

LUCIFER

THE LIGHT-BEARER.

NEW SERIES, VOL. 5, No. 20.

VALLEY FALLS, KANSAS, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, E. M. 287.

WHOLE No. 211.

LUCIFER--THE LIGHT-BEARER.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY.

TERMS:

One copy, one year, \$1.25
One copy, six months, .65
SPECIMEN COPIES FREE.

All letters should be addressed to LUCIFER, Valley Falls, Kansas.

No communications inserted unless accompanied by the real name of the author. Each writer is alone responsible for the opinions, advice or statements made by him.

Bible Temperance.

THE BIBLE AND THE WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION. AN EXAMINATION

OF THE CLAIM OF MODERN CHRISTIANS THAT THE BIBLE IS A TEMPERANCE WORK. BY E. C. WALKER.

CONTENTS:

Introductory Note; Introduction; List A--Passages Unquestionably Condemning the use of Wine. List B--Passages Commanding or Enjoining the use of Wine or Strong Drink, or both, or including a plentiful supply of Wine among the blessings to be bestowed upon favored individuals or tribes, etc., or including the deprivation of it among the punishments inflicted upon the disobedient. List C--Passages Conditionally Condemning the use of Wine, etc., upon stated occasions, by certain persons upon certain occasions, etc. List D--Passages which incidentally mention the use of Wine and strong drink without either condemning or commending them. List E--Passages showing that Scripture Wine did intoxicate. Conclusion.

"Every honest and patriotic movement in favor of temperance is to be commended, but this unscrupulous stuff called 'Bible Temperance' is unobtainable. I have long felt that this sham ought to be punctured. It has been done at last, and most effectively done by the logical pen of E. C. Walker."
JOHN E. BRAMBURA.

Price, per copy..... \$0.10
Per dozen..... 1.20
Address, WALKER & HARMAN, Valley Falls, Kans.

FOWLER'S PAMPHLETS!

CO-OPERATION, its Laws and Principles, 25 pages of splendid reading matter. Just what is needed to-day. Don't miss it.

THE REORGANIZATION OF BUSINESS. In the Store and the Bank, on the Farm and in the Factory. Practical application of the principles of Co-operation.

PROHIBITION. An unanswerable argument against sumptuary methods in temperance reform.

CORPORATIONS: With Special Reference to Railways and Telegraphs. The difference between Corporations and Co-operation.

CO-OPERATIVE HOMES. Mission of the family; social ethics of marriage; mission of the cooperative home; influence upon maternity; status of children; children's rights; material richness; cost of consumption; division of labor; social economy; sickness; woman's status in the family; mutual considerations; associated homes, etc., etc.

Land Tenure. The government's commercial rents, interest rent, arbitrary legislation, potency of natural methods, colonization, country rents, use of equal liberty--equal right theory, administration, size and character of cities, land tenure the index of civilization, list of land grants.

Price, 7 cents each, the six for 35 cents. Address, WALKER & HARMAN, Valley Falls, Kans.

J. H. SHULER, AT BELAND'S OLD STAND ON BROADWAY.

Has a large stock of Furniture!

For Spring and Fall trade. Full display of the latest in line and hours to attend funerals. Terms as low as the lowest.

E. I. SEFTT, PHYSICIAN AND SURGEON. Valley Falls, Kan.

Dr. Seftt uses "Electric Specific Medicine." Office over Evans & Kemper's store.

"Westrup's Financial Problem," price 15 cts. For sale here.

PRICE SPECTER.

All conviction should be vigilant: Tell thy truth, if truth it be, Never seek to stem the current: Thought, like rivers, find the sea: It will fill the widening circle Of Eternal Verity.

Speak thy thought if thou believe'st it. Let it jostle whom it may, Even though the foolish scorn it, Or the obstinate gallop by: Every seed that grows to-morrow Lies beneath the clod to-day.

If our eyes, the noble-hearted, Producers of things to come, Had like some been weak and thund, Traitors to themselves and dumb, Where would be our present knowledge? Where the hoped-for millennium?

Where would be triumphant Science, Searching with her fearless eyes, Through the infinite creation For the soul that understands-- Soul of beauty, soul of goodness, Wisdom of the earth and skies?

Where would be all great inventions, Each from bygone fancied-born, Issued first in doubt and darkness, Launched mid'way and scorn? How could anything ever light us But for dawning of the morn?

Where would be our fine opinion, Where the right to speak at all, If our eyes, like some mistrustful, Had been deaf to duty's call, And concealed the thoughts within them, Lying down for fear to fall?

Though an honest thought, outspoken, Lead thee into climes or death-- What is life, compared with virtue? Shall thou not survive thy death? Mark! the future sure lies in thy throat! Listen! tremble, what it saith!

It demands thy thought in justice, Debt, not tribute of the liver: Have no eyes any departed, Grounded, and tilled, and hid for thee? If the past have lent thee wisdom, Buy it to futurity.

CHARLES MACKAY.

Why the Workmen Oppose Churches.

Priests teach that labor is a curse pronounced by God on Adam and his posterity for disobedience.

"Cursed is the ground for thy sake, in sorrow shall it eat of it all the days of thy life. Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shall eat the herb of the field. In the sweat of thy face shall thou eat bread until thou return unto the ground." Gen., chap. 3, verses 17 to 19.

The same chapter declares that God said "man shall rule over woman."

This mythological story has been used and still is, as a command from God to degrade labor--one of the most ennobling pursuits and to enslave woman.

In the childhood of the race men sacrificed themselves and children to please their supposed gods, and widows burned themselves.

Many poor over-taxed men and women still deprive themselves of needful comforts to maintain priests to preach such degrading accounts and call them the word of God.

As labor becomes more intelligent it sees that such benightedness is the enemy of both man and woman and will have none of it.--(J. P. Lewis, in Columbia.

Now You Can "Recuperate."

I say, Messrs. Harman and Walker, editors of LUCIFER, I wish you wouldn't make absolutely every number of your paper so good and true and live and keen and consistent, radical. You are making it unaccountably hard for me to keep up with the profession. Before you came into the field, it was the easiest thing in the world to publish the best paper in the world, and I knew well enough that I was doing it, and was a very complacent and contented man. But, since your advent, you have kept me in a state of perpetual doubt and anxiety. Let Liberty's light be dimmed by LUCIFER'S "In mercy's name, let up a little, and give a tolling torch-bearer an occasional chance to recuperate." B. R. Tucker, Liberty, Nov. 22, '84.

Well, you ought to have "recuperated" by this time, for we "let up" last September (so you say) and have been letting up ever since. And yet the longed-for "let up" does not seem to have brought you the recuperation you hoped it would. else why keep "pitching into" us?

But, seriously, my Mentor, I think we both have more necessary and important work to do than splitting either Autonomistic, Anarchistic or "legal" hairs with each other. I consider that my action was justifiable, you do not; as we cannot agree let us go to work. W.

The Children of Monopoly.

Have the rich and contented classes yet considered the mighty power which advancing civilization has lodged in the hands of the tramp? Probably a single match, begged at a farmer's door, may have lighted the fire that sent so many to destruction. A railroad spike wired to the rail with point toward a coming train may easily escape the vigilance of an engineer and hurl hundreds to their death. A hundred forces are at his command with which to work destruction, and the worst of all is that the throat of that law has no terrors for those who value not life. Upon such, repressive measures can have little more effect than to goad them to more hideous and destructive crimes. We must look elsewhere for our remedies.

