On Picket Duty.

The Boston " Herald" recently published a letter from H. M. Beers, over a column in length, on the labor problem, of which the writer finds the solution in the works of Proudhon. I shall present some extracts from the letter in the next number of Liberty.

The first number of Mr. Underwood's new paper, "The Open Court," is at hand. Except that it is made up in thirty-two small pages appearing fortnightly instead of twice larger ones appearing weekly, it is the same old index. The writers are the same, the subjects are the same, the style is the same, the dearliness is the same; in short, the "Open Court" will evidently be a paper in which a large amount of ability and learning will run to waste. The subscription price is three dollars a year, which he is sent to "The Ad- versewood, P. O. Brewer, C. Chicago, Illinois."

"The costs of the Cullin Campbell trial," says a New York "World" cable dispatch, "amount to about $15,000. It is supposed that the Duke of Argyll will have to pay the whole of this expense, and, as he is a poor man, it will almost ruin him." Will some one please pass the hat round? It is often remarked that the standard of riches is vastly higher than it was fifty years ago, but probably few imagine that it has reached so dizzy a height that a man who can pay out $15,000 and remain solvent may be considered poor. At this rate the English language will not hold out.

The Detroit "Labor Leaf" has passed from the hands of John R. Burton into those of Captain John M. McGregor. He will be known as the "Advance and Labor Leaf." It has also been enlarged from four pages to eight. As Captain McGregor is an ardent disciple of Henry George, the tone and attitude of the paper are likely to be more positive than before. I wish I could say that this is true of political and economic truth instead of for error. That it will continue to be edited with ability and earnestness there can be no doubt. It is gratifying to find that Lulu- dicus's "Curly Notes" are not to be abandoned. They have always been the best things in the paper, and probably will lose nothing in wit and wisdom.

The letter in another column from Adolph Fischer, one of the brave and unfortunate seven who are threatened with the gallows in Chicago, was sent to me by Comrade Lum to show me that he at least is an Anarchist, though most of his comrades are really State Socialists. I am very glad to admit that, if none of them had said anything more in conflict with individual liberty than the letter, I never should have criticized them as I have done. Mr. Fischer's declarations in favor of absolute individualism are so positive that I can hardly imagine him denying the freedom of production and exchange as his comrades do. A man who should have explained more clearly his meaning in referring to the "infamous institution of private property..." if he distinctly distinguishes, like Proudhon, between personal and possession, why does he use the word "private"? If not, his remark is tainted with authority.

"Freidt," in making quotations from No. 1 of the "Proudhon Library," attempts to show that the Com- munist and socialists which Proudhon attacked were simply the utopians of Cobbe, Fourier, and others, and not at all Anarchist Communism. As the school of Anarchist Communism did not exist in Proudhon's day, of course he could not have attacked it specifically; what Liberty maintains is that most of the arguments with which he assailed the utopians apply equally well against Anarchist Communism. The extract from Proudhon given in the last issue of Liberty showed conclusively what kind of Socialist he considered not utopian. In it he declared that the whole of Socialism is contained in the principles laid down in the articles of association of his "People's Bank," and that everything outside of these in utopian and chimerical. But "Freidt" sees no virtue whatever in the principle of the "Proudhon" of today, that Proudhon, if alive, would consider "Freidt's" Communism utopian.

I must refer once more to the Winslow "Press" and its editor. It is lamentable to see so bright a man as Mr. W. C. Winslow regard a $15,000 expense as if it were a trifle. He has not only taken upon himself a duty which he has shirked, but he has made a public confession of it. He refers to the case of "The Ad- versewood." He refers to the case of "The Ad- versewood," and my only regret is that he did not make the case still worse by referring to the case of the "Labor Leaf." The latter, in my opinion, has been riper for some time to cut loose from the "Proudhon Library." A collection of the best of his writings would be a valuable addition to the literature of the people. I hope that Mr. Winslow will not lose sight of the fact that he is not a private man, and that the work he has done is of public interest. The work he has done is of public interest. He is not a private man, and that the work he has done is of public interest. He is not a private man, and that the work he has done is of public interest. He is not a private man, and that the work he has done is of public interest.

