

We date from the First of January, 1801. This era is called the Era of Man (L. 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 vice-gerent 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. Bruno sealed his devotion to the new truth with his life on the 17th day of February, 1600. During the 17th century Galileo wrote the first work upon international law.

LUCIFER THE LIGHT-BEARER

Our name, "Lucifer," comes to us from Astronomy. Its etymology: Lux (Lucis), Light, and Ferre, to bring or bear. It was originally applied to the Morning Star. To show how this illustrious name was bestowed by the pagans, see Webster's Dictionary, page 792—note by Henderson. See also page 321. "Lucifer" is in fact, no profane or Satanic title. It is the Latin "Luciferus," the Light-bringer, the morning star, equivalent to the Greek "Phosphorus," and was a Christian name in early times, borne even by one of the popes. It only acquired its present association from the apostrophe of the ruined king of Babylon, in Isaiah, as a fallen star. As the night of theology wears, and as the daylight of Science advances the grand old name will regain its pristine significance. "Lucifer" will be hailed "Son of the Morning!" "Star of the Dawn!" "Bringer of the Good Time Coming!"

NEW SERIES, VOL. VI., No. 21.

VALLEY FALLS, KANSAS, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, E. M. 288.

Whole No 207.

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.
Entered at the Valley Falls Post-office as second class matter.

UPWARD.

Upward, still upward, the fountain is springing;
Upward, far upward, the songster is winging;
Up to the blue dome delightfully fair,
Roaming the second laden ocean of air.
The bird's dainty throat is o'erflowing with gladness;
The fountain exultingly shouts, "I am free!"
They sing of a life still untrammelled with care,
Unto me.

Upward, still upward, the forests are growing,
Upward, still upward, their budding twigs throwing
Up to the untrammelled regions of space,
Where waits for each tiny comer a place.
Proud of its brood is each doughty old tree,
Anxious a prosperous future to see.
A gentle breeze shines from the broad woodland's face
Upon me.

Upward, still upward, the daisies are creeping;
Upward, yes upward, the blue-bells are peeping;
Up from their dainty pedestals of green,
Reaching the sun with a glorious sheen.
Crowded for love or for the tongues of the bees,
Till shines all the plain like a flower-crested sea.
Fraught with all manner of pleasure serene
Unto me.

"Upward" the plea of the daisies demure,
"Upward," the song of the fountain so pure,
Up from the baser low levels of earth,
Striving each other from the moment of birth;
I would that no happier thoughts ever might be
Than those that arise, gems of Nature, from thee.
As I watch you exhaling your treasures of mirth
Upon me.
C. M. HARGRE,
In Current.

LIBERALISM AND "PROTECTION."

Some of Mr. Wakeman's Errors.

Mr. T. B. Wakeman, in the *Free-Thinker's Magazine*, says:

"(The government) should not indulge in the temperance business by taxation pretended to be for that end any more than it should run the post-office in the interest of some supposed moral or political purpose. Every true democrat and every Liberal should vote against Cleveland in order to sustain this thoroughly democratic principle."

And yet Mr. Wakeman, only a few months ago, was urging that the government "indulge in the temperance business" by making the business of manufacturing alcoholic beverages a crime punishable by pains and penalties. He would have the government forbid the sale of alcohol except as a poison—the same as arsenic or prussic acid, when alcoholic beverages are used in every civilized nation, and are used by the majority of men, including the most educated and intellectual in every city of the United States. How about personal freedom in this matter?

Mr. Wakeman says that Jefferson opposed "the Federal Whisky tax of his day;" but did Jefferson advocate the suppression of the manufacture and sale of whisky? Did Jefferson advocate a high protective tariff? Did he advocate a protective tariff of any kind except against "casual embarrassments"? Did he not say in his sixth annual message in 1806 that taxation should be governed by the consideration that "the great mass of the articles on which import is paid are for foreign luxuries purchased by those only who are rich enough to afford themselves the use of them."

Was not Thomas Paine a Jeffersonian Democrat? In the *Rights of Man* he said:

the reciprocal interest which every nation feels in supporting it; it is common stock; it exists by a balance of advantages.

Mr. Wakeman classes free trade with slavery and rebellion. Does he forget that Daniel Webster helped to defeat attempts to impose high duties upon cotton and woolen goods in 1816? Does he forget that the merchants of Salem, Mass., in 1820, sent a memorial to Congress, drawn by Judge Story, protesting against the proposed duties as "repugnant to those maxims of free trade, which the United States have hitherto so forcibly and perseveringly contended for as the sure foundation of national prosperity?" Does Mr. Wakeman forget that Webster said he wished "freedom of trade to be the general principle and restriction the exception?" Does he forget that in 1824 when Henry Clay, in reporting the tariff bill, said it "would lay the foundation of a general American policy," Daniel Webster replied:

"This, sir, is an assumption which I take the liberty most directly to deny. Since he speaks of the proposed measure as a new era in our legislation, since he proposes to invite us to depart from our accustomed course, to instruct ourselves by the wisdom of others and to adopt the policy of the most distinguished foreign states, one is a little anxious to know with what propriety of speech this invention of other nations is denominated an 'American policy,' while on the contrary, a preference for our own established system as it now actually exists, and always has existed, is called 'foreign policy.' There is a country, not undistinguished among the nations, in which the progress of manufactures has been far more rapid than in any other, and yet unaided by prohibitions or unnatural restrictions. That country, the happiest which the sun shines upon, is our own."

It is but fair to state what Mr. Wakeman omits to mention, that Webster had different views at different times on the tariff.

Mr. Wakeman says that "free trade is only about a hundred years old, and was born in England." Does he know nothing about free trade in the Netherlands in the 15th, 16th, and 17th centuries, when, as De Witt, the great statesman of the Netherlands, wrote, "by this free trade the Netherlands became both the most peopled and the richest country on the earth and loans could be effected there for a lower interest than anywhere else?"

Mr. Wakeman says that "the tariff as a war measure was abolished practically by the revision of 1863, and the only war taxes now in existence are the internal revenue taxes on tobacco and alcohol." The truth is, the average duty in 1861 was 18.54 per cent. It was raised from time to time "by way of compensation to domestic manufacturers against foreign imports" to quote from Mr. Morrill, and in 1865 it was raised to 47.10 per cent. It is now 47.08 per cent. This war tariff was imposed in consideration of the internal revenue tax paid by manufacturers. The internal revenue tax has been swept away, but the war tariff has been retained, and since 1860 the people of the United States have paid the manufacturers more than a hundred millions of dollars annually, in consideration of an internal tax, not a farthing of which has been paid during this time. Such gigantic bare-faced fraud was never before practiced upon any people. And this robbery has been kept up in the professed interests of labor.

