Rex Warner. London: Penguin Books, 1972.
- Tocqueville, Alexis De. *Democracy in America*. Trans. George Lawrence. New York: Perennial Classics, 2000.
- Tucker, Benjamin. *State Socialism and Anarchism*. Colorado Springs: Ralph Myers Publisher, 1972.
- Vanderschraaf, P. (2006). War of Peace?: A Dynamical Analysis of Anarchy. *Economics and Philosophy*, 2, 243–279. Retrieved from the ProQuest online database.
- Weiss, T. G. (1975). The Tradition of Philosophical Anarchism and Future Directions in

World Policy. *Journal of Peace Research*, 12(1), 1-17. Retrieved from the JSTOR online database.

Wolff, Robert Paul. *In Defense of Anarchism*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1998.

ANARCHISTS:

Malatesta: “Many and varied are the theories by means of which attempts have been made to explain away and justify the existence of government. All in all, they are all founded upon the presumption, confessed or not, that men have contrary interests and that it takes an outside force to compel some to respect that interests of the rest, by prescribing and imposing such a line of conduct which would, insofar as possible,

reconcile the conflicting interests and afford each of them as much gratification as possible with the least possible sacrifice” (*No Gods No Master*, 2005, 357).

Malatesta: “The State is born of military might; its has grown through recourse to military might, and, logically, it is upon military that it must rely if it is to retain its omnipotence. Whatever the form it may assume, the State is merely oppression organized for the benefit of a privileged minority” (*No Gods No Master*, 2005, 388).

Malatesta: “Anarchism offers a remedy for this state of affairs, with its underlying principle of free organization, generated and sustained by the free will of the associated with no authority of any sort, which is to say, without any individual’s having the right to foist his wishes upon anyone else” (*No Gods No Master*, 2005, 353).

“The defining mark of the state is authority, the right to rule. The primary obligation of man is autonomy, the refusal to be ruled” (Wolff, 1998, 18). “The argument runs thus: men cannot be free so long as they are subject to the will of others, whether one man (a monarch) or several (aristocrats). But if men rule themselves, if they are both law-givers and law-obeyers, then they can combine the benefits of government with the blessings of freedom” (Wolff, 1998, 21).

“Can anyone deny that instant direct democracy would generate a degree of interest and participation in political affairs which is now considered impossible to achieve?” (Wolff, 1998, 37).

“If the individual retains his autonomy by reserving to himself in each instance the final decision whether to cooperate, he thereby denies the authority of the state; if, on

the other hand, he submits to the state and accepts its claims to authority, then... he loses his autonomy” (Wolff, 1998, 40).

“A promise to abide by the will of the majority creates an obligation, *but it does so precisely by giving up one’s autonomy*” (Wolff, 1998, 41).

“The citizens have created a legitimate state at the price of their own autonomy! They have bound themselves to obey laws which they do not will, and indeed even laws which they vigorously reject. Insofar as democracy originates in such a promise, it is no more than voluntary slavery” (Wolff, 1998, 42).

“Rousseau distinguishes a true political community from an association of self-interested individuals who strike bargains among their competing interests, but nowhere strive for the good of the whole” (Wolff, 1998, 49).

“If democracy is to make good its title as the only morally legitimate form of politics, then it must solve the problem of the heteronomous minority” (Wolff, 1998, 58).

“Marx and Hobbes agree that in a community of men of good will, where the general good guided every citizen, the state would be unnecessary. They differ only in the degree of their hope that so happy a condition can ever be realized” (Wolff, 1998, 70).

“”The just state must be consigned to the category of the round square, the married bachelor, and the unsensed sense-datum” (Wolff, 1998, 71).

“If the individual has a right to govern himself, all external government is tyranny. Hence the necessity of abolishing the state” (Tucker, 1972, 20).

“”The Anarchists are simply unterrified Jeffersonian Democrats. They believe that ‘the best government is that which governs least,’ and that which governs least is no government at all” (Tucker, 1972, 20).”

