

# LUCIFER

## THE LIGHT-BEARER.

NEW SERIES, VOL. 5, No. 6.

VALLEY FALLS, KANSAS, FRIDAY, MAY 27, E. M. 287.

WHOLE No. 200.

### LUCIFER--THE LIGHT-BEARER.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY.

TERMS: One copy, one year, \$1.25  
One copy, six months, 65  
SPECIMEN COPIES FREE!

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

No communications inserted unless accompanied by the real name of the author.

Each writer is alone responsible for the opinions, advice or statements made by him.

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

Dr. Sentf uses "Electric Specific Medicines," Office over Evans & Kemper's store.

DOOLITTLE & CO.

Dealers in

Hardware, Stoves, Tinware, etc

BARB WIRE,

VALLEY FALLS, - - KANSAS.

J. H. SHULER,

AT BELAND'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.

PHOTOGRAPHS

OF

Lillian Harman and Edwin C. Walker.

To gratify many friends who have asked for pictures of the "Autonomistic pair," and to help defray the expenses incurred in the struggle for Freedom of Choice and Contract, and in the present battle for a Free Press and an Inviolable Mail, we offer photographs of Lillian Harman and E. C. Walker, who were imprisoned for more than six months for failing to comply with the statutes of Kansas "regulating" the natural right of marriage.

Cards of Lillian Harman 20c  
" E. C. Walker 25c  
One of each 30c  
The above were taken before the prosecution.

Cabinets of Lillian Harman and E. C. 40c  
Walker, taken in one picture 40c  
The last two named were taken since the release from Oskaloosa Jail.

Any two Cabinets 70c  
Also, Cards of M. Harman 20c  
Address, Lucifer, Valley Falls, Kan.

### 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 both, or including a plentiful supply of Wine among the blessings to be bestowed upon favored individuals or tribes, etc., or including the deprivation of it among the punishments inflicted upon the disobedient. List C.—Passages Conditionally Condemning the use of Wine, etc., upon stated occasions, by Certain Persons upon Certain Occasions, etc. List D.—Passages which incidentally mention the Use of Wine and Strong Drink without either Condemning or Commending Them. List E.—Passages Showing that Scripture Wine DID Intoxicate. Conclusion.

"Every honest and 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, one by the logical pen of E. C. Walker."  
JOHN E. REMBURG.

Price, per copy..... \$0.10  
Per dozen..... 90  
Address, WALKER & HARMAN  
Valley Falls, Kans.

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

### "PEACE REIGNS IN WARSAW."

Ask, Is it Peace? of the nations, and thou shalt for answer be told, Peace is for those who can buy her, she barters her honor for gold.

Tyrants together have sworn upon crowns and contemptible things, Peace shall be bought any more but the armed alliance of kings.

Where is the garland of olive wherewith she was shadowed of yore? Where the goodwill that of old for a frontlet of glory she wore?

Surely a strange and wonderful Peace broods over the land, Peace propped up upon muskets, a two-edged sword in her hand.

Dare to dispute her sway, and for battle she thrusts and is fain, Dare to deny her dominion, and thou thyself shalt be slain.

Honey and oil of the olive and wheat and the fruits of the earth— These are no longer her emblems, but drought and disaster and death.

Nay, but this cannot be Peace that of old to the nations was wed, Not Peace she, but a harlot who triumphs and reigns in her bed.

What shall be said of her beauty with that red stain on her brow? What shall be said of her body, and whom doth she wanton with now?

What is her meed but a hissing, and what but a byword her name? Girt with reproach for a garment, and robed in a raiment of shame.

How shall her worshippers greet her, wherewith is her grace to be won?

What is the gift must be brought, and the sacrifice meet to be done? Offer the oil of the olive—her fierce eyes kindle with fire; Pour out the blood of a victim, and thou shalt have all thy desire.

Ask in her temple for nurture, and pray of her priests to be fed, Stones she will give thee for succor, and bayonets rather than bread.

Nought may appease her fierce anger but travail and torture and toil, Nought but the sweat and the tears of the sorrowing sons of the soil.

These be the gifts that delight her, these only she taketh for toll; These and these only can quench the insatiate desire of her soul.

Glory is hers and high honor of those that oppress and enslave, Shelter she gives to the poor in the sheltering mouth of the grave.

Commerce and riches increase in the hot rank steam of her breath, Keen is his blast to the toilers, and cold as the shadow of death.

Tyrants may kiss and caress her, and kindle a curse at her lips; Hers is the name they invoke to envenom the lash of their whips.

All that is evil and base is refreshed by the glow in her eyes; All is banished that is honest, and withery, and dwindle, and dies.

Therefore, since shame is the portion she chooses and is not ashamed; Since without scorn and derision her harlotries may not be named;

Since she has truckled to tyrants, and wantoned with cowards and kings; Since on her brow is a blood-mark, and healing is not in her wings;

Now shall the people proclaim that the day of her triumph is done, Swear that her throne shall no more be set up in the sight of the sun.

Ye, though there come in her stead, or in gloom or in sulphurous air, War with his horrible eyes and a hissing of snakes in his hair;

Yet for the glorious sake of the Peace that hereafter shall be, All men shall turn from the traitress, and swear of her snares to be free;

Shake off her evil dominion, and swiftly make end of her might, Rend her imperial raiment, and put her away from our sight.

—Liberty.

### THOMAS JEFFERSON.

A LECTURE DELIVERED BEFORE THE CHICAGO SECULAR UNION, FEB. 20, 1887, BY GEN. M. M. TRUMBULL.

Reported for the Independent Pulpit.

In religion, Jefferson was a Freethinker; in social theory, he was an Individualist; in politics, he was a Democrat; in theories of government, he was called an Anarchist. As you and I may differ on the definition of the word "Freethinker," perhaps it would be best to allow Jefferson himself to say what he meant by it. I quote from a letter on the duty of Freethinking, which he wrote to his nephew, Peter Carr. He said:

"Shake off the fears of servile prejudice, under which weak minds are servilely crouched. Fix reason firmly on her seat and call to her tribunal every fact, every opinion. \* \* \* Do not be frightened from this inquiry by any fear of its consequences. If it ends in a belief that there is no God, you will find incitements to virtue in the effort and pleasantness you feel in its exercise, and the love of others which it will procure you. If you find reason to believe there is a God, the consciousness that you are acting under his eye, and that he approves you, will be a vast additional incitement; if that there be a future state, the hope of a happy existence in that state will increase the appetite to deserve it; if that Jesus was also a God, you will be comforted by a belief in his aid and love. In fine, I repeat, you must lay aside all prejudice on both sides, and neither believe nor reject anything because any other person rejected or believed it. Your own reason is the only oracle given you by heaven, and you are answerable not for the rightness but the uprightness of its decision."