There exist in every city, wandering aimless along our highways, a class of beings, both woman and men, who, if they have ever tasted the joys of a happy life, have long since been crowded out and the door has been shut against them forever. They exist merely--they do not live. Life to these people has no joys, death no terrors. Setting no value upon their own lives, yet feeling that somehow they are the victims of a social wrong, they resort to crime as a source of profit, a pastime, a revenge. The social pressure under which we live is making them by the thousands. They are trying to get from farm, and mine, and factory, and they threaten with a surer destruction the institutions of our country than could the navies of the world.--Omaha Truth.

The Constitutional Celebration.

Last week the Senior Editor showed conclusively that most of our great nationalities have grown from the germs planted in the Constitution by the compromising majority of the Convention which framed that document. In the article below, Eugene McDonald, editor of the "Truth Seeker," has demonstrated that the good parts of the Constitution have been evaded, nullified and trampled by the politicians and priests of the present age. The Constitution was adopted as a compromise between good and evil, between liberty and invasion, and, as is the case in all such compromises, the good has been lost, the evil lives to torture and slay generations whose number no man may rightly guess.

The articles of Mr. Harman and Mr. McDonald complement each other and furnish, upon the whole, a very timely and just criticism of the Constitution, the Convention which created it, the fruits it has borne, and its proposed centennial celebration. W.]

If we rovere an authority, we are apt to obey its commands, for sincere regard is best shown by works and not by lip service. The Constitution of the United States is held up for an idol, framed for show, pictured as "divine"--and then, like many another precious thing, put away in memory's attic and forgotten. There is not a politician in the country--and the politicians are unfortunately our law-makers--who cares a straw for the Constitution. He never thinks of it; our executive officers forget its existence, and our judges twist it into unmeaning shape when some rash litigant appeals to its provisions. The Constitution is violated at every session of Congress, broken by every state legislature in the country, by almost every municipality and town government.

Our statistics books contain thousands of laws controverting the Constitution in spirit and in letter. The Christian church is, perhaps, its most deadly foe. For the benefit of our pious citizens hundreds of laws have been enacted, every one of which is unconstitutional. Chaplains in the army; chaplains in the navy; Indians given over body and soul to sects; money appropriated for religious purposes; persecutions inaugurated at the instance of the church; religious rites on all public occasions--these, and dozens of other violations, occur annually, done by Congress, of all powers the one that should be the most jealous of our Great Charter. In the

states, matters are worse. Every one of the Demands of Liberalism is a demand for the restoration of Constitutional government, departed from at the solicitation of some begging religious sect. Secular corporations, too, smash the Constitution into verbal splinters, and the courts help them to loquacious decisions of great length and ingenuity. If one of the framers of the Constitution could return to the United States to-day, the first question he would ask is, "When was the Constitution thrown overboard?" Blasphemy prosecutions occurring under a charter guaranteeing free speech; heretics deprived of civil rights in a land where all men are said to be equal; the state treasury robbed in the name of religion, though the Constitution forbids the establishment of religion; churches control its politics, though church and state are supposed to be separate institutions--all these would surprise the reconstructed framer of a Constitution which forbids them, and indicate that the document which he considered impregnable had gone to ruin and decay. It certainly cannot be said to be revered with a very affectionate regard, though it has been and is undoubtedly "tested by danger and adversity."

When the cohorts and the hosts meet in Philadelphia next month, they will probably carry out the programme of turning their eyes to the skies and saying to the air that they are thankful for the blessings which his "Divine Providence" has so kindly vouchsafed. This, also, will be a work of national hypocrisy. There never was so much suffering in this country as now, and if his "Divine Providence" is really conducting the affairs of this planet, his efforts are not exactly blessings. Men are dying of want, and women doing worse, because of poverty; children by hundreds are giving up their little lives ere they are well begun. Heartless oppression is slowly murdering thousands of laborers in mines and factories, and "society" is afraid of a French Revolution on American soil. Injustice is about as common as justice, and a man who lives honestly, deals righteously, and helps his fellows, is pointed out as a phenomenon. This does not look as though "Divine Providence" is distributing blessings with any too lavish hand. The Constitutional Centennial commission would do infinitely more good if it should address itself to the revival of a regard for the spirit and letter of our great charter instead of conducting an extravagant pageant in which the orators will be robbed and emceed and hypocrites, and the audience self-satisfied patriots fabled to be told how great they have become. There is, of course, a good deal of personal liberty yet left in this country, but it is mostly the liberty to starve "in the sphere in which God has placed you."

The Widow.

Expressions that were introduced into a language and generally accepted when a certain condition of morals or manners rendered them true, are retained when the condition of affairs to which they formerly applied has altogether changed. This is especially true of those expressions that pertain to the former degraded position of women. Among these terms is the distasteful one which yet remains in common acceptance, "his widow." The word husband and wife have sacred, tender associations to those who are bound by the ties of love in faithful union. My husband or my wife does not suggest an offensive ownership, and there is equality in it.

When a man dies his wife is called by the language of the law, and by all who have not positive objections to the expression, "his widow." On the other hand, when a woman dies no one ever hears of her widower. There is no good reason why the term should be used in one case rather than in the other. If but serves as a reminder of the days when a man held absolute rule over his wife; of the time when she was virtually his while they both lived, and after he passed into the realm of shadows he still clenched his ghostly fingers in a firm

grip of ownership, which is only relinquished in case a transfer is made by a male relative of the woman to a more substantial individual who is yet in the flesh; given away, as the church puts it; for according to the marriage service of this institution a woman must exchange hands in form of gift from one man to another. In early times it was not always a gift, but a price was required by the legal owner as in exchange of property of any other kind.

I know clergymen even in this day of enlightenment who decline to perform the Episcopal marriage service when requested to omit that portion of it, or those other objectionable words which require a woman to serve and obey. To love and honor is all a woman can promise and retain her dignity and independence, and she certainly owes no thanks to a church which holds to a service which degrades her to a position of serfitude. The moral influence of such a service is unqualifiedly bad, and when the Episcopal church starts out to revise its prayer-book, the marriage service should be stripped of its barbarisms as unworthy of the day and generation.

The expression "his widow" came from the time when woman had, no resort for support save marriage; no chance for position unless it came through her husband; no opportunity to make her place in the world, except as his wife or his widow. To the times when woman could never be in the nominative case, but always in the possessive referring to a masculine proper noun.

