



Send Us Your Article

Our Country is the World, our Countrymen are all Mankind.

TheLiberator.us

Date: 5/25/2024 Edition 39. Main Editors: Cory Edmund Endrulat, William H. Douglas

Founder of “Survival of the Fittest” Was A Scientific Anarchist

By Cory Edmund Endrulat, Excerpts by Herbert Spencer

One of the great originators of “evolution” was a scientific anarchist! There was a famous man from the 19th century who was engaged with almost every field of study, known as a polymath, thereof being a philosopher, psychologist, biologist, sociologist, and anthropologist, who also made discoveries and held innovative views that went on to become the common talk of the town. His name was **Herbert Spencer**. His work is not mentioned nowadays as much as it were then, but Spencer originated the expression “survival of the fittest,” which he coined in *Principles of Biology* from 1864 after reading Charles Darwin's 1859 book *On the Origin of Species*.

Many individuals nowadays when they talk about morality and legality, often talk about how if we did not have laws, there would be chaos, or what they call the “law of the jungle” or “survival of the fittest.” Yet, how many of them are aware of what the originators of these phrases, had to say about the nature of law? Spencer, after all, formulated his views based on his studies of the many sciences. The wisdom he shared may just surprise you, as humanity is continuing to understand the failed patterns and superstitions of history. Therefore, let's delve into excerpts from Spencer's work that particularly deals with the subject of freedom and tyranny:

“All the barbarisms of the past have their types in the present. All the barbarisms of the past grew out of certain dispositions: those dispositions may be weakened, but they are not extinct; and so long as they exist there must be manifestations of them. What we commonly understand by command and obedience, are the modern forms of bygone despotism and slavery... **To whatever extent the will of the one is overborne by the will of the other, to that extent the parties are tyrant and slave.**”

“The tyrant is nothing but a slave turned inside out.”

“If men use their liberty in such a way as to **surrender their liberty**, are they thereafter any the less slaves?”

“**When he is under the impersonal coercion of Nature, we say that he is free;** and when he is under the personal coercion of some one above him, we call him, according to the degree of his dependence, a slave, a serf, or a vassal.”

“It was once also universally supposed that slavery was a natural and quite legitimate institution—a condition into which some were born, and to which they ought to submit as to a Divine ordination; nay, indeed, **a great proportion of mankind hold this opinion still.**”

“Those sins of responsible legislators seen in the long list of laws made in the interests of dominant classes—a list coming down in our own country to those under which there were **long maintained slavery and the slave-trade**”

“As a corollary to the proposition that all institutions must be subordinated to the law of equal freedom, we cannot choose but admit **the right of the citizen to adopt a condition of voluntary outlawry. If every man has freedom to do all that he wills, provided he infringes not the equal freedom of any other man, then he is free to drop connection with the State**,—to relinquish its protection and to refuse paying towards its support. It is self-evident that in so behaving he in no way trenches upon the liberty of others; for his position is a passive one, and, whilst passive, he cannot become an aggressor... Not only does magisterial power exist because of evil, but it exists by evil. Violence is employed to maintain it; and all violence involves criminality. Soldiers, policemen, and gaolers; swords, batons, and fetters,—are instruments for inflicting pain; and all infliction of pain is, in the abstract, wrong. The State employs evil weapons to subjugate evil, and is alike contaminated by the objects with which it deals and the means by which it works... So that, **however insignificant the minority, and however trifling the proposed trespass against their rights, no such trespass is permissible**... That moral sense whose supremacy will make society harmonious and government unnecessary is the same moral sense which will then make each man assert his freedom even to the extent of ignoring the State—is the same moral sense which, by deterring the majority from coercing the minority, will **eventually render government impossible**. And, as what are merely different manifestations of the same sentiment must bear a constant ratio to each other, the tendency to repudiate governments will increase only at the same rate that governments become needless.”

