

LUCIFER.

THE LIGHT-BEARER.

NEW SERIES, VOL. 5, No. 28.

VALLEY FALLS, KANSAS, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 28, E. M. 1917.

WHOLE No 222

LUCIFER--THE LIGHT-BEARER.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY.

TERMS:

One copy, one year, \$1.25
One copy, six months, .75
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: Prefatory 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 Pious allusion 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 Commanding 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 effectively done by the logical pen of E. C. Walker. JOHN E. REMSUVO.

Price, per copy..... \$0.10
Per dozen..... \$1.00
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 summary methods in temperance reform.

CORPORATIONS! With Special Reference to the Difference between Corporations and Co-operation.

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

Land Tenure. The government's commercial rents, interest rent, utility of arbitrary legislation, potency of natural equality, colonization, country rents, use vs. use vs. equal right usury vs. 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 DELAND'S OLD STAND ON BROADWAY. Has a large Stock of

Furniture!

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

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

Dr. Senft uses "ELECTIC SPECIFIC MEDICINE." Office over Evans & Kemper's store. Westrup's Financial Problem, price 15 ts. For sale here.

THE MORTGAGE. We worked through spring and winter, through summer and through fall. But the mortgage worked the hardest and the stendest of them all: It worked on nights and Sundays, it worked each holiday; It settled down among us and it never went away.

Whatever we kept from it seemed almost as bad as theft. It watched us every minute and it ruled us right and left. The rust and blight were with us sometimes, and sometimes not; The dark browed, scowling mortgage was forever on the spot.

The weevil and the cutworm, they went as well as came: The mortgage stayed forever, eating hearty all the time. It pulled up every window, stood guard at every door, And happiness and sunshine made their home with us no more.

With falling crops and sickness we got stalled upon the grade, And there came a dark day upon us when the interest wasn't paid; And there came a sharp foreclosure and I kind of lost my hold, And grew weary and discouraged, and the farm was cheaply sold.

The children left and scattered, when they hardly yet were grown; My wife who pined and perished, an' I found myself alone; What she died of was a "mystery," an' the doctors never knew it; But I know she died of mortgage—just as well as I wanted to.

If to trace a hidden sorrow were within the doctor's art, They'd find a mortgage lying on that woman's breast; Or worm or beetle, drought or tempest, on a farmer's land may fall, But for first-class ruination, trust a mortgage 'gainst them all.

WILL M. CARLETON.

Individualism.

Individualism is a belief that each individual is seeking his own personal welfare is most conducive to social progress.

Under natural conditions this is the true doctrine. Destruction of privilege to hold Nature's bounties and demand tribute of labor for privilege of use, would bring conditions in which Individualism would greatly conduce to social progress for all.

I believe in the individualism of every individual, and not in the individualism of one individual as in Russia, or the individualism of a few privileged ones as in this country. Individualism to me means liberty for every one to do as he pleases with the productions of his own labor, without destruction of the individuality of others. J. M. H.

Anarchistic Socialism vs. State Socialism.

That socialism which advocates voluntariness in co-operative methods of reform, is rightly named Anarchistic Socialism as against State Socialism, which advocates governmental co-operation.

Communism, when voluntary, is Anarchistic and State Socialistic when otherwise. The difference between the two great branches of Socialism lies mainly in the question of reciprocity or "mutualism." The important question to be decided is; shall the individual be coerced into co-operative societies against his will? The state Socialist says, Yes; and is in favor of State control of land and labor. The Anarchistic Socialist says emphatically No; and is in favor of free land and free labor. Between these two schools of Socialism a compromise is impossible on this point. FENWICK.

Liberty and Culture.

FRIENDS:—I am very glad LUCIFER takes the true and brave course respecting the courts and the confined heroes. If the atrocious inquisition murders them I think thousands will feel the rope with Nina the darling wife of Spies. If the press of the nation generally had taken this course the influence on sentiment would have been better, and influenced in turn the demons and hirelings of the farce called trial, differently. As it has gone, hosts of good citizens suppose the sentence just; and also yours, editors of LUCIFER, and Elmina's, if they torture you. With such contempt and ready violation of our constitutional rights, there appears no need of further making god the head of them. The catering to popular favor for reputations and financial interest has made me about sick of the

name liberal. As facts stand, popularity is pitted against liberty and whatever favors it; whoever clings to its graces renounces in deeds the love of liberty, and if he does not in words must be a traitor or in a state of mental confusion. I have long thought a clear reasoner would scorn to be classed as popular. Those who have not the nobility to stand by just measures in all things, whether approved or scandalized, will not help throw the thrallhood from law or love, labor or moral principle. Priestcraft begins with children to culture onwards, and gradually fastens on the slave harness. When bravery and knowledge see what will culture free souls, they will begin with every living age from childhood to grandees, and educate the parents, teachers, exemplars, that imitating childhood may have truth embodied in customs before its eyes. And this one truth must never be forgotten, recklessness of physical purity lays in the system elements of treachery and all sorts of turpitude. Sanitary steps are among the first to be taken with both the young and old. If Christian zealots knew this law, they worked understandingly to control the world. Abnegation of the body for the soul's sake, of the present for the future's happiness, produces dullards to be duped, too stupid to see by experience that physical purity developed the spiritual, and that persons create their own heavens in this and any other world. Yours, M. E. TILLOTSON.

The Home of the Individual.

A. Chavannes and S. B. Fowler have each given their ideas of marriage and home in LUCIFER. As a matter of free competition I would like to place mine on record also. My ideal of marriage is no marriage at all, and my ideal home is briefly defined in my title. My ideal of Society is that of the Anarchist—a society destitute of aggression or invasion; in which raw materials are free; in which free competition prevails, labor is divided, and cost is the foundation principle of commerce. To carry this ideal out will, I affirm, inevitably result in such homes as I now indicate. The principle of individualism requires separateness, but marriage merges two or more individuals in one, and home, as we have it, merges two or more individual's homes in one. Therefore both are contrary to true individualism.

The home of a free individual should be a separate home; a separate house and grounds, or a separate suite of rooms, or a separate room—in any event a separate abode and place of refuge, an extension and reflection of the individual. The sovereign individual must have a kingdom exclusively his own or he is no sovereign at all and has no kingdom at all.