When the protective policy was adopted in this country there was nothing said about protecting labor. It was well understood that the protection was for the manufacturer, and the manufacturers understand this perfectly now. The Republican League, in a confidential cir-

lar letter, dated May 25, 1888, called upon manufacturers to contribute on the ground that they are the men who are getting practically the sole benefit, or at least the most directly important benefits of the tariff laws.

Between Liberalism and protection there is nothing in common. Protection belongs to an exclusive theology, to close communion orthodoxy. Our great Liberal writers like Paine and Buckle, like Harriet Martineau and Frances Wright, have been advocates of industrial and commercial as well as of intellectual freedom.

WHAT IS SECULARISM?

It. G. Ingersoll in "Secular Thought." I understand that the word Secularism embraces everything that is of any real interest or value to the human race. I take it for granted that everybody will admit that well-being is the only good; that is to say, that it is impossible to conceive of anything of real value that does not tend either to preserve or increase the happiness of some sentient being.

Secularism, therefore, covers the entire territory. It fills the circumference of human knowledge and of human effort. It is, you may say, the religion of this world; but if there is another world, it is the religion of that as well.

Man finds himself in this world naked and hungry. He needs food, raiment, shelter. He finds himself filled with almost innumerable wants. To gratify these wants is the principal business of life. To gratify them without interfering with other people is the course pursued by all honest men.

Secularism teaches us to be good here and now. I know of nothing better than goodness. Secularism teaches us to be just here and now. It is impossible to be juster than just. May can be as just in this world as in any other, and justice must be the same in all worlds.

Secularism teaches a man to be generous, and generosity is certainly as good here as it can be anywhere else. Secularism teaches a man to be charitable, and certainly charity is as beautiful in this world and in this short life as it could be were man immortal.

But orthodox people insist that there is something higher than Secularism; but, as a matter of fact, the mind of man can conceive of nothing better, nothing higher, nothing more spiritual, than goodness, justice, generosity and charity. Neither has the mind of man been capable of finding a nobler incentive to action than human love.

Secularism has to do with every possible relation. It says to the young man and to the young woman "Don't marry unless you can take care of yourselves and your children."

It says to the parents, "Live for your children; put forth every effort to the end that your children may be better and grander than you."

Secularism says: "You have no right to bring children into the world that you are not able to educate and feed and clothe." Secularism says to those who have diseases that can be transmitted to children: "Do not marry; do not become parents; do not perpetuate suffering, deformity, agony, imbecility, insanity, poverty, wretchedness."

Secularism tells all children to do the best they can for their parents—to discharge every duty, every obli-

gation.

The great benefit of Secularism is that it appeals to the reason of every man. It asks every man to think for himself. It does not threaten punishment if a man thinks, but it offers a reward, for fear he will not think.

It does not say, "you will be damned in another world if you think." But it says, "you will be damned in this world if you do not think."

Secularism preserves the manhood and womanhood of all. It says to each human being: "Stand upon your own feet. Count one! Examine for yourself. Investigate, observe, think. Express your opinion. Stand by your judgment, unless you are convinced you are wrong, and when you are convinced you can maintain and preserve your manhood or your womanhood only by admitting that you were wrong."

It is impossible that the whole world should agree on one creed. It may be impossible that any two human beings can agree exactly in religious belief. Secularism teaches that each one must take care of himself; that the first duty of man is to himself, to the end that he may not only be useful to himself, but to others. He who fails to take care of himself becomes a burden. The first duty of man is not to be a burden.

Every Secularist can give a reason for his creed. First of all, he believes in work—taking care of himself. He believes in the cultivation of the intellect, to the end that he may take advantage of the forces of Nature—to the end that he may be clothed and fed and sheltered.

He also believes in giving to every other human being every right that he claims for himself. He does not depend on prayer. He has no confidence in ghosts or phantoms. He knows nothing of another world. He knows just as little of a first cause, but what little he does know he endeavors to use, and to use for the benefit of himself and others.

He knows that he sustains certain relations to other sentient beings and he endeavors to add to the aggregate of human joy. He is his own priest, his own clergyman, and his own pope. He decides for himself; in other words he is a free man.

"OVERPRODUCTION."

From "An Address on the Sophisms of Protection," by B. P. Underwood.

When mills are idle and men are unemployed the protectionists say that there is "overproduction." "Overproduction!" That means that there is no market for manufactured goods. Why is this? Clearly because the tariff, designed to give the American manufacturer the control of the home market by protecting his business from competition with foreign manufactures, necessarily shuts him out from all other markets. For this reason: if more goods are produced here than can be sold for home consumption, there is, of course, "overproduction." But if the tariff were removed and materials for manufacturing were admitted free of duties, then American manufacturers could send their goods to foreign markets and sell all they could produce. Then there would be no "overproduction."

Now America cannot compete successfully in those foreign markets. The result is limited market and of course limited production. Limited production means limited employment, limited demand for labor, and that means limited wages. In 1881

there were sold for foreign consumption only \$150,000,000 worth of American manufactured goods. England sold in the same year to foreign consumers \$1,000,000,000 worth of goods. And it may be added that owing to the high prices here the consumption of goods in this country is less than in the British islands where the population is smaller than that of the United States. We could find a ready market for our goods in Canada, in South America, in Mexico, in almost every part of the world but for a system established and sustained in the interests of a class that are amassing wealth rapidly and acquiring the influence which wealth gives, by a heavy tax upon industry. The protective tariff is retarding industrial enterprise and development and depriving the American people of the full results of the natural resources and advantages which this country possesses. The interests of the millions who work for wages, the interests of the people, demand that the shackles which protection has imposed be struck from the hands of honest industry, and that the masses be no longer robbed for the benefit of the few.

IMPORTANT ADMISSIONS.

Buckle, History of Civilization.

The most valuable additions made to legislation have been enactments destructive of preceding legislation, and the best laws that have been passed have been those by which some former laws have been repealed. In the case just mentioned, of the corn-laws, all that was done was to repeal the old laws and leave trade to its natural freedom. When this great reform was accomplished the only result was to place things on the same footing as if legislators had never interfered at all. Precisely the same remark is applicable to another leading improvement in modern legislation, namely, the decrease of religious persecution. This is unquestionably an immense boon, though, unfortunately, it is still imperfect, even in the most civilized countries. But it is evident that the concession merely consists in this: that legislators have retraced their own steps and undone their own work. If we examine the policy of the most humane and enlightened government we shall find this to be the course they have pursued. The whole scope and tendency of modern legislation is to restore things to that natural channel from which the ignorance of preceding legislation has driven them.