Here is no expression either for or against any religion or form of religion whatever. It might have been written by any Christian willing to submit his faith to the test of credible evidence, and the analysis of reason, that sublime defense which the Creator has placed behind the forehead of every man to protect him against imposture and lies. Yet the musical tone of the sentiment, ringing round the world in harmony with universal law, tells us that it must have been written by an Infidel. Unhappily

for us all, the Christian refuses to bring before the tribunal of reason either the facts of his Bible, or the opinions of his priests. He warns us to beware of the foolishness of knowledge and the depravity of the understanding. Any church that refuses to bring every article of its creed before the supreme court of reason, lays itself open to suspicion; and the ministers of the gospel who deny the jurisdiction of that court are afraid that truth will get the verdict, and that justice will be done. From the dawn of human reason until now liberty has been enlightening the world, and logically enough the clergy, all the time, have been trying to put out the light by placing extinguishers upon liberty. The advice of Jefferson to his nephew was the wisdom of a liberal philosopher who knew that the man who is not a Freethinker is not a free man.

This letter is also valuable as a rebuke to those partisan idolaters who subscribe to certain political doctrines because they think Saint Jefferson proclaimed them in his epistle to the Virginians, or the Kentuckians, or, maybe, the Iibernians, or the Helvetians. They worship at the party shrine, and they vote the ticket early and often to prove their enthusiasm for the faith as it was in Jefferson. The mental servility of these devotees is condemned in the epistle to Peter Carr: "Neither believe nor reject anything because any other person ever rejected or believed it." I have always admired the remark of a certain doctor who once lectured before this society. One of the members, in criticising him, called his attention to the authority of some famous physician, to which the lecturer replied with some impatience: "I, myself, am authority on this question." Self-conceit is a mark of weakness, but self-confidence is a mark of strength. Whenever anyone tries to overpower you with "authority" in matters of religious opinion, whether it be the authority of Bibles, Korans, Apostles' Creeds, or Catechisms; the authority of synods, sanhedrims, or ecumenical councils; the authority of popes of Rome, or Canterbury, or Constantinople, answer with the independent self-respect of a Freethinker and say: "I, myself, am authority on this question; and to my own conscience alone am I responsible, and not even to that for the rightness, but only for the uprightness of my decision." The writings and opinions of wise and virtuous men on any subject are worthy of study; they are indeed parts of our education; but we should never allow the wisest of them to speak to us with "authority" in matters of religion. Authority is always ambitious, and is forever striving to extend its dominion over all the interests, and all the relations of men. A feeble Italian priest, of the very narrowest education, an elderly gentleman who does not understand so well as the little news-boy on the street the genius of our institutions, nor the political character of our people, sends his authority all the way from Rome to domineer in the politics of New York; and American citizens who know ten times more than he does, actually bow their heads in degrading submission to that authority. They do not know their own minds until after they have heard from the holy father. There is not one grandmother in Chicago who has brought up children in honor who is not holier than he. And to Americans, the grandmother is a safer political guide than any holy father or holy grandfather in the land of Italy.

Jefferson has been canonized as the founder of a great party, and yet he held in bitter scorn the puffy men who lay their manhood at the feet of the caucus, and hold their ballots subject to the call of party discipline. In 1789, he wrote to Francis Hopkins and said: "I am not a federalist because I never submitted the whole system of my opinions to the creed of any body of men whatever, in religion, in philosophy, in politics, or in anything else where I was capable of thinking for myself. Such an addiction is the last degradation of a free moral agent. If I could not go to heaven but with a party I would not go to heaven at all."

(To be continued.)

Governments are the foes to freedom; Privilege and Authority are their supports; they exist by the exploitation of labor, and by the creation of monopolies which facilitate that exploitation; they are the fountains of social inequality and the destroyers of social prosperity; all the good works ascribed to them are done outside of them, and would be better done did they not exist; the combined knavery and ignorance of barbarians created them; the combined intelligence and determination of the civilized shall destroy them. The political system of tyranny and robbery shall give place to the Anarchistic system of liberty and honesty. Friends of freedom, hasten its advent!—"Honesty," Melbourne, Australia.

### For the Cause.

FRIEND HARMAN! Lecturer of May 6th, tells me the lady, the earnest friend of woman and all humanity, Mrs. Stenker, is in prison—the latest victim to crime widdling the vicious club called law. I am grieved beyond expression, yet I feel almost like saying, I'm glad of it. Why not? I'm afraid sometimes that some of Uncle Sam's minions will do something in a degree becoming human and civilized creatures. Such a misfortune could but further postpone the day that reformers can clearly see must come, when forbearance ceases to be a virtue. We don't court it, but since it must come, then let it. The sooner the better, and the quicker over. Our very best workers must suffer most in the ordeal, but since they must, so let it be. They will stand by their principles even unto death, as do the Nihilists of Russia. We cannot save them, and they cannot conscientiously save themselves; but for all that the imprisoned martyrs suffer not in vain. The suffered persecutions of the Lucifer band in the past six months have put Lucifer and its principles into the hands and minds of thousands, who before would touch them neither materially nor mentally for fear of contamination. That is enough—all we ask is that people read and think on the social and law-authority questions involved, and all honest hearts are with us in the main, though they may disagree slightly with us and each other as to methods.