Observe the growth of trees. Here are two standing close together—married let us say. And happily married it appears, for unlike many such, one does not overtop and smother out the other, but both are equal. Beautiful harmony? But look closer. Do you not see that the branches of the one go all to the right, and those of the other go all to left; and the roots the same? Neither has grown and developed normally,—judging by average specimens of that sort of tree grown under conditions of separateness,—both are symmetrical, both are lop-sided. And the little ones below are shaded and smothered by their great parents.

Now see here! This is an orchard. The trees here are arranged in that scientific order which centuries of practical experience has demonstrated to be the best for the symmetrical growth and development of each individual tree, and the economical appropriation of soil, water, sun, and air. Each tree stands by itself, yet as close to its neighbor as the needs and offices of Nature and arboreal society require. Each tree grows after its own order and fashion, freely; and if any are lop-sided here, it is because they choose to be, and not because they are compelled. And the little seedlings—each is transplanted as soon as it is safe and fit, to a place where it, also, can grow after its own desire, injuring none and uninjured by any.

The two trees typify the communitistic

homes of the Heretofore. The orchard typifies Anarchy and each tree having its own separate location and access to raw material and separate ownership of appropriated material represents the free individual of the future in his free home.

Verbum sat sapienti. J. WM. LLOYD, Grahamville, Fla.

Another Convert.

DEAR MR. EDITOR: Your readers will readily recall the simple statement by Samuel Fielden, Esq., Teamster and Savior, to John W. Gary, posing as a judge, at Chicago, which was, in substance, "When I first heard at a Labor meeting, that Socialism meant 'Equal opportunities,' I at once became a Socialist," &c. Upon reading in Sacla Bailey Fowler's "Irene," that "Never will the Labor question be solved until Woman is free, never will Woman be free until the Labor question is solved," I found myself in Mr. Fielden's position, and as I looked away to the future, and backward across the track of my life, I reflected in this way,—I've been tramping around on this earth now about fifty-seven years, often at a loss to know what I was here for. First I was called an Abolitionist, then Spiritualist, Free Lover, Atheist, Communist, Socialist, Universalist, Anarchist,—always "Infidel," never "Christian," until I learned that these attempts at definition formed the body of "the Cross for me to bear," and I have become so used to the burden that, if I was turned loose and did not find some of these forms pinned to my coat tail I should hardly know who, or what, I was. In all this not unpleasant pilgrimage, as a matter of course, I had tried to examine the logic of all the different propositions which came before me, fit them into place as well as possible, and make of them a light upon the pathway of life—dim at times, and at times bright, always more or less flickering and needing constant attention to keep the pathway in sight. Suddenly, upon coming upon Mrs. Fowler's "Love and Labor Union," I discovered in them the *lucis habes in the manger*, born to become the saviors of the world in the "New Time rolling on," and how finely she has constructed in "Irene" a palace of progressive thought! And it seemed to me that I had familiarized myself with all of them except this one, and when it fell into line it completed the head of the column, and the division was in marching order. Then all the old "duffel" of definitions fell from my shoulders, the old cross of many names was loosed from my back and fell broken to the ground; the "Starry Crown," the one I had been looking for, took the place of the old rotten-egg "plug." The staff of truth was in my hands, the broad girde of freedom sustained the "garments of purity" around my body, which was ready to burst with three cheers for "The New Jerusalem!" Upon a closer inspection of my new "outfit" I find upon the inside cover of the cartridge-box of LIBERTY this inscription, ELAM E. LAMB, Burlington, Wis., Private, Co. "A," First Regiment of NATURAL INDIVIDUALISTS. Enlisted for Life.

I. S.—I think I overhear some of the comrades say "Considerable 'blow' about this new recruit—they are not apt to 'stay'—fell better after the 'first fire,'" &c.—and then I do remember that my wife has "been away visiting" all summer, and perhaps it will be better to wait and see her about it before I do, actually, send in my name for the new enrollment(?) as a

NATURAL INDIVIDUAL.

Falls of Government.

The sole proper object of government and human laws is, undoubtedly, the well-being of the governed. To that end government and human laws should especially protect the weak and the ignorant, and dispense strict and even-handed justice to all. The strong and the intelligent can easily protect themselves. But has any Government, at any time, anywhere, efficiently protected the weak and the ignorant against the strong and the intelligent? Look history answer. Slavery, oppres-

class privileges and class legislation, are entirely due to human laws and Governments. How long would slavery have existed in this world, had not human laws legalized and perpetuated that most fruitful and unnatural institution? Would not the brute force which established slavery have been overcome by the brute force of the enslaved when they became more numerous than the masters, had not the latter been protected by Governments and human laws? Would not man, from natural impulses, attempt to overcome every evil as soon as seriously felt, were he not constantly prevented by human laws, and by Governments, whose powers were obtained under the plea of benefiting the masses, whilst they have generally been used to oppress and injure them? The facts, there is not a single proper object or result sought to be obtained through Government and human laws, that may not be better, more fully, and more certainly attained by the mere action of the natural laws, forces, or impulses that control man, and on the contrary, there is not a single improper object now attained by means of human laws and Governments, that could be obtained were natural laws not interfered with by human laws and Governments. This must be so; for is it not the natural laws and impulses alone that induce man to overcome, not only his own evil or erroneous impulses and actions, but also all the evil effects of Governments and human laws?

Power attained by individuals as individuals, by the voluntary but revocable assent of the community, is invariably beneficial; for, whenever it ceases to be beneficial, it is withdrawn; whereas power obtained by Governments, is invariably retained and exercised long after it has ceased to be beneficial to the community. In fact, such power is never relinquished or destroyed except by a more or less violent struggle, after its injurious effects become untenable.

The old *beau ideal* of the possible results of governmental action is well expressed in that axiom of the pure, high-minded and honest Jeremy Bentham: "The greatest good of the greatest number." This is really the utmost result that can be obtained from human laws and Governments. But does not this axiom acknowledge that the State can only protect a majority; and that, to do this, it may oppress and injure the minority? Does not this axiom give an apparent sanction even to slavery, as long as the slaves are in the minority? How much more beneficial, how far more desirable, are the results produced by the action of Natural laws, which, uninterfered with by man, protect minorities as well as majorities. Under their unimpeded sway, each man will find means to protect himself, by some means or other, for, as men become more intelligent, they perceive more and more clearly that to permit an attack upon the weakest, soon leads to an attack upon others; that to sanction the infringement of the most unimportant rights, soon leads to the infringement of the most important. The same principle that permits the attack upon one, permits the attack upon all.—John Moran, *Government*.