When a married woman dies, the announcement is made somewhat as follows:

Died, Mary J., wife of James Andrews. Sometimes she has the good fortune to die in her residence or her home, or the homestead, but occasionally, even now, she, poor, penniless, homeless creature, dies at the residence of her husband's better, to be sure, than the infirmity, but yet not enough her own to be called hers. There is no word said about leaving a widow. She often has a husband, leaves a husband, but should James Andrews die first, it would be mentioned that he left not a wife but a widow. Now why should widow be used in one case more than widower in the other? And why should a woman who is bereaved of her husband be constantly reminded of it by being called his widow or still worse, Widow Andrews? This ownership does not come with her life, but on her tombstone will be placed an inscription similar to that prepared by the famous "Widow's Head" and the "late relict of Hesketh" is fortunate if she does not sleep in a row of "family wives," all owned by the same man. The number of these one sees in passing through a cemetery suggests that the idea of possession has not yet been relegated to the barbarians of early history. The cultivated classes of people, however, are commencing to avoid this senseless way of marking the last resting-places of women, and give them the individuality of their own names, indicating that the were of sufficient importance to be remembered for what they were themselves and not because they were the wives of men. The man has his name without mentioning whether he was a husband or widower; although he may have been tenderly loved by a devoted wife, it is not in good taste to state the fact upon his tombstone.

May the day soon come when wife and widow-stones shall disappear from our places of burial, and his "widow" become an obsolete expression.--(C. McEverhart, in Open Court.

Give Them a Chance.

That is to say, your lungs. Also all your breathing machinery. Very wonderful machinery it is. Not only the larger air-passages, but the thousands of little tubes and capillaries leading from them. When these are clogged and choked with matter which ought not to be there, your lungs cannot do half their work. And what they do, they cannot do well. (Call it cold, cough, croup, pneumonia, catarrh, consumption or any of the family of throat and nose and head and lung obstructions, all are bad. All ought to be got rid of. There is just one way to get rid of them. That is to take Koecher's German Strip which any druggist will sell you for 75 cents a bottle. Even if every thing else has failed you, you may depend upon this for certain

OUR PLATFORM.

Perfect Freedom of Thought and Action for every individual within the limits of his own personality.

Self-Government the only true Government
Liberty and Responsibility the only Basis of Morality.

We date from the First of January, 1601. This era is called the Era of Man, (E. M.), to distinguish it from the theological epoch that preceded it. In that epoch the earth was supposed to be flat, the sun was its attendant light revolving about it. Above was Heaven where God ruled supreme over all potentates and powers; on earth ruled the Pope as the vicegerent of God; below was the kingdom of the Devil, Hell. So taught the Bible. Then came the New Astronomy, the astronomy of Copernicus, Galileo and Bruno. It demonstrated that the earth is a globe revolving about the sun; that the stars are worlds and suns; that there is no "up" and "down" in space. Vanished the old heaven, vanished the old hell; the earth became the home of man. Bruno sealed his devotion to the new truth with his life on the 17th day of February, 1600. During the 17th century Grotius wrote the first work upon international law. This was the herald of the Arbitration which is to supplant war in the settlement of national differences.

Carlyle says: "Tell me what a man thinks of this universe, and I will tell you what his religion is." When the modern Cosmogony came, the Bible and the Church, as infallible Oracles, had to go, for they had taught that regarding the universe which was now shown to be untrue in almost every particular. So we take the beginning of the 17th century as an appropriate and a convenient starting point from which to date the Era of Man.

ANARCHISM VS. GOSPID.

My opinion is that it is un-Anarchistic to make public private affairs, which are the concern of the parties immediately interested, only, unless these parties are themselves willing that such publication shall be made; and this entirely independent of any alleged harmony or inharmony between the actions stated or charged and the views held by said parties. The essence of Anarchism, Autonomy, is that nothing shall be done to or for the invading individual without his or her consent. The supposed moral or immoral quality of the individual's personal relations does not come within the scope of any inquiry that may be made, so long as he or she has not trespassed upon the rights of others. The fact, if fact it be, that a certain person's private life is in harmony with his public teaching does not warrant any one in divulging or giving a hint of its details without his previously-obtained consent. The only possible open question, then, is whether Mr. Tucker had invaded us to an extent that would have justified such statements regarding his personal affairs. I confess that I do not think that he had, and this with no abatement of my sense of wrong caused by the position he took concerning our action one year ago. W.

This is the beginning of the season of fairs, and we have lately received several pleasantly suggestive reminders of the fact.

The first is a complimentary ticket to the Ninth Annual Fair of the Inter-State Exposition at St. Joseph, Mo. The Exposition opens Sept. 12 and continues one week. Chas. F. Ernst, Secretary.

The St. Louis Autumnal Festivities commence with the Fourth Annual Exposition, Sept. 7th, and extend over forty days, including the G. A. R. Reunion, the Pageant of the Veiled Prophet, etc., etc. Thanks to the Secretary, J. H. Johnston, for proffered courtesies.

The Fifth Annual Ks. State Fair will be held at Topeka, Sept. 19th to 24th. Unusual attractions and complete success are confidently anticipated. Chet. Thomas, Jr., is secretary, to whom thanks for complimentary.

Children's lessons are short talks about the stars, monkeys, fishes, water, stones, leaves, nerves, frogs, cows, dolls, grass, etc. Concerning these and similar subjects she has succeeded in imparting much knowledge in a form most likely to hold the interest and deeply impress the minds of children.—Health Monthly.

I insured in the Kansas Home Company of Topeka, July 27. On Aug. 1 I met with loss by storm. Aug. 19 I was paid in full to my satisfaction.

Wm. Ainsworth.

THE APPROACHING TRIAL.

In a little more than a month from this time we must appear before the United States Court at Leavenworth to answer to the charge of having circulated "obscene" literature through the mails. The offending matter is supposed to be a letter from W. G. Markland which appeared in LUCIFER of June 18th, '96, and which detailed in plain but necessary and chaste words a most heinous outrage perpetrated by a husband upon his wife. The subject is one familiar to most of our readers and we need not here go into further particulars.

Suffice it to say, that every consideration of justice, liberty and the sacredness of womanhood justified us in publishing the communication, and should strongly impel all friends of civic rights, of Free Press and Inviolable Mail, and of all women's immunity from rape, to stand by us in this defensive struggle for our liberty and the possession of our hard earnings.

Since our last appearance at Topeka we have passed through the two largest months of the year for publishers, and now we are the shortest of funds when money is most imperatively needed to defray the expenses of the coming trial. The necessity is urgent, and we do not think that anything more is required at the present time than the above plain statement of facts to induce our delinquent subscribers to pay up. They have received the paper and the pay thereof is justly due us; we need it and trust that they will understand the situation and do their part.

We hope that our agents and all others who can, will secure new subscribers for LUCIFER and thus help us enlighten the people upon the mighty issues of the present. And if there are any who feel able to contribute something to our Defense Fund we shall be very glad of such assistance and shall continue to strive to make LUCIFER still more worthy of their respect and support.

Comrades! These, in brief, are the facts of the situation, these are our needs. Will you assist us to uncoil from about us the unaccountable Constockian persecution or will you leave us to escape or be crushed as the chances of the unequal war shall decide?

"LIBERTY"

As will be seen by reading the closing paragraph of the short article on first page, entitled, "Now You Can Reciprocate," the Junior formally takes leave of the controversy between the editor of *Liberty* and ourselves. Inasmuch as it seems quite impossible for us to make our Boston contemporary see the matter in controversy as we see it, this determination or decision of the Junior is doubtless the proper one to make. And while acquiescing in this decision I ask the forbearance of our readers while I make a short statement in reply to some of the later shots from *Liberty's* batteries. This I do mainly because I feel sure that my continued silence would be misunderstood and misconstrued.