To maintain order, to prevent the strong from oppressing the weak, and to adopt certain precautions respecting the public health are the only services which any government can render to the interests of civilization. That these are services of immense value, no one will deny, but it cannot be said that by them civilization is advanced or the progress of Man accelerated. All that is done is to afford the opportunity for progress; the progress itself must depend upon other matters. And that this is the sound view of legislation, is, moreover, evident from the fact that as knowledge is becoming more diffused and as increasing experience is enabling each successive generation better to understand the complicated relations of life, just in the same proportion are men insisting upon the repeal of these protective laws, the enactment of which was deemed by politicians to be the greatest triumph of political foresight.

LUCIFER--THE LIGHT-BEARER.

VALLEY FALLS, KAN., September 14, 288.

M. HARMAN, Editor and Publisher.

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.

Second Indictment Defense Fund.

Previously acknowledged, \$166.80
Julia A. J. Perkins, Baldwinville, 1.00
N. Y., 1.00
Mrs. D., Success, Kan., 1.00

Mrs. H. is still at the hospital in Kansas City. She expects to be able to return home on Tuesday next.

Quite a number of complaints have been received lately in regard to the non-appearance of LUCIFER. To all inquirers we would say that since the beginning of our recent family afflictions, about August 1st, we have failed to issue one edition of LUCIFER--Aug. 17. All other numbers have been issued in their order, but not always on time. The last two or three have been delayed several days on account of absence of the editor at Kansas City, and by his having double duty to perform when at home.

If any numbers of the paper have failed to materialize--except the issue for Aug. 17--our friends will please notify us at once, and the missing numbers shall be supplied.

Incidental distinctions are always to be avoided, but under the circumstances I must be allowed the privilege of saying that among contributed articles to this issue of LUCIFER I would ask particular attention to those of "Franklin" and Ballou; and of the selected articles those headed "Important Admissions," "Over-production," and "All Knowledge is Good and Pure"--as containing arguments and statements of fact that ought to have great weight, just now, in clearing away the fogs raised by "policy" politicians and by statute moralists.

The brief notice, printed elsewhere in this issue, recording the decease of Maria Elizabeth Emerson, will be read with interest by all who have known, by personal acquaintance or otherwise, the individuals named therein. Not having known the deceased personally I can only extend to Comrade Lloyd the sincere sympathy of a fellow-voyager on life's uncertain sea. While regretting, as is natural and human, her untimely removal, the friends of Maria Elizabeth Emerson are favored in having so many pleasant memories clustering round the name and mental image of the departed one.

ARRANGEMENTS.

Some of our freethought exchanges have adopted the "pay in advance" plan--remorselessly cutting off all who do not renew when the time paid for expires.

In our dealings with mankind some one must trust to the honor of his fellow-man. When we ask pay in advance we ask the subscriber to trust to our honor that we will send him the paper every week for one year. Now if the publisher is not willing to trust to the honor of the subscriber it would seem that he is not willing to do to others as he would have others do unto him. Doubtless the pay-in-advance system is the best when practicable, but times have not been propitious for the rigid adoption of this plan, and the result is that probably a third of LUCIFER's patrons are in arrears on subscription.

Friends, Liberals! Owing to sickness, involving many and heavy expenses, we are much in need of funds. Can you help us to the amount of your arrearage?

Contributions rec'd. to Comrade Dinwiddie's "Deek and Chair" for LUCIFER:

G. H. Dinwiddie, 1.00
Sada R. Fowler, .70
Mrs. Julia O. Franklin, 1.00
Mr. Abbie Knapp, .50
Mrs. Palm, .50
J. J. Johnson, 1.00

Notice.

"The Leavenworth County Association of Spiritualists" will hold their second annual Camp Meeting on the 12, 13, 14, and 15 of October, at Denol's Grove, near Fairmount. Let all Spiritualists and Truth Seekers lay down their way during these four days and come and have a good time. Board and lodging will be furnished those desiring it for one dollar a day. Any desiring information please write to

MARY R. HARRIS, Sec.
Cor. Sec., Leavenworth, Kan.

FOURTH INDICTED ARTICLE.

The fourth and last of the articles, for the publication and mailing of which the (at that time) publishers and editors of LUCIFER have been indicted, is herewith republished. "Family Secrets," or the "Millerite Story," is by odds the least important of the four. As stated by Dr. Foote, Sr., of New York, in his communication published in last week's LUCIFER, this Millerite story is an "old Chestnut" that went the "rounds of the press" about forty years ago. Dr. Foote says he republished the story without the faintest thought of its being considered "obscene." Dr. F. is editor of Foote's Health Monthly, New York City, has been in the publishing business nearly half a century, is a physician of high standing in the profession, and it is presumable, to say the least, that his judgment of the matter in question is quite as good as that of the upstart, the self-elected censors of the press--Anthony Comstock and his western condottieri.

As in the cases of the previously republished indicted articles we ask a careful and candid perusal of the "Millerite Story," and if our readers do not agree with Dr. Foote (and with the "friend" who called his attention to the matter) "that a person who sees obscenity in this story must be one possessing a very filthy, as well as a very vivid imagination," we shall be much surprised. We shall be also surprised if they do not agree with those gentlemen in the opinion that the "use of such a story as the basis of an indictment, shows clearly how hard a strain it is for the Vice Society and its backers to find some ground of accusation against the Valley Falls editors," and "that some ulterior purpose is sought to be accomplished, and not the mere punishment of this trivial pretended offense." What that ulterior purpose is can easily be conjectured.

A word or two may not be amiss in regard to the object or occasion of publishing the Millerite story when first inserted in LUCIFER.

By us, or, more definitely, by me (since the present editor and publisher is morally responsible for its first as well as its second appearance in LUCIFER) the story was not copied from another journal. It was sent to us by an old and highly respected subscriber, living in Ohio. I had never seen or heard the story, at least in its present shape, and supposed it to be founded on fact as it purports to be. It was inserted.

First, and chiefly, in accordance with an established rule of ours to allow our patrons to have their say in their own way through the paper, provided, of course, that in the editor's judgment the writer has something to say that is of value to the general reader, and provided also, that the article is not plainly libelous in its nature.