The Supreme Court Invalidates the Record.

In the "opinion" presented by the Illinois State Supreme Court most of the points raised in the appeal have been completely ignored. And that is not all. The evidence manufactured by the detectives to obtain a conviction in the lower court did not satisfy the higher court, and dutifully the latter furnished what was lacking. As incredible as it may seem to the loyal citizen, it is yet true that the opinion-writer has falsified the evidence given in the "trial." Matters are assumed which are not supported by any evidence in the record; other testimony is distracted and perverted; in short, the supreme court of our State has made out an entirely new case against the defendant; the original one, it is presumed, was "no good." The confidence of the people in our judiciary has and abidably been greatly strengthened by this new departure. Judge Magruder, it may be said in this connection, was his judgment to the Chicago, Alton & St. Louis Railroad Company—Chicago Engineer

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 Defense Fund.

Previously acknowledged.....\$380.44
Julius G. Friton, St. Louis, Mo. 1.75
E. M. Dewey, Tulare, Cal. 1.00

ON THE DANGER LINE.

We have no certain information in regard to our case in the U. S. court. When we went to Leavenworth the grand jury had not acted upon the information against us, and, so far as we know, it has not done so yet, although the probability is that it has. But, on the other hand, we do not surely know that the information was before it at all. In short, we are completely in the dark in regard to it, not a word has been heard from the attorneys or the court officers since we returned from Leavenworth on the 13th and 14th insts. As stated briefly last week we were permitted to go, on our old recognizance, pending the action of the grand jury.

Nearly a week ago there was a newspaper rumor to the effect that an indictment of 200 counts had been found against "W." but the original report, in the Leavenworth correspondence of the Kansas City Times, contained so much that was known by all here to be false, that the entire statement was received very doubtfully by nearly all friends and foes alike.

LATEST: As we go to press—Wednesday—we have a letter from our attorney, stating that all three have been indicted jointly and severally, on several hundred counts.
H. & W.

Mrs. Slenker is to be "tried" the 31st inst., and so, before another issue of LUCIFER reaches our readers, the fate of this brave and conscientious worker for humanity will have been decided, most probably. We sincerely hope "Virginia Justice" shall prove to be justice indeed and triumphantly vindicate Mrs. Slenker's right to receive and impart instruction.

The petition for a writ of error in the case of the Chicago Socialists will be argued in the United States Supreme Court on Thursday, the 27th inst. (This is written on the 26th.) Gen. B. F. Butler, Gen. Roger A. Pryor, Capt. W. P. Black and Mr. Solomon are the counsel of the Socialists. Will justice prevail?
W.

Mr. Friton thinks that democracy is the nearest that we can approach, in practice, to Anarchism. Inasmuch as democracy (majorityism) is the very opposite of Anarchism, I fail to see that Mr. F. has given us even a hint as to the real solution of the difficulty of reconciling Anarchism with every day life, if such difficulty there be. "Each man should keep within his own sphere" is a cardinal principle with Anarchists. Bearing this in mind, will the restraintment of actual invaders (criminals) be a violation of that principle? Certainly it will not be. Rather, that is the only principle which can justify their restraintment or "punishment."

Card from Moses Hull.

FRIENDS HARMAN AND WALKER: I send you to-night the last installment of my reply to those parts of Mr. Braden's speeches which were published in the Register. I am sorry I could not make them fuller, but being constantly on the wing I could not carry with me the documentary evidence I used in my replies; besides that, editing a paper, speaking every day, writing a book and traveling has kept me so much more than busy that I have had no time to do my duty by these articles.

I thank you for the interest LUCIFER has taken in the matter, and hope you and your paper may "live forever."
MOSES HULL.

PRACTICAL CO-OPERATION.

By E. C. WALKER.

Some hints as to the methods of Self-Help and Voluntary Mutualism. Price, 10 cts.

THE GREATEST NEED. NO. II.

If I may judge from the tenor of the criticism in last issue, under the head of "A Dangerous Remedy," by "W." my article on "The Greatest Need," in LUCIFER of Oct. 14, is open to misconstruction, and has probably been misconstrued by more than one reader. To remove all ground of misunderstanding and to emphasize the views inculcated in that article I ask the readers of LUCIFER to exercise the grace of patience while I once more go over the main points of said article. It is perhaps needless to premise that no one is responsible for the utterances or doctrines inculcated in the articles signed "H." except the humble individual who writes them, whether the impersonal pronoun "we" is used or the individualistic and egoistic "I." For common use I prefer the impersonal we, ours and us, as being less offensively egoistic; but lest any one should infer from the use of the plural form that "H." desires or intends to dictate a policy for LUCIFER the singular pronouns will be used in this article, and perhaps in subsequent ones where there seems to be danger of the aforesaid erroneous inference.

First, then, I would say, in treating of the needs of the present day and present hour,

There is need of Radicalism to point out the defects of the old systems, the errors of the old customs and doctrines, and to show to mankind "a more excellent way."

There is also need of Conservatism, to select and preserve the good that has been left us as a legacy by the generations of men and women who have lived on earth before our time.

But above all and beyond all we need the strong common sense, the practical wisdom, that will enable us to utilize, to combine, the Radicalism, the Optimism, that the future offers, with the Conservatism of the past, that offers us the treasures of human experience. In other words, we need the common sense that does not ignore present conditions, present environments; we need the practical ability that does not disdain to make the best of the materials that now lie within our reach. We need to heed the homely wisdom that tells us that the human mind is never a blank page—that there are no "clean sheets" upon which we can write our Anarchism—our Individualistic, our Anarchistic theories or doctrines. That the minds of the people with whom we have to do are written all over with governmentalism—scribed all over with the precepts of authoritarianism and majority-rulers. We find ourselves surrounded by a generation of idolaters—men and women who worship idols (laws) of their own making or made by their ancestors. These people turn away from us in anger—they stop their ears and burn our papers when we talk of taking away their idols. Like Micah of old they are ready to say, "If ye take away my gods [laws] that I have made, and the priest, [ruler that I have elected] what have I more? See Judges xviii, 21. These people imagine that they could not live without their "constitutions," their "statutes" and their paternalistic rulers—for all of which the ballot-box stands as the fittest representative.