A writer says: "When men go wrong women must be punished." I, too, friends, have been behind the prison bars—the victim of a vulgar and illiterate voter, old enough to be my grandfather, whose hand and heart I dared reject, and so brought down his vengeance, while I stood without a friend or even an acquaintance in a strange land. He knew his power; and I could choose between himself and state prison within a limited time. And this man verified his boast of money power and Masonic influence with law officials by having me arrested on a hatched-up charge of an attempt on his life, and I was denied a jury trial (which the Constitution promises to all accused of crime) and convicted, without witnesses or evidence other than his word. Lawyers insolently refused to defend me, sneeringly saying, "you have no friends," and treating my letters and literary identities with contempt. Tho' one willing to take my case did so in insolence, and spoke with hidden evil reflection on my character. I had to pay him for it, too. I meet those soulless creatures daily, singly and in pairs. They are respectful now, but I have seen them unmasked.

Mrs. Stenker has a multitude of true friends. She is spoken of everywhere, where liberal papers are seen, with the esteem and praise she so highly merits. I don't dare hope she will escape conviction. Let her be brave, champion that she is of individual right and social reform, whatever may be the cost. Every liberal paper will gain sympathy and reinforcement by her confinement, new interests will be enlisted, and our cause will strengthen, as it must ere it can achieve its final end.

Your radical friend,  
DAUGMAR MARIAGER,  
Santa Barbara, Cal.

Mr. Anthony Comstock can see a nastier meaning in an innocent work of art than any adult of our acquaintance. Whatever suggests the human form is, to this man, an indecent thing, and has held office in the days of Pheidias, he would have delighted in "suppressing" the friezes of the Parthenon. What a magnificent contempt he must have for the licentious brute who created the Venus of Milo!—Life.

At last we are stuck. The Brooklyn "Citizen" argues that if everybody gets to be well off, nobody will want to die, and so there will be a great deal of grief at the prospect of death. As things now are, there is so much misery in the world that many are glad to get out of it, and this makes it easy for them when the end comes. We are wholly prostrated by the Citizen's powerful argument, and can only open the window to get enough fresh air to cry out, Long live hunger and horror.—John Swinton's Paper.

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.

LIST OF OUR AUTHORIZED AGENTS

- Garthage, Mo.—E. S. Galloway.
Wiley City, Kan.—Dr. J. B. Cooper.
Scammonville, Kan.—J. McLaughlin.
Omaha, Neb.—James Griffith, 1712 Dodge St.
Leavenworth, Kan.—H. H. Hutchinson.
Joplin, Mo.—J. Henrichs & Bro.
Joplin, Mo.—Geo. H. Hutchinson.
Humboldt, Kan.—Wm. Rath.
Burlington, "—Chris. Brown.
Garnett, "—O. Gregg.
Ottawa, "—W. W. Frazier.
Cedar Junction, Kan.—J. C. Collins.
Burlington, Iowa.—Werner Becklin.
West Burlington, Iowa.—James Toff.
Success, Kan.—Chas. Dintany.
Salina Kan.—J. M. Itten.
Seranton, Kan.—John F. Young.
Oarbondale, Kan.—James S. McDaniel.
Preston, Iowa, John Duran.
M. O. Hicks, Siloam Springs, Ark.
H. L. Jolin, Mankato, Minn.
T. E. Palmer, Manning, Iowa.
Kansas City, Mo., Dr. O. Lona Marsters.
Carrie V. Malotte.
New Haven, Conn., M. Franklin.

The Defence Fund.

Table with 2 columns: Name and Amount. Includes entries like 'Previously acknowledged \$319.57', 'Aunette Nye, Northwood, Iowa 5.00', etc.

The copy of Mr. Hull's opening speech on the last night of the Braden-Hull Debate, came too late for insertion in this issue. It will appear next week.

The reception given by the Orangemen of Canada, to the Irish editor O'Brien, is a most lamentable commentary upon the so-called civilization of this age. The only crime charged against O'Brien is that he pleads for Irish nationality and for justice for the evicted and outraged tenants as against the present system of landlordism.

We learn from the daily news that C. D. Reynolds has been found guilty of "blasphemy" in New Jersey and has been sentenced to pay a fine. Thus instead of advancing towards larger freedom of conscience, and to higher regard for personal liberty we find ourselves, in this latter half of the 19th century, adopting again the methods of the middle ages.

BOOK TABLE.

- Report of the Kansas State Board of Agriculture, for the quarter ending March 31, '97. W. Sims, Secretary, Topeka, Kas.
Sin and its Consequences. An address delivered by E. H. Benn, Esq., before the American Spiritualist Alliance, New York City. John W. Lovell, Company.
Is there Reciprocity in Trade? American Farmers and the Tariff of 1883; Defense of our Protective Policy, and Producers and Consumers. These are respectively "Tariff Tracts" Nos. 1, 3, 5 and 7, sent out by The Philadelphia "Industrial League." A waste of food paper.
Little Lessons for Little Folks. By Aunt Elmira. New York: The Truth Seeker Company. In boards. Price, 40 cts.
We have received a fresh supply of this excellent book for the little ones. They are from Mrs. Slouker and are to be sold for her benefit. Every liberal family in which there are children should have at least one copy of "Little Lessons," and all who can should help the self-sacrificing author in her time of trouble.

WHAT NEXT?

During the past week a number of women have been employed by some of the churches of this city at \$2 per day to go about with petitions for signatures to prohibit baseball playing on Sunday.

The threat, or promise, of chief presiding officer Ellen Foster that the Prohibitionists would "keep right on till they bring every man to the feet of Jesus," seems to be the motto of the Leavenworth clergy and of their women workers. "These gentlemen of the cloth are not satisfied" with "prohibiting sports of any kind upon any public grounds, streets or alleys of the city" on Sunday; they now propose to invade private grounds also.

By and by these clergymen will find that driving the ball players beyond the city limits will not help to fill the churches. Then they will send these same women electioneering from house to house for a law prohibiting the game of baseball, or other Sunday recreations, anywhere within the limits of the state.

A writer in this same issue of the "Times" in speaking of the agitation of the Sunday question in Leavenworth, says:

The strenuous efforts now being made to prevent the playing of ball on Sunday by law by a class, who under the guise of Christianity and their infallible knowledge of ethics, is contrary to the spirit of our law and the freedom of conscience allowed by it.

After referring the reader to the times when the church used the "civil authorities" to compel attendance upon its rites and ceremonies, this writer continues:

History is simply repeating itself. Are not the churches combining to secure a law by which they may use the arm of civil power to compel everybody to observe the Sabbath as appears religious in their opinion? We protest against this infringement of our fundamental liberties and equal rights.