Second. It was inserted as a bit of pleasantry, satire or burlesque, at the expense of the superstition which teaches men to look for a special "Judgment Day"--a "last day," a "second coming of Christ," etc. A belief in this superstition, as is well known, is not peculiar to the Millerites, since it is taught and believed by nearly all Christians. It was also inserted as a bit of innocent satire upon the superstition that makes virtue (in the sex-relation) depend upon the possession of a marriage certificate issued by a priest, parson, judge or other civil officer.

That it was inserted by the editor as burlesque or satire, is sufficiently shown by the short prefatory sentence (enclosed in brackets) which reads thus:

Dudes, pudes, and "patent outside" moralists, of the Comstock and Probationist persuasion are kindly cautioned not to read what follows. It is too utterly, utterly shocking! not to any impious and "obscene,"--Ed.

All the articles upon which the present prosecution against E. O. Walker, M. and G. S. Harman, is based, have now been published. As stated in the issue of June 22, '88, these indicted articles are, or have been, republished, "not as an act of defiance, not in order to further encourage those who first secured our arrest and who are now working for our conviction." They have been republished because there was a legitimate demand for their republication. Because it is the right of the general public to know what the alleged offense is that subjects citizens to imprisonment for the term of their natural lives, and to fines aggregating hundreds of thousands of dollars. (This estimate of penalties is based upon the supposition that we are to be convicted on all, or even half, of the counts against us.) If we had been charged with murder, with manslaughter, with arson, with rape, with bigamy, polygamy, or even with selling beer in violation of the prohibi-

tory laws of Kansas, there would then be a doubtfulness, a boundary, so to speak, to the charge, that would, in a measure, satisfy legitimate curiosity; but "obscenity" is a charge so vague, so undefined and so indefinable by any recognized standard of legal definition, that curiosity is at once aroused to know what the specific offense is for which the defendants are held in heavy bonds to answer.

In addition to simple curiosity, there is a tradition still extant that the freedom of the press is absolutely essential to the preservation of "American liberty," (as though American liberty has not itself become a tradition!) and hence when the right of the press to print and circulate anything not libelous is assailed, there is more than ordinary interest manifested to know the exact facts in the case.

The grand jury and prosecuting attorney that first indicted us, refused to let the public know, by official record, what the offense charged really is. They said the matter complained of was too "obscene to be placed upon the record." When the case came up for trial last spring, Judge Foster sustained the motion to quash the indictments on the ground that no indictment can hold that does not set forth the exact facts upon which the prosecution relies for conviction. This defeat seems to have had the effect of whetting the appetite or enlivening the energies of the U. S. prosecutor. He "was put there to win," as the prosecutor in the case of Mrs. Ciguarral said of himself, and so, without an hour's delay, he secured a re-indictment by another jury, on the same charges. Smarting under his late defeat Prosecutor Perry caused the indicted articles to be printed for the use of the jury and to be spread upon the records of the court. This court, this judge and jury, are commonly believed to be the servants of the citizen--servants of the general public--not the masters of the citizen or of the general public. If, therefore, it is right and proper that the servants should know the exact facts complained of in this raid upon the freedom of the press, it is also right and proper that the principals--the citizens, or general public, should know the exact facts in the case.

The reasons thus crudely given seem to me sufficient to justify the republication of the four indicted articles--which articles are now designated as:

First. The "Markland Letter" (republished in LUCIFER, June 22, '88) the animus and burden of which letter is a strongly worded, manly protest against the assumed "marital right" of the husband to invade and abuse the person of his wife.

Second. The letter of Mrs. Whitehead to Mrs. Slenker (republished in LUCIFER, July 20, '88) in which the former uses plain but chaste language in condemnation of the use of "contraceptives."

Third. "Comments on Chavannes' Articles" (republished in our issue of Aug. 10, '88) in which the writer defends Dinnass, in language to which none but a pride or a self-conscious libertine would take exception, unless for "ulterior purposes."

Fourth. The "Millerite Story" republished in this issue, and for the republication of which the reasons have just been given.

Other and even stronger reasons for the republication of the four indicted articles could be given, but these must suffice for this time.

All Knowledge is Good and Pure.

W. A. C. in "American."
All knowledge is good; the book of nature is open; there is nothing so high that the mind of man may not speculate upon it, neither is there anything so low as to be beneath investigation. It is as legitimate to study the order of the universe as it is to examine the composition of an ameba, and in this lower form of life there is as much to raise our wonder as is revealed by the stary heavens.

All knowledge is pure. There is nothing in our outward form, our inward organs, or in the processes carried on within our bodies, that we have any right or cause to be ashamed of, unless we know that defects are externally visible. Even in this case we have but slight cause for shame, unless we are aware that our outward defects are the result of our own faults or vices; yet we ought, as taught in the golden rule, to spare others the sight of deformity as much as possible. Our possession of this shame is proof of the falsity and animality of what we style "civilization." We are indignant at the word "animal," yet are we so conscious of our animality that we dare show nothing but hands and

face. But even these are enough to prove us animal, spite of our shortened jaws. Look upon the animal expression of the faces you meet, notice how the covering worn over most of the body is employed as an appetizer to animal passions, and then reflect how far we are from that paradise which is the dream alike of theologian, poet and philosopher!

That which is beautiful is pure. Physical beauty, the ideal of human external perfection that our imagination has consecrated, is in itself pure, even though it be associated with mental or moral imperfection. Though each one of us is more or less imperfect, either mentally, morally or physically, each of us should admire the beautiful in another. But just as we admire the loveliness of landscapes, or that of any beautiful non-human object, without thought of anything save the witchery of its charms, so were we as civilized as we claim to be, we would admire beauty in human individuals of either sex without thought of harm--without the slightest desire to take advantage of the mental or moral weakness of the being we admire.

Since science is sacred, since it is right to study any portion of the open book of nature, so it is right to copy any portion of it, to combine its various parts of such copies in an harmonious whole, to conventionalize or adopt nature's forms to suit our requirements.

Thus art, so long as it strives to be beautiful for the sake of beauty, is sacred, and has a right to appeal, by every means within its power, to the highest of our senses--that which stands in closest union with the mind. That species of art which loves to portray, with minute fidelity, things in themselves revolting, is scarce worthy of the name of art; while that which surrounds an object of beauty with accessories that appeal to our lower passions is unholy. Such an appeal, in the case of a painting or a statue, may be made by a gesture or an attitude, and is more frequently to be met within a clothed figure than in any suggestive impurity of partial clothing.