“From Shoa (Abyssinia), where ‘of their persons and worldly substance he [the King] is absolute master’; or from Dahome, where ‘all men are slaves to the king.’... So alien to the truth, indeed, is **the alleged creation of rights by government**, that, contrariwise, rights having been established more or less clearly before government arises, become obscured as government develops along with that militant activity which, both by the taking of slaves and the establishment of ranks, produces status; and the recognition of rights begins again to get definiteness only as fast as militancy ceases to be chronic and governmental power declines.”

“He feels that a fellow-man may be **enslaved by imperious words and manners** as well as by tyrannical deeds; and hence he avoids a dictatorial style of speech to those below him. Even paid domestics, to whose services he has obtained a right by contract, he does not like to address in a tone of authority. **He seeks rather to disguise his character of master.**”

On Schooling... “Not only does the physical-force system fail to fit the youth for his future position; it **absolutely tends to unfit him.**”

Carl Jung stated autocracy was the inevitable result of all forms of government and Spencer shares with us, “autocracy presupposes inferiority of nature on the part of both ruler and subject: on the one side a cold, unsympathetic sacrificing of other’s wills to self-will; on the other side a mean, cowardly abandonment of the claims of manhood. Our very language bears testimony to this. Do not dignity, independence, and other words of approbation, imply a nature at variance with this relation? Are not tyrannical, arbitrary, despotic, epithets of reproach? and are not truckling, fawning, cringing, epithets of contempt? Is not slavish a condemnatory term? Does not servile, that is, serf-like, imply littleness, meanness? And has not the word villain, which originally meant bondsman, come to signify everything which is

hateful? That language should thus inadvertently embody dislike for those who most display the instinct of subordination, is alone sufficient proof that this instinct is associated with evil dispositions. It has been the parent of countless crimes. It is **answerable for the torturing and murder of the noble-minded who would not submit**—for the horrors of Bastiles and Siberias. It has ever been the represser of knowledge, of free thought, of true progress.”

“Be it or be it not true that Man is shapen in iniquity and conceived in sin, it is unquestionably true that **Government is begotten of aggression and by aggression.**”

“We should take the ground that **no human being, however wise and good, is fit to be sole ruler over the doings of an involved society**; and that, **with the best intentions, a benevolent despot is very likely to produce the most terrible mischiefs** which would else have been impossible.”

“**As fast as voluntary cooperation is abandoned compulsory cooperation must be substituted.** Some kind of organization labour must have; and if it is not that which arises by agreement under free competition, it must be that which is imposed by authority. Unlike in appearance and names as it may be to the old order of slaves and serfs, working under masters, who were coerced by barons, who were themselves vassals of dukes or kings, the new order wished for, constituted by workers under foremen of small groups, overlooked by superintendents, who are subject to higher local managers, who are controlled by superiors of districts, themselves under a central government, must be essentially the same in principle.”

“Pictures of the slave and the tyrant are exhibited to excite its abhorrence; a state of pure freedom is described to it as the one to be loved and hoped for; and it is made sensible of the sacredness of human rights. After men’s minds have been for many years thus exercised and stimulated, a sufficiently intense manifestation of feeling is produced, and then comes the reform. But this feeling, mark, proceeds from that same combination of faculties by which, as we have seen, free institutions are upheld and made practicable. One of these agitations, therefore, is a kind of apprenticeship to the liberties obtained by it. The power to get freedom becomes the measure of the power to use it. The law of social forms is that they shall be expressive of national character; they come into existence bearing its impress; and they live only so long as it supplies them with vitality. **Now a general dissatisfaction with old arrangements is a sign that the national character requires better ones.**”

Will Herbert Spencer’s words come back to light for humanity to re-examine their belief in human authority over other humans, of government over those whom they claim to represent and rule, and call subjects or slaves? **Government originated in slavery and created and maintained other forms of slavery.** The abolition of slavery will not be complete until as Leo Tolstoy told us, we abolish governments. Voluntaryism is freedom. These quotes and many more quotes, detailed information and action regarding this, can be found in the monumental book “*Slavery Gone For Good: Black Book Edition.*”

