The Turkey's Appeal.

As his anemic spirit strays to God on Christmas Eve.

By T. S. Sosx.

Oh! God, how tired am I among this murderous assembly! Can any one here enter the pearly gates of purity? In the sight of Heaven and Justice they are all guilty of murder as principle or accomplice. We the Spirit of Truth do accuse them of being lying hypocrites when they say they are washed pure and white in the blood of Christ, (their brother). Their hands are red with the blood of the innocent victims they have slain, and they have blessed them with superior strength and sagacity they claim to be better than we.

They put too thousands upon their thousand to death. Then wait kumy to thee with their carrion breath, Hold they say as for the fabric, Their hideous edifice in Turkey bell. They claim today's a day of thanksgiving, 'Tis but a day of custom. Can their hioored souls be pure and clean When they are acting so wicked and mean? They are full of hatred, murder and strife, Constantly taking some innocent life. What sort of God is this of Molly to man, Then set as unceaseful as they can. If thou dost theehy think this makes not me too, And our lives too, must be precious to you, Didst thou give souls to such a cruel set, And then translate whose children men? Man shuffles his sins on an innocent one. Then slimes them with such as are pure. Nothers too, so little of justice know, That there seems to be no earthly blow, Stamping the feet of an unborn child: The scene of her action windex and wide. Man cins that a nearer to him was sent, And he needs but to believe and repent, And salvation to him will be given. Accompanied with a pass to heaven, If some ones bravest but the just and true What will they do with this murderous crew? If they must die once, for each like taken. When, Oh, Lord, when will their souls awake? Lord cleanem them with fruit like the plum and date, And let their souls liveth in a pure state. Had a bit of bread been stumped on their face, Enough would never have been born from their lips. Not content to take their red brother's land, The eagle's claws and beak must rule their head. The eagle pricked in gore of earth Curses their children before they have birth. The snare of the earth display taunts and claw, Carnivorous teeth and murderous jaws. The beads of sweat are turned by greed, On God, plant by their hearts another seed; Let this fair earth so beautiful and wild, Be the god given home of every child. Then will emulate the Christ of old, Be the Christ of old, or oply. When they were told: Then, as their imperious sight does test nature, They will cease to live as brother's gore, Oh! they scrape the bristles from the monstrous blow, As then didst Abraham long years ago. New Leavenworth's Metropolis Christmas Eve. Please open their hearts that they may receive The spirit of the American bird, Whose agencies on the block the off is heard.

"Government is the great blackmailer."—Buckley.

Look at the Post Office.

With a Nationalist or State Socialist exhausts all the arguments he knows of in combating the theories of Anarchy, he will invariably tell you to look at the Post Office, with a wise look, evidently expecting that that settles it. He to Him the Postal system is the biggest lie there is. He thinks it is a symbol of the entire machinery of socialist production and distribution in the Co-operative Commonwealth. He will say that it may not be perfect, but that is because of the fact that the capitalist system prevails, and not because of any internal defects.

All this praise of the Postal Service is due to a prejudice that is born of ignorance of the facts in the case. The postal system is cumbersome, costly, and not calculated to secure the best results with the greatest dispatch and least labor. It is run in the interest of the commercial class, is beyond the reach of the people, is irresponsible and fails to pay expenses, the deficit being taken out of the general revenues, thus putting a burden on the general public for the benefits of the class that uses it most.

Its money order department is burdened with a lot of useless requirements, and instead of being secure, as is generally supposed, is insecure, not being responsible for any losses which the senders of money may sustain because of the loss, by theft or otherwise, of the money order he may send.

Express companies issue money orders that are much more convenient and absolutely secure. Every convenience that will save labor or increase the security of express money orders is adopted by the companies, when brought to their notice, but if the postal money order system undergoes changes it does so very slowly, if at all.

Lest some one might say that I am mistaken in these matters I will cite two instances that have come under my personal observation of late. A year ago last May I sent a money order from Tacoma to J. H. Morris, at Portland. When I returned to Portland I found that Mr. Morris had never received the money order. I found further that a man by the name of Riddell had taken the order from the letter and forging Mr. Morris' name on the back of the order had collected it. I presented the matter to the foreman of the money order department at the Post Office and he referred me to the Inspector. After awhile I found the Inspector in his office and presented the case to him. He wanted evidence which I furnished him. I was then informed that the only way for me to get the money back was to find Mr. Riddell and put the Inspector onto his whereabouts and he would try and bluff the money out of him. I found him and told the Inspector where he was. More than a year afterward the man who paid the order to Riddell asked me if I had received my money yet, and advised me to write a letter to the Postmaster. This I did. I found that the Inspector had twice tried to bluff the paying clerk into paying the amount of the order over to him. I found him in his office one day and he told me he had seen Riddell, and that Riddell refused to give up the money on the plea that Mr. Morris had signed it over to him, although he had abundant proof to the contrary. Since then I have refused to have anything to do with it. This shows the security of the money order department of the Postal service.