An impure mind can draw evil from beauty, but the beauty is not to blame. A child cannot see a flower without a desire to pluck it, but the flower is not answerable for the destructive wish. Thus, if an uncleanly and but half civilized individual of either sex finds that the sight of Thorwaldsen's grand group of "The Graces"--that glorious trio of female forms which sets higher samples of humanity thinking of a world where all is perfect--awakes in him or her only impure ideas, such an individual is the author of the evil he or she discovers and is more fitted to be a butt of ridicule than to pose as a censor of morals. All the moral evils we deplore in humanity are as rampant in those who are physically the reverse of beautiful as in those who are loveliest, and are, as a rule, most rampant in those who have least appreciation of beauty.

LETTERS TO A SISTER.

NUMBER V.--CONTINUED.

Dear Sister:--I have endeavored to show my belief that properly speaking, there is no such thing as a natural right. In nature might makes right every time. Yet I hold to inherent or individual rights which you may claim are synonymous with natural rights. Perhaps the are. My idea is that in the course of evolution man has acquired rights, as he has intelligence or language. That is, a sense of justice has become fixed in his organization which causes him to demand for himself and to grant to others certain rights, based upon the equality of the ego, or self, of manhood, rights to life, liberty and property. Matthew Arnold has said that "all rights are created by law, and based on expedience and are alterable as public advantage may require." If this be so, justice does not exist outside of government, and Hobbs was right when he wrote, "Before the names of just and unjust can have place there must be some coercive power to compel men equally to the performance of their covenants by the terror of some punishment greater than the benefit they expect by the breach of their covenant." I hardly think that Arnold would follow his conviction to this logical conclusion. A student of history, he must know that rights existed before governments. Herbert Spencer tells of tribes in various parts of the world, showing us "before definite government arose, conduct is regulated by customs." After enumerating a great number, he ends with "Kolt's statement respecting the peaceful Aratunas well sums up the evidence. 'They recognize the right of property in the fullest sense of the word, without there being any authority among them but the decisions of their elders according to the customs of their forefathers.'"

Mr. Spencer, speaking of Bentham, says, "He tells us that government fulfills its office by creating rights which it confers upon individuals--rights of personal security, rights of protection for honor, rights of property, etc."

In his "constitutional code," he fixes the sovereignty in the whole people; arguing that it is best to give the

sovereign power to the largest possible portion of those whose happiness is the proper and chosen object. . . . Mark now what happens when we put these two doctrines together. The sovereign people is to appoint representatives, and so to create a government; the government thus created, creates rights; and then, having created these rights, it confers them on the sovereign people by which it was itself created." Mr. S. calls this a "marvelous piece of political legerdemain," and asks us to "observe what are the applications. Each man exists in two capacities. In his private capacity he is subject to the government. In his public capacity he is one of the sovereign people who appoint the government. That is to say, in his private capacity he is one to whom rights are given; and in his public capacity he is one of those who, through their agency, give the rights."

Now, isn't this rather a roundabout way for "we the people" to govern ourselves? Do you not think "twere better to discard these agents and let each man govern himself?"

You say it is easier to govern others than it is to govern ourselves, and you are no doubt right. Fortia, in Shakespeare, says, "I can easier teach twenty what were good to be done, than be one of the twenty to follow mine own teaching." And I suppose it is easier to govern and control twenty, than be one of the twenty to be so governed and controlled. But what sort of justice is it that enables us to govern others when we cannot govern ourselves? Emerson says, "This undertaking for another is the blunder which stands in colossal ugliness in the governments of the world."

A man who cannot be acquainted with mo, taxes me; looking from afar at me ordains that a part of my labor shall go to this or that whimsical end, not as I but as he happens to fancy. Behold the consequence. Of all debts men are least willing to pay the taxes. What a satire is this on government. Everywhere they think they get their money's worth except for these." Spencer says, "The great political superstition of the past was the divine right of kings. The great superstition of the present is the divine right of parliaments. [i. e., of legislatures.--Ed.] The oil of anointing seems unawares to have dripped from the head of the one to the heads of the many."

If it were not for the glamour of superstition which envelops the whole affair, government would not be tolerated a single day. It has become to us a nature, and, like Byron's "Prisoner of Chillon," we have come to love our chains and regard the air of freedom with actual aversion.

A. L. BALLOU.

To be continued.

The rule is that the great majority of people in every country are poor, even in the most favored lands, or at best only possessors of the necessities of life.--Nordau.

OBITUARY.

Maria Elizabeth Emerson, wife of J. Wm. Lloyd, died, of enteric disease, near Palatka, Fla., on Tuesday, Sept. 4th, 288, at 2.45 P. M., in the 33d year of her age. Deceased was a radical Anarchist, Agnostic, dress reformer, and fearless advocate of almost every radical scheme for the advancement of human happiness.

Although at one time an experienced medium, she died without faith in Spiritualism. Her last words on the subject of death were spoken to her husband: "I want you to tell everybody that I die an Infidel, and happy in it. I have always dreaded death because of its uncertainty, but now I do not dread it; yet it never seemed so sure to me before that the grave ends all."

During her last sickness she read with keen pleasure D. M. Bennett's "Truth Seeker Around the World." Her last intelligible words were: "I want rest." After a very painless illness, she passed away at last in a state of unconsciousness, very easily, like a child, and without a sound.

In accordance with her known and expressed wishes the funeral was very simple and unostentatious, without symbols or expressions of mourning, and without Christian ceremonies of any sort.

Mr. Lewis Morris, a resident and well-known freethinker, made a few brief remarks on the life and virtues of the deceased, read a few verses of poetry composed by her husband and concluded with the Service for the Dead to be found in the April (287) No. of the Freethinker's Magazine.

She sleeps in the charming little cemetery of the pleasant rural village of Palatka, Florida, under green oaks, and beneath the swaying banners of the Spanish moss.

Sans peur et sans reproche.

I have a firm hope that the recognition of the fellowship of the human race will gradually increase. The most enlightened men have always had a very clear comprehension of it, and as occasion offered, they accepted martyrdom without hesitation for the future welfare of the human race.--Nordau.

From Alfred Cridge.