“I do not believe that many of the Archists can be brought to say in so many words that liberty is not the prime condition of happiness, and in that case they cannot deny that Anarchism, which is but another name for liberty, is conducive to happiness” (Tucker, 1972, 36).

“I am waiting for someone to show me by history, fact, or logic that men have social wants superior to liberty and wealth or that any form of Archism will secure them these wants” (Tucker, 1972, 37).

“It has ever been the tendency of power to add to itself, to enlarge its sphere, to encroach beyond the limits set for it” (Tucker, 1972, 15).

“Proudhon and Warren found themselves unable to sanction any such plan as the seizure of capital by society. But, though opposed to socializing the ownership of capital, they aimed, nevertheless, to socialize its effects by making its use beneficial to all instead of a means of impoverishing the many to enrich the few” (Tucker, 1972, 17).

“It maintains that the aim of all superior civilization is, not to permit *all* members of the community to develop in a normal way, but to permit certain better endowed individuals ‘fully to develop,’ even at the cost of the happiness and the very existence of the mass of mankind” (Kropotkin, 2002, 293).

“Progress is most effective when not checked by state interference” (Kropotkin, 2002, 51).

“Equality and freedom, which have always been the real, although unspoken goal of humanity” (Kropotkin, 2002, 57).

“When enrichment at somebody else’s expense is the avowed aim of the ‘upper classes,’ and no distinct boundary can be traced between honest and dishonest means of

making money – then force is the only means for maintaining such a state of things. Then an army of policemen, judges, and hangmen becomes a necessary institution” (Kropotkin, 2002, 72).

“For authority and servility walk always hand in hand” (Kropotkin, 2002, 81).

“The law of mutual aid is the law of progress” (Kropotkin, 2002, 96).

“By what right indeed can we demand that we should be treated in one fashion, reserving it to ourselves to treat others in a fashion entirely different? Our sense of equality revolts at such an idea” (Kropotkin, 2002, 99).

“Thus we only appeal to the principle of equality in moments of hesitation, and in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred act morally from habit” (Kropotkin, 2002, 102).

“Their ideal is even found too beautiful, too lofty for a society not composed of superior beings” (Kropotkin, 2002, 115).

“When we ask for the abolition of the State and its organs we are always told the we dream of a society composed of men better than they are in reality. But no; a thousand times, no. All that we ask is that men should not be made worse than they are by such institutions!” (Kropotkin, 2002, 134).

“The best of men is made essentially bad by the exercise of authority, and that the theory of the ‘balancing of powers’ and ‘control of authorities’ is a hypocritical formula, invented by those who have seized power, to make the ‘sovereign people,’ whom they despise, believe that the people themselves are governing” (Kropotkin, 2002, 135).

“We need not fear the dangers and ‘abuses’ of liberty. It is only those who do nothing who make no mistakes. As to those who only know how to obey, they make just as many, and more mistakes than those who strike out their own path in trying to act in

the direction their intelligence and their social education suggest to them. The ideal of liberty of the individual – if it is incorrectly understood owing to surroundings where the notion of solidarity is insufficiently accentuated by institutions - can certainly lead isolated men to acts that are repugnant to the social sentiments of humanity. Let us admit that it does happen: is it, however, a reason for throwing the principle of liberty overboard?” (Kropotkin, 2002, 143).

“Equality before the law... it promised to affect lord and peasant alike... This promise was a lie” (Kropotkin, 2002, 199).

“Law, in its quality of guarantee of the results of pillage, slavery, and exploitation, has followed the same phase of development as capital. Twin brother and sister, they have advanced hand in hand, sustaining one another with the suffering of mankind” (Kropotkin, 2002, 207).

“On the day when no punishment is inflicted upon murders, the number of murders will not be augmented by a single case. And it is extremely probable that it will be, on the contrary, diminished by all those cases which are due at present to habitual criminals, who have been brutalized in prison” (Kropotkin, 2002, 216).

