

LUCIFER

THE LIGHT-BEARER.

NEW SERIES, VOL. 4, No. 10.

VALLEY FALLS, KANSAS, JUNE 4, E. M. 286.

WHOLE No. 152

LUCIFER

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 advanced or statements made by him

FOWLER'S PAMPHLETS!

CO-OPERATION, its Laws and Principles. 25 pages of splendid reading matter. Just what is needed to-day. Don't miss it.

THE REORGANIZATION OF BUSINESS. In the Store and the Bank, on the Farm and in the Factory. Practical application of the principles of Co-operation.

PROHIBITION. An unanswerable argument against summary methods in temperance reform. Price, 10 cents each, the three for 25 cents. Address, WALKER & HARMAN, Valley Falls, Kan.

T. P. FARLEY, Insurance Agent. Valley Falls, Kan. Office in McCannum's Hall.

C. H. GILMAN, DENTIST. VALLEY FALLS, KAS.

E. L. SENT, PHYSICIAN and SURGEON, VALLEY FALLS, KANSAS. Dr. Sent uses "Electric Specific Medicine." Office over Evans' Store.

DR. FRANK SWALLOW, (LATE OF CHICAGO,) VALLEY FALLS, - - - KANSAS.

Office, corner Maple and Broadway. Residence, corner Elm and Broadway.

All calls promptly attended to. Night or day in town or country. Will continue to give special attention to chronic diseases and diseases of women and children. Guarantees a Cure in every case of Rheumatism.

DOOLITTLE & CO. Dealers in Hardware, Stoves, Tinware, etc

BARB WIRE, VALLEY FALLS, - - - KANSAS.

H. F. NOLKER, Groceries.

Everything to be found in a first-class Grocery House.

QUEENSWARE! The largest stock and lowest price in the city.

J. H. SHULER, AT BRAND'S OLD STAND ON BROADWAY. Has a large stock of

Furniture!

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

CAPTAINS OF INDUSTRY.

The chevalier in mail-linked armor clad Received on bended knee his trusty blade To right the widow's wrongs, defend the maid, And from oppression make the orphan glad. All life was strife, and knightly oath forbade The steel which had so oft in tourney played To rest undrawn where piteous glances prayed.

With tearful eyes, disconsolate and sad. All life is strife, and still in fierce array Our knights are met where blows fall fast and hard.

But he who bears aloft the golden prize By greed hath pilfered—as his lawful prey— From unarm'd hands the coveted award To dazzle in his fellow victim's eyes.

LUM.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH AND WOMEN.

BY MISS E. CADE STANTON.

[Continued.]

As the result of the canon law, what is woman's position in the State and Church to-day? We have woman disfranchised, with no voice in the government under which she lives, denied until recently the right to enter colleges or professions, laboring at half-price in the world of work; a code of morals that makes man's glory woman's shame; a civil code that makes her in marriage a nonentity, her person, her children, her earnings the property of her husband. In adjusting this institution of marriage, woman has never yet in the history of the world had one word to say. The relation has been absolutely established and perpetuated without her consent. We have thus far had the man marriage. He has made the laws concerning it to suit his own convenience and love of power. He has tried every possible form of it, and is as yet satisfied with none of his experiments. If an inhabitant of some other planet could suddenly light in one of our law libraries, and read over our civil and criminal codes, he would be at loss to know what kind of beings women are, so anomalous in the position we hold, with some rights partially recognized in one place and wholly obliterated in another. In the criminal code, we find no feminine pronouns. All criminals are designated as "he," "his," "him." We might suppose our fathers thought women were too pure and angelic ever to commit crimes, if we did not find in the law reports, cases in which women had been imprisoned and hung as "he," "his," "him." And yet, while the masculine pronoun can be made to do duty for punishments, when it comes to privileges we are excluded, because the laws and constitutions do not contain the feminine pronouns "she," "hers," "her." We are a kind of half-human, half animal being, like those wonderful questioning sphinxes we see in the Old World.

And we present very much the same appearance in the Church. Go into any little country town, and the chief excitement among the women is found in fairs, donation parties, festivals, Church building and decorating. The women are the chief, untiring, pertinacious beggars for the church. They compose the vast majority of the congregations. Rich women give large sums to clear church debts, to educate young men for the ministry, and to endow theological seminaries. Poorer women decorate the temples for Christmas and Easter, make surplices and gowns, embroider table covers for the altar, and slippers for the rector, and all alike think they are serving God in sustaining the Church and the priesthood.

In return, the whole tone of

church teaching in regard to woman is, to the last degree, contemptuous and degrading.

Perchance the very man educated by some sewing society of women will ascend the pulpit, and take his text in I. Corinthians xiv., 34, 35: "Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home, for it is a shame for women to speak in the church." Ephesians v., 23: "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church." I. Timothy ii., 11, 12, 13: "Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, as the church of Christ was first formed, then saved." I. Corinthians xi., 8, 9: "For the man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man."