The Postmaster in this city got up a postal directory, which, if used, would save at least sixty dollar monthly for the Portland Post Office. He wrote to the proper authorities, offering to get the directory out at his own expense if it did not prove a success, and save as much expense as he claimed. In addition to making the delivery of mail much more expeditious and sure. After a long delay he was informed that if it proved a success every first class office in the nation would want one. Concrete wisdom, is it not? An improved system that would save thousands of dollars annually to all the large cities, and secure a much more certain and expeditious delivery of mails is rejected because it would come into general use.

Employees are not secure in their positions. I know a letter carrier who belongs to a number of Lodges, and a to P. O. Employees Band, as he confesses to me, in order to hold his job. I know other letter carriers who are afraid to speak their honest sentiments for fear of losing their jobs. Employees in the mailing division are over-worked, have no holidays, and receive poor pay considering their work.

The intermeddling of the postal authorities is outrageous. If the Comstock laws were rigidly enforced, if the power placed in the hands of the postal authorities was fully exercised by them, thousands of the best and brightest of our population would be in jail, or serving prison sentences. Witness the suppression of Kretzer Sonata and other books. The imprisonment of Harman, Heywood and Bennett. And remember that any Postmaster can exclude almost anything he chooses from the mail as being "indecent.

The Postal service is a huge monoply, and run so expensively and unsatisfactorily that all competition is prohibited. Were the prohibitory mail laws repealed a more satisfactory and inexpensive service would grow up and that would make the government service a greater expense to the general treasury than it now is.

Thus, too, is class legislation. The man within four blocks of the Post Office in a city, with good sidewalks all the way, has his mail laid down on his desk three times a day, while the man four miles away can wade the mud for his mail.

Thus we see that if the Postal service is a model of what Nationalists and State Socialists hope for we had better stand from under. Excuse us from putting any more public necessities into the hands of the government.

There is not a feature of the Postal service but what can be improved upon and operated more satisfactorily in every respect if freed from the encumbrance of official red tape, and authoritarian intermeddling and supervision.

HENRY ADAMS.

"Under any government, whatever it may be, nature has set limits to the misery of the people. Beyond these limits lie death, flight, or revolution."

THE FIREBRAND.

An Exponent of Anarchist-Communism. Holding that Equality of Opportunity alone Constitutes Liberty, that in the Absence of Money Price and Competition Crowd Exist, and that Communism is the inevitable consequence.
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Anarchy.—A social theory which regards the union of order and chaos as being the true basis of political idealism; absolute individual liberty.—Century Dictionary.

WILLIAM H. DILLARD.
Frutitious Controversy.

If Mr. Morris and I could agree as to the meaning of words, I should still feel that there is too little real disagreement between us to justify controversy. He calls others, I will do my best to understand him. I did not, in the article which he criticised, say: nor any other words which I did not mean. The truth is, he intimates that I said things which I did not say. I repeat that I did not say Communism is impracticable. What I said was that it is only a question of individual freedom and aspiration. He admits, unequivocally, that with my definition, communist experiments have all been failures. He admits, unequivocally, that they were not failures because Communism was impracticable, and he pronounces us ignoramuses for failing to make that distinction. Possibly, he is right. It is always well to try to see ourselves as others see us. And possibly, the Shakers, the Zoarites, the Icarians, the Order of the United Brethren, and numerous others, not to mention the Berlinites, who have called themselves Communists, and whom everybody else has called by that name, have not succeeded in all the world, except Anarchists, are fools, I need not complain of being classed with them.

I must not fail to notice what it is that my distinguished critic regards as the genuine article, the Simon pure Communism. In The Firebrand, No. 9, he uses this language: "Communism, then, mean equality of opportunity, the right to produce, free production, free consumption, and the grouping of individuals according to congeniality and mutual choice." He now refers to articles of mine, No. 25 and No. 10; but I have not seen him say that if he said anything in them, contradictory of what I have quoted, I will accept the correction.