First, then, I wish to say, in a general way, that while this controversy has at times assumed the appearance of a personal *recontre*, it has never been such by my choosing. I have always regarded B. R. Tucker, and still regard him, as a very able and very conscientious advocate and defender of truth as he sees it. Of all the reform writers of the present day there are none who, in our opinion, excel him in clearness and vigor of thought nor in the accuracy and force with which he presents that thought. Let his premises be once conceded and there is but little chance to evade or refute his conclusions. And just here, if we may be allowed to express an opinion, is where the arguments of Mr. Tucker are sometimes defective—deplorably, fatally defective, viz: his premises. He perceives some of the basic truths pertaining to discussions, with exceeding clearness, then he becomes so completely absorbed in their contemplation that he neglects and even refuses to examine others equally important. Like the blind man that "went out to see (?) the elephant" he catches hold of the animal's ivory tusk—he grasps it with all his muscular force, he finds it hard and pointed, and therefore he is prepared to demonstrate, in the most logical manner, to all comers that the elephant is "very like a spear!" To change the metaphor, Mr. Tucker seems often to forget that truth is *prismatic*—that it is more than pentagonal or hexagonal in form. Before speaking dogmatically as to "what is truth," we ought

to be very sure that we have looked at the matter in question from every possible standpoint, and even then it would be well to make some allowances for possible defects in our organs of perception, or for possible defects in the media that connect those organs with the things perceived.

It is this neglect to view and carefully consider the multitudinous facets, phases or aspects of truth that causes many true and good men to be insufferable egotists. Most if not all young philosophers and humanitarians are or have been thus addicted and afflicted. In his youth Benjamin Franklin, as he himself acknowledged, was much addicted to this intellectual vice; in his maturer and wiser years, as he tells us, instead of demolishing his opponent with the favorite weapon of his younger days, the syllogism, he was accustomed to content himself with saying, "Such and such seems to be the truth of the matter, so far as I can now see the facts and the arguments."

That another young Benjamin (also of Boston) is now afflicted much in the same way as was America's most distinguished philosopher we have had abundant evidence in the pages of *Liberty*, within the past twelve months. Instance, when criticizing an article from the pen of "Cornelius" he says in *Liberty* of April 23, '97:

"This is a specimen of the rot with which 'Lucifer's' columns have been riddled ever since I riddled the absurd position of E. C. Walker and his wife with arguments that have received the approval of nearly every prominent Anarchist."

In the same he says that for "pure idiocy" the paragraph quoted from "Cornelius," "distances all competitors."

Now it so happens that a good many readers and thinkers who have read the articles, pro and con, on this autonomy marriage question, do not think that B. R. Tucker "riddled" the position of E. C. Walker and Lillian Harman; and the number of "prominent Anarchists" who unreservedly endorsed Benjamin's "arguments" can probably be counted on his fingers. It so happens also that Cornelius, whose production is ranked as pure idiocy, is a writer and publisher who has gained a celebrity second to but few for the ability and heroism with which he has fought the popular despotism of the day.

Many similar quotations, did space allow, could be given to show that our modern Benjamin has not yet passed that critical period in life that divides the dogmatic egotism of youth from the modest wisdom of maturer years.

And now a few words in regard to matters more personal to myself:

1st. As is well known to our readers, LUCIFER has a very "free platform," from or upon which our correspondents are allowed to have their say in their own way; provided, always, that the conductors of that platform are satisfied that the speaker has something to say that is worth the labor and the expense that, to give such opportunity of utterance, must be borne by the said conductors; and provided, also, that the speaker does not invade individual rights by utterances that would unnecessarily uncover or reveal private and personal affairs. Some months ago, in order to give point and illustration to her argument, one of our correspondents stated, in substance, that Mr. Tucker practiced as he preached in regard to what is right and proper in the sex-relations of men and women. On reading the manuscript copy we saw nothing objectionable therein; and in publishing the letter of Mrs. Hurren we treated Mr. Tucker precisely as we should expect to be treated in turn. No particulars were given and no names mentioned except his own. Mr. Tucker has more than once referred to the publication of this letter as "modest gossip about my [his] private affairs." In *Liberty* of June 18, he says:

But the senior editor, Mr. Harman, aggravates the offense by defending it. Anyven the Junior editor reads impulse and feeling in behalf of the writer. This is a foreign consideration. The article in question is a private letter to be a person much to be contemptible for notice. My grievance is against the editor, whom I once thought of as a man who would not allow his impulse to betray him into indecency. Whatever he may do hereafter, I should be foolish to complain, for I know now what to expect.

Here I am accused of "indecency" because I published a letter stating that B. R. Tucker is a consistent Anarchist, from his standpoint. If there be indecency in this it must be because to accuse a man of practical Anarchism is indecency, for there was absolutely nothing in the wording of that letter to which the most prudish could object. It would now seem that the English vocabulary must be reconstructed and a new definition given to the word "indecency!"

In all seriousness, however, we will add just this: If Mr. Tucker's Anarchism is such a tender exotic that it cannot bear the sun and wind of open-air discussion—if the argumentum ad hominem (argument to the man) must be ruled out for fear somebody's toes will be trampled upon, then we want no such type of Anarchism in our work. It is too sickly a plant to flourish in American soil.

Before introducing another quotation from *Liberty* I wish to say that while attempting to show the errors into which our contemporary has fallen we by no means claim perfection for ourselves. In one instance, at least, we can now see that exact justice was not done by us towards Mr. Tucker, and it is but due to him to say that the explanation should have been made public at an earlier date. Briefly stated it is this:

Last fall, after the Jefferson County Inquisition had put its gag law in force, denying the prisoners the privilege of writing to LUCIFER or any other paper, some criticisms from Edwin's pen occasionally ran the blockade and were printed as editorial in LUCIFER's columns. Among these criticisms was one charging Mr. Tucker with suppressing important facts communicated to him by Lillian. An explanation had been sent to me by Mr. Tucker, and this knowledge should have prevented the appearance of Edwin's criticisms. But the mischief was done and the explanation could not be made, except privately, until after the release of the prisoners. That the error was not publicly corrected before this late date is to be regretted, and I hereby take the blame of the neglect to myself.

Having made this just, though late, amend, we propose briefly to notice the charges of "unfairness" made in *Liberty* of May 7th.

Mr. Tucker, says:

From the beginning up to the present it has never presented to its readers the grounds of my criticism. On the contrary, it has printed attack after attack upon me from correspondents who, if they had any acquaintance with my position (of which they generally gave no evidence), did not gain it through reading "Lucifer."

In our issue of May 20, the entire editorial, from which this quotation is clipped, is reproduced and the main points answered by the Junior; it only remains for me now to state a few facts that are better known to me than to any one else:

1st. *Our columns have always been open to Mr. Tucker and all his friends.*

2nd. Although Mr. T. has not asked to be heard in LUCIFER's columns his friends have frequently had their say in their own way. Messrs. Xarros, Warren, Lloyd, and others have had long communications in our paper, and only in one instance was there complaint of delay in the appearance of these articles, and in that case the delay was the result of accident and oversight rather than of design.