Now what are the dictates of common sense in dealing with these idolaters? Shall we enrage them, endanger our own lives and out off our chances of useful work, by attacking their idols? Should we not rather say to them, "Good friends, do not alarm yourselves. Keep your gods—your statutes, constitutions and rulers—as long as you find them necessary to your health and comfort; or, at least, so long as you find them necessary to keep you from wrong-doing. It [us I heard a man say of himself not long since] the fear of the law is all that keeps you from killing your neighbor, against whom you have a grudge, then, for your state of development, your law is, perhaps, a necessary schoolmaster, a necessary evil. But because you are yourself an idolater is no reason why you should compel others to be such also. Because you feel the need of statutes and rulers to keep you from wrong-doing does not justify you in assuming that all others need the same. If one man feels that the fear of hell is necessary to keep him from robbing his neighbor's hen-roost, let him still believe in hell, but it would certainly be very absurd in him to demand that all men should believe the same and should help support the preacher whose business it is to preach that dogma.

Thus far, by way of re-stating princi-

ples. Now a few words in reply to points raised by our critic.

1st. In speaking of the evils attending the use of the ballot, or majority rule, "W." says, "Cease to do evil, is an injunction of primary importance." Very true. No one deprecates the "profitless craze of the campaign" more than I do. But "W." should remember that voting is not, of itself, an evil. Instance, when a local policeman or a board of arbitration is needed, there is probably no better way of making the selection than by the ballot. Again: Suppose we have one thousand voluntary co-operators. A change becomes necessary in the business. The old business has proved itself unprofitable or undesirable. A dozen new plans are proposed, only one of which can be adopted. The right of withdrawal is always conceded, of course, but as between the evils of withdrawal and those of compromise the co-operator may choose the latter. In this case there is perhaps no better way to ascertain the possible basis of compromise than by the ballot.

2d. The word "charlatan" was used by me not dogmatically nor arrogantly but interrogatively and hypothetically.

3d. "W." thinks the "parallel between the man sick from alcoholism and the one sick from ballot-boxism does not hold good, because 'the former is his own slave master and his own chief victim; the latter is the master of others, and his may be the casting vote necessary to keep one class in subjection to another'."

While it is of course impossible to find metaphors that hold good in all particulars, yet even in this instance it is not hard to find a parallel between the two diseases named. The inebriate from alcohol is not always content with making himself drunk. Sometimes he tries to compel others to drink with him, or in other ways, while under the control of alcoholism, he invades the personal or property rights of his neighbors. But I have been careful always to point out the necessity of the repeal or modification of all laws that would "keep one class in subjection to another." This demand is in full accord with that clause of the Declaration of Independence which declares that "all just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed." Then if any part of the governed refuse their consent to certain laws these dissenters should be exempted from compulsory compliance with such laws. This principle has been acted upon in the case of the "Friends" or Quakers. This sect of Christians are opposed to war, even in self-defense, and they have been exempted from military service. They also object to the legal formalities in regard to marriage, and they have been specially exempted from compliance with those formalities. It has been and will be said that governments could not exist without compulsory payment of taxes, but history shows more than one instance wherein the necessary expenses of government were raised without compulsory taxation, as in the case of the "Free Cities" of Germany. In short, as before indicated in this article, we demand that the same principle shall hold in regard to state superstitions that are ostensibly applied to church superstitions, viz: Let those who want them, pay for them and let dissenters be free to worship one god, a thousand gods—mythologic or statute gods—or no god at all, so long as they do not attempt to coerce their fellow-citizens, or deprive them of their equal share of rights.

VOTING FOR REPEAL.

I certainly do not think that "voting for repeal is a tacit admission of the right of the majority to decide how much of the citizen's private concerns shall be under the control of said majority." Many instances can be named wherein a law has become a dead letter because of the passive resistance to, or general ignoring of, said law—as the "blue laws" of Connecticut and the blasphemy laws of many states. But if a man who constantly violates or ignores these laws should vote for their repeal it certainly would not be a tacit admission of the right of the majority to enact and enforce such laws. By his conduct he has already denied such right; now he votes for their repeal in order to prevent all future trouble in consequence of their possible enforcement, or attempted enforcement.

Again: Paul and Jesus, who were anti-marriageists, had patience with and charity for their weaker brethren who were not "able to receive" the anti-marriage gospel, so I think the emancipated reformer should have patience with and charity for those who are only half-way out of the coils of state superstition. The logical reformer could say to his brother,

"For myself I want no State. For statutes and constitutions I have no reverence, no worship. For human law, as law, I have not even respect. Statutes, laws, are simply the work of men's hands and brains, and, in so far as they invade the natural rights of man, they deserve and shall receive my contempt, my opposition, and not my respect or obedience. But for you, human law is a sacred thing. To you the voice of the people, i. e., the majority, is the voice of God. Your religious (superstitious) conscience tells you that a law must be obeyed until repealed by the same power that enacted it. Now, you freely acknowledge that we have too many laws—that many of them are wrong in principle and hurtful in practice. Yet you cannot or will not disobey these bad laws because of your conscientious scruples aforesaid. Let me help you out of your dilemma. Agitate for repeal and I will help you in all possible ways, even to going with you to the ballot box and casting a vote to bury the hateful thing out of sight forever."

This, it seems to me now, is a more feasible, more practical and practicable way of getting rid of our oppressive "governmental machine" than would be entire dependence on the passive resistance or "let-alone" policy. We certainly have the Autonomistic, the Individualistic right to isolate ourselves from those who cannot or will not rid themselves at once of their inherited reverence for laws, law-makers, law-expounders and law-executors, but I most sincerely believe such isolation to be injudicious, not to say, self-destructive. As indicated in previous articles I think the philosophic Anarchists, Individualists, Autonomists, can, without any sacrifice of principle, co-operate with the Repealers and thereby greatly hasten the total abolition of Authoritarian Government—all government of man by his fellow-man.