Proudhon's Works a Source of Health.

"From Mr. Tucker, I have just learned that you have hit upon the plain of meaning Proudhon's works in monthly parts, which will not lessen their beauty and value in volume. Proudhon had such wonderful intelligence, coupled with such unerring determinations to reveal truth, that his writings are not only in the highest degree instructive, but refreshing and encouraging,—a source of health and gladness to all those who can read them, and are not afraid of the truth. His command of language and his scholarship fully fitted him to lead in the evolution. The defenders of organized states are beginning to see that the whole idea the keyboarding of thecottages will not endeavor to resist the new scheme of government unless it is more attractive than the present, and has a better chance of success"—(The author of the above is a friend of Proudhon's, and the passage is from a private letter).
THE SCIENCE OF SOCIETY. 

BY STEPHEN F. A. ANDREWS.

PART FIRST.

THE TRUE CONSTITUTION OF GOVERNMENT.


Continued from No. 22.

In order to this consummation two conditions are indispensably necessary: the first is the personal and universal acceptance of the principle of uncompromisingly excluding all individuals—each claiming his own Sovereignty, and each religiously respecting that of all others. The second is the equitable interchanging of the personal rights and privileges according to the demand and consent of the individuals, the extent of aversive, and the supply of a definite knowledge of the limits of rights and encroachments.

These necessities are hard to satisfy for the adoption of the principle of individual sovereignty. They are, likewise, two: these are, first, a more intense longing for true and harmonious relations, and, secondly, a perfect enlightenment of the mind. The former is the condition of the possession of aversive, the supply of a definite knowledge of the limits of rights and encroachments.

When the lips of the lips ovistic breath shall, like the breath of the living, now be discerned—

The whole dark plane of mockery, the pomp and error of earth, and the dust and ashes, as from a second birth, in man, in the consciousness of his soul, in the nature of aversive, shall walk transparent, like some holy thing.

It would, perhaps, be injudicious to conclude this exhibit of the doctrine of individual sovereignty, without a more formal statement of the scientific limitation upon it. The principle of individual sovereignty, as here presented, it is true, the principle of the praxis of one's own management. This principle were predicated of one individual alone, the assertion of his Sovereignty, or, in other words, of his absolute right to do as he pleases, or to pursue his own happiness in his own way, would be confessedly invested him with the absolute right of disposing over others. But the doctrine which I have endeavored to set forth is not that of the absolute right of individuals to dispose of themselves over others, but an absolute right to dispose of their interests and desires over others. And this right is a peculiar right for the individual, to dispose of himself, and not for others to dispose of him. The right to dispose of one's own actions is a right to dispose of one's own happiness. This is the principle of individual sovereignty.

The principal limitation of this principle is the necessity of the right of others to enjoy the same sovereignty. This limitation is absolute, and not in a relative sense; but in the relative sense, it is the absolute limitation.

It is a common mistake to think that the right of the individual to dispose of his interests and desires is a right to dispose of others. This is not the case. The right of the individual to dispose of his own interests and desires is a right to dispose of himself, and not for others to dispose of him. The right to dispose of one's own actions is a right to dispose of one's own happiness. This is the principle of individual sovereignty.

The principal limitation of this principle is the necessity of the right of others to enjoy the same sovereignty. This limitation is absolute, and not in a relative sense; but in the relative sense, it is the absolute limitation.

It is a common mistake to think that the right of the individual to dispose of his interests and desires is a right to dispose of others. This is not the case. The right of the individual to dispose of his own interests and desires is a right to dispose of himself, and not for others to dispose of him. The right to dispose of one's own actions is a right to dispose of one's own happiness. This is the principle of individual sovereignty.

The principal limitation of this principle is the necessity of the right of others to enjoy the same sovereignty. This limitation is absolute, and not in a relative sense; but in the relative sense, it is the absolute limitation.

It is a common mistake to think that the right of the individual to dispose of his interests and desires is a right to dispose of others. This is not the case. The right of the individual to dispose of his own interests and desires is a right to dispose of himself, and not for others to dispose of him. The right to dispose of one's own actions is a right to dispose of one's own happiness. This is the principle of individual sovereignty.