As far as I have done this, I proceed to remark that the idea of equality implies individuality, which is Individualism. So does the phrase: Free production. Combined production is not free production. So seems the idea is to be free to work, each on his own account, the same as at present, but with the understanding that there is to be no monopoly of natural opportunities, which includes everything not produced by labor. A logical inference is, that each person may appropriate the product of his own labor; for without this right, equality of opportunities would be but empty words.

This is what we call Individualism, the exact opposite of what we understand as Communism. If Anarchist-Communism, it must mean some one of the second item of my friend definition, namely, free consumption. He now says that Anarchist-Communism does not mean this. Then it does mean something else. To me, personally, I could not say what, because I have not heard him say which he did not mean to say, he should not blame me for it. But it does mean that. It runs all through The Firebrand, and it is shutting to say that it does not go into the products of the market, so plentiful as to destroy their commercial value. When this occurs each will help himself to whatever he needs or wants, but he leaves forever if it finds, without the formalities of exchange.

Now, if it be true that the abolition of monopoly will result as wise men predict, this free consumption may be, and it is not actually consummated; and in that case, the condition of society would be, virtually, somewhat analogous to Communism. But will there be, under these circumstances, any such a system as claimed? How can it be shown that there will be? My critic admits that human wants are insatiable. How, then, can abundance eliminate what want is? The consumption of one being simply free plunder? That is what is bothering us now; and, if wants are insatiable, how can it be otherwise unless free consumption? The problem seems simpler than that. scarcely to say that I am color blind will not answer these questions. Before your system will become practicable, other blind people will have to be made to see, and very few are ever convinced by contumacious and insulting language.

If then, there be any doubt about equality of opportunity, and consequent free production, bringing abundance, sufficient to bring about the means to the measure of the imagination, and Anarchist-Communism is the Bogus article, after all. So, whether it be 1 or Mr. Morris's article that calls black white, it is at least a question for debate. To review my friends hair-splitting as to government will require too much space for this article. I will only say that only those who believe that there is no government, who believe in governing children; and if so, I again ask, why not adults, for the same reasons? Does the free dom of one individual never conflict with that of another?

A. Warrens.

Mr. Morris is of the city, and not in a position to write, and so cannot reply to Mr. Warren's rejoinder. I do not make 'combats' or 'outcry,' but there are a few points in Mr. Warren's rejoinder that I cannot refrain from calling attention to. He says: "Combined production is not free production." I cannot conceive on what he bases that assertion. To assert that two or more persons cannot combine their efforts freely in production is an assumption which cannot be proven. The Anarchist-Communist philosopher that each individual will be free to work on his own account, or the same as at present, for the simple reason that the conditions will be the same as at present, and herein lies Mr. Warren's error. He confounds the present with the future. It is because of this failing to grasp the conception of the future society that Mr. Warren calls Anarchist, that I come to consider Individualism as the extreme opposite of Communism. Mr. Warren's fear that production cannot keep pace with consumption is as groundless as the fear that without Sunday laws people would become so immoral that life for them would be unbearable. Anyone at all acquainted with the actual power of production with the machinery now ready and with the number of non-productive Philistines would, in a condition of freedom, become producers in account, can have no fears of a lack of abundant production to supply all wants. If wants are insatiable, the more constant, the one would offset the other, which fact the objectors to Communism never seem to realize. As far as convenience is concerned, it is more convenient to keep accounts, to one who is acquainted with Anarchist-Communist philosophy, according to Mr. Warren's reasoning, is the genuine article, and there is little room for debate on that point.

An Instance of Modern Freedom.

On the 8th of December, in the evening, a man by the name of Mr. Marks and his wife went to a theatre. Going around about 11 o'clock, Mr. Marks left a tobacco store for some tobacco, leaving his wife outside on the sidewalk. On coming out he saw her struggling and reconstraining with a man. Of course Mr. Marks went to his wife's aid to drive off the man; but he soon learned that the man who had held of his wife was an officer of "law and order," although dressed as a civilian. In an instant there were two more police on the scene, one of them a constable, and the man and his wife were hurried away to the station house. She was charged with approaching men on the street, and threatening them. She was, however, although her charge was not sustained, the woman who was driving her husband was an officer. They were arrested in Essex market Police court, before the Hon. Judge Motl, a well-known man for his love of Justice. The hearing was held in the following way: Mrs. Marks' father, a respectable man, swore that she was a very good girl before she was married. "Did she live with you then?" demanded the Justice. "Yes," replied her father. Judge: "Didn't she live with her husband?"