Now, my friends, what effect do you think such Epistles, as these, written by Paul to the Ephesians, the Corinthians, and the Thessalonians, had on the men and women of those times; and what is the effect of sermons from such texts to-day, but to degrade woman and demoralize man? These teachings in regard to woman so faithfully reflect the provisions of the canon law that it is fair to infer that their inspiration came from the same source, written by men, translated by men, revised by men. If the Bible is to be placed in the hands of our children, read in our schools taught in our theological seminaries, proclaimed as God's law in our temples of worship, let us by all means call a council of women in New York, and give it one more revision from the woman's standpoint.—Index (Boston.)

For LUCIFER.

"Requirements of Natural Morality."

Not any one, or all the "Nine Demands of Liberalism," is in my estimation equal to the 8th—"We demand that * * * all laws shall be conformed to the requirements of natural morality" * * *

In this is implied the essential dignity and capacity for perfection and self government of human constitution. The whole structure of laws that relate to the domestic relations, the union of the sexual, the family, and social life as involved in these relations, is a structure of injustice, immorality, and prevents progress.

The first step practicable for removal of what is termed "Social Evil," is to make maternity legitimate under any and all circumstances, and to make motherhood in or out of legal form, the supreme controller of itself. Motherhood is the agency of "the requirements of natural morality" to promote an ascending grade of life. Man made laws have reversed the operation of the laws of natural morality.

To-day, in families whose deportment is good, and who consider themselves "moral,"—a pregnant maiden, or even child of fourteen years—is a much greater shame and crime than producing abortion and killing the mother.

Is there in the range of human sentiments, ideas or statutes, one so criminally perverting of the requirements of natural morality as that of stamping illegitimacy upon an innocent and wholly defenseless child? It is a cowardly, cruel, unnatural, monstrous violation of natural laws, rights, and parental duties,

and it has wrought corresponding evil in society.

Thousands of young, inexperienced, and often unprotected maidens who have become mothers while not wives, have been driven first from home shelter and sympathy to become the shamed outcast, the abandoned, reckless woman, the moral leper. Dangerous, is it, to remove the odium, disgrace and ban from illegal motherhood?

Can it be more dangerous than the past course of banishment has been?

Would it be more dangerous to save to the unfortunate child and maiden her self respect than to crush it completely?

Would it be more dangerous to preserve in the home a woman, than to thrust upon the world a degraded wretched creature to spread moral and physical contagion, and to ensnare youth, mayhap?

Liberalism could do no grander, nobler, more humanitarian work, than to help emancipate motherhood, purge the statutes of their refined barbarism, liberate the innocent, defenseless child, and thus exalt human nature, and remove one of the most blasphemous regulations of society, and one of the prolific sources of vice.

Who will start a petition, or an agitation in some form, to eliminate this shocking crime of illegitimacy from the statute books, and to deliver motherhood from the thrall of sanctioned as well as unsanctioned lust?

LUCINDA B. CHANDLER.

For LUCIFER.

An Anarchist's Note Book.

We anarchists are accused of breaking up labor organizations. "You have no sympathy, no good will towards the laboring classes. You don't work for them or with them." This is but partly true. We condemn the methods and practices of our labor organizations, we show that there is no moral principle, no purpose, or true solidarity and no rational understanding of the social problems in our labor reform movement. We do work for our laboring classes, though not with them.

And, pray, how can any just and honest person sanction the absurd, extremely unfair and unmanly acts of our labor unions? The Truth Seeker of May 15, gave us a very interesting account of a Knight of Labor boycott. A Liberal was boycotted by the bigoted Christian Knights. Hereby was the cause of the boycott. Here is another characteristic item from a New York daily: "Franz Lachner, cigar-bunch-maker at Lach's factory, Mrs. Lachner's son-in-law, and his wife, a cigar-maker, were discharged yesterday by the foreman because the other workmen complained that Franz bought his rolls at his mother-in-law's. They have six children."

The aims of our labor organizations are absurd. The means, suicidal. The methods, tyrannical. They have got to go and make room for a more rational and more advanced reform movement. In unity there is strength, but not in artificial unity, not in unity under despotism. Without liberty there is no life.

The schoolboys in four of the Baltimore public schools, have organized the "Baltimore Association of Schoolboys' Knights of Labor," and on April 19 the following proclamation was issued by the executive committee: "To whom it may concern, and they better be concerned, unless they join the schoolboys' Knights of Labor and prepare to strike for four hours, to act Monday, they will be knocked out." "The schoolboys have learned their lessons well," says Mr. Tucker. "They have packed into a nut shell the spirit and methods of their pattern organization."

The Anarchists are not organized, but they are united. They have no written constitutions, rules, laws or officers. Yet there is, and when some concentrated action is required will be more harmony and unity among them than in the most perfect of our labor unions. A labor reformer once sincerely told me that the Boston Anarchists form a kind of mutual admiration society. Well, they ought to be proud of it. Mutual admiration is a better and safer basis for organization than mutual dislike, distrust and disrespect, which are easily discovered in that heterogeneous mass known as organized labor.