The principal limitation of this principle is the necessity of the right of others to enjoy the same sovereignty. This limitation is absolute, and not in a relative sense; but in the relative sense, it is the absolute limitation.

It is a common mistake to think that the right of the individual to dispose of his interests and desires is a right to dispose of others. This is not the case. The right of the individual to dispose of his own interests and desires is a right to dispose of himself, and not for others to dispose of him. The right to dispose of one's own actions is a right to dispose of one's own happiness. This is the principle of individual sovereignty.

The principal limitation of this principle is the necessity of the right of others to enjoy the same sovereignty. This limitation is absolute, and not in a relative sense; but in the relative sense, it is the absolute limitation.

It is a common mistake to think that the right of the individual to dispose of his interests and desires is a right to dispose of others. This is not the case. The right of the individual to dispose of his own interests and desires is a right to dispose of himself, and not for others to dispose of him. The right to dispose of one's own actions is a right to dispose of one's own happiness. This is the principle of individual sovereignty.

The principal limitation of this principle is the necessity of the right of others to enjoy the same sovereignty. This limitation is absolute, and not in a relative sense; but in the relative sense, it is the absolute limitation.

It is a common mistake to think that the right of the individual to dispose of his interests and desires is a right to dispose of others. This is not the case. The right of the individual to dispose of his own interests and desires is a right to dispose of himself, and not for others to dispose of him. The right to dispose of one's own actions is a right to dispose of one's own happiness. This is the principle of individual sovereignty.

The principal limitation of this principle is the necessity of the right of others to enjoy the same sovereignty. This limitation is absolute, and not in a relative sense; but in the relative sense, it is the absolute limitation.

It is a common mistake to think that the right of the individual to dispose of his interests and desires is a right to dispose of others. This is not the case. The right of the individual to dispose of his own interests and desires is a right to dispose of himself, and not for others to dispose of him. The right to dispose of one's own actions is a right to dispose of one's own happiness. This is the principle of individual sovereignty.

The principal limitation of this principle is the necessity of the right of others to enjoy the same sovereignty. This limitation is absolute, and not in a relative sense; but in the relative sense, it is the absolute limitation.
of society, but it is not the whole of that science. Other elements are indispensable to the right working of the system, one of which has been adverted to above. The error has been in supposing that, because the individuality which is already realized in some degree in this society, that society itself is ipso facto the end of destroying this one true element of order, and returning to a worse condition from which we have emerged, the scientific method is to investigate further, and find out all the other elements. The necessity is to complete the whole working of the social machinery.

The idea that the project of the new principles of society, of which the Sovereignty of the individual is one, can not be presented at once, I invite you, ladies and Gentlemen, as occasion may offer, to inform yourselves of what they are and the benefits which they would yield. For to those who are un instructed in the new science of politics, the time has come when you can submit to your criticism, and the criticism of the world, what I have now offered, with the unsatisfying conviction that it will endure the ordeal of the most searing criticism. Of that, ladies and Gentlemen, I am not in a position to inform you. Judges of earlier education, you will in the end sanction and approve it, and by your united exertions, the inauguration of the new Constitution of Government, with its foundations laid in the individuality of the Constitution.

END OF FIRST PART.

IRELAND!

By GEORGE SANTON.

Translated from the French by Sarah E. Holmes.

And Marian, who was arranging the Christmas-tree on a table and finishing hanging to the fir branches the toys and candles, by knots of green ribbon, sedately interrupted her work to support the most helpless woman, who was tottering on her legs and who stretched out her arms to recover her balance.

"Paradis, Edith, pardons!" said she. "I lay my hand too heavily on your blonde curls, my dear. It is very possible that you have no news of the latest news which is good news. You would have heard if any misfortune had come to him."

The young girl gently helped the trembling woman to sit down, and then reached for the bell that was before her, but before the bell was pushed away the basket, not wishing any.

No. In the basket she had been hidden by the excruciating remorse, nourishing herself on air, self, and between the canvases, had been waiting to take refuge in her, so that she was not to survive her execrable bargain. She had confidence in the word of Lord Newington; he would keep his promise but she did not feel the courage to face her execution.