Father: "Yes, she lived with me until she was married."

Judge: "You said just now that she lived with you?"

Father: "Yes, Your Honor, I said that she was livin' with me until now."

Judge: "Now don't you come here to tell lies?"

Father: "I didn't say that she was livin' with me; shut up, I don't want to hear another word."

Off from the stand he was ordered, another witness called. He testified that he knew Mr. Marks for 15 years. He is a respectable woman.

Judge: "How often have you seen her since her marriage?"

Witness: "Every day."

Judge: "Can you swear that she has not been out nights?"

Witness: "Well, no, how could I do that, not having any numbers to say she was."

The husband had sworn to that only a few minutes before. The witness was likewise ordered from the stand, before the Marks were acquitted. The woman was sent to the workhouse and the then fined 10 for assaulting an officer. of "law and order." How long! How long, how long, will you free born American stand by and look calmly as your most sacred rights, your most sacred feelings are interfered with? Wake up you mighty men from your slumber. Look around and say, this is enough, stop or we will--"

L. H.

Jersey City, N. J.

I was surprised to find my letter to you published in your paper. My letter was not meant for publication—it was of a private nature. But since it has been published and declared a puzzle (at least to the signatures A. L. I. I will shortly give the following response:

"Personal liberty" can, according to my ideas, only exist when a person has indisputable right to the control of his senses and his body. Since grounded Communism, this will not or cannot be so. I might not as A. L. put it "be quite clear" on this question, in all events not so clear that I don't stand beyond, but conclusions by reading Communist books and papers.

As you will find by this, I am not a convert of my friends in London, that I mentioned in my letter, but still do I regard them, as all as Communists, as friends, yes, as my personal friends, because they stand in mine, is it only the means of finding some personal liberty, that I do not really agree with, hence I am not a Communist.

A. L. says that Individualists are only in the a b c in their conception of a condition of freedom, as shown when they try describe a free society; and I say amen, because outlining and describing a free society is only a speculation. To build a house, we need material fit for all purposes. Individualists also need material fit for that purpose, and that material is the free persons. It seems that society composed of individualists will also depend on the personal liberty. Pro.tested individual liberty is the aim and the motor, and when people once became free, they will surely know how to solve the social question that confronts them.

Oscar F. Vercinon.

Hillman, Minn.

Correct, my friend, personal liberty can only exist when the individual has an indisputable right to indulge in all enjoyments a person might be able to obtain or have a desire for. This is only possible in a condition of freedom—Communism—hence I am not a Communist. The term "produce and consume according to your desire," i.e. there shall be neither restraint in production nor in consumption. To say that means commission of authoritariansm, as the Individualists can be explained by their greedy and insatiable nature. They want the liberty and privilege to exploit their fellow men, which they cannot accomplish in a condition of freedom. When the means of production and distribution are free, the products will be so plentiful that they will become valueless as the air is to-day:
that each individual will be at liberty to produce and consume according to his passions and desires, and that such state of affairs constitutes Communism. The individual might live alone in a house in the community or way out in the woods as a hermit, and without being noticed by anybody, and it would be still a state of Communism, as nobody would charge him for anything he would need nor pay him for anything he would want to dispose of. Indeed, if there would be enough produced in an unrestricted society, it is an assertion that has to be proven yet. If it can be demonstrated satisfactorily, then it contradicts also the assertion of the previous paragraph that the establishment of their proposed institutions will relieve mankind from want and misery. Or will they have some means for compelling people to produce sufficiently of everything?

The so-called Individualists are very well aware of the fact—at least some of them—that the idea of private property, which in reality amounts to the same thing as legal property, is unjust and against the realization of freedom, and therefore try to influence and impress men with ethical phrases as "equal freedom," "not to infringe on the liberties of others," "to respect the rights of our neighbors," etc., etc., because they know that without vaccinating mankind with such relative terms as right and wrong, they will live in constant warfare. Right, "justice," "equal freedom," is their religion, and the sects scare the devil and bell. And they know also that these teachings of conduct will not suffice to keep the "uninitiated" in submission, and therefore propose "Protocols," and "Futurist" laws, etc., to keep those of a more or less rebellious character in obedience.

On the other hand, the Anarchists are aware of the fact that people depend not only on the social and economical conditions, and that freedom is the only equilibrium of all those "infringements" the Individualists lay so much stress upon. The idea of the "equal liberty" will be violated, demonstrates the fact, that their social theory does not propose the removal of the causes which bring such violations about. Aggressive acts will occur long as there is an incentive to them. When mankind reaches the stage of free production and consumption, the cause for cheating, stealing and murdering is removed.

