

LUCIFER

THE LIGHT-BEARER.

NEW SERIES, VOL. 5, No. 21.

VALLEY FALLS, KANSAS, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, E. M. 287.

WHOLE No. 215.

LUCIFER--THE LIGHT-BEARER.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY.

TERMS:

One copy, one year, \$1.25
One copy, six months, .75
SPECIAL 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:

Prefatory Note; Introduction; List A.—Passages Unequivocally Condemning the Use of Wine. List B.—Passages Commending or Encouraging the Use of Wine or Strong Drink, or Including a Plentiful Supply of Wine among the Blessings to be Bestowed upon Favored Individuals or Tribes, etc., or Including the Revivification 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 rational movement in favor of temperance is to be commended, but this nauseating stuff called 'Bible Temperance' is unbearable. I have long felt that this sham ought to be punctured. It has been done at last, and most effectually done by the logical pen of E. C. Walker."

JOHN E. REMSUNG.

Price, per copy..... \$0.10
Per dozen..... 1.00
Address, WALKER & HARMAN
Valley Falls, Kans.

FWLKER'S PAMPHLETS!

CO-OPERATION. Its Laws and Principles. A 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 summary methods in temperance reform.

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

CO-OPERATIVE HOMES. Status family; sexual ethics of marriage; mission of the co-operative home; influence upon maternity; status of children; children's rights; material richness; social economy; sickness; woman's status; the dividing line; practical considerations; associated homes, etc., etc.

Land Tenure. The government's relation to the land; commercial rents; interest rent; fallacy of arbitrary legislation; potency of natural methods; colonization; country rents; use of equal liberty—equal right usually, vs. influence; 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 BYLAND'S OLD
STAND ON BROADWAY.
Has a large Stock of

Furniture!

For Spring and Fall trade. Full supply of Collins always on hand, and horses to attend funerals. Terms as low as the lowest.

E. L. SENFT,
PHYSICIAN AND SURGEON.
Valley Falls, Kan.

Dr. Senft uses "Ecclectic Specific Medicine." Office over Evans & Kemper's store.
Westrup's Financial Problem, price 15 cts. For sale here.

PAUL AT ATHENS.

Zenot uncouth, whose scathing brain
With the maniac visions glows,
What seek'st thou where Athena's fane
Empurpled mount and sea o'erbro'w?
No desert-dweller, prophet here,
His mystic rancor ever poured;
But blue-eyed Pallas, calm, austere,
The might of reason, is adored.

To song and dance and joyous thought
The Muse of Hellas sat, inspired;
No dream of doom the soul o'erwrought
To post-castal madness throb,
Yon is the stately step where
Wise Zenot taught with fluent might:
And his listening pupils there
Serenely walked the Stagirite.

Of hero-moulding ethics stern
The founder o'er, the laws of thought
The other clearly did discern
To post-castal madness throb,
O wandering dreamer! well may shine
With wild, unsteady light thine eyes,
Gazing at afar, marble shrine,
Where glorious shapes of beauty rise.

Harsh, ayes, artists, statesmen grand,
With Jove-like brows, a noble throng,
In bronze and stone, on every hand,
Confront thee as thou mov'st along,
What bring'st thou from the desert air,
Palm-shaded sand and blazing sun?
Furnace-zeal thou com'st to mar
All that the might of thought has done.

Reason is by thy narrow race
Unhinged—high dethroned in thee,
Thou herald'st no man's disgrace,
First of a priestly pedigree,
Because of thee for ages long
Shall thought in chains and darkness sit,
While reign a wild and squalid throng
Of monks, fierce foes of wisdom, wit.

And science, manhood, leave the world
In total, thousand-year'd eclipse;
Sense, judgment, into exile hurled,
No utterance find from human lips.
Futile Asia's rancor fierce
Shall poison Europe's spirit proud;
Long, long 'twill be ere reason pierce
With sun-bright shafts fall'st securely cloud.
—B. W. Bull, in Index.

Restraintment.

Happy would we be if not an organized tyranny existed on earth. No empires, kingdoms, nations, boundaries or states. The whole world one vast society, each member holding no more soil than he actually needed for cultivation. Every one privileged to go to forest and mine to provide himself with lumber and fuel. No law-enforced taxation, monopolies, government privileges and no invasions of natural rights. Now all this could be were it not that there are those who are invaders of the rights of others. They are criminals. Crimes are wrongs inflicted against the consent of the injured party. Those who inflict the wrongs are criminals. Until there are no criminals there must be some kind of social organization of restraint. Why not call this organization the *Restraintment*? This is as proper as *government from govern*. The *Restraintment* should exist for criminals only. Everyone favoring restraint for criminals would support such an organization. Volunteer dollars will come forward as well as volunteer soldiers. Who would not defend his home? This would bring perfect liberty, destruction of government privilege, and officialism. Then we could have life, liberty and unobstructed pursuit of happiness in fact as well as in name. Fenwick.

Artificial Environments.

It makes no difference to me that I was born in, and am yet environed by this machine called government; I have not yet given my consent to such environment. If this environment was a natural one and not an artificial contrivance of man, the case would be different. I have no disposition to view with complacency acts of tyranny labeled government, though enjoined by the "idea" that every man who votes or has the right to vote and, through representatives, has the privilege to help make laws is a party to government." This is one of the living "conventional lies of our civilization." This governmental machine was created before I was born. When I came to man's estate I found it here denying my individuality or compelling me to go to "Salt Lako" or conform.

I do give my consent to all laws founded on these two general principles:

1. Every one who so desires, to have an equal chance at all the bounties of Nature.
2. Perfect liberty for every one to do as he pleases with his own person and the rewards of his own exertion; provided, he does not, against the consent of,

infringe upon the perfect liberty of others.

I not only give my consent to such laws, but will help enforce them. This I believe I can consistently do, and violate the natural rights of no living being. Here I stand.

MADISON HOOR.

What Does Mr. Lum Want?

"Ask us something easier," will probably be your evasive answer to the above puzzling question, and, like yourselves, I find it next to impossible to determine what it is exactly that our friend wants us to do. Indeed, I hardly think he clearly knows it himself. But as we know that a simple question, an, in itself, unimportant suggestion, may sometimes have the effect of changing our thought, of revolutionizing our views, and of clearing up and dissipating the densest confusions, I yield to the temptation to make a desperate attempt at creating order out of mental chaos.

I am encouraged in this rash venture by the one hopeful feature characterizing all of Mr. Lum's otherwise "sad" utterances,—consistency. No, you must not smile; I am serious. He is extraordinarily consistent in his inconsistency. In a recent number of *Liberty* he compared the policy and methods of the "theoretical Anarchists" to the lunacy of the Salvationists, and declared their intelligence to be of the same order with that of the young military officer who asked to be supplied with men eighteen feet high. Now he "does not question" that "the individual is wiser who devotes his energies to a peaceful propaganda than to fanning popular discontent." If this is the case, what fault has he to find with people who, knowing this policy to be a wise one, act in accordance therewith? And is not his admission equivalent to an avowal that he knows his policy to be a foolish one? But "there are many who believe.... that the present seething forces in social life will.... end in bloodshed." Inasmuch, however, as Mr. Lum himself "grants" that the existing state "would be replaced by another state," what interest has it to him? He desires to have certain things settled in a certain way, and, instead of going into the business himself and managing it in the best way known to him, he continually neglects the business on hand and makes common cause with people who have entirely different plans and entirely different purposes. If he joins them simply to convert and correct them, then he is doing precisely what the "raw recruit," the "theoretical Anarchists," the "preachers," etc., are doing. If he joins them for the purpose of helping and encouraging their work, he is doing what no sane person can be guilty of doing and what cannot be discussed from the standpoint of logic and reason.

I am aware that Mr. Lum has much to say about our "laboring to uphold existing despoticism," our "accepting arms from the opponents in order to wage war in their behalf," and our "credulity and optimism" in believing "that the social wheel can be 'braked' by individual efforts" but it does not seem necessary to make any answer to these charges and assumptions. Their absurdity is too obvious. They show only that, in spite of Mr. Lum's assertions that he knows that "at the basis of every dispute in modern history" are to be found the "conflicting principles of liberty and authority," he is really not thoroughly convinced of it. If he were, he would have grasped the idea, so frequently and so emphatically stated for his benefit, that the enemy which we fight is authority, and that we must fight it whenever and wherever it is found. Mr. Lum's insinuations that "cowardice" and "narrowness" are the factors which determine the course of the "Theoretical Anarchists" are unworthy of a self-respecting man, and can be passed in contemptuous silence. In this connection it may, perhaps, not be impertinent to inquire whether it was

"narrowness" or something worse that dictated the concluding sentence of Mr. Lum's article in the *Catholic World*?