NOTE: For several months past the junior has been office editor while I have spent much of my time on the ranch. This gives him the advantage of the "last word" whenever a difference of opinion arises, as must necessarily often arise among individualists. As a rule, these differences have not been of a nature that would make it a matter of any importance as to who shall have the last word in any given number of LUCIFER, and being by nature and habit of a peaceful rather than belligerent temper, I have, generally if not always, waived my claim to the closing word in such discussions as have heretofore arisen between the conductors of LUCIFER.
H. J.

HOUSES AND ORCHARDS.

The futility of going to the animal and vegetable kingdoms for illustrations of the way in which human beings should order their lives has often been adverted to in these columns. Comrade Lloyd's attempt to make the tree in the orchard a type of the individual's home, emphasizes anew the fact that an ingenious appeal of this kind can, like an appeal to the Bible, establish any possible theory—so long as no one interferes with the delicately-woven web of *ex parte* statements!

In the outset, (that I may not be misunderstood, I will say that, in the main, I agree with our comrade in regard to the individualization of the home, and so I shall leave his argument untouched, confining myself here to the easy task of showing that the orchard is one of the poorest possible types of the homes of free individuals.

Properly, the orchard is a type of the paternalistic, Socialistic, State. The trees are set by the hands of an outside power, not primarily for their own benefit, their own development and improvement, but that said power may gather from them the largest possible crop (tax) for its own comfort and enrichment. This well illustrates the objects and methods of the existing State. The uniformity of the orchard is State Socialistic to the utmost degree. The differences between individual trees are not considered. Everything is reduced to the dull level of averages. The average number of feet of ground is fixed upon by a more or less crude and arbitrary computation and the trees that require more space and those that do not need so much are alike forced to abide by the decision of Authority. There is no spontaneity anywhere in the arrangement.

"Centuries of practical experience" may have demonstrated that this uniform arrangement is best for the interest of the cultivator, although I much doubt it, for reasons that will be given further along, but that it is best for the trees has not been demonstrated. The tree has not developed naturally; remove the coddling hand of man and it will be found that all these centuries of cultivation have not produced a species, or variety of tree that can survive in competition with the uncultivated species or varieties. These orchard trees will speedily perish or revert to the ancestral type. In this artificial civilization they are less robust and long-lived than their relatives of the thickets and groves.

Do we want the Home of the indi-

vidual to be planted by the hand of Authority for the sake of the fruit (taxes) that that home will yield to this Authority? Do we want all individual differences to be wiped away and men and women made uniform in their wants and the means of satisfying those wants? Is it possible to average said wants and yet give to each individual the opportunities to grow needed by that individual? Is it possible, in equity, to make each home the exact counterpart of every other, in area and durability? Do we want the resisting and self-helping power of men and women weakened or destroyed by any system of artificial orcharding?

Mr. Lloyd says of his orchard trees: Each tree grows after its own order and fashion, free and unfettered as it can be, and it is because they choose so to be, and not because they are compelled.

This is in no sense true, as the experience of every orchardist in the West, if not elsewhere, bears testimony. Hundreds of thousands of farmers know that they have, in the aggregate, lost millions upon millions of dollars through the attempt to make their fruit trees withstand separately the trying changes of our climate. The young trees are removed from the protecting association of the nursery row and set in the orchard. Here they do not and cannot grow after their "own order and fashion freely." They cannot "choose." The prevailing southwesterly winds bend them toward the northeast and so their unprotected boles are exposed to the scorching rays of our almost tropical sun. This hastens the ascent of the sap in the spring and retards its descent in the fall, with the result that late "cold snaps" in the spring and sudden freezes in the autumn distend and burst the cells, eventuating in the splitting of the bark and finally of the wood, the consequent penetration of moisture to the heart of the tree and its rapid decay and death. In millions of instances the evil has been aggravated and the destruction of the tree hastened by the "trimming up" which is such a mania with the majority of cultivators. This has made the tree too top-heavy, making it still more difficult for the roots to hold it erect in the loose soil against the strong pressure of the winds, and so it has leaned still more to the northeast and the hot afternoon sun given free play upon its unprotected trunk.

Deliver us from the tree-in-the-orchard style of Individual Home, O Comrade Lloyd!
W.

SUNDAY AT THE EXPOSITION.

The board of directors of the exposition held a business meeting yesterday afternoon, at which they decided to rescind their former action with regard to keeping the exposition open on Sunday. There was a strong current of opinion setting in against the closing of the doors on Sunday. A very large majority of the working class of people, who take a strong interest in such displays, and whom they are intended to benefit, were rendered unable to attend if the doors were closed to them on the only day they are free.—K. C. Times "Oct. 22

It is doubtless known to our readers that a great "National Exposition" is now being held in Kansas City, Mo.—the largest and best perhaps ever held in the western, or, more correctly speaking, the central portion of the United States. The exposition building is said to be of immense proportions, "larger than anything of its kind on the continent." If we may judge from the daily reports of attendance, and of the fights and sounds to be seen and heard at the exposition grounds, the management are to be congratulated, and may well be pardoned for a little self-gratulation and felicitation upon the success of the enterprise.

It would seem, however, from reports, such as the one just quoted, that the pathway of the "directors" has not at all times been strewed with roses. As usual, the Sunday question had to be met and solved. At first they gave way to the pressure for Sunday closing, but so manifestly unjust was this ruling, to the thousands of poor working people who could not attend during the week, that the order was rescinded. But only partially rescinded, for while the gates will be open as on week days, the show will not be the same. The report continues:

No machinery will be in motion, no wares will be offered for sale, unless it may be refreshments, and they can be had anywhere at any time. Sunday at the exposition will be more quietly and soberly kept than on the streets of Kansas City. In the afternoon there will be a sacred concert given by one of the finest, if not the finest, company of musicians on the face of the globe.