“Finally, consider what corruption, what depravity of mind is kept up among men by the idea of obedience, the very essence of the law; of chastisement; of authority having the right to punish, to judge irrespective of our conscience and the esteem of our friends; of the necessity for executioners, jailers, and informers – in a word, by all the attributes of law and authority” (Kropotkin, 2002, 217).

“For who would sell their labor for less than it is capable of bringing in if he were not forced thereto by the threat of hunger?” (Kropotkin, 2002, 128).

“Order and unity, destroyed as the products of violence and despotism, will sprout again from the very bosom of liberty” (Bakunin, *No Gods No Masters*, Ed. Guerin, 2005, 165).

“Outside of society, man would not only not be free, but would not even have become truly man, which is to say a being possessed with self-awareness, sentient, thoughtful and with the gift of speech. Only the conjunction of intellect and collective endeavor could have compelled man to quit the savage and brutish condition which was his pristine nature, indeed his starting point for subsequent development” (Bakunin, *No Gods No Masters*, Ed. Guerin, 2005, 171).

“Out of the free collaboration of everyone, thanks to the spontaneous combination of men in accordance with their needs and sympathies, from the bottom up, from the simple to the complex, starting from the most immediate interests and working towards the most general, there will arise a social organization, the goal of which will be the greatest well-being and fullest freedom of all, and which will be the greatest well-being and fullest freedom of all, and which will bind the whole humanity into one fraternal community; which will amend and improve itself in accordance with the amendments, circumstances and lessons of experience” (Malatesta, *No Gods No Masters*, Ed. Guerin, 2005, 361).

“The social world is nothing in itself, and consists merely of the totality of the habits, expectation, beliefs, and behavior patterns of all the individuals who live in it” (Wolff, 1998, 76).

STATISTS:

“Compulsion, either in the direct form or in that of pains and penalties for non-compliance, is no longer admissible as a means to their own good, and justifiable only for the good of others” (Mill, 2005, 10).

“Human nature is not a machine to be built after a model, and set to do exactly the work prescribed for it, but a tree, which requires to grow and develop itself on all sides, according to the tendency of the inward forces which make it a living thing” (Mill, 2005, 40).

“The general average of mankind are not only moderate in intellect, but also moderate in inclinations: they have no tastes or wishes strong enough to incline them to do anything unusual, and they consequently do not understand those who have” (Mill, 2005, 46).

“There is one lot of people who can see nothing in equality but the anarchical tendencies which it engenders. They are frightened of their own free will; they are afraid of themselves” (Tocqueville, 2000, 701).

“Since all princes and rulers of independent governments all through the world are in a state of nature, ‘tis plain the world never was, nor ever will be, without numbers of men in that state” (Locke, 2003, ¶14).

“No discourse whatsoever, can end in absolute knowledge of fact, past, or to come” (Hobbes, 1962, 47).

“The causes of this difference of wits, are in the passions; and the difference of passions proceedeth, partly from the different constitution of the body, and partly from different education” (Hobbes, 1962, 53).

“Whoever ventures on the enterprise of setting up a people must be ready, shall we say, to change human nature, to transform each individual, who by himself is entirely complete and solitary, into a part of a greater whole, from which that same individual will then receive, in a sense, his life and his being” (*The Social Contract*, 1962, 68).

Plato: “If by being well educated they become sensible men, they’ll easily see to all this and everything else we are now leaving out...according to the proverb that friends have all things in common” (Plato, 1991, 101)

“It is reasonable that the best nature comes off worse than an ordinary one from an inappropriate rearing” (Plato, 1991, 171).

“Then that’s why we assert that the three primary classes of human beings are also three: wisdom-loving, victory-loving, gain-loving”(Plato, 1991, 262).