Mr. Lum should re-enter politics. In the ranks of the Labor Party he will find plenty of practical workers and of work he may not believe in the ballot, but neither does he, in sober moments, pretend to believe in dynamite. As between these two forms of force and insanity, the ballot is decidedly the least objectionable.

V. YANOS.

Puritan "Rights."

Rev. George O. Adams, writing from St. Louis to the *Advocate* about the Sunday law, says:

"The charge is freely made that it is an effort to make a 'Puritanical' Sunday, and so it is; for the Puritan certainly believed in equal rights for all, and was not willing to allow any privileged classes."

Yes, indeed! The Puritans of New England "certainly believed in equal rights for all Puritans, but they just as certainly believed in no rights at all for anybody else, not even the right to live, in New England. They were indeed "not willing to allow any privileged classes" except Puritans. In them were summed up all the rights and privileges, even to the right and privilege of hanging Quakers and witches, whipping Baptists, and banishing dissenters of all kinds, under pain of death. Theirs was the right to compel people to go to church on Sunday and listen to sermons such as, said one of the victims, "was meat to be digested, but only by the heart or stomach of an ostrich." Theirs was the right to tie women to the tails of carts and drag them through New England towns, at the same time lashing them upon the bare back with heavy two-handed whips made of "three thongs of twisted and knotted cord or cut-gut," while one of the "privileged" preachers looked on and laughed at such an institution as, if suffered to be completed, would have amounted to one hundred and ten lashes each, as the poor women were dragged through dirt and snow half-leg deep, and the weather bitter cold. And all because the women had the impudent presumption to claim the right and privilege of being Quakers. In this case, when the poor, tortured women had been lashed through three towns with ten stripes each in each town, the people arose in their righteous indignation and set the "ghastly pilgrims" free.

Oh, yes, the Puritan was indeed "not willing to allow any privileged classes!" But may Heaven protect this dear land from any revival of Puritan rule, or any other rule according to Puritan principles. —*American Sentinel*. (Christian).

Liberty or Anarchy.

As an Anarchist partisan who does not think himself mentally broad enough to have surrounded all truth, I highly appreciate the work which the *Truth Seeker* is doing. From your intimation that social chaos is what you understand by Anarchy, and from reading many of your articles, I think that there is some difference in the force of certain words to your mind and ours. To me Anarchy is liberty, and liberty is Anarchy. You say that your party is Liberty—liberty for every one to think, express his thought, and act as he pleases so long as he infringes upon no one's equal right, and certain no other's equal liberty. Now, this is what I want, too, and with this admitted and intelligently applied we should have that condition which we call Anarchy. But I must ask that by "equal liberty" we are at all events to understand liberty, not equal restriction. In a tantalizing sense, there may be "equal liberty" where there is very little liberty. People do not yet seem to realize that when they have put themselves under constitutional law, taking away natural liberty, the imposition upon a dissenting minority is not redeemed by the same being submitted to by the makers. They call that equal liberty. We call it equal slavery.

Whether or not we are to condemn government depends upon what is meant by government. Find me a government

in which all the citizens have agreed to join together and where they have the conceded right to individually withdraw from contributing to its support when it ceases to fulfill their aims, as we now have with churches, and I will admit that such government is compatible with Anarchism. Anarchists have no objection to any number of persons having a government, if such government will curtail none of our liberty according to your definition. We say that when a government levies taxes upon us without our consent, it curtails our liberty and pursuit of happiness by robbing us of our means. As the churches are supported by voluntary contributions, so let the government be supported. That is to say, we have no objection to the subjects of a government voluntarily assuming such obligations and binding themselves as they see fit to contribute and to pay, but let them take nothing from us and interfere in no way with such of our acts as don't infringe upon their natural liberties, and we are content. We believe in preventing and punishing murder and robbery, etc. It is a question of words whether this prevention and punishment shall be called government or not. We refer it, when done by a hired force, to the principle of insurance.

You know that in economic science "rent" has a technical meaning. We give a technical meaning to "government." We do not use it to mean protection, but rulership. Are we not justified logically by the fact that advocates of government are constantly ready to assert that it is impossible for them to carry on their scheme without forcing all natives of the country to be citizens and taxpayers whether they individually wish to be so or not? They will respect our "equal" liberty, but they cannot afford to respect our liberty, neither our property! We are now in the same stage that you would be in if the idea prevailed that, in order to support the church, the majority might force the minority to be members—at least, to contribute to it—and that, their rights of membership, voting, etc., being reserved for them whenever they chose to claim them, they were treated with "equal" religious freedom, but, contribute they must and obey they must in no matter what unnecessary things the authority of the majority ordered. We are seeking to enlighten men as to the wrong and absurdity of promiscuous reciprocal tyranny. In proportion as this enlightenment spreads, the way will be prepared for that which, with your habits of thought, you may prefer to call a philosophic Anarchal government, or government of actual consent, but which we call simply Anarchy. Chaos is a theological fiction. In all nature form and order result from the powers in things. Government other than self-government is violence. To have a self-governing state it would be necessary to have the voluntary adhesion of every citizen. We claim that the adhesion and support of a great majority can be had for equitable regulations compatible with and in furtherance of liberty, and that if any stand out and cannot appreciate the benefits of insurance, we can afford to let them alone so long as they believe themselves. I claim that Anarchy will accomplish in a more true and scientific manner the aim of protection, which is all that attaches republicans to government. I claim this with the same confidence as you claim that natural morality will develop all the virtues—for which alone some conservative people still cling to their Bibles—and develop them far better for not having a mixture or leaven of authority foreign to the meritorious element in the case.—J. L. W. in *Truth Seeker*.

In Brief, And To The Point.
Dyspepsia is dreadful. Disordered liver is misery. Digestion is a foe to good nature. The human digestive apparatus is one of the most complicated and wonderful things in existence. It is easily put out of order. Greasy food, tough food, sloppy food, bad cookery, mental worry, late hours, irregular habits, and many other things which ought not to be, have made the American people a nation of dyspeptics.
But Green's August Flower has done a wonderful work in reforming the digestive system and making the American people so healthy that they can enjoy their meals and be happy.

Remember—No happiness without health. But Green's August Flower brings health and happiness to the dyspeptic. Ask your druggist for a bottle. Seventy-five cents.

MOSES HARMAN & E. O. WALKER
EDITORS.
M. HARMAN AND GEO. S. HARMAN
PUBLISHERS.

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.

THE GREATEST DANGER.

That the times are perilous—that the outlook is ominous of a coming storm—that the prospect of retaining even the semblance of the liberty and justice for which Jefferson and Paine, Washington and Adams, fought with sword and pen, is becoming less and less assured as the years come and go—these are truths that no thinker will for a moment dispute. Upon this point there is little, if any, difference of opinion. But when inquiry is made for the causes of these perils—when the question is asked who or what is to blame, we find a great diversity of opinion. Some charge it to the decay of patriotism, some to the corruption of politics, some to the "hordes" of adventurers from foreign lands, some to the combinations or organizations of workmen such as Knights of Labor, etc.—some say the blame rests upon the concentration of capital in the hands of a few men whereby the transportation facilities, the circulating medium, the land, the forests, the mines, the machinery and the manufactures, can be and are controlled by syndicates, rings and corporations. But while there may be much of danger arising from most if not from all of the causes mentioned, the greatest of all perils to liberty and to all the freeman holds dear, lies in the treason of the American press!

We use the word treason advisedly. The battle between truth and error, between right and wrong, between liberty and despotism, is an unceasing battle, an unending warfare. In modern times the chief arena upon which this battle is waged is the public press. The pulpit and the rostrum are insignificant as battlefields when compared with the press. Indeed it is to the press that the pulpit and rostrum are indebted for most of their importance as arenas upon which truth and error contend for the mastery. It has long since passed into a proverb that error is powerless so long as truth is free to combat it. All that truth asks, then, is a free arena upon which to grapple with error.

And this is just where the treason aforesaid comes in. The pulpit and rostrum have never been free arenas; at least the former has never been free, and it is utterly hopeless to expect that it ever will become so. But the press—here, at least, it has been the American's boast that truth could always find an opportunity to grapple untrammelled with his hereditary foe. Whatever may have been the fact in the younger and purer days of the American republic, it needs no array of argument to show that the press is no longer a free arena. Papers are now published in the interest of parties, in the interest of sects, in the interest of propaganda, and especially in the interest of mammon, *i. e.*, in the interest of the almighty dollar. For this the average editor will fawn and truckle; for this he willingly betrays truth and honor; for this he becomes an intellectual and moral strumpet or prostitute. Very seldom indeed are papers published in the interest of fairplay, of freedom and of justice. Misrepresentation of an opponent's position—nay, this is putting it too faintly—upright and downright, horizontal and broad-gauge lying is the favorite means adopted to crush out an opponent and his cause, and then when he asks for justice, either through the columns of the slanderous sheet or through the courts, it is denied him.

