

# LUCIFER

## THE LIGHT-BEARER.

NEW SERIES, VOL. 5, No. 30.

VALLEY FALLS, KANSAS, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 11, E. M. 287.

WHOLE No 224

### LUCIFER--THE LIGHT-BEARER.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY.

#### TERMS:

One copy, one year, \$1.25  
Duc copy, six months, .65  
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.

We date from the First of January, 1801. This era is called the Era of Man (E. M.), to distinguish it from the theological epoch that preceded it. In that epoch the earth was supposed to be flat, the sun was its attendant light revolving about it. Above was Heaven where God ruled supreme over all potentates and powers; on earth ruled the Pope as the viceregent of God; below was the kingdom of the Devil, Hell. So taught the Bible. Then came the New Astronomy, the astronomy of Copernicus, Galileo and Bruno. It demonstrated that the earth is a globe revolving about the sun; that the stars are worlds and suns; that there is no "up" and "down" in space. Vanished the old heaven, vanished the old hell; the earth became the home of man. Bruno sealed his devotion to the new truth with his life on the 17th day of February, 1600. During the 17th century Grotius wrote the first work upon international law. This was the herald of the settlement of national differences.

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

### 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 Enjoining the use of Wine or Strong Drink, or among the blessings to be bestowed upon favored individuals or tribes, etc., or including the deprivation of it among the punishments indicted upon the disobedient. List C.—Passages Conditionally Commending 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 Commending 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.

Price, per copy.....\$0.10  
Per dozen......30

Address, WALKER & HARMAN, Valley Falls, Kans.

### AN OPEN LETTER. COMMON SENSE ON THE Sexual Question.

By H. W. BOOZER.

We have just received a good supply of this popular and meritorious little work, and have to dispose of them soon to our truth-seeking readers. Price 10 cts. Lucifer, Valley Falls, Kansas.

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 bears to attend funerals. Terms as low as the lowest.

E. L. SENFT, PHYSICIAN AND SURGEON. Valley Falls, Kan.  
Dr. Senft uses "Eucalypti Specifico Medicinae," Wholesale over Evans & Kemper's store

### GREAT LOVE AND I.

BY FRANCES HODGSON BURNETT.

I looked at Love!  
Love seemed a little thing;  
"A small, blind god," I said, "with golden wings,  
For these poor poets to adore and sing,  
Their stock-in-trade, which has its price to bring!"  
I did not know.

I laughed at Love!  
"The merriest jest of all,"  
I said, "a gay, light, bounding ball,  
Which gambols wit at both its rise and fall,  
And never flies our grasp beyond recall!"  
I did not know.

"Your Love," I said,  
"Through the long summer days  
I lie and laugh and listen to his ways;  
Court Poesy is he," I said. "Grow him with boys  
And laurel for the folly of his ways!"  
I did not know.

"Court Fool," I cried,  
"We'll barter all for you;  
You are a toy to mock at, ever new,  
A jest when false, a better jest when true!  
Laughter will always ring at thought of you."  
I did not know.

I looked on Love!  
Alas! I mocked no more.  
Within his hand a dagger sword he bore;  
His eyes were great and sad, and prone before  
Him in the dust I lay, luminescent o'er.  
"Great Love," I cried, "Master forevermore!  
I know, I know."

"Master," I cried,  
And trembling touched his feet,  
His eyes were great and sad and bitter-sweet,  
Beneath his gray hair, all laboring, bent;  
To lift my glance, I knew I was not meet.  
I know, I know.

His face was pale,  
And most majestic fair;  
There was no lightsome joyance in his air;  
A throbbing wound hid in his bosom bare;  
A thorned crown was in his shining hair—  
So did I know.

"Great Love!" I cried,  
"Great Love! am I?" said he,  
"Great pain and tear of long and bitter-  
Tears of heart's blood, salt as the great dark sea—  
And dost thou jest and ring fool bells at me?  
Thou diest not now!"

"Forgive," I prayed,  
"No wings are mine," he said;  
My bleeding feet pass on with weary tread  
Whither I will, and where I will,  
The poet sings but when his heart has bled—  
Dost thou not know?"

"Laughed thou at Love?  
The day will come for tears,  
For pangs and aching longings, heavy fears,  
For memories aying waste all coming years—  
Dead hopes, each one a living flame that scars—  
Then wilt thou know?"

Then I who mocked  
I cried: "I've seen thy face,  
I pray thee, grant to me one piteous grace"  
(To stay his feet I held them in embrace).  
I know, I know!

"I mock no more,  
Great Love, but hear my cry:  
Give me the pangs, the woe, the bitter sigh,  
Bear me, in pity, bear me, lest I die,  
Let me bear all, so love pass me not by,  
Since Love I know!"

### THE "CENTURY."

### WAS IT A FAIR TRIAL?

An Appeal to the Governor of Illinois.

(By Gen. M. M. Trumbull.)

Seven men are now lying under sentence of death in Chicago, nominally for murder, but really for sedition, out of which it is alleged the murder grew. It is averred by friends, and believed by many enemies of the condemned men, that their trial was unfair, the rulings of the court illegal, and the sentence unjust. The decision of the Supreme Court ends the trial of the Anarchists, but not a trial of the judgment.

These men are sentenced to die on the 11th day of November. In the gloom of this impending tragedy, the Governor of Illinois rises into unparalleled importance as the highest court of appeal. He is called upon to say whether the sentence is the decree of justice, or a judicial mandate of revenge. Shall the "Revenge" circular of May 4th be answered by another "Revenge" circular in the shape of a judicial opinion? Shall the law of the land be driven from the Court House by the law of retaliation? The Governor must decide.

flammatory speech, but innocent of murder.

It has been contended that the authority of the Governor over a judicial sentence is the prerogative of mercy alone; and that all questions of guilt or innocence, of justice or injustice, have been settled by the decision of the Supreme Court. This is a mistake. The power to pardon is frequently judicial, although the form of its exercise is not. It is true that the Governor does not reverse or modify the judgments of the courts, except in the form of clemency, yet the power to pardon is continually exercised as a function vested in the chief magistrate. It has been so from the earliest times in England, and there, as here, under the form of mercy, errors of the courts are constantly corrected by the pardoning power. The cause of John Frost will serve as an example.

In 1839, Frost, Williams and Jones, were tried in Wales for high treason. They had levied war against the Government. They had led a mob of men to attack the jail at Monmouth, and they had engaged in battle with the police and soldiers. As a consequence of this mad enterprise fifty men were killed. There was no question about the guilt of the accused, and they were duly sentenced to death. After the trial was over, it was claimed by their counsel that the list of witnesses for the Crown had not been handed to the prisoners the legal number of days before the trial. This point was assigned for error, and it was referred to the fifteen judges sitting in Westminster Hall. Their answer was:

"A majority of the judges in the proportion of nine to six are of the opinion that the delivery of the list of witnesses was not a good delivery in point of law. But, secondly, a majority of the judges in the proportion of nine to six are of the opinion that the objection to the delivery of the list of witnesses was not taken in due time. So the judgment was affirmed; but the Government said that it would never do to hang three men, however guilty, who at their trial, were deprived of the right to which they were entitled by the law, although the prisoners themselves had waived it by not asking for it. The judges having confessed that there was error in the trial, it would be a scandal that the men should suffer death. The sentence was, therefore, commuted to transportation for life. In the Frost case the commutation of the sentence was a judicial act exercised in the form of clemency under the pardoning power.

ERRORS IN THE RECORD.

In the present case the Supreme Court of Illinois confesses errors in the record, and, as in the Frost case, decides as to some of them that objection to them was not made in time. For instance, in the matter of the Most letter, the language of the court is this:

The objection that the letter was obtained from the defendant by an unlawful seizure is made for the first time in this court. It was not made on the trial in the court below.