Can any one be deceived as to their motives in this matter? The execrable auto-da-fé was performed by the civil authorities, the church not holding itself responsible, but who is deceived thereby? Was not the church using the secular power as an instrument to carry out its religious tenets and to prosecute those who chose to have other opinions?

Evidently the church intends to tolerate no rivals. The theatre and concert garden, the Sunday excursion, the Sunday opening of Museums and public libraries, baseball playing and like recreations on Sunday are all rivals in the estimation of the church, and must be suppressed by the strong arm of civil law.

Dr. Monroe (see "Spirit of the Opposition") "finds most of the infidel martyrs of modern times holding some beastly and loathesome attitude toward the sexual relations." Dr. M. sees nothing immoral or "loathesome" in his own rebellion against authority in matters of religion. In fact, he himself, in his paper, uses more epithets that churchmen regard as wicked and "loathesome" than almost any other man in the United States.

Organize everywhere. The more simple the form the better. Let there be a regular contribution, if no more than nickel a week. Use it to spread the light. And, when all the small bodies become affiliated in one central body, we shall see such an onward movement as we have never dreamed of before.

of vice, crime and imbecility for the on-coming crop of humanity to battle with—if to preach the gospel of science in regard to the most important of all human duties, powers and functions as against the old doctrine that "ignorance is bliss"—if to do this is to put ourselves in the condition of "outlaws and persons to be shunned," then, Dr. Monroe, we of the LUCIFER band justly come under the sweeping denunciations of your late article headed "Martyr Making." Your mention of a "Kansas paper" containing Mrs. Slenker's letter from jail makes it evident that your article was in great measure aimed at us, although you did not have the manliness to call us by name.

J. S. Loveland in a series of very ably written articles in the "New Thought" on the "Failure of Spiritualism," attributes much of what he, a Spiritualist, concedes to be failure, to the following:

While we have been so fearful that our individuality would be trampled upon, our children have been gathered by the tens of thousands into church, Sunday-schools and society. We have created no social status around which our children and friends could gather. We have presented no great programs to attract the attention of progressive humanitarians.

To a very large extent this charge is true in regard to Secularists, Freethinkers or Rationalists of every grade. We depend too much upon the public school, upon books and papers, and upon individualistic effort, and fail to avail ourselves of the strength that comes with organization. We all know the power, for good or evil, of early impressions, and yet we send our children to Sunday schools under the delusive impression that they will not be influenced by the falsehoods and superstitious notions there inculcated.

"Oh, well, let the children go to the Sunday School. I got my first start in Freethought by listening to the absurdities of the Bible as taught in Sunday schools."

While to the well balanced intellect there may be but little danger of contamination from listening to such teachings, yet to the child of emotional nature the effect must necessarily be disastrous.

Organize everywhere. The more simple the form the better. Let there be a regular contribution, if no more than nickel a week. Use it to spread the light. And, when all the small bodies become affiliated in one central body, we shall see such an onward movement as we have never dreamed of before.

What say you, sister and brother Liberals? Are not these words of wisdom?

A FEW CRITICISMS.

I have numbered certain sentences in A. Warren's reply to Mrs. Fowler, which, I think, call for a few words from me.

- 1. I judge that most of those who read Mr. W.'s article in LUCIFER of March 11, concluded that he referred to me as one among those who had not yet "conceived of the holy ghost of freedom." But it is immaterial.
2. My contention is that the "free" association in which the freedom consists merely in "not telling" will never win for us true liberty in sex relations. Such freedom as that is no new thing, and still society is full of corruption and men and women are slaves to custom and the state. It takes studied effort to keep such relations secret, and this makes them clandestine and surreptitious. Mr. W.'s fine word play to the contrary notwithstanding. The right to be won is the right to live together (if the

parties choose), without denying or affirming anything. That living together may be a matter of convenience in business, it may be dictated by friendship, it may be for sexual association, or it may be for all these purposes or because of all these reasons. So long as a man must guard against surprise or spying when attending to his own affairs he is not free.

3. Until we shall have won the right to live and work together (if we choose) without danger of fines and imprisonment if we have failed to comply with certain red-tape regulations, we must either not love at all or love clandestinely, i. e., we must not associate with those of opposite sex or we must carefully conceal the fact of such association. Theoretically, we have a right to conceal these things, but practically it is impossible every where save in a few of the larger cities. There can be no permanent happiness where one must be continually on the watch against sneaks and police officials. To so live is not to be free, but is to be slaves to those in "authority above us."

4. The sense in which, as I think, all Anarchists and Mutualists use the word "contract" is that of consent or agreement. The contract may be written or oral, expressed or implied, for a long or a short time or for an indefinite period; it may or may not be attested by witnesses or sworn or affirmed before a notary,—all these are incidentals, the essential fact is that two or more persons have found a mutual act pleasurable in some or many ways.

5. It may not be necessary that Mr. W. should live with any one, but he has the right so to do if he chooses, and the opportunity to exercise that right should be free to him, as to all others. But there are very many who find it necessary to their happiness to live with those they love, and Mr. W. should not presume to say that, merely because of this necessity of their natures, they are less devoted friends of Liberty than he himself is.

Why Mr. Warren should say that Mr. Harman "coined the phrase 'freedom of contract,'" is beyond my comprehension. Assuredly, he must have been familiar with that phrase long years before he even heard of Mr. H. I know that I used it years ago, and it is of frequent occurrence in the writings of many older Individualists.

Editorial Notes.

Mr. Howlett says that he believes in freedom so long as we do not interfere with the rights of others. But does he not believe in freedom after we interfere, also,—the freedom of the invaded "others" to drive us back? Freedom does not exist where the rights of the humblest are not respected.

Elmira must not be discouraged by those who say that reforms come of themselves, that nothing is gained by work. Such assertions are only excuses for idleness, shirking and cowardice. In this stage of development the human brain is the main factor in the evolution of progress. Indeed, so comparatively slight are the combined effects of all other causes, that we may safely say that reforms come only as men and women strive to change the conditions into which they were born.

Yes, friend Naegeli, Gov. Martin is a prohibitionist. A "Republican prohibitionist." He opposed the principle until he became certain that it was to be the settled policy of the party and that those who opposed it to the extent of acting independently could not "get there," and then he came back to the fold and—is now governor!