To illustrate this point we here introduce a clipping from our neighbor, the *Valley Falls New Era*:

G. C. Clemens, the anarchist blatherkite who arrogates to himself the distinction of being the leader and champion of the labor element of Topeka, had Frank P. MacLennan, editor of the *State Journal* arrested

for criminal libel, Aug. 24, the trouble growing out of what the *Journal* said regarding the burning of the building in which Col. G. C. Graves lost his life, the inference being conveyed that the fire was the work of incendiaries, and hinting at the desperate act of Anarchists who infect that city, as the probable authors of the dreadful catastrophe. G. C. Clemens, the reputed leader of this gang of mendacious marauders and assassins, took the matter to heart and imagined himself woefully injured by the remarks of the *Journal*. The case comes up for hearing in Justice Cheney's court at Topeka this morning, and it is to be hoped Clemens will be rebuked by the triumphant acquittal of the editor of the *Journal*.

The facts in this case, as we learn them from persons on the ground, and from the columns of the *Labor Champion*, published in Topeka, are as follows:

A long series of outrages by the police and the police court had finally resulted in arousing popular indignation to the point of entering a vigorous protest against the continuance of such outrages and in a demand, or "petition," rather, for the abolition of the police court and city jail. A "circular address" calling a meeting of citizens at the city park to consider the matter, resulted in "one of the largest meetings ever held at the park." The *Champion*, quoting a daily paper, says:

The concourse of people was estimated at from three to five thousand. A more quiet and orderly assemblage never convened in this city. If any "star"-ornamented individuals were present—the writer did not observe any such—there was not the slightest need of their attendance.

At this assemblage the "orator of the day" was G. C. Clemens, a lawyer who for learning, ability and integrity stands as high as the highest in the city of Topeka. (This testimony we have from Topeka lawyers themselves.) Continuing, the reporter says:

Mr. Clemens, whose appearance on the stand was greeted with hearty applause, in the outset of his speech referred to the inflammatory article concerning the meeting in Sunday morning's "Commonwealth" eloquently repelling the idea that it was, as that paper had insultingly and maliciously declared, a meeting of "angry Anarchists." The purpose of the meeting, he said, was an appeal for the protection of law. The "Commonwealth" said, in the arrest of innocent men no harm was done. Suppose the so-called tramps who have been illegally thrown in the city prison had been wealthy bankers. Would that paper still say no harm had been done? The alleged tramps were human beings, and should only be deprived of their liberty through the proper forms of law. The conduct of the police force, and of Justice Reed, of late had been abominable.

This, then, is the man, this is the orator, that according to such papers as the *New Era*, is an "anarchistic blatherkite," and these are the people who for this meeting to protest against the crimes committed in the name of "law and order" are called "the desperate set of anarchists who infect that city"—"mendacious marauders and assassins!"

It appears from the report that the *Topeka Daily Journal* had been conspicuous as the champion of the police and of "Justice Reed."

One of the most telling things in the address was the happy turning of tables by the eloquent speaker on the "State Journal." That paper in its issue of Saturday evening having declared that the allegations set forth in the yellow circular, or acts of brutality on the part of the police force, were gross misrepresentations, Mr. Clemens proceeded to show that every charge set forth in said circular was fully justified by the police reports published day by day in said paper. Nothing in the remarks of the speaker were so keenly relished by the audience as this vindication by quoting the *Journal* vs. the *Journal*, which called forth bursts of applause.

The reports closes thus:

Many other abuses were referred to by the speaker in his lengthy but highly eloquent address, which evidently made a deep impression on the vast assemblage. Throughout it was an eloquent plea for the lowly and defenseless, that they might receive the same protection of the law that is extended to the wealthy and favored citizens in this city. The address was conservative, not in any way inflammatory.

A few nights after the delivery of this "conservative address" by Mr. Clemens a livery stable was burned, and in the fire a somewhat eccentric individual, named Graves, lost his life. The *Journal* man, smarting under the castigation administered by Mr. Clemens at the meeting aforesaid, charged the origin of the fire to "incendiaries" instigated by such teachings as those delivered from the stand at the city park, on Sunday, Aug. 7. This, of course, could mean nothing else than that Mr. Clemens caused the fire that resulted in the destruction of human life.

Believing that laws are made for the protection of the citizen from assaults against his good name as well as from assaults against his person, Mr. Clemens sued the *Journal* for "criminal libel." What the result of the suit has been we have

not heard, but shall not be at all surprised to learn that justice has been denied the plaintiff. Judging from our own experience with Kansas courts, and also from the experience of the eight men in Chicago, convicted of being "Anarchists," it is utterly hopeless to look to the courts for justice towards those whom the capitalist press has condemned as "Anarchists."

The illustration here given is, as we think, a fair sample of the methods adopted by the average capitalist journals of to-day. The length of our article seems necessary to clearly show that the average conductors of the popular press of today are traitors to the first and the highest duty of journalists, the duty to give to all sides a fair hearing—the duty to furnish an impartial arena upon which truth and error may contend for the mastery.

But this is not all, nor the worst even. It is bad enough to misrepresent and slander the teachings and the men whom these editors cannot answer, but in addition to this they do their utmost to kill the very few papers that have the fairness and courage to give a hearing to all sides. The *Kansas City Times*, *Valley Falls New Era*, and others, after denying us the right to be heard in reply to their misrepresentations and falsehoods, have sent out the report, all over the land, that our paper has been suppressed—doubtless thinking that a report to that effect would go far towards achieving the desired result. Whether malignity or ignorance is most conspicuous on the part of these editors it might be difficult to say, since few men can be presumed so ignorant as not to know that the suppression of papers is an act of despotism, a violation of constitutional rights, that in this country has not yet been tolerated, if attempted, except as a military measure in time of war.

Many of our readers are old enough to remember the time when the treason of the press brought on the most disastrous war of modern times. Not that the press of the South advocated "secession!" This they had the natural, the civil and the moral right to do. Their treason consisted in refusing to furnish the free arena of which we have been speaking. When the teachings and the characters of the Abolitionists were misrepresented and maligning in the popular press of that day the conductors thereof refused to those abolitionists and their friends their natural right to be heard in the same columns through which they had been assailed. Few thinkers will now combat the proposition that it was the falsehood, the cowardice, the treason of the press, more than any other single cause that made the late American war possible. And so, to-day, if the horrors of domestic war again stare us in the face it is owing, more than to any other cause, to the falsehood, the cowardice, the treason of the conductors of the popular press. II.

INACCURATE, AS USUAL.

Those of *Lucifer's* readers who have not yet learned that no dependence can be placed in the statements of the popular press when reformatory subjects are under discussion, are probably few, but for the benefit of those who read the "leading" dailies in hope of obtaining accurate information concerning current events, I will here call attention to the comments of the *Leavenworth Times* upon the resignation of the reportorial staff of the *New York Leader*. The *Times* heads its article, "Opposed to Anarchy," and after some preliminary words, says:

A few days ago at a meeting in which the name of John Most was suggested for president, the ultra-socialist element of the "Leader" which was started as a "co-operative labor newspaper" with German tendencies. The staff was gathered from the newspaper population of the city. Upon the announcement that the "Leader" was under control of a triumvirate composed of English, French and German anarchists, the whole body of local and editorial writers resigned.

The *Leader* was started as and remains the organ of the "Organized Labor of New York." But when started it had also a special political work, the election of Henry George to the mayoralty of New York. He in his candidity and in its work found the most earnest and hard-working supporters among the State Socialists (not Anarchists.)

The time came for holding the N. Y. Convention of the United Labor Party. George and McGlynn, although State Socialists in their doctrines, so far as they go, decided that the State Socialists must be excluded from the councils of the party they had done as

much if not more than any other division of the labor element to build up, for these leaders were determined to push the "land tax" issue to the front and make it the only issue of the United Labor Party. They were successful in their designs and the Socialistic delegates were refused their seats in the Syracuse Convention. Among the excluded delegates was Sergius E. Shevitch, then and now editor of the *Leader*. Of course the paper had strongly opposed the contemplated expulsion, and now that George had rid himself of his unpopular allies, interest at once centered in the action of the *Leader*. Continuing its opposition to George, the reporters resigned. It seems that these reporters, whom the *Times* cannot praise too highly for what it calls their devotion to "principle," had been content to work for the paper so long as it supported George, even though its editors were State Socialists.

The revolutionist, Johann Most, was suggested for president (of the concern), the *Times* says. What a god-send to the capitalist papers! It is so nice to have his name to conjure with, when timid folk are to be frightened. But the *Times* conveniently forgets to tell its readers that Most was nominated by a reporter of the *Evening Star* and that he received one vote out of a total of two hundred and forty-nine! What a reliable and accurate newspaper!