As a technical rule of practice this may be correct, and, perhaps, binding on the Supreme Court, but it is not binding on the Governor, as the like decision in Frost's case was not binding on the Crown. Technicalities in favor of life should be liberally allowed, and this is a maxim of the law. Technicalities in favor of death have a glastly look; they are altogether shocking, and they are odious in the law.

In the deepest tragedy there are scenes of comedy. So in this. Scarcely had the Supreme Court handed the seven men to the Lord High Executioner when up steps Mr. Justice Mulkey, a member of the Court, and with comic paradox passes mortal judgment upon the decision itself. The stab he gives it is fatal. Here is what he says:

It is not my intention to offer a separate opinion, as I should have done. I desire to avail myself of this occasion to say that while I concur in the conclusions reached, and

also in the general views as entered in the opinion filed, I do not wish to be understood as holding that the record is free from error, for I do not think it is.

Which is to say, that Mr. Justice Mulkey agrees to the conclusions, but not to the premises on which they are founded. He agrees to the general views and not to the special reasons. He is neither ethical nor logical, for if the premises are bad, the conclusion must be, at least, dubious. If the special reasons are unsound the general views resulting from them cannot sanctify the hanging of seven men. Judge Mulkey's concurrence in death for the Anarchists on general principles is but a judicial echo of the angry clamor of the streets. "They didn't have a fair show," said the president of a vigilance committee, in excuse for the hanging of a gang of bad characters, "but most of 'em was guilty." The apology was weak.

Judge Mulkey thinks that he can sanction the decision, and at the same time sustain his reputation as a lawyer, by disclaiming all responsibility for its errors. He knows that the decision becomes authority in Illinois, and that it will be embalmed in the "Reports." He sustains the decision, barring the errors in it. When the passions of this hour are gone, when the seven men are silent in the grave, when the bar of Illinois is laughing at the decision as a legal statement, Judge Mulkey reserves the right to say, "I told you so at the time; I said then that errors were in the record; these that you ridicule are the errors that I meant." This resource cannot avail him, because he is not brave enough to expose in a separate opinion the errors he confesses. Chief Justice Pilate confessed that there were errors in the trial, and even washed his hands of the judgment, but the stain remains forever. Mr. Justice Mulkey consents to the death of seven men under a judgment which, although legally defective and infirm, is good enough for them. The intimation of Mr. Justice Mulkey that he has a dissenting opinion in his mind, which he declines to spread upon the record, is of itself a full justification for interference by the Governor of the State.

### THE ODDS AGAINST THE PRISONERS.

In the trial of the Anarchists the law itself was bent and strained to the breaking point. On the floor of the Court House they stood at a perilous disadvantage. The scales of justice were not poised evenly between the accused and the State. They were poor; the prosecution rich. The whole machinery of the city and county government was at the service of the prosecution. The treasury was reckless of cost. The police force, the detective force, and every official influence were active against the prisoners. They were beaten from the start. In the arena of life or death they fought against odds unfair and invincible. They played for a jury with dice loaded against them. The indictment was a bewildering contradiction of sixty-nine discordant counts, and every count was the horn of a dilemma. If Schnaubelt threw the bomb, says the Supreme Court, you are guilty as his accomplice, because the indictment alleges that Schnaubelt threw it. If Schnaubelt did not throw the bomb, as you have tried to show, then the case of the State is proved, because the indictment says that it was not thrown by him, but by an unknown person. The exact language of the Court is this:

All the proof introduced by the defendants thus tending to show that Schnaubelt did not throw the bomb tended also to prove that an unknown person threw it.

From a dilemma like that escape is hopeless. Evidence and its contradiction are alike fatal to the accused. From a labyrinth of sixty-nine counts the most experienced pilot cannot extricate the prisoners. There is not a guide either in legal or moral philosophy that can show the way out. On this subject the rebuke of Lord Chief Justice Denman, in delivering judgment in the O'Connell case, may be quoted with approbation. He said:

"I must take the liberty to throw out an observation that, in my opinion, there cannot be a much greater grievance or oppression than these endless, voluminous and unintelligible indictments. An indictment which fills fifty-seven folio pages is an abuse to be put down, not a practice to be encouraged."

In the O'Connell case there were eight defendants, as in the Anarchist case, and they also were imprisoned in the convolutions and sinuosities of an indictment with many counts, "endless, voluminous and unintelligible." The indictment which drew from Lord Denman that indignant criticism contained only eleven counts, while that against the Anarchists contained sixty-nine. This is a six-fold greater "grievance and oppression" than the indictment in the O'Connell case, and the offense charged was only a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment and fine.

### THE WRONG OF REFUSING SEPARATE TRIALS.

As if the tortuosities of the indictment were not sufficiently complicated, they were again multiplied by eight when the court refused a separate trial to each of the defendants. (There is not another State trial in the history of political prosecutions where eight men were tried together for their lives on an indictment containing sixty-nine counts.) There is not an enlightened nation on the globe that would permit it, and if such a trial can legally hang a man in Illinois, her civilization needs hurrying up. Will the Governor permit this "grievance and oppression" to prevail; he alone can save the character of his State from the irony of the law. We ask the Governor for clemency, and we base our petition on the right of every man to a fair and impartial trial.

The Supreme Court decides that the matter of separate trials is within the discretion of the court below, to allow them or deny them. True, but this is a judicial discretion, not an arbitrary power; a discretion subject to be reviewed by the Supreme Court, and corrected wherever its exercise has been oppressive or unjust. It is a discretion that may be reviewed by the Governor of the State, when by its operation the lives of seven men are placed in jeopardy. The joinder of the defendants made the testimony against each avail against all. It practically deprived them of the benefit of each other's testimony; it embarrassed them at every step of the trial, and it confused the jury, who never even tried to sift the evidence or apply it. In hopeless bewilderment they contented themselves with a hurried verdict of guilty "as charged in the indictment," an indictment which alleged the killing of Deagan in sixty-nine different ways. They never read the indictment, for they were not out long enough to do so.

By trying the defendants all together, nearly every piece of evidence against them separately was multiplied by eight. For instance, a public speech made by Parsons in February, 1885, is made evidence against Fielden and six other men on trial for a murder committed in May 1880. So, a public speech made by Fielden in March, 1885, is made evidence against Parsons and six others in the same way. Old editorial articles by Spies were made evidence against Parsons and the other six, while editorials by Parsons were transmuted into testimony against Spies. The defendants were weighed down with hundreds of criminalizations, which, having reference to only one of them, were made to bear upon them all. Says the Court:

Spies, Schwab, Parsons and Engel were responsible for the articles written and published by them as above shown. Spies, Schwab, Fielden, Parsons and Engel were responsible for the speeches made by them respectively.

Here Fielden, whose name appears not in the first sentence, is ingeniously woven into the mixture of writing, publishing and speaking, although he never wrote or published anything.

If it is pretended that the jury applied the evidence to the defendants "respectively," the proof is absolutely conclusive that they did not. It was impossible for them to do so in the short time occupied by them in deliberation. In that short time they could not have reviewed, compared or applied the evidence either to the counts in the indictment, or to the defendants "respectively."

The Supreme Court itself was compelled to recognize the illegal character of the testimony above described, although in an apologetic way. The confession and apology of the court is in these words:

"Declarations that are merely narratives of what has been done or may be done, are incompetent, and should not be admitted."

(Continued on fourth page.)

# LUCIFER

VALLEY FALLS, KAS., Nov. 11, 1887.

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.

## ELMINA VICTORIO

The following telegram brings the glad tidings of Elmina D. Slonker's release from the clutches of Comstock and his tools:

ARINCOTON, VA. 1  
Nov. 4, 1871.