EDITOR LUCIFER: Your Chattanooga letters about the financial provisions and other undemocratic absurdities of the U. S. Constitution bring to light facts which I—a "foreigner"—have long known, but whereof Americans generally are totally ignorant. I have long been aware, from a perusal of authentic histories of the convention of 1787, that the Tories virtually captured it and substantially won back what had been conquered by seven years of war ending only a few years previously. The greenbackers—some of them—are well versed in financial history since 1860, but should go back a little further, and instead of demanding that the United States should issue money "in sufficient volume for the demands of business"—a very indefinite proposition—should demand that every State and municipality should be authorized to issue money for public works, etc., subject, perhaps, to the referendum. With my present light I am not prepared to say that individuals or private corporations should have that power, in view of the liability to its abuse under our present industrial system, but it would be less harmful to throw the door wide open than to confer the function on a privileged few.

The history of the Constitutional Convention, or such of it as the Chattanooga letters contain, should be followed by a history of the so-called Shays "rebellion" which preceded it. The demands of the "insurgents" were much in accord with those of greenbackers and others to day. In January, 1837, I happened on a Springfield, Mass., *Republican* containing a history of that series of events, published on the centenary of its suppression, accompanied by a portrait of Daniel Shays, who appears therefrom to have been a man of prepossessing and highly intellectual appearance. Had the principles affirmed in that "rebellion" succeeded, those of the Declaration of Independence would have been really carried out. The whole of the *Republican* article would occupy about three columns of *Lucifer*, but I could make extracts and condensations to any extent desired. It is about time that modern reformers should do justice to the memory of Daniel Shays.

ALFRED CRIDGE.
San Francisco, Sept. 1, '88.

Legal Murders, and Executions.

EDITOR LUCIFER: The gallows has been a concomitant of the cross during the reign of Christianity, and to-day it stands in every Christian country to break a Bible command—"thou shalt not kill." And we find men with natures sufficiently brutal to act in the capacity of legal murderers, while the horrible fascination which attends human suffering, never fails to draw more applicants for admission to the hanging than the jail will hold or the law permit to be present. In the state of Ohio the law has recently been changed in regard to legal murders, and all executions must now take place at midnight, while press reporters are forbidden to publish details. In a late number of the *Truth Seeker*, Mr. Ed. W. Chamberlain discloses information that must have been obtained from a private source, relative to the fearful scene enacted while legally destroying the life of a man named Morgan, at Columbus, Ohio. The details are terrible to contemplate, and in every breath that throbs with one spark of human sympathy they must cause feelings of horror to prevail. That such things can occur at this age of the world, and among people who boast long and loud of their superior civilization, is astonishing; and it should lead every man of humane feelings to protest against such damnable doings, as these bungling, agonizing, judicial murders. It men must be killed to insure the safety of society, let it be done as quickly and painlessly as science can devise a way. The mental agony which precedes the day and doom of one condemned to death, is sufficient punishment without inflicting needless torture at the end of a rope. If society and justice demand the breaking of a commandment which Christians believe emanated from God; if one murder demands the perpetration of another to establish equity, let mortal man be as merciful in the manner of doing the dreadful deed as is possible. Personally I am not a believer in capital punishment, for having peculiar views in regard to the freedom of man's will, I give no man credit for a good deed or censure for a bad one; for, being a product of fate—inevitable necessity—and the creature of conditions he cannot and does not control, man from my standpoint is more of an automaton in the hands of universal Nature than an independent actor. The late Thomas H. Inezard, a man noted for sympathetic nature and kindness of heart, once declared that in interviewing many condemned murderers, all invariably asserted that the deed of blood was committed under impulses so strong as to preclude all thoughts of punishment. Still society holds them fully accountable, and nothing but a violent death will appease the demands of vengeance and revenge. Every attempt of the doomed man to commit suicide is care-

fully guarded against, and a death watch is set over him for weeks, that he may not escape the hangman's noose and fail to afford excitement for those who delight in seeing the agony of a fellow being. The death watch was lately placed over a murderer in this state who is soon to meet his doom, and a phrenologist who examined his head, has admitted that he was very unfortunate as to prenatal influences; in a measure a victim of descent, deriving much of his low animal instinct from his ancestors; and as in character eccentric and one-sided owing to cephalic lack of self-mastery. Yet in view of these facts he is held responsible, and the thoughtless rabble and pious Christians cry for his blood. Although his death should satisfy their cry for revenge and "justice," some morphia found in his possession was removed to prevent his escaping the hangman, and now, until the 14th of September, he will forever evade the eyes of paid officials whose object is to keep him alive for the slaughter. In view of the terrible scenes which have been enacted under the gallows, and considering that murders are not prevented by the torture of a condemned murderer, it is time for our boasted civilization to dispense with barbaric customs; and by connecting cause and effect to learn that man is a creature of fate and that if so constituted as to be a dangerous element in society it is better to deprive him of his liberty than to kill him. Many innocent men, also, have been hung, and a doubt exists regarding the guilt of this Morgan who was so painfully punished for a deed it is possible he did not commit. But whether men are innocent or guilty it is time the gallows was abolished; and if death must be inflicted, let mercy and science unite in devising a better mode of execution than that of slow strangulation. C. SEVERANCE.
Los Angeles, Cal., Sept. 2, '88.

FREE PLATFORM.

Two Years Among the Spirits in the Godless Town of Liberal.

I have just received a twenty-five cent pamphlet with the above title, and read it with a deal of interest.

I have always been one of the foremost in trying to investigate the claims of Spiritualists and have taken from two to six papers advocating them for twenty or thirty years steadily, and have written and received hundreds of letters from mediums and non-mediums, believers and non-believers, and I took a trip to New York, Brooklyn, Boston and Syracuse, visiting every prominent medium I could find, and honestly and carefully combed the whole thing, for and against, as far as I could, and found nothing at all!

And lately Mr. Burr, of Washington, commenced investigating at my request, and he and his wife decided that the spirits of the dead really communicated with the living, but I am no more convinced than I was at the time Rochester Rappings first came out. This expose of Dr. Bouton's shows so well how the whole thing can be done by trick and delusion, and can satisfy even the most radical unbelievers that it is all genuine, and make the Spiritualists themselves so enthusiastic worshippers of Dr. Bouton as a medium between the dead and the living that they deemed it a gracious privilege "to his sacred garments."