Another wholly untrue statement of the *Times* is its assertion that the *Leader* is controlled by English, French and German Anarchists. Its editors and backers are State Socialists, gentlemen who hold to a philosophy whose fundamental principles are at the antipodes from those taught by the Anarchists.

State Socialism is an easy and logical extension of the principles and practices of the paternal government which the *Times* so zealously, I may say, rampantly, supports. That is, its defenders, while mostly men and women of large and active sympathies and noble aims, have retained in their system the deadly dogmas of Authority and State supervision. From the Anarchistic point of view, their chief mistake is seen to be the proposed administration of just a little larger dose of the same nauseous drug of governmentalism which the *Times* is so fond of forcing down the throats of the people. Why should that paper be so severe upon them because they are now ready to swallow and prescribe a little more State medicine than it says is necessary. What it thinks I do not pretend to know.

Now, if the *Times* does not understand that there is a gulf as wide as the ocean between State Socialism and Anarchism; if it does not know that it occupies a position between the two, being much nearer to Karl Marx and his disciples, including the editors of the *Leader*, than it is to Jefferson and the scientific Anarchists, then it is not competent to instruct the people upon living issues; but if it does know those facts, then all that can be said is that its unveracity is equalled by but few journals, even of its own class.

For the information of editor D. R. Anthony I will here state that there are but two Anarchistic papers, in the English language, in the United States,—*Liberty*, of Boston, Mass., and *Lucifer*. W.

CURRENT COMMENT.

In the columns of the *Leavenworth Times* of September 1st, we find the following:

A Bazaar, for the benefit of the sisters' school, at the fort, will open on Monday, the 8th of September, and continue four or five evenings.

The large and beautiful hall, known as the Officers' hop-room, has by order of the commanding officer, been thrown open to the public for the occasion, and the officers' ladies have kindly offered their valuable services in whatever way they will tend to make the Bazaar a success.

Church schools, denominational schools, are the chief if not the only hope of the Roman Catholic church in this country. Experience has shown that conversions to Romanism from Protestant sects, and especially from Rationalists, are very rare indeed, among adults. Hence the tremendous, the persistent, the unflinching efforts of that church to establish denominational schools, and to get control of the education of the children and youth of the country. To this work of religious propagandism among the helpless infants the "Sister of Mercy," so-called, is admirably fitted. Cut off, as she is, from woman's first, best, and most glorious vocation—motherhood—her womanly instincts would naturally cause her to accept the place that most nearly approaches that of mother. Then her vows of consecration to a religious life would lead her to welcome the task, the opportunity, of directing the young mind to what she believes to be the only true faith.

The methods of raising funds for this

religious school are very similar to those adopted at the ordinary church fair. A gold watch, a tea set, a "cane of Bethesda water?," a chest of tea and other "numerous and valuable articles" are to be "voted to officers of the most popular arm of the service, infantry vs. cavalry." The "officers," we notice, are to get all the fine things, while the "enlisted men" get nothing but cigars! The usual Rebecca, ice-cream, fish-pond, supper tables, etc., are promised; also, music.

While it is profoundly to be hoped that Nationalists will never so demean themselves as to resort to such tricks as these to raise money we often wonder whether the friends of Freethought will ever manifest a tittle of the zeal for their cause that is now shown for theirs by the devotees of religious despotism.

We learn from the *Christian Statesman* that 2,000 delegates attended the New York Prohibition Convention, August 23 and 27, at Syracuse, and that "all these were found to be church members."

And if we are to judge from the "Declaration" made by its sister convention in Pennsylvania, that, too, must have been composed mainly if not entirely of church members. The editor of the *Statesman* thinks this declaration is "destined to have a mighty influence in shaping the political controversies of the near future." It is as follows:

We declare that Pennsylvania is a Christian Commonwealth, and was founded to promote civil and religious liberty; that our fathers acknowledged the God of the Bible as their God and the Supreme Ruler, and the Bible as containing his code of laws. The religion of the Bible was their religion, and continues to be the religion of our people, and they have a right to expect and demand from their servants in the legislative and executive powers such laws as will protect them in the full enjoyment of life and property and in their religious convictions and observances, not conflicting with the personal and equal rights of others, and securing to all the quiet enjoyment of the Sunday of our fathers, with the instruction and influence so promotive of public good, is our inheritance, which must be defended against all secular employments and all attempts of men to treat it "as any other day," whatsoever may be the plea or pretext.

Here we have a political convention, met to nominate candidates for officers of state government, laying down a religious platform, putting forth a religious pronouncement under which and by which they propose to go forth "conquering and to conquer." We trust, however, that the double-dealing, the hypocrisy, the transparent fraud embodied in this "declaration" will be seen and treated as they deserve to be treated by the secularists of Pennsylvania, and that the danger of a religious war may yet be averted.

Read this "declaration" again, please! Can anything be more self-contradictory, more completely self-stultifying and at the same time more hypocritical than the proposition that "our fathers acknowledged the God of the Bible as their God and the Supreme Ruler, and the Bible as containing his code of laws," and yet in the same sentence affirming that the "Commonwealth" established by these fathers "was founded to promote civil and religious liberty!" What sort of liberty is it that finds support and guarantees in the Bible and its "code of laws?" Take the first commandment of the "Decalogue," so-called: "Thou shalt have none other gods before me." This is one of "his code of laws," and one of the by-laws made to enforce this law reads as follows: "If thy brother, the son of thy mother, or thy daughter, or the wife of thy bosom, or thy friend which is as thine own soul, entice thee secretly, saying, Let us go and serve other gods * * * thou shalt not consent unto him nor bearken unto him; neither shalt thou eye pity him, neither shalt thou spare, neither shalt thou conceal him; but thou shalt surely kill him; thine hand shall be first upon him to put him to death."—Deut. xiii. 6-9. This by-law has not been repealed.

We have now in this country Hindoo missionaries who worship Brahm. We are liable to have Parsees among us, who worship the sun. Now it is quite supposable that these missionaries will make converts among our people; in fact we read, the other day, of one such conversion. Now, if these converts were to seek to make other converts to Brahmanism or to Parseecism, the Bible code would require the *killing of wives, brothers, sons, daughters*, etc.

Again, the Bible code says, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live." Witches were those who dealt with "familiar spirits," as the witch of Endor. By this code all spiritualistic mediums must be put to death, for they deal with familiar spirits. In short, the Bible code provides for a *theocracy*, a government of or by a god, and not of and by men; and this god, Jehovah, according to his own account of himself, is a

partial, jealous, revengeful god; one who tolerates no rival, and therefore, no liberty, no freedom of choice. For cruelty, for indiscriminate butchery of old and young, not sparing women nor "sucklings," even down to the "cattle," and to "everything that breatheth"—we have no history that gives an account of any commander whose orders equal those of Jehovah in atrocity.

No, no; gentlemen of the Pennsylvania Prohibition Convention; we grant you the fullest, freest right and privilege to worship and serve the "Bible God" to your hearts' content, but when you undertake to force his code upon others, it becomes quite a different matter. We freely grant you the "quiet enjoyment of the Sunday of your fathers" but when you try to force the observance of your puritanic Sunday upon us, then we say "hands off!" We acknowledge no god but nature, we worship at no shrine but that of truth and reason; consequently your Sunday is to us no better than "any other day." We believe in making every day a "holy" day, and to do this we devote, we consecrate, every day to labor, to recreation and to rest, in the proportion as seemeth best to us; and we resent as a personal affront, as a personal injury, all attempts by the worshipers of Jehovah to compel us to observe one day in the week as different from "any other day."

You speak of Sunday as your "inheritance, which must be defended against all secular employments!" Have Secularists no "inheritance?" Evidently you take us for fools or for cowardly slaves, or both, when you speak of "not conflicting with the personal liberty and equal rights of others," and in the same breath deliberately inform us that you intend to deprive us of our natural inheritance—our right to follow the example of nature in spending "Every day alike."

Forewarned is forearmed. The Secularists of the country ought to thank these Pennsylvania Prohibitionists for showing, even in this facing-both-ways manner, what it is that we may expect when their party gets the reins of government in their hand.

II. HYPOCRISY.

Before proceeding with my theme I desire to make a statement and correction. Between three and four years ago, if I rightly remember the time, a story appeared in some of the newspapers to the effect that Dr. Monroe, editor of the paper known now as the *Iron-Clad Age*, had been surprised in a compromising situation with a lady, and arrested. I think the report had it. As the Doctor had had been very bitter in his attacks upon social radicals, I mentioned and commented upon the supposed fact in this paper. It seems that it was a considerable time afterwards that Dr. M. became cognizant of what I had written. In the meantime the paper which originally published the story had retracted it, it having been ascertained that the Dr. Monroe implicated was not the Infidel editor. The latter sent me a copy of his paper containing the correction, but it did not reach me, as I was out in the canvassing field and the paper, forwarded from this office, miscarried in the mails.