“Aristotle admits that it is difficult or impossible to act virtuously or to attain happiness without a modicum of “external goods.” These include not only some amount of wealth, friends, and political power, but also children, good birth, and even good looks” (Strauss & Cropsey, 1987, 124).

Hooker: “Human nature being what it is, seeking perfection and yet corrupted and blinded by sin, some kind of government, and nature ‘leaveth the choice as a thing arbitrary’” (Strauss & Cropsey, 1987, 362).

Machiavelli: “Fortuna could be mastered by strong men, and even that, through the development of an effective method, man’s nature (perhaps nature itself) might be changed” (Strauss & Cropsey, 1987, 458).

“According to Spinoza, human nature functions in accord with intelligible and unvarying principles” (Strauss & Cropsey, 1987, 463).

Kant: “The existence of his moral doctrine forbids a solution of the political problem by means of institution; the nature of that doctrine forbids a solution by means of education” (Strauss & Cropsey, 1987, 619).

“Mill sees a continuous line of development from slavery to self-government, with each stage prepared by the learning of a specific lesson, that is, by the acquiring of a new character trait on the part of the population as a whole” (Strauss & Cropsey, 1987, 792).

Aristotle: “Wealth is less important as an external condition of happiness than human relationships” (Strauss & Cropsey, 1987, 124).

Machiavelli: “The recovery of ancient virtue consists of the reimposition of the terror and fear that had made men good at the beginning. Men were good at the beginning not because of innocence but because they were gripped by terror and fear” (Strauss & Cropsey, 1987, 310).

Hooker: “Men are by nature free and equal, but a life that is not social is a brutish existence in which man cannot advance toward perfection. Accordingly men have a natural inclination to society” (Strauss & Cropsey, 1987, 361).

Hobbes: “He attempted to deduce the natural law from what is most powerful in most men most of the time: not reason, but passion” (Strauss & Cropsey, 1987, 397).

“Human behavior, according to Hobbes, is to be understood primarily in terms of a mechanistic psychology of the passions...The objects of the passions, Hobbes says, vary with each man’s constitution and education” (Strauss & Cropsey, 1987, 398).

“Despite these exceptions to the obligation of obedience to the sovereign, the sovereign’s absolute right remains: he may rightfully punish with death any refusal or resistance, however just” (Strauss & Cropsey, 1987, 408).

Spinoza: “In order to acquire a true understanding of reality, the philosopher must see things as they are, and not as they appear to him because of the influence of his passions on his reason” (Strauss & Cropsey, 1987, 461).

Spinoza: “Freedom is life in accord with reason” (Strauss & Cropsey, 1987, 465).

Spinoza: “Because of man’s selfishness and passionate nature, if each citizen has the right of interpreting the laws, the state will be dissolved by self-interest” (Strauss & Cropsey, 1987, 465).

Hume: “In tracing the origin of government it is permissible to begin by hypothesizing man in a ‘savage and solitary condition.’ We find that more than any other animal he is at once necessitous and weak. He needs food, clothing, and shelter. Yet he is ill-equipped by his natural abilities to obtain and secure them. Society alone can compensate for his weakness...Only in society can his wants be met – including the new wants that society itself engenders” (Strauss & Cropsey, 1987, 548).

Hume: “We are thus apt to seize an immediate advantage gained by an act of injustice at the expense of the real but remote advantage to be gained from justice. The principal safeguard devised by men to prevent themselves from giving way to this weakness is government” (Strauss & Cropsey, 1987, 550).

“In the wise framing of political institutions, Hume says, ‘every man must be supposed a knave,’ i.e., to be always seeking his own interest” (Strauss & Cropsey, 1987, 552).

“Kant goes even further: It is precisely the selfish propensities in human nature that nature exploits in order to bring about those ends proposed by the venerated but impotent general will of mankind. Selfishness promotes war and acquisitiveness, but it simultaneously inspires those selfish counter-measures against aggression and cupidity that lead to a pacified, prosperous progress” (Strauss & Cropsey, 1987, 600).