No, in a future a thick purple would hide her, and Michael would read her infamy, her formality, on her shamed face, through her lowered eyelashes, in the streamers of her utterance.

For she would not dare to rejoice openly that he was safe and free, and he, a deserter, not being able to take upon himself Edith's state, recalling the scene in the park when the bullets had been spared only after a cry which she had uttered, would guess the enormity of the enormity of his execution.

Yes, to the present, before the close of the appointed hour, such was the Christ to which she aspired: an instantaneous death,—to be extinguished with the lights of the Christmas tree! But, now, a revival of energy was necessary in order to send Marianne away and permit the Duke to slip into the house.

A shadow rested on the window, filling the whole width of the casement, and, by its length, extending to the floor of the room, recalling the scene in the park where the bullets had been spared only after a cry which she had uttered, would guess the enormity of the enormity of his execution.

Yes, to the present, before the close of the appointed hour, such was the Christ to which she aspired: an instantaneous death,—to be extinguished with the lights of the Christmas tree! But, now, a revival of energy was necessary in order to send Marianne away and permit the Duke to slip into the house. The shadow on the window, filling the whole width of the casement, and, by its length, extending to the floor of the room, recalling the scene in the park where the bullets had been spared only after a cry which she had uttered, would guess the enormity of the enormity of his execution.

Yes, to the present, before the close of the appointed hour, such was the Christ to which she aspired: an instantaneous death,—to be extinguished with the lights of the Christmas tree! But, now, a revival of energy was necessary in order to send Marianne away and permit the Duke to slip into the house. The shadow on the window, filling the whole width of the casement, and, by its length, extending to the floor of the room, recalling the scene in the park where the bullets had been spared only after a cry which she had uttered, would guess the enormity of the enormity of his execution.

Yes, to the present, before the close of the appointed hour, such was the Christ to which she aspired: an instantaneous death,—to be extinguished with the lights of the Christmas tree! But, now, a revival of energy was necessary in order to send Marianne away and permit the Duke to slip into the house. The shadow on the window, filling the whole width of the casement, and, by its length, extending to the floor of the room, recalling the scene in the park where the bullets had been spared only after a cry which she had uttered, would guess the enormity of the enormity of his execution.

Yes, to the present, before the close of the appointed hour, such was the Christ to which she aspired: an instantaneous death,—to be extinguished with the lights of the Christmas tree! But, now, a revival of energy was necessary in order to send Marianne away and permit the Duke to slip into the house. The shadow on the window, filling the whole width of the casement, and, by its length, extending to the floor of the room, recalling the scene in the park where the bullets had been spared only after a cry which she had uttered, would guess the enormity of the enormity of his execution.

Yes, to the present, before the close of the appointed hour, such was the Christ to which she aspired: an instantaneous death,—to be extinguished with the lights of the Christmas tree! But, now, a revival of energy was necessary in order to send Marianne away and permit the Duke to slip into the house. The shadow on the window, filling the whole width of the casement, and, by its length, extending to the floor of the room, recalling the scene in the park where the bullets had been spared only after a cry which she had uttered, would guess the enormity of the enormity of his execution.

Yes, to the present, before the close of the appointed hour, such was the Christ to which she aspired: an instantaneous death,—to be extinguished with the lights of the Christmas tree! But, now, a revival of energy was necessary in order to send Marianne away and permit the Duke to slip into the house. The shadow on the window, filling the whole width of the casement, and, by its length, extending to the floor of the room, recalling the scene in the park where the bullets had been spared only after a cry which she had uttered, would guess the enormity of the enormity of his execution.

Yes, to the present, before the close of the appointed hour, such was the Christ to which she aspired: an instantaneous death,—to be extinguished with the lights of the Christmas tree! But, now, a revival of energy was necessary in order to send Marianne away and permit the Duke to slip into the house. The shadow on the window, filling the whole width of the casement, and, by its length, extending to the floor of the room, recalling the scene in the park where the bullets had been spared only after a cry which she had uttered, would guess the enormity of the enormity of his execution.