M. HARMAN, Valley Falls, Kan.—Elmina discharged. The blackmail business pretty well broken up. E. W. CHAMBERLAIN.

This and similar dispatches sent to many other journals will bring a sense of relief, a feeling of joy and gladness to thousands of homes, scattered all over the land. Next week we hope to be able to give particulars of the trial. II.

## "DECLENSION."

If the discussion of methods of work were foreign to the "conflict into which we have been forced by the Comstock inquisitors" I would be quite willing, even though placed in a false position before our readers, to say no more, for the present, at least, in regard to points adverted to and animadverted upon, by the Junior in last week's *LUCIFER*. But just here, as I take it, lies a fundamental error. It is not enough to "know that you are right and then go ahead!" It is vitally important to know just how to go ahead! We may go ahead in such a headlong way as to make it morally certain we shall never reach the objective point aimed at. Inasmuch, however, as this comparison of ideas seems to be taking on (contrary to my wish and intention) something of a personal character, I am quite willing, after briefly noticing a few points, to wind up, for the present, my side of the aforesaid discussion.

Scrutim, then, in reply to the Junior's "This, and No More," in last issue:

1st. Yes, I have "advocated passive resistance to invasion, association for business and other purposes outside," but not necessarily antagonistic, to "the State." But when did I ever advocate total "abstention from voting?" I have always advocated "repeal" of invasive laws, and I have distinctly and emphatically regarded voting as one of the best methods of repeal—at least such is my recollection now.

2nd. The answer to this paragraph is like unto the first. Certainly, I claim the right to change; I have often done so before. Without change there could be no progress. But in the present instance I fail to see the signs of change.

3d. "Smashing of idols" may be "educative" and yet be "invasive," at least it may be considered in that light by the owners of the idols, unless we are very careful to disabuse their minds in this regard. This is just the point to which I was calling attention, in an impersonal way, in the paragraph which "W." says "is totally irrelevant to the subject in dispute." I did not wish to make the application personal, and shall not do so now.

My reply to the third paragraph answers, also, the fourth. It only remains for me to state, very briefly, why I used the words "declension" and "reversion" at all. If the reader will kindly look up last week's *LUCIFER* and read the article entitled "The Greatest Need, No. 3," he will see why I used these words. Those who have read our paper and *Liberty* (Boston) for the past year, do not need to be told that there was a divergence of opinion between the editors of the two papers, and that that divergence was solely on the question of methods—we taking and defending what we conceived to be practical, yet consistent, methods, while *Liberty* advocated what we believed to be impractical methods. This, I think, is all that needs to be said now.

In another place, under the head of "Voting" will be found what may be considered a brief defense against the charge that I am making a "retrogressive movement towards statist methods." Throughout this

short controversy—if such it may be called—I have aimed to avoid personalities—have stood on the defensive rather than upon the aggressive—have tried to state general principles and to outline methods of practicalizing those principles, leaving to others the personal application thereof. This has been the head and front of my offending. II.

## MORE, AFTER ALL.

In accordance with my announcement last week, I should say nothing in response to "II." criticisms of my positions, but one very surprising statement of his involves a matter of fact and imperatively demands a few sentences from me. It is this:

I have always advocated repeal of invasive laws, and I have distinctly and emphatically regarded voting as one of the best methods of repeal—at least, such is my recollection now.

I do not know how "II." "regarded" voting, but I do know that he has not recently put himself on record in favor of it as a method of reform, that is, in distinct terms. To be sure, he has advocated repeal, and so have I, but with me, at least, there was no expectation of taking part in voting for repeal.

But where, in *LUCIFER*, during the past two and one-half years has he "distinctly and emphatically" advocated voting? I am all the more certain that he can find nothing of the kind, from the fact that had he so expressed himself I should have been sure to criticize him publicly. Of course, in speaking of his "declension," I had in mind his position viewed in the light of what he had said and written, not what he may have thought—"regarded." I am not a mind-reader.

The views he has expressed upon this subject since Moses Hull's second visit are a complete surprise to me; I had never before heard him utter in conversation nor had I seen anything from his pen which could be construed into harmony with his present opinions. Of course, no one denies the right of change; it is the fact of change which now concerns us.

An important question: Can we get a majority to vote for the repeal of bad laws? If we cannot, voting for repeal is useless, as I have said. If says that such a majority of good men is impossible. Hear him (in *LUCIFER* of July 27, '80):

"In order that majority-rule may be better than minority-rule the majority must be composed of better and wiser materials than the minority. This we know to be impossible in the nature of things."

Italics are mine. II. now thinks that bad laws can be repealed at the ballot-box. On June 18, '80, he did not so think. Then he said:

"All we can do at the ballot-box is to choose our masters for the next constitutional term of years."

All we can do? So he then said, So long ago as May 8, '85, II. said, in reply to a correspondent:

You say, "we have all the necessary power to adjust our wrongs." It is just possible that we have the power, so that we may carry out a little more consistently, but we can never throw off nor abolish this load of wrongs until the parent wrong—the governmental machine itself—is abolished. Without the aid and protection afforded by this parent wrong the pestiferous brood of minor wrongs would soon starve to death.

But let no one say that because we advocate the abolition of our governmental machine we are therefore in favor of a violent revolution. Peaceful Evolution, by means of Educational Agitation, is our motto.

In other words,—We cannot throw off our load of wrongs, made up principally of laws, so long as the governmental machine remains; it is through this machine that we vote for repeal; but voting will not remove the wrongs because they are not to go while the machine remains and when the machine goes there will be nothing to repeal! Therefore, voting is useless.

More briefly; if you do not—as you say you cannot—remove these evils until after the elimination of the governmental machine, then you do not have its aid in removing them.

Yes, Educational Agitation is our motto.

II. complains that this discussion of methods has taken a "personal" form. That was inevitable. When one in a band of workers suddenly begins to criticize methods which were once common to all and are still pursued by the others, it is only natural that the latter, while defending those methods, should point to their critic's former advocacy of said methods.

Once again, in tiresome reiteration, to avoid all possible misunderstanding—The right of change is strongly maintained by me, but

when the fact of change is denied it becomes my bounden duty to show it, as I do—not by an appeal to the *vox populi*, to the opinion of "our readers," but by the unimpeachable record.

## PEACE OR WAR.

No mortal man ever had occasion to feel solemn in view of the responsibility resting upon him, that man is Richard P. Oglesby, now holding the position of governor of Illinois. From this hour, Tuesday morning, till Friday 10 A. M., of this week, the responsibility will rest upon him, more than upon any other living man, to say whether the sunshine of peace or the lurid clouds of war shall cover the face of this fair land for many months and perhaps years to come.

Is this putting the case in stronger language than the facts warrant? Listen, a moment or two. For months before the Haymarket tragedy there had been war in Chicago, and at many other points throughout the United States, growing out of the differences between laboring men and their employers. There had been no formal declaration or recognition of war, unless "strikes" on the one hand and "lockouts" and evictions on the other could be called such; neither was there a formal declaration or recognition of war during the Kansas troubles of '56-'58, and yet actual war along the "border" existed during these years, as we all know. In Chicago, in East St. Louis, in Milwaukee and elsewhere, blood had freely flowed in this struggle between capital and labor. As in the border conflicts of '56, so also in these later conflicts, the struggle was between the claims of Liberty and Justice on the one hand, and the demands of human slavery on the other. As then, so now, the defenders of Liberty and Justice worked against fearful odds. The proslavery men in '56 had the whole power and prestige of government at their back, while the anti-slavery men had to bear the odium, the burden, of opposing the government. The worst that could be said of the abolitionists was that they acted hastily and unwisely—that they appealed to force before public sentiment had been educated up to the point of justifying force, but it is now freely admitted that even John Brown, the most hot-headed and fanatical of them all, was a heroic champion of liberty against oppression, and that he died a martyr to the cause of human advancement.