But while our columns have always been at the service of Mr. Tucker and his friends, how stands the record on the other side? Last winter I sent to *Liberty* a short communication and also a short article clipped from LUCIFER, written by Lillian. Our object in these was to show to the readers of *Liberty*, in an *impersonal* and non-controversial way our attitude towards our tormentors. These communications were declined, and, after a time returned, with the reasons therefor. This correspondence is printed in full in LUCIFER of Feb. 21. Mr. Tucker closes thus:

"I must refuse to allow my name to be used for propaganda of which I disapprove."

Again, in April last, just after their release from prison, Edwin and Lillian sent a communication, asking Mr. Tucker to allow them to present their reasons, in their own way, for paying costs and leaving the Jefferson County Jail. Mr. Tucker replied in the editorial reproduced by us in LUCIFER, May 20, prefacing his remarks with:

"I am in receipt of a communication from E. C. Walker and his wife, which it is not my purpose to print."

One of our chief causes of complaint against such journals as the Kansas City Times, and the Valley Falls New Era, is that their habit is to comment adversely upon our articles but never allow their readers to see what it is that we really do say. Now, where is the difference between the treatment received by us from these so-called Christian editors and that received by us, within the past six months, from the so-called "Anarchist" editor of *Liberty*?

And now in closing this long article we will just say that although tempted to do so we shall not apply to Mr. Tucker

the remarks of one of his oldest and hitherto most faithful friends, John F. Kelley, of New York, who, in last *Liberty*, closes a communication to him in these words:

"Of course, with your present philosophy, there is no reason you should not misrepresent when you find it to your advantage to do so."

Neither will we apply to him (Mr. T.) the words he so unjustly used in reference to us, when he said, "Whatever he may do hereafter I should be foolish to complain for I know now what to expect." Notwithstanding the prospect at present seems discouraging enough, we adhere to the view expressed in the beginning of this article, that our Boston contemporary is a conscientious as well as very able exponent of truth as he sees it; that his faults are the faults of youth, and that while age does not always bring wisdom there is good ground to hope that the eminent example of Benjamin the First, of philosophic fame, will not be lost on Benjamin the Second.

TEMPERANCE AND PROHIBITION.

From a private letter recently received from a valued friend and earnest co-worker I quote this paragraph:

I was brought to total abstinence, reared every day in Temperance principles—and my faith in its educational value, instead of its prohibitory measures—but so far as I should feel called upon to forward temperance work, I should press upon thought WHAT temperance is—what you do excellently and the beneficial advantages of temperance in life, rather than mere denunciation of Prohibition, so long as it is held and advocated that it is a means to safety on the weaker side of the question—along the Promiscuous side of the question must hold a space in the work of delivering humanity from the thrill of alcohol as a stimulant. Were it held to be an UNLAWFUL traffic, the more effective education could proceed. It seems a pity to me to spend time fighting the method of prohibition, while the legally-protected traffic is constantly assailing the weaker side of so many human beings. I should, and do, as far as I can, work for the advance of people in living temperance—but, I cannot set myself against those who think that to cut down the traffic is the best way.

To me it seems that my correspondent does not at all sense the principle involved and that she looks at this question at issue from the wrong point of view. *The Right of untrammelled Growth* is the heart and soul and essence of every upward striving of Humanity. That is, LIBERTY. So long as it is held that prohibition is right, so long will insistence upon the right and necessity of personal initiative and mutual choice be the first duty of every lover of his kind. So long as prohibition is advocated by a considerable number of people, so long will real temperance work remain undone. This prohibition crusade has set back the temperance cause for at least fifty years. There are tens of thousands of genuine temperance men and women who to-day are practically shut out from all associative labors in behalf of that cause. They are scattered all over the country, and, search as they will, they can find only a very few if any congenial minds within the circle of their acquaintances. All the organizations are committed to the odious principle of prohibition, and the nauseating odor of Pecksniffian piety is everywhere. We know the great importance of temperance in all things, but we also know that temperance does not come from without, that it is not forced upon the individual by a superior physical power, and we keenly realize that our work is no longer that of special temperance teachers; we know that we can best inculcate the lessons of sobriety by making men and women vigilant in guarding their rights and persons against invasion. The virtues of the slave are only negative ones, at the very best.

It is useless to attempt to "press upon thought what temperance is," so long as the mind of our pupil is in a state of rebellion against us, and it will be in rebellion so long as we stand over him with the club of prohibition authoritatively telling him that he must believe our definition the true one and must act in accordance therewith.

What is right (righteous) is one thing; what a man has a natural and should have a civic right to do, may often be quite another. It is not right that a man should overwork himself; his natural and civic right so to do is good against all claims of his neighbors to the contrary. As it injures my system, it is not right for me to eat pork; but if I should disregard Nature's warning and partake of this article of diet, would my fair correspondent claim the right to forbid me so to do? If not, she must admit that the State has not the right to do it, for what one person has not the right to do no aggregate of persons has.

We must never lose sight of the vital distinction between what is morally right and the civic rights of the individual. So my questioner will readily perceive that she is in error when she metamorphoses the issue as to the civic right to buy, sell and use alcohol, into a question of moral right (righteousness). We are told that if the sale of in-

OUR PLATFORM.

Perfect Freedom of Thought and Action for every individual within the limits of his own personality.

Self-Government the only true Government Liberty and Responsibility the only Basis of Morality.

We date from the First of January, 1601. This era is called the Era of Man, (E. M.), to distinguish it from the theological epoch that preceded it. In that epoch the earth was supposed to be flat, the sun was its attendant light revolving about it. Above was Heaven where God ruled supreme over all potates and powers; on earth ruled the Pope as the viceroy of God; below was the kingdom of the Devil, Hell. So taught the Bible. Then came the New Astronomy, the astronomy of Copernicus, Galileo and Bruno. It demonstrated that the earth is a globe revolving about the sun; that the stars are worlds and suns; that there is no "up" and "down" in space. Vanished the old heaven, vanished the old hell; the earth became the home of man. Bruno sealed his devotion to the new truth with his life on the 17th day of February, 1600. During the 17th century Grotius wrote the first work upon international law. This was the herald of the Arbitration which is to supplant war in the settlement of national differences.

Carlyle says: "Tell me what a man thinks of this universe, and I will tell you what his religion is." When the modern Cosmogony came, the Bible and the Church, as Infallible Oracles, had to go, for they had taught that regarding the universe which was now shown to be untrue in almost every particular. So we take the beginning of the 17th century as an appropriate and a convenient starting point from which to date the Era of Man.

ANARCHISM VS. GOSPID.

My opinion is that it is un-Anarchistic to make public private affairs, which are the concern of the parties immediately interested, only, unless these parties are themselves willing that such publication shall be made; and this entirely independent of any alleged harmony or inharmonicity between the actions stated or charged and the views held by said parties. The essence of Anarchism, Autonomy, is that nothing shall be done to or for the invading individual without his or her consent. The supposed moral or immoral quality of the individual's personal relations does not come within the scope of any inquiry that may be made, so long as he or she has not trespassed upon the rights of others. The fact, if fact it be, that a certain person's private life is in harmony with his public teaching does not warrant any one in divulging or giving a hint of its details without his previously-obtained consent. The only possible open question, then, is whether Mr. Tucker had invaded us to an extent that would have justified such statements regarding his personal affairs. I confess that I do not think that he had, and this with no abatement of my sense of wrong caused by the position he took concerning our action one year ago.