“Kant differs indeed from his predecessors in presenting morality as condemning the state of nature and commanding men to enter a lawful state in which they come under external constraint and in which alone the rights of man can be respected” (Strauss & Cropsey, 1987, 603).

Kant: “Right demands that there be constraint, both of law-breakers and of those who must be forced into civil life” (Strauss & Cropsey, 1987, 605).

“Kant regards the political problem as incapable of perfect solution: Man is an animal that needs a master, but the master is himself a man” (Strauss & Cropsey, 1987, 606).

Paine: “‘Society,’ he said, ‘is produced by our wants and government by our wickedness’” (Strauss & Cropsey, 1987, 681).

Bentham: “But all punishment is mischief: all punishment in itself is evil. Upon the principle of utility...it ought only to be admitted in as far as it promises to exclude some greater evil” (Quoted in Strauss & Cropsey, 1987, 723).

“Life itself is but motion, and can never be without desire, nor without fear, no more than without sense” (Hobbes, 1962, 45).

“That men, which looks too far before him, in the care of future time, hath his heart all the day long, gnawed on by fear of death, poverty, or other calamity; and has no repose, nor pause of his anxiety, but in sleep” (Hobbes, 1962, 81).

“In such condition, there is no place for industry; because the fruit thereof is uncertain” (Hobbes, 1962, 94).

“For nothing is more easily broken than a man’s word, but from fear of some evil consequence upon the rupture” (Hobbes, 1962, 99).

“Covenants extorted by fear are valid” (Hobbes, 1962, 104).

“Before the names of just, and unjust can have place, there must be some coercive power, to compel men equally to the performance of their covenants, by the terror of some punishment (Hobbes, 1962, 108).

“There are very few so foolish, that had not rather govern themselves” (Hobbes, 1962, 115).

“That dissolute condition of masterless men, without subjection to laws, and a coercive power to tie their hands from rapine and revenge” (Hobbes, 1962, 142).

“Though of so unlimited a power, men may fancy many evil consequences, yet the consequences of the want of it, which is perpetual war of every man against his neighbors, are much worse” (Hobbes, 1962, 161).

“In the United States, as in all countries where the people reign, the majority rules in the name of the people” (Hobbes, 1962, 173).

“The majority of mankind...will either believe without knowing why or will not know precisely what to believe” (Tocqueville, 2000, 187).

“The most natural right of man, after that of acting on his own, is that of combining his effort with those of his fellows and acting together. Therefore the right of association seems to me by nature almost as inalienable as individual liberty” (Tocqueville, 2000, 193).

“Extreme freedom corrects the abuse of freedom, and extreme democracy forestalls the dangers of democracy” (Tocqueville, 2000, 195).

“If...you do not succeed in linking the idea of rights to personal interest, which provides the only stable point in the human heart, what other means will be left to you to govern the world, if not fear?” (Tocqueville, 2000, 239).

“Men cannot be absolutely equal without being entirely free” (Tocqueville, 2000, 504).

“Individualism is based on misguided judgment rather than depraved feeling. It is due more to inadequate understanding than to perversity of heart” (Tocqueville, 2000, 506).

“The more government takes the place of associations, the more will individuals lose the idea of forming associations and need the government to come to their help” (Tocqueville, 2000, 515).

“Under this system the citizens quit their state of dependence just long enough to choose their masters and then fall back into it” (Tocqueville, 2000, 693).

“He obeys society not because he is inferior to those who direct it, nor because he is incapable of ruling himself, but because union with his fellows seems useful to him and

he knows that this union is impossible without a regulating authority” (Tocqueville, 2000, 66).

“But as the king of the vultures would be no less bent upon preying upon the flock than any of the minor harpies, it was indispensable to be in a perpetual attitude of defence against his beak and claws” (Mill, 2005, 5).