The book explains how it was all done and proves that the doctor did might be done by all other mediums, and the inference is that probably a majority of them all are tricksters trading upon the credulity of the public. Some are self-deceived, and a few may possess some occult power though I have found no evidence of such personally. The expose is intensely interesting to me, as I was so much mixed in with the whole thing as much so as any one could be and not be on the spot. Readers will find some of my correspondence in the book, and read replies from believers who were so positive, yet as we see, so mistaken. I hope one and all will order the book of *LUCIFER*. It will be an eye-opener and good for reading to others. I do not approve of Bouton's deception. The role of Detective may be useful, but I for one could never accept it. Still I think it right to make the best use of all that comes to our hands, and I hope friends will order hundreds of these pamphlets, and scatter them far and wide. Truth will prevail and error will fall. Give all sides a fair hearing and trust in Righteousness.

ELMIRA DRAKE SLENKER.
Snowville, Va.

LETTER FROM CHATTANOOGA

NUMBER XII.

Money is a thing that is a legal tender in payment of debts; paper money is generally considered as of no intrinsic value; and it was truly said by John Law, the famous Scotchman, who was financial minister of France in 1720, that—

"If we establish a money which has no intrinsic value, or whose intrinsic value is such that it will never be exported, and the quantity of which shall never exceed the demand in the country, we shall have reached wealth and power."

Every word in this paragraph was carefully selected and put into its proper place by a man whose great soul was filled with love for suffering humanity,

and the idea that he has expressed will live in the memories of men as long as their habitations are found upon the earth.

Law's financial system, an adequate supply of irredeemable paper money, has been successfully tried in Italy, France, England and America.

Louis Blanc, an eminent French historian, says: "While Law's system prevailed manufactures increased, mendicants found employment, industry had wings, interest fell, usury was crushed, and smiling plenty reigned upon every hand."

Sir Archibald Allison, in his History of Europe, speaks in glowing terms of its happy effect in distributing wealth among all classes of English people from 1797 to 1819, during which period "specie payments were suspended in the British kingdom and labor troubles were unknown."

And Adam Smith has shown conclusively in his work entitled the "Wealth of Nations," published in 1776, that our Colonial ancestors preferred legal tender Treasury notes to gold and silver coin, finding the paper money far more convenient and desirable as a circulating medium.

Then why should the American people be told in the platform of the Democratic party that nothing is honest money but gold and silver coin, and paper currency convertible into coin?

Is it not because the aristocratic leaders of that party know, as Hon. R. M. T. Hunter of Virginia, has so well said, that "A paper medium promising to be convertible into specie and dependent upon it for its circulation and continued existence is the prime contrivance for producing inequalities in human condition," and that "from this invention spring the Barings, the Rothschilds, and the splendid few who live at the expense of the many, and control the multitude through this instrument which controls all contracts and consequently all commerce?"

Will the rank and file of the Democratic party never get weary of letting the splendid few live at the expense of the many? Will they always be content with the shells so long as their party leaders can get the oysters? Do they not know that if we are to have no paper currency except what purports to be convertible into specie on demand, that this will necessitate the establishment of banks of issue; that these banks of issue, as Mr. Jefferson said, will be more dangerous than standing armies; and that National banks, like the State banks before the war, will give us expansion, contraction and financial convulsion about once every nine years, resulting in the wholesale plunder of the people? And do they not remember that Franklin, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Jackson, Tyler, Calhoun, and many other distinguished statesmen were in favor of a paper currency issued and regulated by the government?

In accordance with this idea the Republican party has given us the legal tender Treasury notes of the United States—the best money this country ever saw—and a quantity adequate to the demand is all that we lack to "rouse the nation from its torpor and drive a thousand spurs into its flanks."

But we can never hope to see John Law's financial system fully established in this country so long as the aristocratic leaders of the Democratic party control any of the great departments of the government.

We should begin to consider therefore, whether each State can not do something for itself in the way of obtaining an adequate amount of paper money.

The first thing that strikes our attention when we investigate this subject is the fact that the States are bound hand and foot with the chains of the National Constitution, and we no not hesitate to say that those chains should be broken—peaceably if possible, forcibly if necessary.

(To be continued.)

Sexual Hypocrisy.

EDITOR LUCIFER: A friend of mine sent me a copy of your valuable journal for perusal, with the special request to give my opinions on the subjects discussed in the article "Visionary Non-sense," by C. Severance. This is my excuse for appearing on the arena.

My own experience, as well as those of many other intelligent women I have spoken to; that the sexual desires of women could not be well less than those of men; and when we consider that so many women give themselves freely up to sexual enjoyment, notwithstanding the terrible consequences that so frequently follow, it seems reasonable to suppose that nature has endowed us with more intense sexual desires than the men.

On the other side, is it not natural that woman, having over men and still being the sexual prey of men (no matter how much State and Church regulations may disguise and mitigate the fact) has for her self-protection to suppress her desires (to the injury to her health frequently) and hypocritically assume the appearance of sexual indifference? Although this sexual hypocrisy is sanctioned by society and every woman has to submit to it under penalty of terrible

ostracism, I do not think that women reap such great benefits from it as they expect. The knowledge of woman's hypocrisy in the sex-realm could not be kept from man, and thus he is stimulated to greater perseverance in his importunities and even to improper intrusions. Like in all things I think perfect frankness and truthfulness is also the best course to follow in the relations of the sexes.

Another false impression, I think, has been created among men by this sexual hypocrisy of women; it is this—and I guess men form their judgment about the sex-nature of women from the sex-nature of men: men think that, since they are excited sexually at the sight of any woman not absolutely repulsive (and so much more so if any part of her body is unusually exposed) women would be also thus excited under such circumstances, and even in a higher degree. But nothing is further from the truth. You may place a hundred very likely men before a woman, under very enticing circumstances even, and not one may stir her sexually. Does Mr. S. think such a thing would happen to a man, if one hundred likely women were placed before him?

I think Mr. S. is right, when he supposes that only the smallest part of cohabitation is for the object of maternity—I believe in one out of ten thousand of pregnancies it was perhaps desired, in the rest it was an undesired accident, either while submitting passively and without pleasure to mistaken duty, or in the enjoyment of a function God or Nature has given to us women for enjoyment just as much as to the men.

Now why should women not avail themselves of the means of protection that science has discovered, and reason and conscience pointed out to her as beneficent. The fears expressed by some that these protective means might be abused are entirely irrational. The same reasoning might forbid the use of fire.

ALMA S.
Macon, Ga., Sept. 2, '88.