So, then, the exposition on Sunday must be made as much like a church as possible. Machinery must not be in motion, but a company of musicians, "one of the finest on the face of the globe," will be allowed to make more noise, perhaps than all the machinery in motion at once could make. This company is none other than the celebrated "Gilmore band," of "anvil chorus" fame, the sound of whose instruments

added to the "500 voices," is said to be simply deafening. It is not stated whether all the instruments are to be used on Sunday or not, but if not, why not? Why should the working people, who can attend the exposition on no other day, be deprived of the pleasure, if it be a pleasure, of hearing all the instruments and seeing all the machinery of the place in motion? The music of Gilmore's band is not simply a Sunday feature of the exposition, but their "engagement with the manager" is to last several weeks. The admittance fee will presumably be the same on Sunday as on other days, and if so, is it not legitimate to ask on what principle of justice or equity can the management demand full pay for only a part of the usual entertainment?

In a previous issue, while speaking of the Sunday closing business, the Times used this language:

Not only as a matter of consideration for the working population but for the sake of the advancement of public instruction and morality, reopening the exposition Sundays would be a better policy. It is a bad time for the progress of a nation's morals when the churches are ranged in opposition to innocent instruction because it is not under their direction.

"True, O King!" but did the Times man ever know the time when the churches were not "ranged in opposition to innocent instruction" and amusements that were not "under their direction?" Of course, in saying this we do not wish to be understood as including all church people, or even all Christian ministers. Many of these are better than their ecclesiastical governors, but that the policy of the church has ever been to oppose and destroy whatever it cannot control in its own interests, is indisputably true, and never more true than at the present time.

My friend Pinney, of the Winsted (Conn.) Press, takes quite decided exception to some sentences of mine in LUCIFER of October 7. I said that it was necessary that men of brains should "have more faith in the whole truth that they see." And I also said that the way to reform human conditions was for men and women with progressive ideas to lead instead of following the masses. I see no reason to alter these statements.

Perhaps, however, had I said that would-be reformers should keep in advance of the masses, I should not have been misunderstood, as Mr. P. has evidently misunderstood me, and so my critic would not have had to imply that "desire for domination," etc., inspired my utterance.

"Men are not inflamed by thoughts far above their own," says Mr. P. I have no desire to "inflame" men. I wish simply to get them to think, and I know, as does the editor of the Press, that men are inclined to think and progress, not by listening to or reading thoughts upon the line of their own or in the rear of them, but those in advance. The vulgar demagogue may hide most or all the truth he sees and, by hypocrisy, by catering to their prejudices he may "inflame" the masses, but he does not compel them to think. And far better is it to tell the masses truths of which the masses have no comprehension, than to cover truths, and inflame them by appealing to their supposed interests, and love of flattery. You will not reach so many as will the time-server and popularity hunter, to be sure, but neither will your influence vanish even more quickly than it came.

Reading Mr. P.'s strictures upon me, one not acquainted with him would naturally suppose that he trims his sails to the winds of popularity, and tells only so much of the truth that he sees as he thinks will be acceptable to the masses. But such a conclusion would not be in the slightest degree warranted by the actual facts. There is no more fearless writer in America, upon nearly all the unpopular reforms of the day, than this same Lucian V. Pinney. Week after week, month after month, year after year, he gives expression through his paper to ideas and advocates principles that will not be understood and accepted by the masses for a hundred years. In short, he is, as a teacher of reform, just what I said the reformer should be, the utterer of the whole truth which he perceives. And yet he scolds me for giving the advice! My brave comrade! I must smile at your glaring inconsistency.

"And the way of the masses is their own and the best for them." Until they know better, perhaps, but not best for us whom they, with the bludgeon of the ballot, strike down into the mire of pas-

sion and prejudices with them. Were they content to live their own lives in their own way, and leave others undisturbed to do the same, they would not so often be shocked and frightened by the teachings of those who, as a matter of self-preservation, are compelled to try to "lead" them—by education—to better views and ways of life.

In it "courting martyrdom" when a man tries to be honest with himself, to make his life harmonize with his belief and knowledge? For shame, comrade!

Zeno has very clearly shown that there is a great difference between monopoly of natural resources, and private property in the fruits of one's own labor. To confound property with monopoly "is anything but reason," he says. That is my opinion, also. His illustration of the hazel thicket, and fishing-rod is apt and conclusive. "If there be common sense in deeming ownership of my rod 'robbery' or 'monopoly' I should like to hear the argument," says Zeno. So should I. "Monopoly of Nature" is the source of interest, continues our correspondent. Right again.

But now Zeno gets off the track. He thinks that increase of productive power has been accompanied by increase of want. I shall not dispute it. And when he says that this want has been caused by monopoly I shall not demur, and I shall agree with him when he specifies that "monopoly of natural gifts" has been a factor in producing this want, but when he adds,—"and (monopoly) of capital that should have been public,"—I stop to ask him, What capital "should have been public?" By "capital" he does not here mean the gratuities of nature, for he has just classified them as "natural gifts" and stated that their monopolization is one of the causes of want.

The fish in the lake and the hazel thicket are "natural gifts," and so, in our search for the "capital that should have been public," we have now to examine only the status of the fishing-rod. Zeno made and the fish he caught. Should they be regarded as public property, public capital? Hear Zeno on this point. (Repetition is absolutely necessary sometimes.) He says: "The definition for 'property' is, 'exclusive right of possessing.' To confound the term with monopoly is anything but reason." Again: "If there be common sense in deeming ownership of my rod 'robbery' or monopoly," I should like to hear the argument." Precisely, Zeno, and the same is true of all products of labor, and we should like to hear the argument in support of the assumption that any of these products "should be public" capital. Again Zeno: "The right to withhold from use is not the source of interest. Monopoly of Nature is the source." Then, as access to the raw material is the right of all, and as conversion of this raw material by labor into articles of use renders those articles property which the converter has the "exclusive right of possessing," and as it is not reasonable to confound this possession with monopoly, where are we to find the "capital that should have been public?"

Zeno is determined to prove that possession of labor fruits does not constitute monopoly and that, therefore, those fruits can not rightfully be public property. Hear him once more: "It is a sad and cannot see injustice in monopoly of the hazel thicket (or fish in the lake), and justice in ownership of my rod, and the fish I take, that mind is lacking the faculty of distinguishing between things that are different."

I respectfully submit that Zeno has demonstrated that monopoly of natural gifts and opportunities is the chief cause of want, and that the products of labor belong to the laborer and should not be made public property.