E. M. D. is mistaken in regard to what he considers the failure of infidel writers to note the glaring contradiction in the two accounts of the first 12 years of the life of Jesus, as given by Matthew and Luke. Nearly all the writers whose works I have read and who have dwelt at length upon the discrepancies of the gospel accounts, have put this in the list of the most marked and irreconcilable.

The Topeka "Commonwealth," speak-

ing of the new act for the regulation of the manufacture, transportation and sale of explosives, passed by the Illinois legislature, takes occasion to add:

Had it also provided for the immediate hanging of the Anarchists already condemned and sentenced, it would have been well.

No, it would not have been well; no proof has been produced to show that any of the condemned Eight had anything to do with the so-called "Haymarket massacre." They were condemned and sentenced by the press, not for what they had done or advised to be done, but for the Socialistic views they had expressed. Seven policemen had been killed by a bomb thrown by someone, nobody knows who,—at least nobody who will tell,—and the blood atonement must be made. The real culprit cannot be found, and so eight of the leading agitators of the city are seized; they will do for the sacrifice, and it will be easy to convict, for there is a strong popular prejudice against them; they are convenient scapegoats to be sent away into the wilderness of Death bearing the sins of the Unknown.

New York hopes to soon have her museums open on Sunday, for part of the day, at least. The Directors of the American Museum of Natural History say they will open from 1 to 6 o'clock if they are given an additional \$15,000 per year. The "Truth Seeker" states that it is twice or thrice what the extra service will cost, but it is presumable that the officials want something to salve their consciences, for you know they think it wicked to have the institution open on Sunday, no matter how much money they get from the city!

Orthodoxy seems to be about the same on the Pacific Coast as it is here in the Middle West. We learn from the San Francisco "Chronicle" that while S. T. Putnam was lecturing at Ukiah a few evenings ago, one Hamilton, a citizen of "high standing," became so angry and excited that he arose and interrupted Mr. Putnam, ending his performance by throwing a lighted lamp at the lecturer, and leaving the hall madly whirling another about his head. The first lamp struck and broke the chandelier, missed Mr. Putnam, and going through a window, exploded outside. The second scattered drops of flaming oil over the audience, burning the dresses of several ladies. Very fortunately, it did not result in a conflagration, although in the panic several people were injured. When the love of god is deeply implanted in the heart of the citizen of "high standing," the rights, liberties and lives of his neighbors are apt to appear very small in his eyes.

Of course Mr. Hamilton threw the lamp at Mr. Putnam because he could not just then think of any other way to answer that gentleman's arguments. For precisely the same reason we have been threatened with mob violence and have felt upon us the cruel power of invasive statutes. And for the same reason we are now confronted with this utterly baseless charge of obscenity. Bigotry, ignorance of Nature and intolerance constitute a trinity of curses which well-nigh makes this earth what the old-fashioned Christians used to call it, "a vale of tears" and an "abode of sorrow."

We are prosecuted for using a Latin term; Mrs. Slenker, for adhering to the plain English. What do the censors want? Are they so dis-natured and corrupt that their reproductive parts and functions have become, to them, shameful and degrading, so much so that they want to send to prison all who are honest and pure enough to call a spade a spade? And yet the vast majority of these inquisitors who are so virtuously intent upon imprisoning sincere investigators have no scruples against using in ordinary conversation, in a blackguard way, all these inhibited words. How is this? Is it allowable to utter in vulgar jest words which are made cause for prosecution and imprisonment when used in the course of an inquiry into the causes of the wrongs and miseries which afflict humanity?

From the appearance of the writing upon the wrapper, we judge that Mr. Putnam sent us the copy of the "Chronicle" above-mentioned. We are all working for the enlightenment and disenfranchisement of the race, and all such items of news are welcome to us, but we cannot forget that during all our troubles the Secretary of the American Secular Union never once, so far as we have seen or heard, lifted his voice in protest against the outrageous invasion

of our rights by the sectarian bigots. And neither has he said anything about the Comstock prosecution which followed the marriage persecution, although he is known to be a radical in his views regarding the freedom of publication. But he accepted office in an organization which had compromised its principles for the sake of securing a larger constituency, and not much really valuable pioneer work can be expected from him.

The spirit that prompted the throwing of the lamp at the head of S. P. Putnam and which led to the prosecution of C. B. Reynolds for "blasphemy," is the identical spirit of Authoritarian intolerance which sent Lillian Harman and me to jail and which is frantically striving to consign Mrs. Slenker, the Harman and myself to the penitentiary. Does Mr. Putnam know this, and if he does, why does he not say so? He believes in the unity of the universe, in the unity of the race, and is not the unity, the Oneness, of all reforms, equally apparent?

The report of the Cincinnati Vice Society, which we reprint in the Opposition column, takes the palm for downright falsification. Think of the mendacity involved in calling Mrs. Slenker "the most depraved woman in America!" This man McAfee says that she has written and published some of the "vildest literature ever known." In what condition is the mind of a man who can say that of the productions of such a humanitarian writer as Elmina Slenker? He may not agree with her Alphoto philosophy—I do not—but only an obscene mind could make the statements that he does concerning her conscientious studies in sexual science.

Our Alma City correspondent likes Lucifer because it is Liberal and don't like it because it is too Liberal. He is afraid of "Anarchy and Freeloivism," but it is supposable that he does not define these terms as we do. We shall send him this paper and now request him to give us his idea of what we mean when we avow that we are Anarchists.

#### Exchange Table.

"Honesty!" That's a good name for a paper, and it is borne by the Anarchist journal which comes to us from Melbourne, Australia. It has twelve pages, two wide columns to the page, and the typography and press work are good, very good.

These paragraphs from its prospectus will give a fair idea of its principles and purposes:

"Honesty" will zealously guard the liberty of the individual, and will oppose the infringement of one's liberty by that of another. It will rest satisfied with nothing short of individual sovereignty—the equal liberty of each, limited alone by the like liberty of others, or in other words, unlimited liberty.

"Honesty" will champion the cause of equity. It will oppose every form of privilege and imposed authority, every form of monopoly, every form of slavery. It will make no compromise with the slaveholder, but demand equality of opportunity for every individual to obtain free access to natural resources, and to labor upon them for his own welfare and support.