That the hanging of the Chicago seven by the State of Illinois will precipitate a war all along the line, wherever the power of monopolistic and corporate slavery is arrayed against the demands of the great unorganized army of wage-workers—just as the hanging of John Brown and his comrades by the State of Virginia, precipitated a general war between the upholders of privilege and the champions of freedom and equality—seems to be rapidly becoming a foregone conclusion. Among many similar utterances that might be quoted, take the following attributed to Judge McAlister of Illinois:

"It is an awful responsibility for the government. It is not hesitate to say if it allows the law to take its course, it will make these men martyrs in the opinion of thousands of people. It will be to the monopolists what the hanging of John Brown was to slavery, and so you will find it."

And what was the "hanging of John Brown to slavery?" More than any other single act in the great historic drama, this act told the death-knell of chattel-slavery! But human slavery did not die. It only changed its tactics and rapidly became more powerful than ever before.

We say the slave power changed its tactics. Before the war it monopolized the fruits of labor by owning and controlling the bodies of the workers. Now it monopolizes the fruits of labor by owning and controlling, the tools, the motor powers, the machinery and raw materials,—the opportunities,—out of which these fruits must be produced; and also owning and controlling the medium—the currency—through and by means of which exchanges of values are effected.

But in one respect, at least, the slave power has not changed its tactics. Before the war it entrenched itself behind the power and prestige of government, and it freely used that government as the most effective means by which to hold in subjection the bone, the muscle and even the brains, the very souls, of the toilers in the mine, in the shop, in the factory and on the soil. And in proportion as the power and prestige of government are greater now than they were in chattel slavery times so now the

power of the monopolists—the oppressors of labor—is greater than it was in chattel slavery times.

JUDGE MORAN.

Another Chicago judge—Moran—one of the signers to the petition for amnesty for the condemned, in giving his reasons for signing, said:

"It is not customary in this country to hang a fellow for talking. The sentiment is to let him talk; that the people will be all right any how. Besides, it is just to allow these men to become martyrs? Among the laboring and middle classes will it not give rise to the belief, ungrounded though it be, that a man of wealth can say what he pleases, but if a laborer or a laborer's mouth-piece talks he will be hanged? Many facts as well as statements are misconstrued and developed into far-reaching consequences.

This, it will be seen, is a very guarded statement of opinion, but it is a type of that expressed by a large class of fair-minded men who do not wish to offend the capitalistic lords. It is an appeal from the standpoint of policy rather than of justice, but all the same, it is an acknowledgment that the hanging of these men will widen the breach, already so wide and deep, between labor and capital—in fact that it will be a virtual declaration of war.

WILL THEY HEED THE WARNING?  
Will the "monopolists" heed the warning voice of Judge McAlister, Judge Moran and thousands more, who without committing themselves in the least to the Socialistic or Anarchistic theories of the condemned, ask for official clemency? And will these monopolists demand of their mouth-pieces, the great city journals, that they stop their howl for blood, and, before it is too late, help to turn the tide of popular sentiment in favor of amnesty and justice? Alas, no! Whom the gods destroy, they first make mad, is a proverb whose truth never was more apparent than it is to-day. The proslavery monopolists demanded the blood of John Brown and his comrades, believing that by this means they could "stamp out" abolitionism in the United States. The result was that they stamped out their own "peculiar institution." The monopolists of to-day demand the execution of Spies, Parsons, Fielden, et al., believing that by this means they can stamp out the great popular uprising against the despotism of corporate capital. Their success will probably equal that of their illustrious predecessors.

What then? After the deluge, What? The conflict growing out of the wrongs of the black man radically changed the character of this government. Before the war it was a proslavery government. Chattel slavery was a recognized, a law-protected institution. For many years this institution dominated and terrorized the government. It was the power behind the throne, greater than the throne itself. By the war, this was all changed. Chattel slavery was destroyed—not of choice, even of its enemies—not designedly, but as a military necessity. In this new war, caused by the wrongs to the laborers, white and black, will the character of the government be changed? Will monopolies cease to be the government? Will they now be the power behind the throne? Will the condition of the great mass of workers be changed for the better, or will monopolists change their tactics, just a little, and go on as before? Time alone can tell. II.

## THE COMING THEOCRACY. III.

Underlying all the differences of the creeds there is the essential unity of one common purpose—The church of Christ must rule mankind. This remains unchanged amid all the changes in dogma wrought by modern freethought and science. The hell of the fathers may indeed have been transformed from a place where actual fire tortured the wicked, into the quiet "place of the dead," but none the less strong is the fanatical resolve of the unbroken central divisions of the Church militant to bring all men to the feet of their Christ, to make all institutions and governments harmonize with the "Law of God," as they, (the Lord's anointed), interpret it.

Under all the ominous signs of storm and wreck, the Theocrats cling to their idols and work unremittently to the one end, the overthrow of the republic, the destruction of civil and religious liberty, the establishment of the Theocracy. The threatened and seemingly inevitable legal murder of seven rash but honest Champions of Labor stays not for an instant the march of the Covenanters and their allied hosts as they sweep on with gathering momentum toward the goal of their hopes and ambitions, the enthronement of their fetishes as the God, the King and the Supreme Law of America. The fall of the fatal trap at Chicago will shake this nation from ocean to ocean, may shake it as not even the death of Brown at Charlestown, not even Moultrie's iron hail on Sumter, shook it, but the imminence and fear of all this cools not in the least the ardor of the advocates of the religious

Amendment; they are citizens first of Christ's kingdom and if this nation is not Christ's, then welcome any sacrifice, welcome any horror, welcome any earthquake of passion and disaster that will bring rulers and people penitent to "His" feet.

That the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is the intermediary relied upon by the Theocrats to bring the prohibition party upon their platform has already been clearly shown in these columns, but the evidence continues to accumulate, and I will now lay another installment of it before our readers, premising it with the observation that the only way in which our people can be reached, the only method by which they can be aroused to a sense of the gravity of the situation, is the persistent presentation of the facts upon which we (alas that we are so few!) base our conviction and prophecy that the Coming Theocracy is almost here, that the day of its complete triumph even now reddens the eastern sky with the portents of the intolerance, persecutions and martyrdoms that shall most darkly and deeply stain its reign.

In a letter to Rev. T. P. Stevenson, who is the Corresponding Secretary of the God-in-the-Constitution Association, Mrs. May A. Woodbridge, a prominent W. C. T. U. worker, writes of the prohibition party as

"The only party that has declared for the utter annihilation of the liquor traffic, for an observed Sabbath, and for marriage and divorce laws on a biblical ground, and who has acknowledged the Lord, our nation's sovereign."

The W. C. T. U. of Westmoreland, county, Pa., declared

"That we will work for the advancement of God's glory, of Christ's kingdom in the earth and authority over nations, and the Word of God as a rule in politics as in private life."

The New York Convention of the same society adopted this resolution:

"Believing that Christ in government should be acknowledged by the utterances of political parties in their platforms, and knowing that His heaven only can change our purposes for righteousness and truth, and that we recommend that the W. C. T. U. of this State make urgent request of all political parties to this end."

Ohio falls into line with this: Resolved, That we believe the government most rest upon His shoulders who is the wonderful "counselor" and in whose name we have set up our honors; and that Christ must rule in legislatures and in parties as well as in individual lives, if our nation is to be saved.

This convention, after listening to two addresses by Secretary Mills, of the Nat. Reform Association, was ready to explain and indorse the objects of the latter association, in these explicit terms:

"WHEREAS, The National Reform Association is an organization in active advocacy of great national principles and of broad non-sectarian Christian doctrines touching the government of God and the kingdom of Christ, which requires the Bible should be recognized as the basis of all moral legislation in the nation."