Learn more & check out the book: <https://theliberator.us/book>

“If you think in terms of a year, plant a seed; if in terms of ten years, plant tees; if in terms of 100 years, teach the people.” – Confucius

Everybody *Actually* Desires Voluntarism (19th Century Text)

By J. Wm. Lloyd (from *Liberty 19th century Newspaper*)

What relation has Anarchy to reform? This. **Anarchy comprehends the fundamental principles of all true reform. Justice (or right relationship), Freedom, Natural Law,**— these are the principles of Anarchy; they are the principles of reform. As the greater includes the less, then, why should not all reformers become Anarchists, and, by supporting Liberty, support the Mother of Reform?

Consider a few samples. In religious reformers there should exist peculiar sympathy with Anarchism. How to win that universal mental liberty of which freethinkers dream to be realized without universal physical liberty,— liberty for the whole man. Free-thought denies the divine right of priests and bibles; Anarchy denies the divine right of rulers and statute books. Free-thought says: Leave all religions questions to the reason and conscience of the individual; Anarchy says: Leave all questions to the individual reason and conscience. The former denies the need of religious chiefs; the latter, of political chiefs. **Freedom from arbitrary and conventional control, and the elevation of the individual,** are the common aims of both: the only difference being that Anarchy is infinitely the most sweeping, radical, comprehensive, and logical. Therefore, of necessity, all Anarchists are freethinkers, though the converse is by no means true. Anarchy opposes every power, spiritual or material, religious, social, or political, that binds the free spirit of man. It brands it a title-less usurper. **Only to natural law is the free man responsible, and in his obedience to that law does his liberty consist,** for, in the eloquent words of Wakeman:

The association of law with restraint or compulsion comes from considering the word as meaning a statute or State enactment. But law in science does not mean a criminal code, but the line of least resistance, wherein only freedom is to be found. The forces always follow this line of least resistance, and so the order of the world is simply the record of freedom. **Law is achieved liberty, the observed order of Nature. In so far as we conform our lives to her order, we are free. When we conquer by obedience, we are emancipated from restraint.** Says Goethe:

Only the law can to us freedom give. (*Und das Gesetz aur Kann uns Freiheit geben.*)

Then you find that law is the absence of restraint; for its recognition transforms duty into devotion. To do our duty because we can and wish to do no otherwise, any more than the tree wishes to grow downward instead of up towards the light of the Sun,— that is **the most beautiful realization of Liberty, Law, and Religion, for it is the three in one.** Take, for instance, our American elm, so grand that it may stand for our symbol life-tree. How freely it lifts its head towards the sky! With what unbounded freedom and grace it plays in the breeze! And yet not a branch or leaf or cell in all that glorious structure takes part in that play except under and by virtue of eternal, inevitable, inexorable law. Thus, freedom and law are the same in the New Faith; for **law is the order that freedom takes in executing itself.**

From the very logic of their position, therefore, every atheist, agnostic, Free Religionist, or freethinker of any other name or station, should be an Anarchist.

In medical reform the same principles come into play. Physicians have banded themselves into associations, forming a veritable priesthood, formulating an arbitrary code of ethics, dictating to each and every individual physician how and by what rules he shall practise, what agents employ, and what prices charge, and invoking the aid of the State to

support them in this outrageous attack upon free action and free competition. **The physician was once the priest, and seems never to have forgotten it.** He still wields the anathema and excommunicates the heretic. “Regular” and “Old School” have the same place in the medical world that “Orthodox” and “Mother Church” have in the religious. Let the learning and ability, the skill and success, of the individual healer be what they may, if he does not belong to the association, subscribe to the code, and display the sacred charm of the diploma, above all, if he has peculiar ideas of practice, he is a “quack” and an “irregular.” The priest of the body is as full of pride and acrimony as the priest of the soul. Unfortunately, medical reformers generally ape political reformers, and, in escaping from an old despotism, have no higher motive than the establishment of a new one,— an Eclectic, Homoeopathic or Physio-medical school, in place of an Allopathic one. These are great improvements, but not radical. **The true medical reformer should become Anarchistic, and then he will proclaim and defend the right of every individual to practise the healing art according to his own intelligence, without the license or dictation of any man or set of men, being responsible only to his patients for his well-doing or malpractice.**