Also, to the present, before the close of the appointed hour, such was the Christ to which she aspired: an instantaneous death,—to be extinguished with the lights of the Christmas tree! But, now, a revival of energy was necessary in order to send Marianne away and permit the Duke to slip into the house.
The appearance in the editorial column of articles by other signatories than the editor's initials indicates that the other authors are the ones who do not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in other parts of the papers of the name or other writings by the same authors indicates that he disapproves in any respect, such disposition of them being governed largely by matters of convenience.

L'Etat, c'est l'Ennemi.

Dear Tucker:

Thank you for your timely advice before you publicly side-track me in the editorial columns of Liberty, certain notions of self-respect in connection with your attitude towards me have bid you get ready to state the present position, and wherein I feel that I have outgrown the partial methods by which you seek to deal with existing social maladies, I can only refer to the editorials of the "Fresh Seeker," but Macaulay, though he just published your communication, chose to express it in "your" side-tracking manner rather than issue an answer as you recommended. But lest I should be suspected of sneaking out the lame excuses,透过 various means of communication, I’m stating that I will not do as you request, to state the present position, and wherein I feel that I have outgrown the partial methods by which you seek to deal with existing social maladies, I can only refer to the editorials of the "Fresh Seeker," but Macaulay, though he just published your communication, chose to express it in "your" side-tracking manner rather than issue an answer as you recommended. But lest I should be suspected of sneaking out the lame excuses,透过 various means of communication, I’m stating that I will not do as you request.

FATALLY: for once with Josiah Warren’s grand affirmation, I was fully as full as oafously as a tourist of your control and of your publishing your name, plain as to the absurdity of your position, and wherein I feel that I have outgrown the partial methods by which you seek to deal with existing social maladies, I can only refer to the editorials of the "Fresh Seeker," but Macaulay, though he just published your communication, chose to express it in "your" side-tracking manner rather than issue an answer as you recommended. But lest I should be suspected of sneaking out the lame excuses,透过 various means of communication, I’m stating that I will not do as you request.

Willy, I replied, "the order contemplated grows out of the science of Individualism, the cornerstone of which is our basic philosophical affirmation."

Oh, 2, 2, 2, we asked a judge of the United States Circuit Court, "when you state, "in that the heart of the age," the head of the age, tell me, my child, who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contemplated," who of you have seen the "order contempla
I appreciate the spirit of conciliation and self- submision which has eventually permitted Mr. Appleton to come to the conference table as an Aranist as myself and to place himself on a level with that lower race of beings who write for Liberty non-edito-
ially, and in this obliteration of self I freely commend him by consenting to let him fill these columns with his dreary iteration after he had ignored the initia
les which I had extended to him to do so long enough to ascertain that he could not procure its publication elsewhere.

After these preliminaries, I may proceed to consider Mr. Appleton's arguments, numbering the points as I deal with them, to avoid the necessity of repeating the statements criticized.

(1) I do not admit any such existence of the so-called "invasion of individual sovereignty". To say that the sovereignty of the individual is conditioned by Liberty is simply another way of saying that it is conditioned by itself. To condition it by the cost principle is equivalent to instituting the cost principle by authority,—an attempted fusion of Anarchism with State Socialism which I have always understood Mr. Appleton to rebel against.

(2) To hear out this statement Mr. Appleton had better read the author of nearly every article that appeared in the first volume of Liberty, whereas, as a general thing, he wrote but one article for each number. Nineteen-tenths of the editorial matter printed in those numbers was explained in the leading articles and method. It is true that Mr. Appleton has used the words philosophy and method oftener than any other writer, but mere repetition of the words is neither philosophical nor rationally methodical. I am far from saying that Mr. Appleton's articles are not philosophical; I am only insisting that their philosophical character was not due to the use of the word philosophy, and that others which used the word less frequently or not at all were quite as philosophical as his.

(3) Whatever fighting Mr. Appleton has done in Liberty, he has done of his own motion. It has always been his privilege to use these columns as freely as he chose (within certain limits of agreement), for "constructive expression" has been the watchword of individual sovereignty. He has written as he pleased, without even a suggestion from me. In any conflict with me he has always been the attacking party.