This is the beginning of the season of fairs, and we have lately received several pleasantly suggestive reminders of the fact.

The first is a complimentary ticket to the Ninth Annual Fair of the Inter-State Exposition at St. Joseph, Mo. The Exposition opens Sept. 12 and continues one week. Chas. F. Ernst, Secretary.

The St. Louis Autumnal Festivities commence with the Fourth Annual Exposition, Sept. 7th, and extend over forty days, including the G. A. R. Reunion, the Pageant of the Veiled Prophet, etc., etc. Thanks to the Secretary, J. H. Johnston, for proffered courtesies.

The Fifth Annual Kans. State Fair will be held at Topeka, Sept. 19th to 24th. Unusual attractions and complete success are confidently anticipated. Chet. Thomas, Jr., is secretary, to whom thanks for complimentary.

Children's lessons are short talks about the stars, monkeys, fishes, water, stones, leaves, nerves, frogs, cows, dolls, grass, etc. Concerning these and similar subjects she has succeeded in imparting much knowledge in a form most likely to hold the interest and deeply impress the minds of children.—Health Monthly.

I insured in the Kansas Home Company of Topeka, July 27. On Aug. 4, I met with loss by storm. Aug. 19 I was paid in full to my satisfaction.

Wm. A. M. STEAM.

T. P. Farley, Agt.

8-19-87

THE APPROACHING TRIAL.

In a little more than a month from this time we must appear before the United States Court at Leavenworth to answer to the charge of having circulated "obscene" literature through the mails. The offending matter is supposed to be a letter from W. G. Markland which appeared in LUCIFER of June 18th, '86, and which detailed in plain but necessary and chaste words a most heinous outrage perpetrated by a husband upon his wife. The subject is one familiar to most of our readers and we need not here go into further particulars.

Suffice it to say, that every consideration of justice, liberty and the sacredness of womanhood justified us in publishing the communication, and should strongly impel all friends of civic rights, of Free Press and Inviolable Mail, and of all women's immunity from rape, to stand by us in this defensive struggle for our liberty and the possession of our hard earnings.

Since our last appearance at Topeka we have passed through the two *dryest* months of the year for publishers, and now we are the shortest of funds when money is most imperatively needed to defray the expenses of the coming trial. The necessity is urgent, and we do not think that anything more is required at the present time than the above plain statement of facts to induce our delinquent subscribers to pay up. They have received the paper and the pay therefor is justly due us; we need it and trust that they will understand the situation and do their part.

We hope that our agents and all others who can, will secure new subscribers for LUCIFER and thus help us enlighten the people upon the mighty issues of the present. And if there are any who feel able to contribute something to our Defense Fund we shall be very glad of such assistance and shall continue to strive to make LUCIFER still more worthy of their respect and support.

Comrades! These, in brief, are the facts of the situation, these are our needs. Will you assist us to uncoil from about us the unaccounted of Comstockian persecution or will you leave us to escape or be crushed as the chances of the unequal war shall decide?

"LIBERTY"

As will be seen by reading the closing paragraph of the short article on first page, entitled, "Now You Can Re-occupate," the Junior formally takes leave of the controversy between the editor of Liberty and ourselves. Inasmuch as it seems quite impossible for us to make our Boston contemporary see the matter in controversy as we see it, this determination or decision of the Junior is doubtless the proper one to make. And while acquiescing in this decision I ask the forbearance of our readers while I make a short statement in reply to some of the later shots from Liberty's batteries. This I do mainly because I feel sure that my continued silence would be misunderstood and misconstrued.

First, then, I wish to say, in a general way, that while this controversy has at times assumed the appearance of a personal *recontre*, it has never been such by my choosing. I have always regarded B. R. Tucker, and still regard him, as a very able and very conscientious advocate and defender of truth as he sees it. Of all the reform writers of the present day there are none who, in our opinion, excel him in clearness and vigor of thought nor in the accuracy and force with which he presents that thought. Let his premises be once conceded and there is but little chance to evade or refute his conclusions. And just here, if we may be allowed to express an opinion, is where the arguments of Mr. Tucker are sometimes defective—doubtably, fatally defective, viz: his premises. He perceives some of the basic truths pertaining to discussions, with exceeding clearness, then he becomes so completely absorbed in their contemplation that he neglects and even refuses to examine others equally important. Like the blind man that "went out to see (?) the elephant" he catches hold of the animal's ivory tusk—he grasps it with all his muscular force, he finds it hard and pointed, and therefore he is prepared to demonstrate, in the most logical manner, to all comers that the elephant is "very like a spear!" To change the metaphor, Mr. Tucker seems often to forget that truth is *prismatic*—that it is more than pentagonal or hexagonal in form. Before speaking dogmatically as to "what is truth," we ought

to be very sure that we have looked at the matter in question from every possible standpoint, and even then it would be well to make some allowances for possible defects in our organs of perception, or for possible defects in the media that connect those organs with the things perceived.

It is this neglect to view and carefully consider the multitudinous facets, phases or aspects of truth that causes many true and good men to be insufferable egotists. Most if not all *young* philosophers and humanitarians are or have been thus addicted and afflicted. In his youth Benjamin Franklin, as he himself acknowledged, was much addicted to this intellectual vice; in his maturer and wiser years, as he tells us, instead of demolishing his opponent with the favorite weapon of his younger days, the syllogism, he was accustomed to content himself with saying, "Such and such seems to be the truth of the matter, so far as I can now see the facts and the arguments."

That another young Benjamin (also of Boston) is now afflicted much in the same way as was America's most distinguished philosopher we have had abundant evidence in the pages of Liberty, within the past twelve months. Instance, when criticising an article from the pen of "Cornelius" he says in Liberty of April 23, '87:

"This is a specimen of the rot with which 'Lucifer's' columns have been riddled ever since I ridged the absurd position of E. C. Walker and his wife with arguments that have received the approval of nearly every prominent Anarchist."

In the same he says that for "pure idiocy" the paragraph quoted from "Cornelius," "distances all competitors."

Now it so happens that a good many readers and thinkers who have read the articles, pro and con, on this autonomic marriage question, do not think that B. R. Tucker "ridged" the position of E. C. Walker and Lillian Harman; and the number of "prominent Anarchists" who unreservedly indorsed Benjamin's "arguments" can probably be counted on his fingers. It so happens also that Cornelius, whose production is ranked as pure idiocy, is a writer and publisher who has gained a celebrity second to but few for the ability and heroism with which he has fought the popular despotisms of the day.

Many similar quotations, did space allow, could be given to show that our modern Benjamin has not yet passed that critical period in life that divides the dogmatic egotism of youth from the modest wisdom of maturer years.