"Honesty" will unmask and oppose every scheme, which has for its object the robbery of one class by another, or of individuals by others. "Thou shalt not steal" will be its watchword; and it will fearlessly oppose both Church and State in their systematic ignoring of this lofty maxim while pretending to indorse it. It will carefully explain to the unfortunate workers in the social life the prevailing methods of exploitation of the laborer by means of rent, interest, profit, and taxation; and it will ruthlessly tear aside the veil of sophistry in which craft has enveloped privileged interests.

There are able articles by D. W. Brookhouse, Juste Au Milieu and W. C. Andrade; selections from Proudhon and others, and a great variety of notes and short criticisms.

"Honesty" is a monthly, and is sent postpaid for 3s, 6d per year. Including letter postage and money order, it will cost \$1.10 to be supplied with "Honesty" for one year. We shall be glad to order it for any of our subscribers.

We give most hearty greeting to our Anarchistic contemporary on the other side of the globe. May it live long and prosper in its honest work.

"The Credit Foncier of Sinaloa," of May 17, contains the second official report of the Company. Among other things, we find in full the charges and specifications brought against our friend, L. H. Hawkins, which resulted in his expulsion and the forfeiture of his stock. It is generally believed that there are at least two sides to every question; in this report we have one side of this question.

On May 17 the Baltimore "Sun" celebrated its fiftieth anniversary by sending out a supplement containing a summary of the principal events in its journalistic life of half a century, and also a facsimile reproduction in miniature of a page of its first number and one of its anniversary issues.

Elizabeth C. Stanton's letter from England, "Fairs and Jubilees," in "Open Court" of May 14, and from which we quoted last week, is a timely expose of the miserable toadying of English and American blunkies at the feet of a woman whose family absorbs the earnings of British subjects while the people live in squalor and misery, and who is now actively countenancing the penny and pound contribution business, the object of which is to build a costly monument to Prince Albert.

The "Labor Organizer," late of Kansas City, Mo., has been consolidated with the "Labor Enquirer," Denver, Colorado. Harry C. Vrooman, editor of Labor Organizer, is associate editor of the consolidated paper which now comes out as an eight page weekly. Burnett G. Haskell, formerly editor of San Francisco "Truth," is editor in chief of the "Labor Enquirer." We regard this as one of the ablest of all our labor exchanges.

"Sunshine" is "devoted to the interests of Media and Mediocrity." Six of the semi-monthly parts are bound together, making a magazine of 60 pages, 15 cts. Philadelphia, Pa.

#### To Sada Bailey Fowler.

Before replying to your last letter, (Lucifer, April 8th) I wish to correct three typographical errors in my former one, published March 11th. In the last line of the 2nd paragraph, after would, insert "soon." In the 14th and 15th lines of the 3d paragraph, for their children, read "the child." In the 8th line from the same paragraph, after earnest, insert "thought."

I am somewhat disappointed in your last article, in that you saw fit to postpone or evade the questions that went to the root of the matter in controversy, and contented yourself with some further personal apologies for Walker and Harman, and some personal criticisms of my poor self. As to your ideal industrial home, it has not been my intention to criticize it; for, being proposed as an aid in the work of human emancipation, my sympathies have been in its favor, and nothing would prompt me to oppose it, but to learn that it is to be based on a foundation essentially incompatible with its design.

Your charge that the other Individualists want Lucifer to say "We intentionally disobey the law," seems to me wholly unwarranted. Certainly, I have expressed no such wish. It breaks no law to refrain from marriage. What I have advocated is that we avoid parting with our freedom voluntarily. The "Freedom of contract" seems to me merely the freedom to alienate one's "inalienable right." What freedom does the contract theory promise? If the so-called contract is to have no binding quality, it is a fraud and a farce. I have not denied the right of parties to marry by contract; but why waste ammunition fighting for a barren right, especially when there is no hope of winning the battle? It is not a fight for freedom, and a willingness to endure the suffering it costs is no evidence of devotion to the cause of freedom. There is plenty of evidence that comrade Walker is a genuine friend of freedom, but his marriage, and consequent suffering, are no part of that evidence. (1) I did not say that he has not yet conceived of the holy ghost of freedom. I intended the remark for no one in particular, and no one need appropriate it, unless it be Mr. Harman, who coined the phrase "Freedom of contract."

Of course, you all have the right to differ with me. You have a right to give your whole strength to the maintenance of the right to get married by contract; but when you go further, and demand that I help to furnish the sinews of war, on the ground that we are all alike interested in the result, your action seems to me a little queer; and when you go further still, and threaten to disown me for proposing to dispense with even the contract, and every other device that my experience has taught me to recognize as a yoke, it seems more and more queer. Some of you belong to a secret organization of free lovers, and some, if not all, of the members of that organization believe in the "Variety" theory. This class do not, as a rule, publish their love affairs. They know that in their case it would be a mischievous kind of nonsense to do so. What strikes me as the queerest of all, is that any one of these should help to swell the clamor against "Secret love relations." I do not charge you with being a member of the order. You have a right to abuse me all you please, because it seems you do not advocate "Variety," and presumably do not favor more than a limited freedom. This is why I ask you what about loving two or more at the same time. I observe that you prefer not to answer this knotty question, just now.

Well, it is all right; I will excuse you, and even thank you for the intimation

that, in your grand ideal home, there will be no need for making love relations public. All we differ, then, is in that I see no need of it now. I regard love as a matter not to be published. (2) To me it seems that, to go about revealing one's private affairs is to betray a weakness in the mental machinery. There is nothing "clandestine," or "surreptitious," in minding one's own business. Those words imply disobedience to rightful authority and an infringement of somebody's rights. (3) To stigmatize love as clandestine, or surreptitious, is to deny the right to love except by permission of authority above us.