Resolved, That we heartily approve the aims and operations of the National Reform Association; which couples with its teachings the support of all the reforms, so dear to the heart of the Christian, and the observance of the Sabbath, observance, use of the Bible in the public schools, purity of the individual and the home, sanctity of the marriage relation as taught in the gospel of Christ, etc.

Maine does not lag behind. Hear her:

Resolved, We believe the watchword of the hour is God in Government, and that the party of the future will be the one that recognizes the Wonderful Counselor, reveres His Word, and promises to stand as a unit on the platform of prohibition of the use, manufacture and sale of intoxicants.

Kentucky and Nebraska, led thereto by Mrs. Clara Hoffman, adopted this:

Resolved, That we see with sorrow and alarm the tendency of our country to Sabbath desecration, irreverence and irreligion of every kind, we re-affirm that "the most righteous nation that ever dwelt upon earth shall perish." We therefore earnestly petition the Prohibition party, State and National, to make clear and emphatic acknowledgement of Christ as the true and rightful ruler of nations.

There is nothing doubtful in the ring of this preamble and resolution, adopted by the State Convention of the Pennsylvania W. C. T. U.:

"WHEREAS, God is the universal Sovereign, Christ the Supreme Ruler, and the Holy Bible the supreme law on which all law should be based; therefore, be it resolved, That the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Pennsylvania do heartily indorse and will zealously co-operate with the National Reform Association, in its work to secure a recognition in the Constitution of God and His Son Jesus Christ as the ruler of nations, His Word as the higher law to which we appeal in all things; and also that we unite in their efforts for the reformation of God in the public schools, as an educator to Christian citizenship and Christian legislation."

As showing the strength of this association of Christian women and the power it can wield, it is only necessary to state that nearly five hundred delegates attended the Pennsylvania Convention, and that they represented 1051 local unions in that State.

Assuredly, in previous issues and in this one has been quoted from the official declarations of the W. C. T. U. to show conclusively that that body is at one with the National Reform Association in demanding that the cardinal doctrines of Theism and of Christianity shall become parts of the fundamental law of the land and that they shall be enforced by appropriate legislation. Then, when we remember that the W. C. T. U. is the heart and soul and life of the prohibition party, that it will use all its power and wiles to induce that party to stand with it for "King Christ,"

we are fully justified in regarding the outlook as most serious, and in warning men who, calling themselves Freethinkers, are yet in the prohibition camp, to get out and stay out—they have no place there, that is the home of despotism, and they, as Freethinkers, are the soldiers of Liberty.

In immediate connection with these deliverances of the W. C. T. U. I must quote the following squib from the N. Y. Voice, national organ of the prohibition party:

Personal liberty always has been and always must be restricted when public safety demands it.

Put the Church-prohibition party in power and how much personal liberty do you suppose the priest-rulers would regard as compatible with "public safety?" Let the dark, sad, bloody history of the past give answer; that past when Christ was king indeed in the minds of men and his church held humanity in the hell of its most cruel slavery.

The Christian Statesman says:

What we seek is to maintain the separation of Church and State, and at the same time to maintain the connection between religion and the State.

There is Jesuitism in its subtlest form! What does Mr. Stevenson mean by "religion?" Christian Theism, of course. He would indignantly scout the idea that there is any true religion other than this? And are not all the different branches of the Church in this country also Theistic and Christian? Certainly. What, then, does he mean by saying that his party is against a union of Church and State but wants to "maintain the connection between religion and the State?" He means to catch the unwary. He is weaving a web of sophistry in which to enmesh those too optimistic or stupid to profit by the lessons taught by the Past. What Liberal is there who will support prohibition and so be snared by this clerical bird-catcher?

A call has been issued for a General Conference of the Evangelical Alliance to meet at Washington, D. C., Dec. 7, and continue in session three days. The notorious W. E. Dodge is president of this Alliance, for the United States, and among the prominent signers of the call I note the names of President McCosh of Princeton, President Angel of the University of Michigan, and several more college presidents. Here, too, appear the names of Gen. Howard, Senator Colquitt, Howard Crosby, Rev. Stevenson and a very large number of other distinguished lay and clerical pillars of the evangelical churches. The object of the meeting is to secure greater concert of action among the orthodox Christian bodies. It is one more danger signal. Watch and work, Comrades.

Rev. M. A. Gault reports the young pastor of the Presbyterian church at Rochelle, Ill., as saying:

I would not use a Sunday train even to attend my mother's funeral.

Theology kills the natural affections, or, when not strong enough to kill, it maims and debens.

Suppose that the mother of this elip of a preacher is at the door of death, longing for the hand-touch and kiss of her son, and that he can, by taking a Sunday train, reach her ere the loving mother eyes are forever closed; while, on the other hand, if he waits until Monday, the chances are all against his reaching her while life remains—the question is, will he give his mother this one comfort and joy in life or will he be loyal to his damnable creed and let the last pulsation of her heart be a pang of pain, the last feeble look in her fading eyes a mute pleading call for the son who comes not because a dogma has dehumanized him? All that need be said is that a religion that induces a man to give expression to such an atrocious sentiment as that attributed to the Rochelle minister ought to be buried forever out of sight and sound in the fathomless gulf of a world's loathing and contempt.

Just now a friend at my elbow impudently wants to know if this young clergyman should die on Sunday, whether he would go to heaven on that day, or would he still object to travel on the "Sabbath?"

The National Reform Association is each year sending a circular letter to the governors of all the States, urging them to make their Thanksgiving proclamations more distinctly Christian; to authoritatively recognize the "fact" that "all our national blessings come through Christ our Lord, and that our thanks are offered in his name, as becometh a Christian people." Last year the Association received a "gratifying response" from Gov. Seales of North Carolina. It is suggestive, the eager-

ness with which these pious gentlemen, who are otherwise great sticklers for "law," engage in the work of arguing, cajoling, and browbeating officers of the State and national governments into flagrant violations of the wholesome provisions of the national Constitution and State Bills of Rights, concerning the separation of religion and the civil power. They well know that every Thanksgiving proclamation is unconstitutional and they should remember their own invariable prescription to other discontented classes—"The good citizen will always obey the law, no matter how distasteful it may be to him, until it is repealed." Do they? No, Sir. They care nothing for any law that stands in the way of their work. They will bend or break or repeal it, as they can,—anything to clear the road for the Coming Theocracy.

VOTING, ETC.

There is really little difference between the position held by the Junior and that defended by me, on the voting question. No less than he do I deny the "right of the majority to decide how much of the citizen's private concerns shall be under the control of said majority." It is to abolish this feature, this abuse, of the ballot that I advocate voting for repeal of invasive laws. I certainly do not accept the challenge of the personification called the State, to "fight a duel with her." The parallel between the "code duello" and voting by ballot, is a false, a fictitious parallel. Duelling is murder; it is an unmitigated evil. Not so with voting. "W." has already admitted that under voluntary associations voting is a proper and legitimate method of securing practical unanimity. So, likewise, I maintain that voting is a proper and legitimate method of securing the abolition of the invasive, the despotic features of the present state and national governments, and thereby reducing these governments to the status of voluntary associations. It by no means follows that when voting for repeal we would thereby tacitly agree to abide by majority-rule in case of defeat. "Passive resistance and voluntary self-help" would be left to us all the same. If the code duello had been a part of the law of the land I would freely have gone to the polls to vote for its repeal; and if defeated I should certainly not have felt bound to accept the challenge of the first choleric "gentleman" who might fancy his "honah" insulted by some innocent remark of mine!

Finally, on this point I would just say that I have not at any time intentionally or knowingly side-tracked the Junior from the "main line of argument." My points have never been side-issues but always pertinent to the subject in hand, as I think our readers will admit.