And now a few words in regard to matters more personal to myself:

1st. As is well known to our readers, LUCIFER has a very "free platform," from or upon which our correspondents are allowed to have their say in their own way; provided, always, that the conductors of that platform are satisfied that the speaker has something to say that is worth the labor and the expense that, to give such opportunity of utterance, must be borne by the said conductors; and provided, also, that the speaker does not invade individual rights by utterances that would unnecessarily uncover or reveal private and personal affairs. Some months ago, in order to give point and illustration to her argument, one of our correspondents stated, in substance, that Mr. Tucker practiced as he preached in regard to what is right and proper in the sex-relations of men and women. On reading the manuscript copy we saw nothing objectionable therein; and in publishing the letter of Mrs. Hurren we treated Mr. Tucker precisely as we should expect to be treated in turn. No particulars were given and no names mentioned except his own. Mr. Tucker has more than once referred to the publication of this letter as "middle-class gossip about my [his] private affairs." In Liberty of June 18, he says:

"But the sententious editor, Mr. Harman, aggravates the offense by defending it. And even the Junior editor pleads impulse and feeling in behalf of the writer. This is a foreign consideration. The article in question, if written by a person much too contemptible for notice, My grievance is against the editor, whom I once thought of as a man who would not allow his impulse to betray him into indecency. Whatever he may do hereafter, I should be foolish to complain, for I know now what to expect."

Here I am accused of "indecent" because I published a letter stating that B. R. Tucker is a consistent Anarchist, from his standpoint. If there be indecency in this it must be because to accuse a man of practical Anarchism is indecency, for there was absolutely nothing in the wording of that letter to which the most prudish could object. It would now seem that the English vocabulary must be reconstructed and a new definition given to the word "indecent!"

In all seriousness, however, we will add just this: If Mr. Tucker's Anarchism is such a tender exotic that it cannot bear the sun and wind of open-air discussion—if the *argumentum ad hominem* (argument to the man) must be ruled out for fear somebody's toes will be trampled upon, then we want no such type of Anarchism in our work. It is too sickly a plant to flourish in American soil.

Before introducing another quotation from Liberty I wish to say that while attempting to show the errors into which our contemporary has fallen we by no means claim perfection for ourselves. In one instance, at least, we can now see that exact justice was not done by us towards Mr. Tucker, and it is but due to him to say that the explanation should have been made public at an earlier date. Briefly stated it is this:

Last fall, after the Jefferson County Inquisition had put its gag law in force, denying the prisoners the privilege of writing to LUCIFER or any other paper, some criticisms from Edwin's pen occasionally ran the blockade and were printed as editorial in LUCIFER'S columns. Among these criticisms was one charging Mr. Tucker with suppressing important facts communicated to him by Lillian. An explanation had been sent to me by Mr. Tucker, and this knowledge should have prevented the appearance of Edwin's criticisms. But the mischief was done and the explanation could not be made, except privately, until after the release of the prisoners. That the error was not publicly corrected before this late date is to be regretted, and I hereby take the blame of the neglect to myself.

Having made this just, though late, amend, we propose briefly to notice the charges of "unfairness" made in Liberty of May 7th.

Mr. Tucker, says:

"From the beginning up to the present it has never presented to its readers the grounds of my criticism. On the contrary, it has printed attacks after attack upon me from correspondents who, if they had any acquaintance with my position (of which they generally gave no evidence), did not gain it through reading 'Lucifer.'"

In our issue of May 20, the entire editorial, from which this quotation is clipped, is reproduced and the main points answered by the Junior; it only remains for me now to state a few facts that are better known to me than to any one else:

1st. Our columns have always been open to Mr. Tucker and all his friends.

2nd. Although Mr. T. has not asked to be heard in LUCIFER'S columns his friends have frequently had their say in their own way. Messrs. Xarros, Warren, Lloyd, and others have had long communications in our paper, and only in one instance was there complaint of delay in the appearance of these articles, and in that case the delay was the result of accident and oversight rather than of design.

But while our columns have always been at the service of Mr. Tucker and his friends, how stands the record on the other side? Last winter I sent to Liberty a short communication and also a short article clipped from LUCIFER, written by Lillian. Our object in these was to show to the readers of Liberty, in an *impartial* and non-controversial way our attitude towards our tormentors. These communications were declined, and, after a time returned, with the reasons therefor. This correspondence is printed in full, in LUCIFER of Feb. 21. Mr. Tucker closes thus:

"I must refuse to allow my name to be used for propaganda of which I disapprove."

Again, in April last, just after their release from prison, Edwin and Lillian sent a communication, asking Mr. Tucker to allow them to present their reasons, in their own way, for paying costs and leaving the Jefferson County Jail. Mr. Tucker replied in the editorial reproduced by us in LUCIFER, May 20, prefacing his remarks with:

"I am in receipt of a communication from E. C. Walker and his wife, which it is not my purpose to print."

One of our chief causes of complaint against such journals as the Kansas City Times, and the Valley Falls New Era, is that their habit is to comment adversely upon our articles but never allow their readers to see what it is that we really do say. Now, where is the difference between the treatment received by us from these so-called Christian editors and that received by us, within the past six months, from the so-called "Anarchist" editor of Liberty?

And now in closing this long article we will just say that although tempted to do so we shall not apply to Mr. Tucker

the remarks of one of his oldest and hitherto most faithful friends, John F. Kelley, of New York, who, in *last Liberty*, closes a communication to him in these words:

"Of course, with your present philosophy, there is no reason you should not misrepresent when you find it to your advantage to do so."

Neither will we apply to him (Mr. T.) the words he so unjustly used in reference to us, when he said, "Whatever he may do hereafter I should be foolish to complain, for I know now what to expect." Notwithstanding the prospect at present seems discouraging enough, we adhere to the view expressed in the beginning of this article, that our Boston contemporary is a conscientious as well as very able exponent of truth as he sees it; that his faults are the faults of youth, and that while age does not always bring wisdom there is good ground to hope that the eminent example of Benjamin the First, of philosophic fame, will not be lost on Benjamin the Second.

TEMPERANCE AND PROHIBITION.

From a private letter recently received from a valued friend and earnest co-worker I quote this paragraph:

I was much in total abstinence, reared every day in Temperance principles—and my faith in educational influence, instead of prohibitory measures—but, so far as I should feel called upon to forward temperance work, I should press upon thought what temperance is—what you do excellently and the benefit and advantages of temperance in life, rather than much denunciation of prohibition, so long as it is held and advocated that it is a means to secure the weaker side of the question—so long the prohibitionist side of the question must hold a space in the work of delivering humanity from the thrall of alcohol as a stimulant. Were it held to be an unlawful traffic, the more effective education could proceed. It seems a pity to me to spend time fighting the method of prohibition, while the legally-protected traffic is constantly assailing the weaker side of so many human beings. I should, and do, as far as I can, work for the advance of people in living temperance—but, I cannot set myself against those who think that to cut down the traffic is the best way.

To me it seems that my correspondent does not at all sense the principle involved and that she looks at this question at issue from the wrong point of view. The *Right of untrammelled Growth* is the heart and soul and essence of every upward striving of Humanity. That is, Liberty. So long as it is held that prohibition is right, so long will insistence upon the right and necessity of personal initiative and mutual choice be the first duty of every lover of his kind. So long as prohibition is advocated by a considerable number of people, so long will real temperance work remain undone. This prohibition crusade has set back the temperance cause for at least fifty years. There are tens of thousands of genuine temperance men and women who to-day are practically shut out from all associative labors in behalf of that cause. They are scattered all over the country, and, search as they will, they can find only a very few if any congenial minds within the circle of their acquaintance. All the organizations are committed to the odious principle of prohibition, and the nauseating odor of Pecksniffian piety is everywhere. We know the great importance of temperance in all things, but we also know that temperance does not come from without, that it is not forced upon the individual by a superior physical power, and we keenly realize that our work is no longer that of special temperance teachers; we know that we can best inculcate the lessons of sobriety by making men and women vigilant in guarding their rights and persons against invasion. The virtues of the slave are only negative ones, at the very best.