“The ‘self-government’ spoken of, is not the same government of each by himself, but of each by all the rest” (Mill, 2005, 6).

“The practical principle which guides them to their opinions on the regulation of human conduct, is the feeling in each person’s mind that everybody should be required to act as he, and those with whom he sympathizes, would like them to act” (Mill, 2005, 7).

“The only part of the conduct of any one, for which he is amenable to society, is that which concerns others. In the part which merely concerns himself, his independence is, of right, absolute. Over himself, over his own body and mind, the individual is sovereign” (Mill, 2005, 10).

“Each is the proper guardian of his own health, whether bodily, or mental or spiritual” (Mill, 2005, 12).

“Whatever crushes individuality is despotism, by whatever name it may be called, and whether it professes to be enforcing the will of God or the injunctions of men” (Mill, 2005, 43).

“We have a right, also, in various ways, to act upon our unfavorable opinion of any one, not to the oppression of his individuality, but in the exercise of ours” (Mill, 2005, 51).

“We shall reflect that he already bears, or will bear, the whole penalty of his error; if he spoils his life by mismanagement, we shall not, for that reason, desire to spoil it still further: instead of wishing to punish him, we shall endeavor to alleviate his punishment, by showing him how he may avoid or cure the evils his conduct tends to bring upon him” (Mill, 2005, 52).

“A government cannot have too much of the kind of activity which does not impede, but aids and stimulates, individual exertion and development” (Mill, 2005, 75).

“In transgressing the law of nature the offender declares himself to live by another rule than that of reason and common equity” (Locke, 2003, ¶8).

“A criminal, who, having renounced reason, the common rule and measure God hath given to mankind, hath, by the unjust violence and slaughter he hath committed upon one, declared war against all mankind, and therefore may be destroyed as a lion or a tiger, one of those wild savage beasts with whom men can have no society nor security” (Locke, 2003, ¶11).

“Keeping of faith belongs to men as men, and not as members of society” (Locke, 2003, 268).

“It is plain that men have agreed to disproportionate and unequal possession of the earth” (Locke, 2003, 286).

“For law, in its true notion, is not so much the limitation as the direction of a free and intelligent agent to his proper interests, and prescribes no further than is for the general good of those under the law. Could they be happier without it, the law, as an useless thing, would of itself vanish, and that ill deserves the name of confinement which hedges us in only from bogs and precipices...The end of the law is not to abolish or

restrain, but to preserve and enlarge freedom. For freedom is to be free from restraint and violence from others, which cannot be where there is no law” (Locke, 2003, 289).

“The freedom, then, of man, and liberty of acting according to his own will, is grounded on his having reason” (Locke, 2003, 292).

“But if either these illegal acts have been extended to the majority of the people, or if the mischief and oppression has light only on some few but in such cases as the precedent and consequences seem to threaten all, and they are persuaded in their consciences that their laws, and with them their estates, liberties, and lives are in danger, and perhaps their religion too, how they will be hindered from resisting illegal force used against them I cannot tell. This is an inconvenience, I confess, that attends all governments whatsoever” (Locke, 2003, 368).

“The just come to light as wiser and better and more able to accomplish something, while the unjust can’t accomplish anything with one another” (Plato, 1991, 352 b-c).

“The starting point of a man’s education sets the course of what follows too” (Plato, 1991, 425c).

“Nature alone operates in all operations of the beast, whereas man, as a free agent, has a share in his” (*Origin of Inequality*, 2004, 9).

“We shall easily conceive how much the difference between man and man in the state of nature must be less than in the state of society, and how much every inequality of institution must increase the natural inequalities of the human species” (*Origin of Inequality*, 2004, 25).

“The boundaries of the possible in the moral realm are less narrow than we think; it is our own weakness, our vices and our prejudices that limit them.”(*The Social Contract*, 1962, 136).