All I seek in this controversy is a fair understanding. If you are opposed to entire freedom, or if you choose to content only for partial freedom, and will plainly say so, I have no desire for further argument. We will quietly part company, of course; for I am for unconditional emancipation, and cannot pose before the world as an advocate of autonomous marriage, or any other kind of marriage. (4) I claim the right to love without any contract whatever, and without anybody's permission or knowledge, except that of my love. (5) It is not necessary that we live together, either in the isolated or the combined household. All the holy ministrations of genuine love can be exchanged, and the relation can be amply honored, without living under the same roof, and without parading them before the world. "The living together, and the merging of interests, are what consume the love and wreck the happiness of nearly all under the old system. There can be no "divine" building constructed with these rotten timbers. Communistic homes have been tried for much more than a thousand years," and have always proved the graves of both freedom and love. A communistic home, of love and freedom, can exist only by a miracle. If you, my sister, can succeed in establishing such a combination, your name will be handed down to posterity as the real savior of the world, and Jesus Christ will have to take a back seat. In the meantime, lest your "divine builders" get tired out before the work is done, I hope to be pardoned for improvising a "dugout" for myself, and assisting a few others to do the same, so that we may at least be monarchs of all we survey, without being either hermits or barbarians, despots or slaves. What would you have more outspoken? As to which is best, or which rests upon the exploded theories of the past, it is a matter about which opinions are liable to differ.

A. WARREN.

#### Elmina Defended.

Statute and society moralists are making desperate and not entirely ineffectual efforts to suppress and prevent free speech and action. The last blow having struck our faithful veteran, Aunt Elmina, it becomes the imperative duty of us younger ones, who have been working less diligently, to take our places promptly and firmly by her side, and prove, if only by a few words, how much we appreciate her earnest endeavor to probe the social cancer to the core, and remove the thorns from the paths all coming generations must travel.

Those who are studying the social problem have decided, to a person almost, that the sexual organs are naturally as pure as any other organs of the body, although we have been taught that they must be kept in perfect secrecy and that the mere mention of them is total depravity. Reformers are working earnestly to remove these erroneous ideas, and to elevate the functions and knowledge concerning these organs to a higher plane, and to prove, logically, that they should be cared for, talked of and thought of the same as our lungs, mouth, stomach, eyes, or any other organs of the body. The objection to Aunt Elmina is, that she wishes to call these organs by their English names, which, as yet, are not used in print. The bravest and truest reformers feel fully justified in trying to redeem the sexual organs from their unjustly degraded positions, but they shrink from using the names by which they have been known. How can the name be any more obscene than the object?

I suppose if our organs of sight and of taste had ever been held in the deep disgrace that the organs of generation have been, and if we were now making efforts to restore them to their proper places in the estimation of the people, Aunt Elmina would have been arrested and put in jail for sending through the mails the words eyes and mouth.

GEORGIA REPROBATE.  
POCONKESKIE, N. Y., May 18.

#### To Friends.

The time has come when Scientific Truth must cease to be the property of the few—when it must be woven into the common life of the world.—Prof. Agassiz.

The book Diana—the attempt to inculcate the principles of which by means of private correspondence has caused the present complication of affairs—is for sale by the publishers of Lucifer. I want all my friends to order a copy and read it well.

It has been called "The Free Lover's Prayer Book," yet it is written expressly for the married. I believe if its advice were followed happy homes, happy heredity and a pure morality would overpread the earth. Only 25 cents will open up a new world for you.

A world where lust, prostitution and the long train of diseases that follow in their wake will no more be found. The

book is in its third edition, so you need not fear but it is safely available.  
MAY 4, 1887.

ELMINA.

#### From Mrs. Slenker.

DEAR FRIEND: I got home Wednesday, the 11th, but have not been well enough to write half I ought. Home don't seem home now with all against me.

You all pull together in your trials, and that gives a family support that will carry one through almost any trouble. But I am utterly alone, old, feeble, and most worn out.

Sometimes I doubt if I'll be able to stand trial, or will live till then, (July 12). I thank thee for good words, and W. and all of you. I know in all conscience Lucifer and "Word" could not go back on me. I am not sure of others whom they know all.

As to the story, do with it as you please. I give you all rights, and only regret it is not a sexual story. If I come out all right I will write a sexual one!

Please send me a few of Lucifer with your remarks on my case. I want them for friends, and of all future issues. I'll make it square if I can. If I am used up you must lose it! Of May 6th is the papers I want most.

So few will stand by me that I prize all the more those who do.

Mr. S. bailed me out. Friends in New York were preparing to do so had he not done it.

ELMINA D. SLENKER.

P. S.—3 r. m. May 13, and some twenty-four letters to read and answer—will carefully preserve "Health Monthly" and return some time if I can. It was lucky to say the least, that they found one.

I am glad friends continue kindly feeling. Yes, the heaviest penalty of all is finding home friends so hard against me and all I have done, yet even those own that I meant all for good work. They believe in me but not my work and the manner of it. I have only time to thank thee and thy son and all who are helping and encouraging me. Sometimes I feel hopeful, then some cruel snail from one I love will make the wound bleed afresh and all will be gloom and darkness. My life has been largely affectional, and now the woo and anguish I have caused others, eat out my life.

Harman and Walker had family unity, Bennett was surrounded by friends, Heywood has his wife—I have no one, only far off friends. Is it a wonder I feel desolate and my crime (1) is ten fold of theirs, and my thousand fold, if all be counted in? Sometimes I get a letter saying it is all bosh to try to reform the world. That no reformer ever does good. Reformers come of themselves by Nature. I don't believe it, yet even those help to pour cold water on one's courage and self gratulation. But when I calmly look back on a lifetime of work I feel that I have done almost miracles! Some seed that shall produce a grand crop some day. Affectionately,  
ELMINA.

#### "The Blue Agony."

Comrade Kolso asks the "outraged Christians" of Valley Falls what they would do with the parties to "that other (autonomous) marriage" recorded in the scriptures, which resulted in the birth of Jesus Christ—the temporary marriage of Jehovah, or the Holy Ghost, to Mary, at the time she was "betrothed" to Joseph—provided they should dwell in the holy land of Valley Falls.

Kolso was pungent and brief, considering that the aforesaid autonomous marriage, on account of which King Herod slew all the male children in Judea under the age of two years, and caused the mother (and father *de jure*) to flee from their home, to wander twelve years in a foreign land, and that the final tragedy ended with the execution of the Son of God on the cross, between two thieves,—considering all this I think brother Kolso might have hit them another dig on their tough old "moralistic" diaphragm.