The living together in small or large communities, the using of one trowel or the eating together at one large table, does not constitute Communism, not even if the gathering or association is called "voluntary." The phenomenon has been established or secured by ethical declarations or constitutions on paper, but must result from the social and economical conditions essential to free production and free consumption.

As to B C of the Individualists in "outlining and describing" a free society, I did not express myself correctly. The question is not, how a free society will be, as such outliving can only be of a speculative nature, as my opponent truly says, but the question is: What constitutes freedom? And what I meant to say is, that when the Individualists try to define freedom, they are in the B C, as I am in the English language.

The theories of the so-called Individualists resemble exactly those of the present governments, and if it was not their theories outlived their time, the result would be the same. In theory our governments are for the protection of life and property, for the weak against the strong, etc. But in reality governments protect nothing but property, I e., they give to the rich the privilege to rob the poor.

No, my friend, the so-called Individualists are not Individualists at all, in the real sense of the word. I admit, as you say, just as much as you do, but I am aware of the fact, that my individuality can only develop and extend itself fully, when my fellow men have the same opportunity to the enjoyment of the fruits of life that I have, independently of their abilities or "fitness." I cannot really enjoy life as long as there are any suffering men around me. Science and art cannot develop freely as long as scientists and artists to struggle for the means which sustain life. Communists are the real Individualists.

To conclude with, let me say that the controversy between the Anarchist and the Individualist is fruitless as long as we hold a different definition of the word Anarchism. The Communists mean a condition of freedom when they use the term "Anarchism," while the Individualists mean simply the right or liberty to choose or consent, no matter what the conditions are, forgetting that the outcome of their propositions would destroy those liberties. This outcome has to be taken into consideration in future controversies.

A L.

The Proposed Anarchist Convention.

I THINK Convention is the true private convention of the com- rade who proposed this "general convention" rather severe and in bad taste. The comrade was very fair in his proposition, made no pretensions of immorality, and asked for the expressions of opinion. This is according to my memory of the matter.

The proposition was, I think, made to the proper spirit—that of individual initiative. And while there is no doubt that good would result from a general gathering of the comrades, I would suggest that it is absolutely impossible for an Anarchist meeting to be a "delegated" affair. The ball being started by individual initiative and the unconsidered and undeniable Anarchist principles be at once aban- doned? Can an Anarchist be represented except in his own proper person? If we abandon Anarchist principles in our manifestos, propaganda, etc., what we may expect as a result of the said convention?

The meeting should be composed of volunteers. Any other method would smack too much of parlia- mentarism. The delegates should not adopt a resolution, no individ- ual can bear the expense of a trip from the West to New York, True, and since all cannot go, let groups form for the purpose of aiding certain volunteers.

Again, there might be a division of the comrades of a town, and the business be that no one to be enabled to go. I do not see how this can be reme- died, except by adopting authoritarian methods and conspelling, heaven forfend, to contribute to the expenses of a comrade in whose going they are not interested. But, once more, this is a small mat- ter and the importance of having as many as possible at the meeting outweighs it? I say no; nothing of greater importance than the purity of the movement at its inception. Now is the primitive period, and if we build up a heterogeneous mass of Anarchist liberty and Anarchist power, it must inevitably topple and fall of its own weight. A little error to- day means little but error tomorrow. Habit is the strongest thing in life. If we fall into the habit of not taking care of ourselves and stand in the way of the desire of the MAJORITY, in small things, that habit will lead us about in a circle until we find ourselves at the point from which we started. Anarchist doctrine is something for the representatives of all parliamentary systems. It aims as certainly at the annihilation of the ballot as a method of determin- ing yes and nay as at the sceptres of kings.

Flynning Replis.

I am sorry Mr. Morris finds me remiss in confirming my discussion with him, and especially sorry that my remissness is going to deprive me of the pleasure and benefit of his discussion. Although Mr. Morris is not always sensible, there is a good deal to be learned by debating with him. But I really have not so much time for writing letters. And kindly credit me with.

Since he is not to answer me, I cut short my answer to him; but I want you to answer briefly, and shall be glad to be so advised. I have the Fire- brand's contributors, as Mr. Morris suggests.