“How many crimes, how many wars, how many murders, how many misfortunes and horrors, would that man have saved the human species, who pulling up the stakes or filling up the ditches should have cried to his fellows: Be sure not to listen to this imposter; you are lost, if you forget that the fruits of the earth belong equally to us all, and the earth itself to nobody!” (*Origin of Inequality*, 2004, 27).

“The origin of society and of laws, which increased the fetters of the weak, and the strength of the rich; irretrievably destroyed natural liberty, fixed forever the laws of property and inequality; changed an artful usurpation into an irrevocable title; and for the benefit of a few ambitious individuals subjected the rest of mankind to perpetual labour, servitude, and misery” (*Origin of Inequality*, 2004, 39).

“For those vices, which render social institutions necessary, are the same which render the abuse of such institutions unavoidable...It would be no hard matter to prove that every government, which carefully guarding against all alteration and corruption should scrupulously comply with the ends of its institution, was unnecessarily instituted; and that a country, where no one either eluded the laws, or made an ill use of the magistracy, required neither laws nor magistrates” (*Origin of Inequality*, 2004, 47).

“Man’s first law is to watch over his own preservation; his first care he owes to himself; as soon as he reaches the age of reason, he becomes the only judge of the best means to preserve himself; he becomes his own master” (*Social Contract*, 1968, 50).

“Force is a physical power; I do not see how its effects could produce morality. To yield to force is an act of necessity, not of will; it is at best an act of prudence. In what sense can it be a moral duty?” (*Social Contract*, 1968, 52).

“To renounce freedom is to renounce one’s humanity, one’s rights as a man and equally one’s duties” (*Social Contract*, 1968, 55).

“Men are not naturally enemies. It is conflicts over things, not quarrels between men Which constitute war, and the state of war cannot arise from mere personal relations, but only from property relations” (*Social Contract*, 1968, 56).

“If rights were left to individuals, in the absence of any higher authority to judge between them and the public, each individual, being his own judge in some causes would soon demand to be his own judge in all” (*Social Contract*, 1968, 60-61).

“As soon as the multitude is united thus in a single body, no one can injure any one of the members without attacking the whole, still less injure the whole without each member feeling it. Duty and self-interest thus equally oblige the two contracting parties to give each other mutual aid; and the same men should seek to bring together in this dual relationship, all the advantages that flow from it” (*Social Contract*, 1968, 63).

“To be governed by appetite alone is slavery, while obedience to a law one prescribes to oneself is freedom” (*Social Contract*, 1968, 65).

“In truth, laws are always useful to those with possessions and harmful to those who have nothing; from which it follows that the social state is advantageous to men only when all possess something and none has too much” (*Social Contract*, 1968, 68).

“The general will is always rightful and always tends to the public good; but it does not follow that the deliberations of the people are always equally right. We always

want what is advantageous to us but we do not always discern it. The people is never corrupted, but it is often misled” (*Social Contract*, 1968, 72).

“The commitments which bind us to the social body are obligatory only because they are mutual; and their nature is such that in fulfilling them a man cannot work for others without at the same time working for himself” (*Social Contract*, 1968, 75).

“Humanly speaking, the laws of natural justice, lacking any natural sanction, are unavailing among men. In fact, such laws merely benefit the wicked and injure the just, since the just respect them while others do not do so in return” (*Social Contract*, 1968, 80-81).

“Laws are really nothing other than the conditions on which civil society exists” (*Social Contract*, 1968, 83).

“The goal of every system of law, we shall find that it comes down to two main objects, *freedom* and *equality*” (*Social Contract*, 1968, 96).

“It is the power of the state alone which makes the freedom of its members” (*Social Contract*, 1968, 99).

“The citizens being all equal by the social contract, all may prescribe what all must do, instead of nobody having a right to demand that another shall do what he does not do himself” (*Social Contract*, 1968, 145).

“When, therefore, the opinion contrary to my own prevails, this proves only that I have made a mistake, and that what I believed to be the general will was not so” (*Social Contract*, 1968, 153).