The Junior winds up the discussion in regard to the the impersonal use of "we," and sits down upon it. With him I think there is not much to be gained by the continuance thereof, and so, with a few more explanatory words I will also close my side of it. 1st. I fully agree that "impersonal journalism" has been carried too far, and that the individualistic editor should be very careful not to use the word "we" in such way as to make others responsible—against their will, or without their authority—for his own utterances. 2nd. "I-ism" means "Individualism," just as heism, sheism and tism mean individualism, but you and your mean individualism, mean one person, and we, ours and us may, likewise, mean individualism. 3d. When a man goes "down upon the street," or speaks to people from the platform or elsewhere, he usually has discretion enough to use the word "we" in such a way as to be understood by his auditors; just as he always has discretion enough to use the pronoun "you" in such a way as to leave no doubt in the mind of his hearers whether he means one person or more than one. 4th. I think it unfortunate that the singular forms thou, thy and thee, have been banished from common use. Our language has been impoverished thereby. We have also great need of a pronoun, or pronouns, of the common gender, similar to the French "on." It would also be very desirable if we could (I mean, if everybody could) agree upon a uniform system of phonetics, phonography and phonotypy, so as to get rid of our present deplorable system—or rather lack of system—in spelling, writing and printing our vernacular. But all these reforms, like the reform in the use of the pronouns we, ours and us, are of minor importance when compared to the reforms that concern

the right to self-ownership and the right to an equal share of nature's gratuities, and especially the right to use pen, tongue, press and mail in discussing these rights.

In order that we may stand a better chance of getting a respectful and candid hearing in regard to these more important reforms, I, for one, think it best to conform to or with common usage in all non-essential, and comparatively unimportant matters.

"W." is unfortunate in his selection of metaphors. The dog's tail is not an excrescence, not an invasive, subversive tumefaction on his body politic, as is the case with our present invasive, subversive laws. The dog's tail is a useful as well as ornamental member while kept in subjection to the head—that is, so long as the dog wags the tail—but if the tail should defy the order of nature and begin to wag the dog, as our despotic laws are now doing, then the question might be legitimate and pertinent as to whether said tail should be eliminated at once by amputation, or whether by some process of medication, it might not be healed of its infirmity and made useful and ornamental again—or, peradventure, whether by some constitutional change the tail might not be absorbed into the body of the animal, a la pollywog!

Once more, only, for this time: Most sincerely and earnestly do I advocate the egoistic individualistic principle as a basis of all development, of all reform, of all progression; but I do not believe in, I do not advocate egoism to the exclusion of Altruism. For myself I wish to be truly altruistic as well as radically egoistic. Indeed I think it is only through altruism that the highest and best egoism can be reached. It is natural and perhaps unavoidable that the young, the vigorous and the impetuous should cultivate or push the egoistic to the neglect of the altruistic, and if, in unconscious pursuit of self-individualization, a little dogmatism, a little arrogance and pretentiousness should occasionally be exhibited by these younger members of the Free-thought army, such minor and perhaps ephemeral defects should be overlooked and condoned by those who have reached that stage of life when the impetuosity of youth should be tempered by experience and reflection.

THE RESTRAINTMENT, ETC. TO MR. HOLMES.

It is not my choice to reply to Mr. Holmes in detail; the unhappy juncture of affairs makes it best that the overwhelming proof in contravention of some of his statements should not now be brought forward. A few words, only, then, upon some minor points: 1st. As to our alleged repudiation of the name "Anarchy" I need only to quote a portion of what I said to Mr. Holmes in our issue of Oct. 7: Certainly, after the "event of the Haymarket" we saw the necessity of having some word not so almost universally misunderstood as was Anarchy, to help explain and illustrate the latter name. \* \* \* Outside the ranks of the Anarchists themselves, and a small group of students and philosophical thinkers who are not Anarchists, there are none who understand what Anarchy is and least of all do many who themselves bear the name. The so-called "Revolutionary Anarchists" and the "Communist-Anarchists" are, in many of their principles, as far from genuine Anarchism as are the governmentals. It should be added, that the term Anarchism stands, in our minds, for certain definite principles and when we see men advocating antagonistic principles under the same name, we are, naturally, disinclined to remain silent, and so we disavow, in all ways possible, responsibility for their propaganda. 2d. So long as Mr. Holmes fails to recognize the wide difference between the reciprocal tyranny of invasive governmentalism and the free association of freemen for defense against the invasive actions (such as murder, theft, arson and rape) of criminally disposed persons, it is useless to attempt to discuss with him the propriety of the term "restraintment." So long as he fails to see the opposed nature of the principles underlying these two classes of actions, respectively, his mind, to use the apt words of "Zeno," "is lacking the faculty of distinguishing between things that are different." Certainly, "restraintment" under any other name is still restraintment, but restraintment is not necessarily governmentalism. In fact, restraintment is only another name for self-defense, and so, freedom from governmentalism, whether that governmentalism is imposed by a common murderer, a king, or a majority, is possible only by the exercise, in some way, of the principle, the right, of self-defense, of restraintment. I have no wish to make light of the practical difficulties in the way of the restraintment of actual criminals, but the fact that there are such difficulties was not and is not the question at issue, which was, and is, the right of the individual and of associations of individuals to restrain criminals,—the right of self-defense, and the propriety of using the

term "The Restraintment" as the name of such defensive association. 3d. It is said that I ignored Comrade Freiligh's position that "The recovery of wealth, even by force, is not contrary to individual liberty." While true, in the abstract, it is a principle not always possible of application. Set upon by an overwhelming force of robbers, our comrades have an undoubted right to defend themselves by force, but to do so would be an act of the supremest folly. We, of LUCIFER, have an equally undoubted right to defend ourselves by force against this most criminal prosecution, but could an act of madder folly be conceived than such resistance would be? But, aside from this, to put oneself in the force relation is bad, always bad, even when the last resort of the oppressed. Anarchism and Revolution are irreconcilable; while the revolution lasts you can have no Anarchism; for force and authority are indispensable in war. No, "W." does not regard Kropotkin and Reclus as Anarchists. They have Anarchistic tendencies only.

4th. Mr. Holmes draws a very fine picture of a free communal society, but the old readers of the Alarm know that the free communism for which he now contends is something entirely different from what was advocated in its columns. But, as I intimated in the outset, I do not choose to reply now to the latter part of Mr. Holmes' communication. The men of Chicago are in the shadow of the scaffold. Mr. Holmes, with his usual rashness, has thrown out a challenge. I will not accept it at this time. Let us hope no one else will do so.

YEA, SHAME!

Says B. R. Tucker, in Liberty. On the fifteenth of October the American Secular Union met in the city of Chicago to hold its eleventh annual congress. It sat through six sessions, lasting two days. Many of the leading Freethinkers of the country took part in its proceedings, and much was said in a general way in honor of the liberty of speech.

Not far away from the hall in which this body sat, one of its members, Samuel Fielden by name, lay languishing in a dungeon which he had occupied for a year and a half, awaiting the execution, to take place within one month, of a death-sentence pronounced upon him for no other offense than the exercise of the liberty of speech. Yet, throughout these six sessions, and among all the delegates present, not one voice was lifted, so far as appears from several long reports in the Truth Seeker, in condemnation of the outrage thus in process of infliction upon a fellow-member of the body. SHAME! SHAME! SHAME!

What better could be expected of an organization that has no views in regard to freedom of Press and Mail? This invertebrate society was born at the Cassadaga Congress; there was surrendered its right to an opinion upon the infamous Comstock laws. Has it dared since that time to protest against their enforcement, no matter how earnest a Free-thought worker the victim might be? Has it even hisped for Mrs. Slenker?

FLASHES.