The Hygienist goes still further. His appeal is always from the arbitrary laws of medicine, fashionable dress and diet, etc., to the unalterable laws of nature. Just as the religious reformer defeuds the right of every man to be his own priest and attend to the salvation of his own soul, so the hygienist defends the right of every man to be his own doctor and care for the salvation of his own body. **He opposes compulsory vaccination just as the freethinker does compulsory baptism.** Just as the freethinker considers that by right relationship to the laws of mind he can maintain spiritual health without the aid of priests; just as the Anarchist considers he can maintain social health by right relationship to humanity without the aid of rulers; so the hygienist believes that by right relationship to the vital laws of the body he can maintain physical health without the aid of physicians. Therefore, by the logic of his position, every hygienist should be an Anarchist, and work radically for the good time coming, when the arbitrary priest, ruler, and physician will be supplanted by the teachers of morals, justice, and health, whose advice will only be accepted in so far as proved by the laws of the universe and approved by the individual reason.

How can the free lover be aught but an Anarchist? His whole course and doctrine is an eloquent protest against the arbitrariness of those **man-made laws which so insult, invade, enslave, hamper, and restrict the holiest and sweetest of human emotions** that millions of human souls make horrible shipwreck on this fairest of life’s seas. So far as he goes, every free lover is an Anarchist, and he should go on to the glorious end.

Even those reformers who wish to accomplish reform by legislative enactments will often find those ends better accomplished by no enactments at all. The best way to reform the civil service is to abolish it. When there are no statute laws to bind unequally on man and woman, when woman is free to learn and do all that her brother may, then the righters of Woman will see the fruition of their hopes. **Pure democracy is only realizable in Anarchy, for that alone is a government in which each man has his full share, and all his political rights and privileges.** Where can the financial reformer find a financial policy more radical and scientific than that advocated by Anarchists? Where can the labor reformer find a better reform than that which emancipates him at one stroke from the tyrannies of Capital and Trade Unionism? Does not the land-reformer, the interest-reformer, the rent reformer, the libertarian of whatever scope, or name, or sect, find all he desires, and more, under the broad wings of Anarchy.

Even the reformer in art matters, the Pre-Raphaelite, or what not, finds his power in appealing from the conventionalisms of the schools to the sweet law and liberty of Nature. In short, **every true reformer, consciously or unconsciously, follows the route of Anarchy,— from misrelation to justice (right relation), from the arbitrary to the reasonable, from the hampered to the free.**

Pride & The False Self

By Victor Johnson, Edited by Cory Edmund Endrulat

Pride is the false self, like ego it disguises itself as real while the true authenticated person hides in the shadows, afraid to let themselves be known. Being aware of the old warning that pride goes before the fall, we may realize that both pride and ego are detrimental to human growth and development. What if we were to eradicate all pride and ego from our lives?... And to take a lot of pride in *that*. This joke illustrates the insidiousness and tenacity of this false self. The best way to deal with it is to replace it with something else. Autonomy and sovereignty will work. Autonomy means being self-governed in accordance with *Objective (Basic non-contradictive) Morality* rather than external control. **Sovereignty simply means *not a slave, going all the way back to it's Latin and Old French roots (super-regnum)***. One might wonder if there is a need for pride at all, yes but only enough to know that you have Rights inherent in Nature and that you will defend those Rights and to defend the Rights of others if they are unable to do so themselves. You are in a position to do so. Equal Rights, not special rights. This is the only pride one needs and not an inch more.