This it happened that it was at least one year and a half if not two years after my first knowledge of the alleged trouble before I knew that it was not true in fact. Then it seemed needless to say more about it, as it would merely revive a scandal that had doubtless been forgotten by nearly all who had heard it. But as it now becomes necessary to severely criticize Dr. M. for what he has done I think it may be out of place to again mention the matter, state the circumstances and say that I am sincerely sorry that I, believing the story true, gave currency to a baseless charge against Dr. Monroe.

No one can deprecate more than myself contentions in the Freethought ranks, but there are times when it becomes necessary to expose the hollowness of the pretensions of those who set themselves up as more virtuous and gleam than their radical comrades.

Last week I placed in our "Opposition" column some extracts from editorial articles in the *Iron-Clad Age*. These articles were fiercely and vituperatively denunciatory of Free Love and Free Lovers, of Anarchists and Anarchism, especially of the former. In fact, it would be difficult to surpass the vileness of the language used in regard to people whose views upon social problems do not coincide with those of Dr. Monroe. It is not my purpose to here enter into an argumentative criticism of epithets which have in them nothing of argument, I am going to give Dr. Monroe a

free advertisement to give him to be entirely welcome. I shall give him this advertisement because of the following two sentences which I find in the editorial in the *Age* of the 27th ult. from which I quoted last week:

No law has ever interfered with the 'Iron-Clad Age' nor its publications. No law has ever restricted the liberal work we are doing. Mrs. Slenker was engaged in a work

in which plainness of language was essential to the accomplishment of good. The same is true in the case of the *Physiologist*, of E. H. Heywood, of Dr. Foote, of ourselves, and of very many others who have fallen under the ban of the Comstock law. All were engaged in an attempt to instruct the people in matters of vital importance in the domains of sexual physiology and pathology. And yet Dr. Monroe has let pass no opportunity to slur and denounce us all. The excerpts from his writings given in *LUCIFER* of Sept. 2d are fair samples of his style and show very well the spirit which animates the man when antagonizing social radicals and advanced physiologists.

And now to fittingly cap the climax of his outrageous attacks upon us he mockingly makes the amazing assertion which I have quoted above. Why Comstock has not arrested him long ere this I do not know; certainly not for lack of provocation. If there are any works ever sent out by a Liberal publishing house which rightfully come within the purview of the Comstock statutes, the four numbers of Dr. Monroe's "Holy Bible Stories" are those works. If Liberals have ever published books which could have the effect of unhealthfully stimulating the sexual passions, these "Stories" are the books. Dr. Monroe wields a facile pen and often writes most charmingly. In this case he has thrown the delusive glamour of love, poetry, and a quaint humor of his own over the dry Biblical narratives which recount the amorous adventures of the heroes and heroines of the so-called "sacred scriptures." By insinuation, innuendo, suggestion and double entente, he makes his reader see and feel what is described; makes him see and feel situations and acts which the chances are ninety-nine in a hundred would never have been suggested to him in reading, by itself, the colorless story as given in the Bible.

Dr. Monroe may plead that his intention was good in writing the "Stories." May be, but when Mrs. Slenker says that her intention was good in circulating the Diana correspondence; when Mr. Heywood avers that his intention was good in writing and circulating Cupid's Yokes, what is the answer of Dr. Monroe to their pleas? A shower of filth from his batteries of defamation. So far as the internal and collateral evidence goes, there is much more reason for supposing them sincere in their work than for believing that he wrote the "Holy Bible Stories" in the interest of sexual purity.

And I ask no one to take my word for it. Dr. Monroe still advertises the pamphlets and his address is Indianapolis, Ind. Let any one who believes me prejudiced send to him for them. W.

III. FETTERING.

It is not my purpose to interfere with the discussion between G. L. James and Zeno, so far as the main issue is concerned, at least not for the present, but I desire to here set Zeno right as to a matter of fact. That gentleman continually appears as a defender of State Socialism, and yet he seems never to have read its platform or to be familiar with the claims and arguments of its representative champions. To illustrate; in his reply to Mr. James, which appears in this number of *LUCIFER*, he says that "State Socialists would use collectively only a portion of all the capital." This certainly is not the State Socialistic position. Says Burnett G. Haskell, editor of the *Denver Labor Enquirer*, in that paper of Aug. 20, '87:

"We insist that the burning social question is—not a land tax—but the abolition of all private property in instruments of production; in land, certainly; but above all in machinery and raw materials."

The italics are Mr. Haskell's. Does not this declaration completely nullify Zeno's statement? But here is something still more clear and definite. It is a plank of the platform of the Socialistic Labor Party: We demand: That the land, the instruments of production (machines, factories, etc.), the products of labor, become the common property of the whole people; and, That all production be organized cooperatively, and be carried on under the direction of the commonwealth; and also the cooperative distribution of the products in accordance with the service rendered, and with the just needs of the individuals.

Here is no qualifying word or clause; it is "the instruments of production"—not a "portion" of them; "the products of

labor"—not a "portion" of them; "all production"—not a part of it; "the co-operative distribution of the products" by the commonwealth—not of a "portion" of them.

Whatever is used by man, outside of the bounties of nature, is one of the products of labor. This platform demands that the "products of labor," with the land, etc., "become the common property of the whole people." What does this leave for the individual? Can Zeno tell? There is nothing left. In short, Zeno, while claiming to be a defender of State Socialism against what he is pleased to call our "slanders," has never yet in *LUCIFER*, nor anywhere else that I have seen, frankly presented the principles of State Socialism as they are to be found in the writings of its chief expounders and in the platform of the Socialistic Labor Party. Come, Zeno, let us have a square issue. What you present as State Socialism is not that, according to the platform of the S. L. P. Which is "going by the record," you or it?

Another matter: It seems impossible for Zeno to understand the vital difference between self-defense and invasion, between the *Restraint* and the *Government*. As to the question by what method the agent of the free community shall be chosen, that is a matter of detail. He may be selected or elected by lot or by ballot, or otherwise. The essential thing is that the organization shall confine itself to the defense of the personal and property rights of the individual. This can be guaranteed only by the active recognition of the individual's right of withdrawal. This means no compulsory taxation. The person must be as free to leave the anti-theft society as he now is to cancel his fire or life insurance policy.

And this leads me to Zeno's comical assertion that "the word 'thief' implies law." This is akin to the avowal of a certain minister that sex-association between blood relatives was not incest until god in his "law" declared it to be such. Until Zeno made this statement I was not prepared to believe him to be so saturated with superstition. Theft is the forcible alienation of labor fruits. That is, it is the taking, without his consent, of the products of a man's work, or that which was a free gift to him. It was theft before any "law" forbade it; it is theft whether forbidden, or condoned or made possible by law only. To creep into a man's granary at night and take without his consent a sack of his wheat, is theft. To take the sack of wheat under the forms of law by means of a tax to which he has not consented, is equally theft.

"Theft implies law?" Yes, in a sense the opposite from Zeno's, it does. The most colossal robberies of all the ages have been committed in the name of "law."

Undoubtedly the merriest woman in the United States lives in Binghampton, N. Y. She is the "widow" of Dr. Titus L. Brown, who was President of the N. Y. Freethinkers' Association, a radical Materialist, an Infidel holding all church creeds in utter scorn, and a scientist of much ability and learning. Dr. Brown recently deceased, but some time before his death, while in the full possession of his physical and mental powers, he prepared a funeral discourse and had it put in type. By his direction, it was to be read at his obsequies. He died as he had lived, a staunch, outspoken Freethinker.

Every obligation of honor demanded of his wife and relatives that his wishes should be respected; that his views of life and death should be presented when friends and neighbors gathered to perform the last sad duties. No minister had any business to officiate, and none who had a particle of self-respect would, as a minister, have entered the house of death at that time. The dead man's life should not have been belied by any of the services of the church whose dogmas he regarded as the veriest superstition.

But this wife held her loyalty to god (or society, which?) as paramount to her respect for her husband, and so, "alive in Christ" but dead to honor, she called in the Episcopal rector to mouth the inane platitudes of his church beside the bier of the helpless Infidel. Could treachery be more vile? Could outrage be greater? Had they, after reading his discourse, taken the unconscious clay and thrown it amongst the hogs, to be torn and eaten by the foul beasts, their conduct would have been excusable be-

side what they did. In that case there would have been lacking the deliberate betrayal of trust, the premeditated attempt to prove the dead man to have been a fool or a villain while living, which make their action so atrocious.