Humanity is not infallible, hence there can be no "infallibly just restraint or punishment." But the more nearly we approach the Anarchistic standard, the less organized invasion has to do with the individual, the more we shall simplify matters and the easier it will be to draw the line between personal rights and those acts of selfish aggrandizement which nullify those rights.

I can see no valid reason for the use of the plural pronoun by an independent editor. Why an editor more than other men should seek such adventitious aid I do not know. The editorial "we" is one of the surface indications of our inward abnegation of individuality; we are not content to stand or fall upon our own simple manhood, but must seek for our views the seeming support of the many, we must give what is merely the opinion of one man the appearance of

being the dictum of the majority; the man is enlarged into a colossus by the majesty of the mystery!

The editorial "we" is one of the voices thundering on our ears a warning against majorityism. In unmistakable language it tells us that in America the man and woman are sinking out of sight in the mass; they no longer have opinions of their own but delegate to the impersonal, irresponsible "we,"—the majority,—their right to think and speak.

Whatever well-intentioned reformers who were early in life indoctrinated with the false and pernicious Christian idea of "poverty of spirit" (humbleness) may think, the fact remains that there is far less of pretension and arrogance in the use of "I" than of "we" by editors. "I" takes a man to man, speaking upon his own individual responsibility. "We" speaks as kings speak, with words weighted as with authority, and responsibility is lost in the unknown.

Finally, why should it be taken as an indication of modesty for the editor to write "we" rather than "I" while it is considered perfectly proper for the preacher in his pulpit, the speaker upon the rostrum, the correspondent in the letter to his friend, the teacher at his desk and the author in his book, to say or write "I"?

Especial attention should be called to the fact that the 11th of November is not far away and so everything that is possible should in the meantime be done to awaken interest in behalf of the condemned seaman in the Chicago jail. This office has just received from Lucy E. Parsons, the brave wife of A. J. Parsons, a package of the latter's "Appeal to the People of America." This sells at 50 cts. per hundred, \$9 per thousand, and may be ordered of us or of Lucy E. Parsons, 785 Milwaukee avenue, Chicago, Ill. All receipts from sales are to be used in helping pay the expenses of the Appeal to the U. S. supreme court. Send also for "Parson's Appeal to the Governor, an open letter asking for his judgment as a lawyer." Act at once, friends of free speech and justice. People in town who desire to know the facts should call and get copies of these documents. Free.

It is the old stale objection of orthodoxy to Free thought that the latter does not distinguish between the good and the bad in the past, but would "destroy all indiscriminately. No charge could be more untrue. And it is only the most radical investigation that enables us to distinguish the good from the bad, the valuable from the worthless, and so gives us power to preserve anything. If we would avoid revolution and its inevitable destruction of true and false together, each man who has a thought differing from those of his fellows must give it voice. Do not mind about those who cannot understand you, for them you are not talking but for those who can understand you. Never fear, there are plenty who will talk for the former; the intermediate ranks will reinforce you on the outposts and they in turn will be filled from those behind. Each man has his work to do, a work that is not his neighbor's but his own. The "common sense" method of agitation is for each man to speak his thought to those nearest to him; they shall translate it to those at a little greater distance and so, if it be bottomed on facts and human needs, it will finally permeate the whole mass and grow into triumphant deeds of righteousness. Do not put the seal of silence on your lips or open them to speak only half the truth you see because of fear that whole truths will not be understood and valued. They will find their own. With unerring instinct they will seek and link to yours all kindred minds.

Inasmuch as Anarchists would, quite as surely as others, restrain actual criminals, such as murderers, thieves and rapists, there is no question about letting the people retain their "idols," in so far as these idols are laws against such actual crimes, and so there is no difference between any "common sense" reformer and myself upon that point, and no need to take space discussing it. As is well-known, I, no more than "H," aim at the destruction of "The Restraintment," only at the elimination of government. Where there is no divergence, why amplify? What I claim should be clearly taught by every individualist is this, that while the man who thinks that he cannot be kept from robbing his neighbor's hen-roost except by the fear of hell has a need for and a right to that belief, he has no right to vote for a law imposing a fine and imprisonment upon me for not

believing, merely because he fears that I, says that belief, will rob his hen-roost.

So far as smashing idols with mental clubs is concerned, there is no greater iconoclast than "H," and as I do not propose to use any other kind in breaking them, there is no real difference between us. A careful perusal of LUCIFER's pages for the past five years will conclusively show that he has not been one whit more "conservative" than I. Some of the most ultra "radical" articles which have ever appeared in the paper were from his pen, and it was one of these which proved to be the straw necessary to break the back of the patience of one of the old subscribers and supporters of LUCIFER. A man who clings to his "idols" with the greatest tenacity and thought us at once the most foolish and most wicked of innovators and "radicals" for trying to teach him that he had no right to break our heads with his paternalistic "crutch."

It would seem that it should not be necessary for me to say that in any purely voluntary association (from which, of course, withdrawal is attended by no penalties), where the things which may be done by majority vote are clearly defined, and agreed to by all, and where the officers (agents) elected have no duties to perform which invade the rights of uninvading associates,—it should not be necessary for me to say, I repeat, that in such an association voting is legitimate, because it is then confined to the selection of agents to perform certain work which all agree shall be so performed, and if any are dissatisfied with the agents chosen they can freely leave with no fear of coercion.

And neither should it have been necessary to say that I was not talking about the voting in any such association as this, but in the existing compulsory state, which is at the antipodes from the Free Society. I did not for a moment suppose that it was required that I should go out of my way in that article to provide against this "switch" of "H," from the main track of argument. That I was talking about the State, and it only, not any voluntary association, seemed perfectly clear.

As to endangering "our own lives and cutting off our chances of useful work, by attacking their idols," the above remarks fully apply, and in the same connection I will say that, up to date, so far as we know, the "Markland letter" has played quite as important a part as anything else in threatening at least the latter result, and the letter found its way into these columns while the "radical" W. was in the north and the "conservative" and "common sense" H. in full control as publisher and office editor. The moral is obvious, especially when we recollect the bravely radical editorial from the Senator's pen, in the second issue following that containing the letter.