O. L. James to Zeno.

"Zeno" announces that he is willing to spend the rest of the nineteenth century trying to make me understand Malthusianism. That is more creditable to his patience than his modesty, for I have studied Malthusianism a good deal, and, perceiving that he never did, advised him several times to read a 25 cent book on the subject published by the Harpers. But he evidently remains innocent of Bonar's Malthus, or anybody else's Malthus, except Henry George's. So good a logician as Zeno ought to know that to make another understand anything you must first know something about it yourself.

Malthus did not teach that population increases faster than food except as food itself is checked by want of land. I defy Zeno to quote the passage.

In the first and second paragraphs of his last letter, which as usual is no model of arrangement, Zeno holds forth one of those quibbles in which he continually catches himself. Because it is a logical maxim that the effect precedes the cause he thinks it absurd for me to attribute present want to that overcrowding which, if properly were abolished and marriage not, would, according to Malthus, and according to me, and according to Zeno himself, very shortly follow. Cannot Zeno get the idea through his head that men, especially "smart" men can foresee want, that they usually propose to guard against it, often with little regard to the rights of others, that slavery, landlordism, &c., are so many ways in which they say to the less intelligent, hold, united, and enterprising, "Thou shalt want ere I want;" and, that if the world would be over-peopled in 175 years but for premature death, as Zeno has admitted, then to abolish these forms of tyranny without abolishing the fundamental tyranny of man over woman

would (Zeno himself being witness) only make misery universal, even, if indeed, it were practicable, which from the constitution of man it is not. State Socialism does but daily with the branches of the Upan; the Anarchist alone strikes at the roots. The Malthusian free-love Anarchist who is not afraid of woman's freedom, does not try to avoid the subject, does not talk of women's rights with bated breath, and butts, and ifs, and ands; he, alone, digs underneath the tap root.

Zeno, the professed apostle of George, who never said a word for woman in his life, hopes we may find some nobler ground for her emancipation than fear of over-population. I don't know what he means by noble, but I venture to say that few reasons could have more weight with women themselves than the fear of infant mortality, of maternity resulting in nothing, of raggedness and hunger, of girls exposing themselves for bread, of children standing on tip-toe to operate machinery, of young men cut down by the the million in wars which while they seem to superficial reasoners the sport of wicked kings yet somehow manage to engage the enthusiasm of the people—the people who know, though in a vague, blundering way, that there is no room for them; that war makes it; that the neighbors of whose aggressions they complain are making it less. All these things are summed up in that word over-population. Teach women that, and you may count on their support; and

N. B. you will never affect the social revolution without it.

So the *Labor Enquirer* would not allow me to publish the letter in which Zeno was shown to demolish himself, because no more room was to be assigned to the debate! Then why did that paper allow Zeno (who began the debate) to print another of his usual screeds, ridiculing and misrepresenting me after that? "It's too thin," as the girl said of circus liondances.

C. L. JAMES.

Family Secrets.

Republished from *LUCIFER* July 23, '88.

In Coles county, Ills., there lived a man named Isaac Dodson and his wife, who were firm believers in the prophecy of Father Miller, and not doubting for a moment the correctness of their prophet's calculations, set about making active preparations for the eventful day that was to terminate the existence of all subhuman things. After having "set their house in order," the following conversation took place:

Husband.—My dear wife, I believe I have made every preparation for tomorrow. I have forgiven all my enemies and prayed for the forgiveness of all my sins, and feel perfectly calm and resigned.

Wife.—Well, husband, I believe I'm ready for the sound of the trumpet.

Husband.—I'm so rejoiced to hear it; but my dear wife, I have no doubt but there are many little domestic secrets which we have kept hidden from each other, which had they been known at the time of their occurrence, might have produced unpleasant feelings, but as we have but one day more to live let us unbosom ourselves freely to each other.

Wife.—Well, husband, you are right; there are some little things that I never told you, and which I intended should remain between me and my God; but as we have but one day left, I reckon it is right to make a clean breast of it to each other. I'm ready—you begin, husband.

Husband.—No, dear, you begin.

Wife.—No, husband, you begin, I can't.

Husband.—Not you know, my love, Paul says husbands have the right to command their wives. It is your duty as a Christian to obey your husband and the father of your children; so begin, love.

Wife.—In the sight of God, I reckon it's right, so I'll tell you, dear husband; our eldest son, William, is not your child!

Husband.—Great God! Mary, I never dreamed of your being untrue to me! Is that so?

Wife.—(In tears) Yes, God forgive me, it is true. I know that I did wrong, and am sorry for it, but in an evil hour I fell, and there is no help for it now.

Husband.—William not mine? In the name of God whose child is he?

Wife.—He's Mr. Graham's the constable; the Lord be near your poor wife!

Husband.—So William ain't my child! Go on.

Wife.—Well, our daughter Mary, named after me, ain't yours, neither.

Husband.—Salvation! Talk on, Mary, come right out. Who's Mary's father?

Wife.—Mr. Grider the man that built the meeting house, and went to the lower country.

Husband.—(resignedly). Well, as there is but one day more, I'll bear it, so go on if you have anything else.

Wife.—Well, then, Johnny our youngest.

Husband.—I s'pose Johnny ain't mine neither?

Wife.—No, dear husband, Johnny that we both love so well, ain't yours neither.

Husband.—Merciful Lord! Is that so? In the name of the Savior, whose is he?

Wife.—He is the one-eyed shoemaker's that lives at the forks of the road.

Husband.—Well, by G—d! (Gabriel, blow your horn! I want to go now!)

UNCLE TOM.

If Christians would teach Infidels to be just to Christianity, they should themselves be just to Infidelity. It can do truth no service to blink the fact, known to all who have the most ordinary acquaintance with literary history, that a large portion of the noblest and most valuable moral teaching has been the work, not only of men who did not know, but of men who knew and rejected the Christian faith.—John Stuart Mill "On Liberty," page 87.

Slavery is not yet abolished. The very principle, subjugation, which ruled under ancient slavery, serfdom, and under negro slavery, rules yet under the wage system.—(Front door).

Where restrictive or prohibitive laws are called for, the evils they are designed to most may be traced to previous restriction to some curtailment of natural rights.—Social Problems, p. 186.

If any opinion is compelled to silence that opinion may, for ought we can certainly know, be true. To deny this is to assume our own infallibility.—John Stuart Mill "On Liberty," page 87.

Think not I come to send peace on earth. I come not to send peace, but a sword.—Jesus Christ, quoted by George in *Social Problems*, page 17.

The experiment of popular government in the United States is clearly a failure.—George, *Social Prob.*, page 23.