Comrade Callahan of the Denver (Col.) Labor Enquirer has this to say regarding our prosecution:

"The editors and proprietors of LUCIFER, published at Valley Falls, Kansas, have been indicted by the grand jury ostensibly for printing and sending obscene matter through the mails, but in reality for publishing a journal which contained radical utterances on the labor, social and free thought questions in general. Through a conspiracy of the parasitic priests, preachers, politicians and wealthy men of the vicinity, the editors of the paper have been arrested on trumped up and frivolous charges heretofore, solely with the view of breaking up the paper."

The Enquirer publishes also a part of my appeal to the friends of fair play and liberty of the press. Thanks.

The discharge of Mrs. Slenker is a splendid triumph. The news is as gratifying as it was unexpected. The rulings of the judges have been almost uniformly against Freethinkers who have been entrapped by the Comstock decoys and when Judge Nelson ruled so exceptionally just in the last Haywood case it did not seem possible that another so fair a judge could be found. But now it would appear that he has been found in Virginia, although, of course, there may be another cause or other causes for Mrs. Slenker's prompt discharge. Probably that worthy woman's traducers will be less obtrusive now.

I trust that all our readers will enthusiastically read the installment of Gen. Trumbull's "Was it a Fair Trial?" which we give in this issue of LUCIFER. The Chicago Labor Enquirer pronounces it the best thing yet written, in review of that Star Chamber "trial." Mrs. Parsons sold nearly 5000 copies in a few hours on the streets of Chicago. We can supply it at 10c per copy.

The Overton-Laetra controversy has assumed an altogether too personal and vituperative character and I hope that Comrade Laetra will let C. M. O. "gang his alu" in future. The editor of the American Idea usually answers himself. So utterly contradictory are his ideas and opinions that about every three weeks he succeeds in cancelling all his various "sums" in moral and political mathematics. Any attempt at a serious refutation of his heated

misrepresentations of radicalism seems like a total waste of time and paper.

Our day of publication this week is the day set for the murder of the seven condemned Socialists in Chicago. As we go to press on Wednesday all is uncertain; Governor Oglesby may commute the sentence of some of them, but I fear that he will let them all go to the gallows. It appears inevitable that some will hang and the death of one only will be terrible, terrible in itself, more terrible in its possible consequences.

Against this proposed deliberate crime I protest with the whole energy of my nature. No more can be said now in a few short days we shall know all; then we can speak understandingly.

Justice grant that these seven men shall live, and soon breathe the air of Liberty. Nothing less than their unconditional release will satisfy the demands of right and of Humanity.

"The Restraintment"—Communism—Anarchism.

Concluded from fourth page. not made. As Spies flayed and forcibly expressed it, when before the Congressional Ministers in this city, "We are the storm birds heralding the approach of the coming tempest." That is it! We are the prophets (in one sense) of the revolution. W. ought to know better than to take the statements of the capitalistic press as to what we taught and I am sure he will not add a single word in the speeches of our comrades (with perhaps the single exception of Lings, who, previous to the Haymarket affair, was unknown to us) that could be construed as advocating violence.

Now you are probably aware that with some of our condemned comrades, I was closely and personally connected. I knew five of them well, long before their imprisonment; but with some of them I was on very intimate terms. Parsons, Fielden and Spies were members of the American Group, of which I was for nearly two years secretary. I was with them in their work. Our families were intimate. I had the very best respect for their integrity, their courage, I therefore assert that they were not Anarchists. With probably two exceptions they are Anarchists of the Kropotkin (or Communist) school, as are both my wife and myself. That is, we believe that after the revolution many people will prefer to live in free communities, having everything in common, and all general Anarchy prevails. It has always seemed strange to me that our individualistic friends should deny the possibility of free communism under Anarchy. Suppose, for instance, that the revolution is an accomplished fact, and Anarchy prevails. Several people, believing in the principle of a community of goods of perfectly free production and distribution, without the adoption of a medium of exchange, get together and agree to form a common co-partnership. There is no compulsion but each adult agrees to labor for the general welfare of the community say four hours each day. The product of their toil is carried to a central or general storehouse, from which each person takes supplies as he needs them, without money and without price. What would you all do with this? Is it not communism? Or if you like the term better—communism?

This is the kind of an Anarchist I am, and I know Parsons and Fielden have the same views. Some of the others also have, while one or two are more nearly Proudhian Anarchists. Such a belief, remember Liberty and Lucifer to the contrary notwithstanding) is in perfect harmony with the most perfect individual liberty—fact it is the very essence of freedom—therefore you are right also in your claim that our comrades believe in individual liberty. As man is naturally a social and gregarious animal, and as his wants would be better supplied by the adoption of close co-operative associations, these views seem to me both logical and just. (Our position as revolutionists is also logical, in that we are in favor of a common destruction—as LUCIFER seems to consider us—we should still be none the less Anarchists. Immediately after the bomb was thrown our conservative friends—the State Socialists—declared that the cause of Socialism had been set back 500 years. Who thinks so now? In an article which I wrote for the Denver Labor Enquirer in reply to their attacks, I showed that whoever the person was that threw the bomb at the Haymarket, the cause would receive a tremendous boom thereby, and later developments have proved my prediction to be true. The world has to be startled every now and then by some such occurrence as the Haymarket; and it is our conservative friends, who are horror-stricken at such a deed, it is done, that afterward reap all the benefits.

But the work of our comrades here in Chicago has always been in the educational line. We tried to show how certain causes would produce certain results. We have been the "storm birds"—heralding the revolution. We have also urged the people to prepare for it, so that when it came it would not find them without arms. That we are to do more than once that his greatest fear was that the revolution would come too soon and find the workmen unprepared. None of us ever counseled or advocated violence. Our speeches and our writing have been against war, against force, oppression and tyranny. I am surprised that the editors of Lucifer and Liberty, based on that old and prejudiced "Chicago" article, showed so strongly after the 4th of May tragedy—still clings to them, and while conceding that our comrades have not had a fair trial, they continue to regard them as a set of fools and idiots if not worse. There is too much of this spirit yet abroad among our co-edited friends, and I would like to see it put to rest, and do not regret a single word or act.

Fraternally yours, W. HOLMES, Chicago, Ill., 10-30-87.

W. N. Bell's Engagements in Kansas Seneca, Nov. 5, 6, 7; Clinton, 8; Cawker City, 11, 12, 13; Garden City, 16, 17, 18; Dodge City, 20; Humboldt, 23. Would like to visit Valley Falls if possible.

Notice to Agents. New thing! Coal Oil utilized for fuel, saving its cost every month. Sells at eight! Agents wanted. Write for terms at once, and be first in the field. CLIMAX FUEL CARTRIDGE CO., St. Joseph, Mo.

Was It a Fair Trial?

Continued from first page.

cept as against the defendant making them, or in whose presence they are made. The utterances of the defendant... his paper, his speech or his conversation, were in furtherance of the purposes and objects of the conspiracy in which he was engaged.

Unfortunately a great deal of testimony "not of the character indicated" was admitted, not only against the defendant making them, but against all the others. It is a violent assumption that it could not have injured the others when it is remembered that the jury did not attempt to sift the evidence and attach each piece of it to the particular defendant implicated by it.

"It was for the jury to determine whether he told the truth or not. They had a right to consider that he was on trial for murder." All through the argument in the trial below, the jury were urged by counsel for the State to disbelieve the testimony of the defendants, because they were on trial. Here again the prosecution takes advantage of its own wrongs.

(Continued next week.)

PRAIRIE MEMORIES.

BY HAMILIN GARDNER.

A wide-er-arching summer sky! Sea-drifting grassing, rustling reeds, Where young geese to their mothers cry, And locusts pipe from whistling weeds;

Far west-winds bringing odors fresh From mountains' range as monarchs are In royal robes of blue and white;

My western land! I love thee yet, In dreams I ride the ether's train, And breast the breeze of sweet feet From out the meadows cold and wet,

Oh, shining suns of boyhood's time! Oh, winds that bring the myrtle west And call to mind the breezes of the past, Oh, singing wild-birds thrilling chime!