It is useless to attempt to "press upon thought what temperance is," so long as the mind of our pupil is in a state of rebellion against us, and it will be in rebellion so long as we stand over him with the club of prohibition authoritatively telling him that he must believe our definition the true one and must act in accordance therewith.

What is right (righteous) is one thing; what a man has a natural and should have a civic right to do, may often be quite another. It is not right that a man should overwork himself; his natural and civic right so to do is good against all claims of his neighbors to the contrary. As it injures my system, it is not right for me to eat pork; but if I should disregard Nature's warning and partake of this article of diet, would my fair correspondent claim the right to forbid me so to do? If not, she must admit that the State has not the right to do it, for what one person has not the right to do no aggregate of persons has.

We must never lose sight of the vital distinction between what is morally right and the civic rights of the individual. So my questioner will readily perceive that she is in error when she metamorphoses the issue as to the civic right to buy, sell and use alcohol, into a question of moral right (righteousness). We are told that if the sale of in-

HIGH AND POOR: OR HAINT AND SINNEH.

BY T. L. PEACOCK.

The poor man's sins are glaring; In the face of all the world; He is caught in the fact Of an overt act— Buying greens on Sunday morning.

FREE PLATFORM.

Editors Lucifer: I will write a few lines to your valuable paper: I must say I like it very much for its liberal views, its free discussions on all subjects; especially for your free discussion of the sex-question.

Lucifer: Although I am not personally a subscriber, I feel inclined to send a few encouraging words to the persecuted friends of Liberty, whose personal affairs have been made public to advantage, as I think, I mean the cases of Lillian Harman, E. C. Walker, Mrs. Slenker and others.

LOOK CHEERFUL. Arise, and the visions from memory drive, Return with joy unto thy duties in life.

Enterprise, Kans., 7-21-'87. I am glad to see you folks keep up courage; I shall try to help you a little more for you're in trial in October.

The Liberns here as well as in other places do not try to help one of our leaders when they are pounced upon by the vultures of the church.

"The Bridal Veil." I have long believed Alice Carey fully honored when this exquisite poem was produced. Think she took the suggestive figure of the veil to show discrepancies, uncertainties and concealments of withering hearts in marriage ownership.

And the revelations in this grand poem were never stumbled upon, but intended. The strength of purpose so skillfully displaying the tyrannous force of the unequal tie, matches the eloquence of expression.

"American Christianity." Dear Lucifer: I would like to ask those Christian politicians where they find their "American Christianity." Christ was not an American, but a "darned foreigner" entirely ignorant of our American institutions.

And the revelations in this grand poem were never stumbled upon, but intended. The strength of purpose so skillfully displaying the tyrannous force of the unequal tie, matches the eloquence of expression.

Books For The Defense Fund. Below is a list of excellent books, pamphlets, etc., which we desire to sell at once. They were mostly contributed by generous friends to aid in our defense, and the prosecution under the "Comstock" statutes necessitates the raising of more revenues than we now have at command.

Books For The Defense Fund. Below is a list of excellent books, pamphlets, etc., which we desire to sell at once. They were mostly contributed by generous friends to aid in our defense, and the prosecution under the "Comstock" statutes necessitates the raising of more revenues than we now have at command.

Anti-Prohibition; by W. S. Bell. Right to the point. Liberty and Moral; by W. S. Bell. Our Hall we hangings clearly, but never more clearly than in this brochure.

False Claims; by John E. Remsburg. Should be circulated by the million. Bible Morals—Twenty Four Times and Vices enumerated by Scripture—Falseness and Deception, cheating, theft and robbery, adultery and prostitution, murder, wars of conquest and extermination, despotism, intolerance and persecution, injustice to woman, unkindness to children, cruelty to animals, human sacrifices, cannibalism, witchcraft, slavery, polygamy, intemperance, poverty, and ignorance, and many other vices, obscenity.

Sexual Question. COMMON SENSE ON THE Sexual Question. By H. W. BOOZER. We have just received a good supply of this popular and meritorious little work, and have to dispose of them soon to our truth-seeking readers.

Books For The Defense Fund. Below is a list of excellent books, pamphlets, etc., which we desire to sell at once. They were mostly contributed by generous friends to aid in our defense, and the prosecution under the "Comstock" statutes necessitates the raising of more revenues than we now have at command.

Books For The Defense Fund. Below is a list of excellent books, pamphlets, etc., which we desire to sell at once. They were mostly contributed by generous friends to aid in our defense, and the prosecution under the "Comstock" statutes necessitates the raising of more revenues than we now have at command.

Don't Get Married UNTIL YOU HAVE READ IRENE; or, THE ROAD TO FREEDOM. The "Uncle Tom's Cabin" of Woman Slavery. The Most Wonderful Love Story Ever Written. An Encyclopedia of Heart History.

Sexual Physiology for the Young, cloth, 50 cts. Science in story, a comic, amusing, scientific and sensible story, cloth, illustrated, 50 cts. Plain Home Talk, the cheapest book in the world and full of hygienic information.

AN OPEN LETTER. COMMON SENSE ON THE Sexual Question. By H. W. BOOZER. We have just received a good supply of this popular and meritorious little work, and have to dispose of them soon to our truth-seeking readers.

Books For The Defense Fund. Below is a list of excellent books, pamphlets, etc., which we desire to sell at once. They were mostly contributed by generous friends to aid in our defense, and the prosecution under the "Comstock" statutes necessitates the raising of more revenues than we now have at command.

JEWEL TOP LAMP CHIMNEY. Guaranteed FINEST QUALITY LEAD GLASS. Manufactured only by Dithridge & Co., FORT PITT GLASS WORKS, PITTSBURGH, PA.

ELMINA'S ADVERTISEMENTS. Sexual Physiology for the Young, cloth, 50 cts. Science in story, a comic, amusing, scientific and sensible story, cloth, illustrated, 50 cts.

DR. FOOT'S HAND-BOOK OF Health-Hints and Ready Recipes. COMPREHENSIVE information of the utmost importance to everybody concerning their daily habits of eating, drinking, sleeping, dressing, bathing, working, etc.

PRACTICAL CO-OPERATION. By E. C. WALKER. Some hints as to the methods of Self-help and Voluntary Mutualism. Price, 10 cts.

Wives! Mothers! Daughters! BE YOUR OWN PHYSICIAN! A lady who for years suffered from distressing female complaints, weaknesses, etc., so common to her sex, and had despaired of a cure, finally found remedies which completely cured her.

STEWART'S HEALING POWDER. CURES ALL OPEN SORES ON ANIMALS FROM ANY CAUSE, SORE SHOULDERS, CUTS, KICKS, ROPE BURNS, SORE BACKS, SCRATCHES, CUTS FROM BARB-WIRE FENCES, ETC.

STEWART'S HEALING POWDER CO. 15 and 50 Cents a Box. AT DRUG OR HARNESS STORES.