Now, just a few words in iteration of the gist of my article last week: It is absurd to suppose that those who think they must vote will confine themselves to voting for repeal. That is the last thing in their minds. Per contra, they are, most of them, dead sure that they could get along without laws of any kind, laws either of the restraining or of the governing sort, but they are equally sure that other people can not, and so they will continue to vote, not to repeal laws that oppress others, not to make laws for their own governance solely, or even chiefly, but laws to govern those who do not agree with them. Then why argue about a truth which they will not accept one minute sooner because it is sugar-coated?

Lack of space prevents further consideration of this subject in this issue.

The Valley Falls Debate.
Moses Hall's Eleventh Speech in Reply to Ed. Clark Braden.
Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:
All things come to an end, including Bro. Braden's way of stating his proposition. His arguments ended long ago, and with a few more propositions the statements end. His thirty-third statement is as follows: "Christianity gives to man a social organization, the Church of God, perfect in its divinely appointed organs; with perfect commandments for obedience, and perfect ordinance and service for worship and perfection; perfect truth in morals and religion, and eternal themes for thought, cultivation and elevation, prayer, praise, benevolence and nobleness of life. It requires at man's hand a perfect consecration of life—love to God with his whole being and his neighbor as himself—a life molded and regulated by the rule of life which is perfect in teaching and model."
Here is a long and verbose proposition, but what is there in it? absolutely nothing

proven; and nothing asserted but what has been asserted and without even an attempt at proof thirty-two times before. I am not astonished that Mr. Braden's friends are sick of his mode of conducting this debate, I would be if I were they. Now, let us search among this everlasting string of words and see what ideas can be found.

1. Christianity gives to man a social organization.
2. This social organization is perfect, with perfect commandments, truths and morals and religion.
3. It requires of men a perfect consecration—love to God, etc.

These are the propositions simplified and brought within your comprehension, now let us examine them.

1. Does Christianity give to man a social organization? If by this Mr. Braden means to infer that man had no "social organization" before, he is mistaken. From the Bible comes that the church with its "appointed organs and perfect commandments" was an old institution when Jesus, the supposed author of Christianity, was born. In Matt. xiii: 17 Jesus recognizes the church as being an old institution when he was on earth. So if the church was what Mr. Braden refers to, it was old, not only among the Jews but each nation had a "social organization" corresponding to the church. If he refers to the various "social organizations" known as churches, to-day the organizations which have existed only to persecute those of a different opinion I would like him to name he or she means. Does he mean the "social organization" known as the Holy Catholic Church? that is the oldest organization of the kind to-day, and would exclude him as quickly as it would me; and probably, if it had the power, would burn him at the stake as quickly as it did millions of other heretics. If he does not refer to all the churches let him tell us which he does mean. Christianity has given us all or one or none of these organizations. When he points out the one Christianity gave with its perfect commands and ordinances I want to compare it with others. Alexander Campbell said:

"The various worshiping establishments throughout Christendom, considered together by their respective voluminous confessions of faith, are not churches of Jesus Christ but the legitimate daughters of the mother of harlots, the church of Rome."

Thus, according to the founder of the system that Mr. Braden preaches, neither the church of Rome nor the "worshiping establishments" mentioned by their respective voluminous confessions of faith are churches of Christ. I fear Bro. Braden's "social organization" is of late date, and a very small affair.

2. Where are the perfect commandments and ordinances in Mr. Braden's "social organization" that are not everywhere else? that were not before Christianity, and that I cannot find where Christianity was never heard of? Come, Bro. Braden, these assertions are getting a little monotonous, please to favor us with a little proof.

3. I agree with Mr. Braden, that Christianity requires of man a perfect consecration, but to what? to superstition; to forms and ceremonies, not to manhood. According to Dr. Draper, the consecration Christianity to shrine cures, to forms and ceremonies and to *verbi*, hold the world back from progress fully one thousand years when the Mohammedans got into Spain then consecration to science—to *material* medical; to physiology, to anatomy, to astronomy, to mathematics and the other sciences—moved the world onward very fast, but when Christians got in there and drove these reformers out, the hand on the dial plate of progress turned backward. These fellows who killed humanity did it for the love of God. They were "consecrated to God," more than any people have been since.

Let Mr. Braden, instead of standing here and reading his stale propositions, point out the good Christianity has done that could not have been done and there been no Christianity. When he does that his Christian friends may begin some of the interest in his side of this debate, which has been on the wane ever since he read his first proposition.

Mr. Braden would, if he could, in his 34th proposition lead us to believe that without Christianity children would not love their parents, wives their husbands nor husbands their wives. This would do very well if it were not a fact that in the animal kingdom almost every thing is the same for the male and its mate. Besides, the heathens all did the same. The love of companionship, of parents and of children was a particular feature of the old Teutonic tribes, and it was preached and practiced among all nations as far back at least as Zoroaster, long before Moses' day. Cicero and Seneca both enjoined it. Seneca asserts that he who bet his wife or his child had a wickedness hands on the most sacred things in the world. Mr. Braden's other two propositions have been met so often in the previous ones that I will not reply to them again.

- LIST OF OUR AUTHORIZED AGENTS**
- Charlottesville, Mo.—E. S. Galloway.
 - Wear City, Kans.—Dr. J. H. Cooper.
 - Scammonville, Kan.—J. McLaughlin.
 - Omaha, Neb.—James Griffith, 1712 Dodge St.
 - Leavenworth, Kan.—H. H. Hutchinson.
 - Joplin, Mo.—J. H. Nichols & Bro.
 - Clinton, Mo. (E. T.)—Geo. H. Hutchinson.
 - Humboldt, Kan.—Wm. Ratti.
 - Burlington, "—Chris. Brown.
 - Garnett, "—C. Gregg.
 - Ottawa, "—W. W. Frazer.
 - Cedar Junction, Kan., J. O. Collins.
 - Hartington, Iowa.—Werner Roskell.
 - West Burlington, Iowa.—James Toft.
 - Succas, Kan.—J. H. Nichols & Bro.
 - Salina, Kan.—J. M. Isten.
 - Serranville, Kan.—John F. Young.
 - Carbondale, Kan., James S. McDaniel.
 - Preston, Iowa, John Durant.
 - M. O. Hocks, Sion Springs, Ark.
 - H. L. Joslin, Nankalo, Minn.
 - E. E. Palmer, Manning, Iowa.
 - Kansas City, Mo., Dr. O. Linn Marster.