"Are, tear their holies limb from limb, But only know that not through them Shall freedom come to shame."

When the Anarchists of Chicago were on trial for their lives, the detectives and police forced themselves into their private desks and converted every letter, document and paper they found into a witness against the defendants.

What Am I To Do? The symptoms of Biliousness are unpalatable food, indigestion, and other ailments.

The digestive system is wholly out of order and diarrhea or constipation may be a symptom or the two may alternate. There are often hemorrhoids or even loss of blood.

When the Anarchists of Chicago were on trial for their lives, the detectives and police forced themselves into their private desks and converted every letter, document and paper they found into a witness against the defendants.

What Am I To Do? The symptoms of Biliousness are unpalatable food, indigestion, and other ailments.

The digestive system is wholly out of order and diarrhea or constipation may be a symptom or the two may alternate. There are often hemorrhoids or even loss of blood.

FREE PLATFORM.

To FENWICK: If you refused to join the commonwealth I would do nothing with you whatever, but what would you do with yourself?

EDITORS OF LUCIFER, Dear Bros: Please find inclosed \$3 to be applied to my arrears for LUCIFER. I wish I could send you ten times as much, but times are the closest in this part of Kans. they have been in thirty years.

The bottom has not been reached yet. The Church and State and the black hand of greed are in a death struggle with the spirit of Liberty.

Yours for Love, Liberty, Justice and Equality,

FRANCIS McSHANE. Mound Creek, Kas., 10-22-'87.

"The American Idea."

EDITORS LUCIFER: Will you allow me some space in your columns to write up some of the "freaks" of the most singular man I ever met, C. M. Overton, who publishes a paper called The American Idea, at Liberal, Mo.?

The arrest and imprisonment of the editors and workers on LUCIFER, also Mrs. Slenker's arrest, and the arrest, imprisonment and coming execution of the Chicago Anarchists, the whole devilish business, has sprung from American brains and ideas.

1st. LUCIFER never found fault with the name "Anarchy," or thought of offering a substitute for it, prior to the memorable fourth of May. Then its editors were carried away by the general clamor, and considering that the Chicago Internationalists had brought disgrace upon the name, they repudiated it, and with it the men who to the present day have openly and defiantly stood its champions against the world.

2d. I held and do hold that restraint under any other name is still restraint. My argument was principally against the idea that restraint, which is synonymous with authority, could be softened by applying to it a softer sounding term. Yet if we admit the right of restraint, even to prevent the possibility of murder, it is an open question where that right would end, or how far we could carry the practice of restraint.

But I did not intend to bore you with my arguments in support of a point which I do not consider of sufficient importance now to occupy your attention. I simply refer to it because I wish to call your attention to the illogical logic of our LUCIFER friends, and to the fact that they invariably dodge the real points in controversy.

3d. It was not as attempted makers of revolution that our work was done. We all realized the fact that revolutions are concluded on third page.

A Handy Pocket Atlas. An attempt to put in pocket size the contents of a large reference Atlas is usually accompanied by rough, inaccurate, and inelegant engraving and printing.

Yours for Universal Mental Liberty, now and forevermore. R. E. LA'FERNA. Melior, Kas.

"The Restraint"—Communism—Anarchism.

The following from Comrades Holmes and Preigh are, with one exception, self-explanatory. It is necessary only to say that Mr. Preigh has Mr. Holmes' permission to publish the latter's letter.

E. C. WALKER, Dear Comrade: I herewith send you a letter I received from Comrade Holmes of Chicago, which—if not trespassing too much upon your space—I should like to have you publish as our joint reply to your editorials, criticizing our articles in issue of Oct. 7th.

L. H. FENWICK JR. Dear Comrade: Yours rec'd, yesterday. I am very glad that you have got so many names to the petition. If all our friends had done as well we should have hundreds of thousands of names to send to the governor.

I am one who has but little hope of a stay and of course I do not believe there will be a new trial. Even our most sanguine friends here have lost all hope in the latter, though a short time ago they dubbed me a fool for predicting the worst.

1st. LUCIFER never found fault with the name "Anarchy," or thought of offering a substitute for it, prior to the memorable fourth of May. Then its editors were carried away by the general clamor, and considering that the Chicago Internationalists had brought disgrace upon the name, they repudiated it, and with it the men who to the present day have openly and defiantly stood its champions against the world.

2d. I held and do hold that restraint under any other name is still restraint. My argument was principally against the idea that restraint, which is synonymous with authority, could be softened by applying to it a softer sounding term.

3d. It was not as attempted makers of revolution that our work was done. We all realized the fact that revolutions are concluded on third page.

A Handy Pocket Atlas. An attempt to put in pocket size the contents of a large reference Atlas is usually accompanied by rough, inaccurate, and inelegant engraving and printing.

Yours for Universal Mental Liberty, now and forevermore. R. E. LA'FERNA. Melior, Kas.

ELMINA'S ADVERTISEMENT.

Sexual Physiology for the Young, cloth, 50 cts. Science in Story, a comic, amusing, scientific and sensible story, cloth, illustrated, 75 cts.

Books of Practical Truth for Present Times. Poems, miscellaneous and logical, 320 pp. Bound neatly in cloth and gilt, with likeness, \$1.00.

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.

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

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.

The Kansas City Times. 1888. The Leading Paper of the West. 1888. The great political campaign which opens this fall suggests to every one that he should subscribe for the paper which will give all the news in the most attractive shape.

The Marriage Slave. The Wage Slave. The Free Love Slave. A Startling Exposure of our present Inhuman Social System, showing the letters thrown around the true expression of love.

The Kansas City Times. 1888. The Leading Paper of the West. 1888. The great political campaign which opens this fall suggests to every one that he should subscribe for the paper which will give all the news in the most attractive shape.

AYER'S HAIR VIGOR

Is a delightful toilet article, and, at the same time, an effective remedy for all diseases of the hair and scalp. It causes the hair to grow luxuriantly, renders it soft, pliant, and glossy, and restores the youthful color.

"I have been using Ayer's Hair Vigor with marvelous success. It restores the color to gray hair, promotes a fresh growth, and keeps it strong and healthy. As a toilet article, I have never found its equal."

Prepared by Dr. J. C. Ayer & Co., Lowell, Mass. Sold by all Druggists. Price \$1; six bottles, \$5.

One DOLLAR for Thirteen Weeks. The POLICE GAZETTE will be mailed securely wrapped, to any address in the United States for Three Months on the receipt of One Dollar.

AGENTS double their money selling our PATENT REFLECTING SAFETY LAMP. Can be sold in every family. Gives more light than five ordinary lamps.

PRESBYTERIANS. Who do not take the Herald and Presbyterian, should SEND Five One-Cent Stamps FOR A Sample copy of that paper and a beautiful Calendar for 1888.

English Spavin Liniment removes all Hard, Soft, or Calloused Lumps and Blemishes on horses, Blood Spavin, Curbs, Splints, Sweeney, Stiffles, Sprains, Sore and Swollen Throat, Coughs, etc.

AGENTS. We have the world for low prices. A handsome and strong Photo-graph Album, 8 1/2 x 10 1/2 inches, with 12 pages of blank space for 65 cents, retail price \$1.25.

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.

The Marriage Slave. The Wage Slave. The Free Love Slave. A Startling Exposure of our present Inhuman Social System, showing the letters thrown around the true expression of love.

SPECIAL OFFER. Until Jan. 1st '88 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.

The Kansas City Times. 1888. The Leading Paper of the West. 1888. The great political campaign which opens this fall suggests to every one that he should subscribe for the paper which will give all the news in the most attractive shape.