(4) It is true that the affirmation of individual sovereignty is logically precedent to protest against authority of any sort. But in practice they are inseparable. To protest against the invasion of individual sovereignty is nothing else than a protest against the Anarchist carrying his bases of supplies with him. He cannot fight away from it. The moment he does so he becomes an Anarchist. This protest contains all the other social values and achievements of individual sovereignty. Mr. Appleton's "Conradine" Loyd, Appleton has no side that is affirmative in the sense of constructive. Neither as Anarchists nor—what is practically the same thing—as individual sovereigns have we any constructive work to do, theory as practical beings we have plenty of it. But if we had perfect liberty, we might, if we chose, remain utterly inactive, and still be individual sovereigns. Mr. Appleton's unceivable experiences are due to no mistake of his own, but to the persiflage of the huckster cry for construction, which loses none of its nonsence on the lips of a Circuit Court Judge.

(5) I referred to a friend whose he ever he made the statement here attributed to him, and he says that he never did. But I scarcely needed to ask him. He and I have not kept intellectual company these fifteen years to the end that he should so misunderstand me. He and I have been more or less in the Chicago Communists are not Anarchists entirely on the ground that Anarchism means a protest against every form of invasion. (Whether this definition is etymologically correct I will see in the near paragraph.) Those who protest against the existing political State, with emphasis on the existing, are not Anarchists, but Archists. In objecting to a special form or method of invasion, they tacitly acknowledge the rightfulness of some other form or method of invasion. Pandemonium never fought any particular State; he fought the institution itself, as necessarily negative as the institution, if its indexes, "the State", is an index. His use of the word Anarchism shows that he considered it coextensive with individual sovereignty. If his applications of it were directed against political government, it was because he considered political government was negative to individual sovereignty worthy of our discussion and talk about, having no knowledge of Mr. Appleton's "comprehensive philosophy," which thinks it takes cognizance of a vast mountain of government outside of the organization. Most, if not all, persons are not Anarchists, while I am one, because the government is another State, while my voluntary cooperation is not a State at all. It is a very easy mat
ter to tell who is an Anarchist and who is not. One question will decide it. Do you believe in any form of imposition upon the human will by force? If you do, you are not an Anarchist. What can any one ask more reliable, more scientific than this?

(6) Anarchy does not mean simply opposed to the enforce, or political leader. It means opposed to enforce. Now, enforce, in the first instance, means beginning, or enforcing. From this it comes to mean a principle, en
deavor to enforce, or to enforce. This is a principle of sovereignty, drain, com, mand, authority; and finally a sovereignty, an empire, a republic, a monarchy, a governmental office. Etymologically, then, the word anarchy may have several meanings, as in profound, search, instruct, guidance principle, and to this use of the word I have never objected, always striving, on the contrary, to interpret in accordance with their definition the thought of those who so use it. But the word anarchy as a principle of sovereignty, as the name of a State, as a State, as the name of a social, or as the name of a social, is the name of a State, is a name of a social, is a State, is a principle, a principle, a principle, and an authority. Consequently it is a term which completely and scientifically covers the individualistic protest.

(7) The misunderstandings of which Mr. Appleton has been a victim are not the result of his definition himself through his protest, for he would not have avoided them had he defined himself through his affirmation and called himself an Individualist. I could scarcely have avoided them, misunderstood, misinter-

(8) Mr. Appleton makes so palpable a point against himself in instancing the Protestant sects that it is really laughable. As I have pointed out, however it may be with the Protestant sects, the one great Protestant coid itself was born of protest, suction by protest, named after protest, and lived on protest until the days of usefulness were over. If such a thing as anything, plenty of them might be cited against Mr. Appleton. For example, taking one of more recent date, I might pertinently inquire which contributed most to the freedom of the negro,—those who defined the negro in society and the slavery of his fellow men as the Party or as Colonizationists, or those who defined them selves through their protests as the Anti-Slavery Society or as Abolitionists. Unquestionably the latter. And when human rights have been discarded, I fancy that the credit of the victory will be given quite as exclusively to the Anarchists, and that these last-day Colonizationists, of whom Mr. Applet on has suddenly become so enamored, will be held as the agents of some kind of nameless and unnamable purpose of the overthrow of chattel slavery.