He says of natural opportunity, "The only condition (barring the use of arms) which will still let the individual have a favorable opportunity is that he has free access to the products of labor applied to the most favorable opportunity." But surely the woods are full of men who are willing to forgo the opportunity of receiving a certain compensation in cash (single tax) and Mr. Tucker and many others are willing to forego it simply to avoid the alternatives of such a course, state tax and Communism.

Mr. Morris says: "Natural opportunity is invaluable because a primary condition of existence itself. When Mr. Tucker considers his estimate (in nickels) of the value of the opportunity to live." But theoretically there is no reason why I may not be beyond price any natural opportunity except such as is acquired, while Mr. Tucker's statement is strictly true; and practically we know that all sorts of natural opportun- ities are constantly traded in at a well-known and much-quoted market value. This one is to be taken to be influential in future controversies.

He says: "Anarchism is a political education of the people, to acquaint them with the necessity of life did in fact constitute such a monopoly of the natural source as to deprive the properties of their original possibility of access to that opportunity." I don't acknowledge the statement. But this is precisely what I deny; and Mr. Morris undertakes to answer my denial in his next point. I point out that private property constitutes or implies any monopoly of natural opportunities at all. He answers, first, "If I own a crop of wheat, I have monopolized the land the time the crop was growing." I reply that it is all right if he has received the consent of the rest of the people that he may monopolize this land this year; and that if some of the people refuse such consent, but have no better plan to propose on their part that part of his labor (or its product, which is the same thing) be put at the disposal of all comers, then those who wish to use the labor (or its product) may have to compete with the monopolist of the monopoly by which he defends his liberty. Next he argues that profit in itself implies monopoly, because "if the opportunity to make a chair is free, the present un- employed would make them so that there would be no profit on them." I want the premise proved. The rest of his argument rests on his final assertion that "an effort to provide equal opportuni- ty and the tools of production is an economic fal- lacy." But, anarchism as my whole contention is that nor products should not be treated like natural opportuni- ties, this is begging the question.

The amazing thing in his article is his closing para- graph. If he could not otherwise immediately supply the need of a man with a spiritual apple labor, he would take away by force the walking-stick I was using, the product of my labor. Why, if taking a thing out of a man's hands by force to relieve the needy is not government, what is it? I am surprised at this, having never known Mr. Morris to go so glaringly astray from the path of Anarch- ism, but after reading Mr. Andrews' articles on "Liberty and Property" and comparing them with what else he has lately written I think I see what is the matter. Mr. Morris has been led astray by Mr. An- drews' sophistry, and has adopted the Andrewsian view of the essence of Anarchism.

Mr. Morris commends Mr. Andrews' article to my special attention. The first thing in it, however, call for no answer from me except to say that Mr. Andrews is attacking a doctrine which I do not hold, nor do I know of anybody who holds it. There may be Australians who are such anarchists, as Mr. Andrews describes (though I doubt it), and that in his article of Oct. 11 he describes the single tax as "a death tax." Anyhow, however, the taxes do not believe even in Australia) but the Individualist- Anarchists of the United States, at any rate, do not hold that doctrine of "to each according to his work," meaning that each must be allowed to consume just as much as he produces. Ours is the shorter principle, "to each his own"; and we recognize the making of a good and bad bargain as part of a man's work. There- fore, if two men make a bargain, the cash values are exchanged, the first gets the fruit of the wheat works—production and good bargain together—and the other gets the wheat—production and bad bargain together. Anarchist principles have been perfectly maintained.

In his fifth section he argues that the principle of property will not work in certain social emergen- cies. But Tucker has been proclaiming for a long time that all principles must give way in great emergencies. Victoria and New South Wales have \(12.5 \text{ cents} \) a day, but Yarros has not answered Tucker's latest on this subject, while I have formerly acknowledged myself a believer. Those who have not been heard from are most probably the soundest. To sum up in Mr. Tucker's language: "It is now that we are perfectly clear of the Newcomen Steam Engine," say that is now the generally accepted view among American Individualist-Anarchists. So I need not oppose it.

It is in his sixth and last section, where he stops fighting imaginary enemies and begins the positive development of his own philosophy, that we see the real trouble. It is in what Mr. Andrews calls Individual-
ualism—the doctrine that we should not let our actions be directed by principle.

Now, in the first place, I want to make a protest on behalf of the English language. The word "individu- 
ality" has a settled meaning. It is everywhere understood to mean the doctrine that we should be 
directed by a certain principle, to wit, by the principle that they should not otherwise have turned that it is useful to society.
The rule of not killing each other would have some value if it were only a statement of the rule that they would not otherwise have turned that it is useful to society.
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