Bahodis, it may have escaped the notice of Mr. Kolso, as it seems to have of all writers, Christian and Infidel, that there are two accounts of the birth of Christ, one of which represents his parents as warned by a dream to flee into Egypt, Mat. II, 13, 14, 15, where they dwelt twelve years, the other telling how the child was taken up to the temple, Luke II, 22 to 42, with public rejoicing, the mother going through the thirty days purification, etc., with not a word about the Star of Bethlehem, King Herod, the Slaughter of the Innocents, or the land of the Pharos.

It also seems to me that the lineage of Joseph, the husband of Mary the mother of Christ, from David down, is an absurdity, considering that Joseph was not the father of Jesus, as it is said he did not consort with his wife till after the birth of Christ.

But there would be no end to the waste of time or newspaper space if we were to follow up the absurdities within the lids of the Bible.

F. M. D.  
Tulare, Cal.

Wanted.—A definition of the theological crime "blasphemy." Answer here.

#### LARGE THOUGHTS IN SMALL TYPE.

Never on earth, my comrades, has there been a state where justice was done to citizens, irrespective of sex or "of previous condition of servitude."—*Maria Howland, in "Credit Foncier."*

The only new party wanted in this country is one to advocate the repeal of laws.—*H. G. Ingersoll.*

The highest legislative wisdom—not even the supreme wisdom of that body of supreme wisemen, the Massachusetts Legislature—ever yet succeeded in framing a parchment law which, at some possible and conceivable application thereof, it would not be a greater virtue to disregard than to obey. Life for any of us would not be worth living through one single day if all the laws that legislatures, with the very best of intentions have made, could be enforced throughout the hours of that day. All of us would in that case commit suicide before sunset. There is too great a craze among us for multiplying laws. It is no sign of advancing civilization—it is rather a sign of the contrary. Alas! the members of the Massachusetts Legislature are in session. They stand more than half their time in working purely legislative mischief.—*Rev. J. K. Applebee.*

Government is either an individual, as a king or czar, or a combination of individuals or a fixed class, or the ability of shifting mass, i. e., the majority,—forcing the rest of their countrymen to conform to such laws as they like to make for them.—*D. W. Brookhouse, in "Honesty."*

The spasms of puritanical "virtue" which has attacked New York and to a certain extent the rest of the country, will perhaps open the eyes of the people to the importance of those personal liberties which they have heretofore enjoyed in spite of the fussy moralists and little pupil popes. At least we hope so, for if to the rest of us will condescend to read the literature that we have to have their way unchecked much longer.—*Winsted (Conn.) "Press."*

There is not a corporation doing business in the United States to-day that does as poor work as the postal system, and were express companies and general transportation lines run as poorly they would receive no business.—*Medicine Lodge "Index."*

Reverence for a flag is a virtue only when the flag symbolizes good government and protection of the natural rights of the people.—*Anti-Monopolist.*

The best society for the suppression of pernicious literature is the family. The best legislation that can be passed for the prevention of the sale of vile literature can be passed by father and mother in joint convention assembled. Daily teaching to love and study good and useful things will bring boys and girls to detest the opposite. These are the only means by which the sale of pernicious literature can ever be permanently and effectually suppressed. The passage of laws by the State and the watchfulness of the societies for the suppression of pernicious literature may do some good for the youth who have no parents to teach them, but to provide sound early training for them would do far more.—*Baltimorean.*

#### SPIRIT OF THE OPPOSITION.

The Cincinnati Society for the Suppression of Vice held its annual meeting at the Gibson House last night. Mr. J. D. Hearn, President of the Third National Bank, was Chairman, and William V. Coorsolo Secretary. Mr. Hearn made a few remarks about the objects of the society, the suppression of obscene publications and pictures. He spoke of the good results accomplished in this city by Mr. F. L. McAfee, of St. Louis, agent of the Western Society, made his annual report, which was very interesting, aside from the statistics. During the year Mr. McAfee caused the arrest of twenty-seven persons—twenty-three were indicted, twenty-two were convicted and sent to prison for terms aggregating four years and four months and were fined \$3,491, and one of the number, The gentleman referred to Elmina D. Slenker, of Snowville, Va., as being probably the most depraved woman in America. She has issued and published some of the vilest literature ever known. Much of it was indecently filthy. Mr. McAfee captured the manuscript of one of her proposed books, and she was arrested and thrown in jail. Mrs. Slenker is over fifty years of age, and has been a contributor to free love and other obscene papers for some time. In the past year Mr. McAfee arrested two editors—one in Iowa and the other in Wisconsin—for publishing indecent articles, and both were sent to jail. The report showed that vulgar and obscene literature is being widely stamped out. The financial statement of the society showed receipts amounting to \$1,116.33, expenses \$1,131.08.—*Cincinnati Enquirer.*

Dear Sir: At present, I take the "Inventor" and no many other papers as I can afford. I admire your paper for its liberality, but I think it is a little too liberal, it borders on Anarchy and Freeloivism, either of which I cannot indorse.

Yours Respectfully,  
WM. THOMPSON.

Alma City, Minn., 5-8-87.

It has always been a mystery to the writer who some alleged infidels conceive a hatred for the restoration and decrease of authority and constantly seek to put themselves in the condition of outlaws and persons to be shunned. There is no reason why an infidel shouldn't be a high-minded, honorable gentleman or lady. We find most of the infidel martyrs of modern times holding some beauty and loathsomeness attitude toward the personal relations.—*Iron Clad App.*—Comments on the Slenker case.

The passion for liberty, slumbering or extinct in the the bosom of the average American drunk, rules supreme in the heart of the average Russian Nihilist. One of the men condemned for complicity in the recent attempt to assassinate the Czar declared that he and his accomplices acted from firm conviction that what they set out to do it was their duty to perform. Another of the prisoners is a brilliant young student who had just won the gold graduation medal of his university and then sold it to obtain funds to enable an accomplice to leave the empire. All of the prisoners, says a dispatch from St. Petersburg, plead guilty, and every one refused and/or threat or promise to betray any accomplice. One of the witnesses was a woman who said she was the wife of one of the accused though she had never been wedded to him by "unnecessary religious formalities," whereupon, the dispatch naively says, she was at once arrested and conducted to prison.—*Winsted Press.*