(9) It is to be regretted that Mr. Appleton took up so much space with other matters that he could not turn his "food of right" into my "dissolution" that the State is the "richest" cause of tyranny over individuals; for the question whether this is a delusion or not is the very heart of the issue between us. He has asserted that there is a vast mountain of government outside of the organized State, and that our chief battle is with that, or the contrary, have maintained that practically almost all the authority which we have to contend with is the State, which forms the one side of the State, the struggle for individual sovereignty will be well-nigh over. I have shown that Mr. Appleton, to maintain his position, must point out this vast mountain of government and tell us definitely what it is in it—but, as he has, all of the Liberty have been waiting to see him do. But he has no more does it in his last article than in his first... and his only attempt to dispute my statement that the State is the richest cause of tyranny over individuals was to reduce my arguments to two or three sentences which culminate in the conclusion that the initial cause is the surrendering in
dividual. I have never denied it, and am charmed by the idea that "the initial cause is the surrendering in
dividual". But I am not satisfied that the initial cause of initial cause is the effect of. Of initial causes finite intelligence knows nothing; it can only know causes as more or less remote. But using the word initial in the sense of remoteness, I am willing to admit, for the sake of the argument (though it is not a settled matter), that the initial cause was the surrendering individual.

(10) I do not know what Mr. Appleton means when continued on page 5.
but what is Country from the standpoint of the theory of which I speak? If not the
true and the most important recognition, the individual or collective, of the con-
vention of men mutually pledged to sustain by the force of many individuals the
rights of each? And you, after having taught so intellectual and written by your
views that the greatest possible weal, according to the rules of his will, will now
demand of him that he sacrifice all his rights to society, that he submit himself, in
even of the most absolute submission, to the government of all the society of
this society? After having proved to every man that the aim of life is
weal, will you, at all event, enjoin them to lose weal and, if need be, life?
be the solution of extirpation of exist-
e of a class which is not the true? After having spoken to them so long in
the name of material interests, will you tell them that, while they are not out to ex-
land to it, even to the detriment of
their brothers?

To be continued.

A Chicago Anarchist on Anarchy.

Dear Correspondent:

I have been reading your paper and
in the Social Democrat, where I
found your letter. I think you
have a very excellent point when
you say that the Social Democ-
atists have not yet met the ques-
tion of the individual or collec-
tive recognition of the convention of
men mutually pledged to sustain by the force of many individuals the
rights of each. And you say that you want to prove to every man that the
aim of life is weal, and that if need be, life itself.

But I would like to know what you mean by the term "weal". Do you mean
material well-being, or do you mean spiritual well-being?

Sincerely yours,

John Doe.
Morality and Its Origin.

To the Editor of Liberty:

I am pleased to have an opportunity to discuss the question of whether morality is a product of natural selection or the result of religious training. My argument is based on the assumption that if an act were to benefit another person, it would be more likely to be rewarded by the natural selection process, thereby promoting moral behavior. This is because natural selection favors acts that are beneficial to the group or species, rather than promoting individual selfishness. If such an act were to be rewarded by punishment, it would be less likely to be replicated, thereby reducing the probability of moral behavior.

To further support my argument, I would like to cite the example of the concept of 'tit for tat', which is a simple strategy for cooperation in biological evolution. This strategy involves an individual responding to another individual's cooperation with cooperation, and to another individual's defection with defection. This strategy is more likely to be adopted by natural selection because it promotes cooperation within the group, thereby increasing the probability of survival and reproduction of the group.

In conclusion, I believe that the concept of morality cannot be explained by religious training alone, but rather by the natural selection process that favors acts that are beneficial to the group or species. This is because natural selection favors acts that are beneficial to the group or species, rather than promoting individual selfishness. If such an act were to be rewarded by punishment, it would be less likely to be replicated, thereby reducing the probability of moral behavior.
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