What can be said which will fitly characterize the conduct of a wife who could be guilty of doing what Mrs. Brown did? And what a commentary this terrible incident is upon the debasing, individual-obliterating, institution of legal marriage! These two were "one" and so much one that the surviving half had no scruples against doing that which, more than might else, the dead half did not want done, something that he had directed should not be done, something against which he had done his best to provide.

And the minister? What of him? How lacking in self-respect the man must be who can go to the house of another and say over him a service which he knows the dead man when living despised with all the strength of his mind! What courage it is which can thus triumph over a prostrate antagonist! But he is a priest, and must magnify his office!

And hold not blameless the church which is responsible for the deplorable acts of this woman and this priest. The Church it is which rewards with all subtle flatteries such a woman as this, such women as she and Madame Liffre, wives who perfidiously betray their Freethought husbands, making them, when dead, testify in favor of a religion which, while living, they esteemed it their highest duty to criticize, expose and denounce.

Let us for a moment reverse the circumstances; let us suppose a Freethought wife and a Christian husband. He, while well, and clear in mind, selects the hymns he wants sung at his funeral; he chooses the minister he desires to have speak. He dies. Immediately his wife proceeds to do the very things he did not want done, to leave undone the things he wanted attended to with honorable fidelity. She calls in a Freethought lecturer, she has sung Infidel songs, and she does whatever else she can that will leave the impression that he lived and died a Freethinker. How quickly every Christian cognizant of the facts would denounce her action as most dishonorable and an outrage upon the dead man! And such it indeed would be. But when a Christian wife souls in the same manner a Freethought husband we hear no word of protest; it is all right you know, because a Christian is under no obligation to keep faith with an Infidel.

The natural attractions, and ideas of obligation, which bind us to others are not to be confounded with the extraneous forces which tyrannous men bring to bear upon us to secure the performance of our real duties or of the artificial obligations which they would impose in the name of morality, religion or patriotism. The natural attractions, repulsions and obligations will never influence us as they ought until we have rid ourselves of the fear and restraint of despotic churches and governments. Repressive statutes, swords, cannon and prison walls are opaque bodies and their victims can not through them see even the outlines of stern and yet golden-hearted Duty. Let our earnest sister, Lucinda B. Chandler, consider well these truths ere she advances as arguments in favor of prohibition, legal marriage, and other suppressive and repressive measures and institutions the Altruistic sentiments, impulses and duties. Between Duty and Despotism there must ever be war.

The Topeka *Commonwealth* urges that the attempt to abolish poverty cannot be a move in the right direction because the attempt to get away from poverty is what causes great many men to get rich. The inference is that if poverty is abolished vast numbers will remain poor because there will be no poverty to spur them into wealth-accumulation! Let us apply this marvelous logic to the question of health and sickness. The health-teachers are trying to banish premature ill-health. This cannot be a move in the right direction because ill-health stimulates many men to take care of themselves and thus become well. If we abolish all ill-health a great many people will be sick because there will be no ill-health to spur them into getting well! Try again, Father Baker!

The *Investigator* says that the arguments that will establish the right of publication and circulation of Liberal

literature will not establish that of so-called obscene books, etc., because there is no "resemblance" between the two classes of works. Strange it is that any Freethinker should fail to see that it is not a question of "resemblance," but of the right of people to differ in their estimate of books and of papers. I wonder if Mr. Souver finds much "resemblance" between the writings of a Catholic and an Atheist? And yet I'll warrant that he thinks that the arguments which establish the right to publish and circulate the works of the first are sufficient to establish the right to publish and circulate those of the second.

In another number of his paper Mr. Seaver writes as though he thought we should defend the right to print such works only as we deem worthy of "imitation." It is not at all a question of imitation. I presume that Mr. S. would not have the least desire to imitate the sermons of Sam Jones, yet it is somewhat doubtful if he is in favor of a law against their publication and circulation in the mails.

"The land tax"—"the single tax"—is the rallying cry now. And what does it signify? That one colossal landlord is to fleck from labor what before hundreds and thousands flecked. Who will pay this tax? The wage worker will pay fully as large a proportion of it as before. Whom will it benefit? For one, the occupier who has the money necessary for cheap production, which will enable him to put the products of the soil he tills upon the market at a lower price than his poor neighbors can theirs.

That is a clear, cogent, logical and eye-opening article of J. L. W.'s, reproduced on first page, "Restraint!" That is the word! It is the word for which Appleton, Tucker and many others of us have been looking for a long time. Walk right up to the head, "Fenwick,".... The *World* appears again, dating September. E. H. H. is as uncompromising as ever.... Alas, poor C. M. Overton! His latest "find" is the notion that Christianity and Liberalism are identical. He began by repudiating Free Love and so he ends. As he to Wakeman, so I to him, "Hail—and farewell!".... The outlook seems dark for the Seven of Chicago, unjustly condemned to die. Is it possible that the people of Illinois are so lost to every sentiment of justice and humanity that they will murder these innocent men?.... "American"—exclusively American—is almost too narrow a platform for a Freethinker. There is now and then a good idea besides the "American Idea,".... The anti-medical monopoly hosts seem to be gaining ground in Iowa. So says the *Liberator*. Good!.... Our subscriber, L. H. Froligh, Jr., of St. Louis, is considerably more than a match for Mr. Souver of the *Investigator* in their discussion of the so-called obscenity question, in that paper.... Seward Mitchell sends out another number of his *World's Reformer*. Help him along by sending 10c for a copy. Newport, Maine. W.

"Delicious Morsels." I wish to assure my friends I have sent no packages of *The World* with any marginal notes of the kind spoken of above. Though it is not my "pot paper," I feel too great an interest in the sexual question to thus make light of what is of the very highest importance to the race. While I do not understand all of Mr. and Mrs. Heywood's ideas and opinions on various subjects, the more I read *The World*, the more convinced I am that it is performing a valuable mission, and doing good work in its own peculiar way. As for Emanuel, I have received two friendly letters from him since my arrest, denying any complicity with causes that produced it, and professing to hope I should be cleared of the charges against me. He seems to think some mutual enemy is trying to make trouble and war between us. Don't know why he or Grace should feel any personal hatred toward me. I'm not aware of having done ought to injure either of them. True, I have combatted some of their pet beliefs, and so they have mine, and this is all right for any or either of us. In a multitude of counsel there is wisdom, and in a multitude of opinions there is a chance that facts and truths will come uppermost. MELINA DRAKE SLENKER. Snowville, Va., Aug. 30.

The Defense Fund and other important matter is crowded out this week.

I insured in the Kansas Home Company of Topeka, July 27. On Aug. 4th, I met with loss by storm. Aug. 13th I was paid in full to my satisfaction. Wm. Armstrong. T. P. Farley, Agt.

HAND-IN-HAND.

The thinker must work and the worker think.
For both go hand in hand.
The smith's stroke and the drop of ink
Make the brain and brain of the land.

O you at your forge and you at your books,
Do both at your implements striving
To uplift from the dust the kingdom of man
To a higher and better living.

The man that tolls and the man that thinks
Must work now, shoulder to shoulder,
All labor is worthy, if honest it be,
The world must grow wiser as older.

When we lift the man at the desk, we lift
The laborer at the plow,
When from a measure of wrong we lift,
Two measures are sited somehow.

—John Swinton's Paper.

Dead Indians' Debts.

"The debts of dead Indians are paid by their relatives," said an ex-merchant on Main street, Monday. "When Anderson and Bernhart," he continued, "killed an Indian several years ago, he owed me \$315. Since that time \$330 of this amount has been paid me by his relatives. Kentucky died the other day owing me about \$55. Already his relatives have approached me on the subject and made arrangements to pay me the amount. It is a law with them to pay the debt of their dead relatives and they never break it. I am sure of getting my money if an Indian dies owing me, but when a white man dies leaving no property, no matter how rich his relatives, I never expect to get a cent. There is a great deal of good about a dead Indian, anyhow," said the ex-merchant, as he closed his interesting conversation and walked away.—*East Oregonian.*

One Caudill American.

The *Litchfield (Conn.) Enquirer* discovers that "prohibition is finding more favor with the native American, and out for the foreign vote it would speedily prevail in probably half the states in the Union." The attempt to enforce the dogma of total abstinence upon the man who has come here expecting to find liberty seems to that man more "tyrannical than anything he has had to endure at home." To "Americanize the German into a teetotal" is, according to the *Enquirer*, "the most difficult bit of education yet to accomplish." And so it seems that the average American prizes individual liberty much less than does the poor fellow who has never voted for a master to rule over him. The fact is that the American is the greater sneak and hypocrite, preferring to indulge by deceit and stealth in the vices which he deems it polite to condemn in others. This comes of being born and reared where individual preference, political and social, depends entirely on keeping up appearances. It would be characteristic of the American to vote for prohibition with a mental reservation in favor of his private rum bottle, and that, in fact, is just what he does. The victims of hereditary rule in Germany and elsewhere have not learned that trick and it is to be hoped that they won't learn it. — *Wisland (Conn.) Press.*

Progressing.

When we recall how uncompromisingly Mr. Benson of the Boston *Investigator* fought Col. Kelso when the latter plead for civil rights for the Mormons, we are surprised and gratified to find in the *Investigator*, quoted with no word of adverse criticism, the article given below. It seems that the veteran Free-thought editor is beginning to understand the minutiae of the anti-Mormon crusade.

W. THE INWARDNESS OF THE MORMON CONVICTION.—Would it not be a good thing for the United States to take charge of all the church property in the country, and appropriate it strictly for the benefit of the public schools?

"The Government has as much right to confiscate the property of the Methodist or Baptist churches as it has the Mormons.

Wipe out the Mormons first; then pitch into the Baptists, and the Mormons will aid in their downfall out of revenge. When the Mormons and Baptists are no more, pick up some of the rest.

It will be just as Constitutional as what is now being done with the Mormons. Wiping out Mormonism is a good precedent for future legislation. The time had to be broken somewhere in order to take away personal liberty and enslave the people.

The liberties of a people are never taken all at once. Legislation of this kind begins on some weak body, and gradually uses one faction against another until all are made slaves.—*Saguache Sun, (Aspen, Town.)*

"Little Lessons for Little Folks" is the most readable, interesting, and instructive book for children that it has been our pleasant privilege to peruse. Mrs. E. D. Stenker is the author, and in the preface she says that "it is like a school-book, which aims to teach the groundwork of facts." It is compiled from reliable sources, and put in plain, simple language, so that all may understand. This editor dearly loves children, and he wishes that he were able to present one of these nice books to every child in the land.—*The Philadelphian.*

A MARVEL OF ELOQUENCE AND BEAUTY.

COLONEL INGERSOLL'S
Tribute to Henry Ward Beecher.
Price, 5 cts. Three copies for 10 cts. Address this office.

FREE PLATFORM.

"Bond"—age.

Can LUTHER give a brief space to a suggestion presented to my mind by the article in Aug. 5th number, "The Marriage Bond," by J. W. G. To vindicate the prevailing spirit and working of the marriage system is no part of my motive in claiming that there is no high possibility in human life reached except through the bond of love.

Did not the inexorable law of maternity first bind the mother to the fulfillment of the law that gives life to another, there would be no individual. Did not the mother-love bind her to the new life with a devotion that involved a surrender of the ego, and its prerogatives, the individual would lack sustenance, and all the conditions calculated to best fit the ego to assert itself, and attain selfhood. Association is a prerogative of human souls and hearts. The maternal law of surrender of individuality to secure the perfection, development, and protection of the ego, is as necessary in society, for collective humanity, as in the case of the individual personality.

It is a truth above dispute that "no man liveth unto himself." There is a realm of selfhood—and which no well-trained, considerate person will willingly intrude upon. But the best of the individual is not unfolded in this sacred sanctum.

The relations, associations, and surrenders, even, involved in the "bond" of love, seeking the welfare, comfort, happiness, rights of others, as a part of the conditions of one's own welfare and happiness, are an education and means of development, which the individual cannot afford to omit, or dissolve itself from, even to preserve "the divine prerogatives of the Ego."

When the union of man and woman is one of love, the "bond" does not interfere with the "integrity," or self respect of a well rounded individuality. Individuals and individuality divorced from association and the unifying "bond" of love, in its all-embracingness, would make a cheerless, comfortless world. The Ego is but an atom of collective humanity.

LUCINDA B. CHANDLER.

Liberal's Liberalism.

Editor's Lucifer: There are times in life that words are inadequate to express one's feelings—and this is one of the times in my life. I can hardly tell which feeling predominates—whether that of shame or indignation.

I am so mortified that our pretended "Liberal town," should tolerate the bigotry of a brazen institution that would flaunt its advertisement to the world of a "FreeThought University" and then with ruthless hands tear from its walls the name of one whose whole life has been devoted to the cause of FreeThought. Away with such bigotry and intolerance! No one could believe that a man pretending to teach FreeThought could molest the name of Elmina D. Stenker, but I am ashamed to acknowledge that Liberal is the place—of all places—where there is no FreeThought.

But this is only one more leaf turned over in the book of persecution that is being yearly printed by the Liberals of Liberal; no wonder the world stands off and points the finger of scorn at us,—we deserve it. Just think of it! Our Hall stands as a monument of our poverty. We emblazon on it the three letters that all true FreeThinkers are justly proud of, U. M. L., but we are as close willing to grant to all Universal Mental Liberty? With a sense of inward shame and mortification we must all answer No, a thousand times, No. From the day this town was founded it has been FreeThought only in name. You are free to think—so long as you do not get ahead of the would-be leaders of the town, but so soon as you advance one idea contrary to the ideas they prescribe, that moment you become a target. Just for one moment think of it—for about eight years the name of Elmina D. Stenker has occupied a conspicuous place in our public hall; her "Little Lessons" used as a text book in our instruction school; for years she had a "corner" in our paper, the "only FreeThought journal in the world," and her weekly lessons, written and sent every week, were read before the school, being held solemnly by both teacher and pupil. But "oh a change has come over the spirit of my (our) dreams." What is the matter? Has she really committed some terrible crime, or is she merely a victim of "misplaced confidence?" She, the soul of honor, giving all the best days of her life in trying to benefit her race! We do not pretend to say she has been entirely prudent, but must we judge people by the result or by the intention of their actions?

When the Principal of the FreeThought University was asked why her name was taken down he replied that she was a Free Lover. We are undecided whether to attribute that answer to ignorance or willful falsehood; we did not suppose there was a man or woman in the world—pretending to be a Free-thinker—who did not know that Mrs. Stenker was not a Free Lover. She never has indicated such a thing in her writings. All readers of her writings agree that she is a student in search of knowledge, and no matter how much we disagree with her we should, as Liberals, be willing to grant her the right to think for herself, and every true Liberal should offer a protest against the intolerance that would dare remove her name from the hall simply for "popular opinion's" sake, simply because she is under a cloud. It would not have looked so bad had the world-be pure people waited until she was convicted, instead of showing their ignor-

ance by falling in with the rabble and, for getting their former follies, again made themselves ridiculous.

The thoughtful observer is led to ask why the picture of D. M. Bennett is allowed to remain on the wall—he, too, was said to be bad, sent a letter through the mail, &c., &c. The only reason we can give is that he was of the masculine gender, and the people of this progressive town are just that far advanced that they will trample a woman underfoot and eulogize her betrayer. We had hoped better things of a class of people calling themselves FreeThinkers or Liberals.

Yours for justice,
NEDA ELSON PARSON,
Liberal, Mo., 8-21-'87.

Rent, Interest and Population, Again.

Mr. James fails to show that I misrepresented him. He now stands forth as a communitist, denying all right of control over capital by the individual or community. No man shall hold, says he, for future use, the product of his own labor, be it a spade or a steamboat, if any other desires to use it. State Socialists would use collectively only a portion of all the capital, that portion to be controlled by appointed agents, who, of course, have no power to withhold it from use. This shall be done only when the people demand it when they are tired of monopoly. But every atom of personal capital shall remain sacred property. This plan is called despotism, while to deny all personal control over capital is thought, by Mr. James, to be true freedom.

The only sense in which abolition of government would destroy individual power over capital would be, that a stronger man could take my capital from me and wear it out; the power that before restrained him is gone. Government does not restrict the use of capital except by upholding the monopoly of land, which is the source of capital. Open land to free access and men would soon create their own capital, indifferent to the fact that government protects ownership to the old stock of capital. Government does not give banks power to charge interest by forbidding the "unlicensed to issue their own paper at whatever it may be taken for," or other method, excepting land monopoly, thus limiting the production of capital, increasing interest.

People want capital, not paper money. Increase of paper money would not make interest, the price paid for the use of capital, any lower. Paper money is not capital. It is merely an order for commodities or anything having value. Good money is an order that all men will honor. Any man may issue all the orders or notes he pleases, and offer them as payment for capital. Why assert that the government prevents him? Let Mr. James ascertain how many of his neighbors would accept individual money, "for what it is worth?" The era of "wild-cat" banks is past. The promises issued by states proved inadequate. What then would be the fate of promises issued by individuals? Experience teaches that money that circulates in a nation—must be secured by the nation. But Mr. James will need no money under Anarchy. Why issue paper money to pay for capital, when no one can withhold capital from use?

Mr. James says the statement that "as rent increases interest decreases if we consider the actual share that each receives of production," is false. He contends interest with the gain caused by monopoly. Interest is the reward paid to the owner of capital for allowing it to be used in production. Labor and capital wish to engage in production; the reward for each will be governed by the number of laborers, or the amount of capital, offering. When labor is denied access to earth, and capital is plenty, the enterpriser, who employs both, reaps the results, but his gain is not interest. Interest is the wages of capital when it is loaned, just as a salary is the wages of a man who loans his powers to labor. That interest and wages are lower in old countries where capital and laborers are both plentiful cannot be disputed.

"There is no reason why property in land should be treated as an exception."

There is a vital reason. The owner of capital prevents no one from creating a like capital from the earth; but the owner of the earth will not permit men to apply their labor in the making of capital. A man for instance has access to the earth; he produces an implement which assists in further production. He is a robber, says Mr. James, if he claims exclusive ownership of that implement, although others may produce similar capital if they desire.

To charge every evil to the government, is convenient. I am not defending any government; I am looking for causes. Government does not "subject women through marriage to dangerous male bipeds." The subject is due to religion or a personal sense of duty, or monopoly of land. Government does not prevent a woman from leaving a man, nor compel her to return. Free the land, and labor and capital become so active that woman can be industrially independent; then if she remain a slave to man the case is one for mental emancipation. Population never yet pressed upon subsistence, and cannot while a fertile acre remains unclaimed.

Mr. James did say that when over-production could not be sold there would be a "complete revolution." Perhaps a revolution is not a crisis. But I hold that point for it is immaterial. My object was to hold up for critical examination, the acrobatic mind which recognizes the existence of over-production, and, at one and the same time,

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. A True Tale of Slave Life—Not of the Black Slave of Long Ago, but of the White SLAVE OF TO-DAY: The Marriage Slave. The Wage Slave. The Free Love Slave

A Startling Exposure of our present inhuman Social System, showing the fetters thrown around the true expression of love. And the thrill of freedom to which woman has ever been subjected in the love relation, both in and out of marriage—with suggestions whereby a more natural love life may be made practical, with greater freedom for woman and better conditions for parents more in accord with the important laws of Heredity; and whereby the tolling millions may be emancipated from the wage serfdom to which they are now subjected.

A wide-awake book by a wide-awake woman, a resident of Philadelphia, who has been behind the scenes and knows of the facts which she writes. New type, good paper, handsomely bound in cloth. Price, ONE DOLLAR. For sale at all first class book stores, or sent post paid by H. N. Fowler & Co., 1123 Arch. st., Philadelphia, Pa.

SPECIAL OFFER: Until Oct. 1st '87 we will send to all new subscribers, and to present subscribers who pay up all arrears, LUCIFER one year and one copy of "Irene" for \$1.50

believes that population presses upon the capacity of the earth. Either Mr. James does not understand Malthus, or he is hedging on his own bid. I recognize that a new country is more favorable to increase of population; witness the large families of pioneers. As the power of production increases misery also increases while the size of families decreases. Malthus thought that the misery was due to pressure of population even while population was increasing less rapidly than the productive capacity.

"State Socialism is the natural end of democracy," says Mr. James. Very true. Now I will try to compromise LUTHER which admires Jefferson—the best of democrats. When "W." can show how the "Agent" is to be chosen, and what rules shall govern his actions, without a democratic majority vote, Socialists will begin to understand Anarchy. A group "may hire an agent to guard their flocks and herds from the thief," etc. But the word "thief" implies law. Mr. James comes upon the scene and says "Property in sheep is robbery," and hints that as the government, which gave power to withhold wealth is dead, therefore nothing prevents him from taking a ewe or two. The agent, being under orders, cannot debate; and so economic science is merged into personal combat. How would Nature, whose laws "have the admirable property of executing themselves," (says Mr. James) decide the matter? Some men think strength and bravery a good title to other men's flocks. Are they not guided by the natural law that every animated being seeks gratification of desires along the line of the least resistance? Every inequitable statute can be traced to this natural law. There seems to be two sets of natural laws; one is favorable, the other unfavorable to life. Human devices are designed to promote the one and to baffle the other. If in the free action of natural elements Socialists see injustice, they are justified in advocating restrictions to the play of natural laws that work wrong.

Mr. James has not explained how he can in the same book, condemn all property, and commend a quotation from Macaulay who admires the system of letting public works to capitalists, to be conducted for profit, that system securing better service. ZENO.

ELMINA'S ADVERTISEMENT.
Sexual Physiology for the Young, cloth, 62 cts.
Science in Story, a comic, amusing, scientific and sensible story, cloth, illustrated, \$2.
Plain Home Talk, the cheapest book in the world and full of good information. 1000 illustrations, \$1.50; Health Hints, 25 cts. These four are by Dr. E. B. Foote.
Tokology, the best book for married women. Parturition without pain, and all manner of information needed by wife and mother. 25 colored illustrations, \$2.
Diana—the hero of contention. Sexual advice for the married, cloth, 35 cts.
Special Physiology for Girls, \$1.
Special Physiology for Boys, \$2.
Origin of Life, (with splendid) by Dr. H. M. Nichols, cloth, 50 cts.
The Truth About Love, (very radical), \$2.
A Revelation in Sexual Science, 25 cts.
And any other Physiological or Liberal book, at publisher's prices.
Address, ELMINA D. STENKER, Snowville, Virginia.

ANIE BESANT'S WORKS.
MARRIAGE: AS IT WAS, AS IT IS, AND AS IT SHOULD BE.
THE LAW OF POPULATION
Its Consequences and Its Bearing Upon Human Conduct and Morals.
Books which have had an immense circulation and which are of inestimable value to every thinking man and woman. Price, 15 cts. each.
Just received from an earnest co-worker as a donation to the Defense Fund, one hundred copies of the Law of Population, excellently printed on better paper than are the above, and containing
A FINE STEEL PORTRAIT of the beautiful and gifted authoress. Price, 25 cts. Two copies for 45 cts. Address this office.

Wives! Mothers! Daughters!
BE YOUR OWN PHYSICIAN! A lady who for years suffered from distressing female complaints, weakness, etc., so common to her sex, and had despaired of a cure, finally found remedies which completely cured her. Any sufferer can use them and thus cure herself, without the aid of a physician. Two recipes, treatise and full directions FREE, Sent. Address Mrs. W. O. HOLMES, 658 Broadway, N. Y. (Name this paper.)

English Spavin Liniment removes all Hard, Soft, or Calloused Lumps and Blemishes on horses, Blood Spavin Curbs, Splints, Sweeney, Stiles, Sprains Sore and Swollen Throat, Coughs, etc. Save \$50 by using one bottle. Every bottle warranted by Heland & Tuttle Druggist, Valley Falls, Kansas.

AN OPEN LETTER.
COMMON SENSE ON THE
Sexual Question.
BY H. W. HOOPER.
We have just received a good supply of this popular and virtuous little work, and hope to dispose of them soon to our truth-seeking readers. Price 10 cts. Lucifer, Valley Falls, Kansas.

THE PRODIGAL DAUGHTER,
—OR—
The Price of Virtue.
By RACHEL CAMPBELL.

The GREATEST LITTLE book of the Century. A fearless unflinching exposure of Social Ugliness. This pamphlet goes right to the heart of our Moral and Sexual Ugliness. Price .10 cts.

INGERSOLL'S LATEST
"BLASPHEMY!"
Col. R. G. Ingersoll's Great New Jersey Heresy Case in the trial of Charles B. Reynolds for Blasphemy at Morristown, New Jersey, May 2nd, 1887.
Chicago Edition: One copy 8 cents; two copies 15; six copies for 25 cts.; \$3 per hundred, delivered. Send to this office.

THE PRODIGAL DAUGHTER,
—OR—
The Price of Virtue.
By RACHEL CAMPBELL.

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

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. NO SMELL TO ATTRACT FLIES; DOES NOT BURN A SORE LIKE LINIMENTS; EASILY APPLIED AND ALWAYS READY FOR BURNS, CHAFING, SORES OR CUTS ON PERSONS; IT HAS NO EQUAL.
15 and 50 Cents a Box. AT DRUG OR HARNESS STORES.
STEWART HEALING POWDER CO., ST. LOUIS.

Doolittle & Co.,
Dealers in
Hardware, Stoves, Tinware, etc
—AND—
BARB WIRE,
VALEY FALLS, - - KANSAS.
THOMAS JEFFERSON
—AS AN—
INDIVIDUALIST.
An outline of his Political Principles by which the Sharp Contrasts between them and the dominant ideas in the Government of today is clearly shown. Agents vs. Governor, The Tyranny of the Majority, etc., etc.
Read it, and learn what "Judonian Democracy" means. By Gen. M. M. Trumbull. Price, single copy 60c.; two copies 10c; per dozen, 60c; per hundred, \$5.50
Address, LUCIFER, Valley Falls, Kansas