The Chicago bomb has thrown thousands of editorial prostitutes into convulsion and incurable insanity. Those of our labor papers

that were not wholly destitute of reason before the throwing of that bomb, have become so since. And we must remember that the masses of the country read these papers and get all their ideas and information from them.

Mr. Lum, who is considering facts, not theories, should consider these facts. The hostility of the white slaves to their yellow brothers is a fact; the tyranny the folly of our labor organizations is a fact; the propaganda by deed is a fact. When Mr. Lum considers all these facts he will probably have something to say about them. His views and ideas are of more value to us than his prophesies. Come what may, we want to know what is intrinsically right and wrong. Let the logic of events take care of itself, and give us a piece of our own logic.

We must allow for human nature, pleads Mr. Lum. The laws of justice and equity do not excuse our blunders and ignorance. If we violate them the punishment fits the crime. Human nature is elastic and ever-changing. The more men know of the laws of justice the more perfect they are.

Zeus is perseverant but unsuccessful. He thought he came very near proving that Michael Bakounine was a State Socialist, but Mr. Tucker interfered and destroyed all his calculations. So he made up his mind to rob us of Paine's sympathy. He is trying very hard to find state socialist heresies in his writings. But he will be disappointed. There can be no State socialist in an "Age of Reason," when the "Rights of Man" are held sacred. Even at the time of the "Crises," "Common Sense" is uncompromisingly opposed to despotism.

As to the power granted by the Constitution to Congress to establish post offices and post roads, the New York Sun remarks that at the time the Constitution was made it was not thought that post offices and universal transmission of correspondence could be accomplished by any agency except the state. It would be better for us, adds the Sun, if the post office establishment were not a monopoly.

The Sun sorrowfully admits that we have too much government already. "Tyrants naturally desire to enlarge and intensify government machinery, but free people must labor always to diminish it." Does the democratic Sun labor to diminish government? It labors for monopoly, the money kings and property-beasts. It is misleading and treacherous to the laboring people. It knows, but does not mean well.

The articles of Messrs. Tucker and Appleton and Miss Kelly on the Chicago outrage, are truly remarkable. Mr. Lum's "Recollections of Christianity" should be carefully read by every freethinker in England. It would prove highly instructive to Mr. McDonald of the Truth Seeker. I have no doubt.

PLUM-LINE.

The One Sacred Thing.
"You might lock out and shut out men and women asking for a decent living out of the enormous wealth which their labor has created;—you might outlaw them and blacklist them from town to town, and on all the railroad lines from Maine to California, thus pronouncing sentence of idleness and starvation;—you might huddle children at the baby age of six years into factories to work twelve hours a day, and have a cat-o'-nine-tails hanging on the wall to be used in keeping them awake and up to their work;—you might drive them by despair, at the tender age of twelve or fourteen years, on the street and into the vile brothel dives that flourish, unmolested by the police, on every hand;—yes, you might degrade men, sacrifice childhood, prostitute girlhood, and the corrupt judge, the false priest, the time-serving editor, will have no anathemas for you. There is but one sacred thing—property. Cast a look of disapproval at property, you starving wretch! seek to make intelligent inquiry into the way by which colossal property is acquired, and these cultured representatives of our so-called Christian civilization will curse you. Starve and kill men and women at your will, but lay a sacrilegious hand on a money-bag, or on a holy pile of lumber or bricks and mortar, and no punishment is adequate to your crime but the gibbet."—Madame Delaclose.

MOSES HARMAN & E. C. WALKER
EDITORS.

M. HARMAN AND GEO. S. HARMAN
PUBLISHERS.

OUR PLATFORM.

Perfect Freedom of Thought and Action for every individual within the limits of his own personality.

Self-Government the only true Government Liberty and Responsibility the only Basis of Morality.

LUCIFER'S AUTHORIZED AGENTS.

Carthage, Mo.—E. S. Galloway.
Weir 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.—(East)—Geo. H. Hutchinson.
Humboldt, Kan.—Wm. Rath.
Hartington, "—Chris. Brown.
Garnett, "—C. Grege.
Olathe, "—W. W. Prizer.
Cedar Junction, Kan.—J. C. Collins.
Burlington, Iowa.—Wm. Bocklein.
West Burlington, Iowa.—James Toft.
Success, Kan.—Chas. Dinning.
Salina, Kan.—J. M. Hiten.
Beranton, Kan.—John F. Young.
Carbondale, Kan.—James S. McDaniel.
Preston, Iowa.—John Durant.
M. O. Hicks, Sil in Springs, Ark.

THIS PAPER may be found on file at Geo. F. Russell & Co's News Agency, 150 Broadway, New York, where all advertising contracts may be made for it IN NEW YORK.

RECEIPTS ON PRESS FUND.

Previously acknowledged \$22.20
No additions this week.

JOB WORK.

Our friends will please remember that we are now prepared to do job printing, such as Cards, Notes, Bill-heads, Envelopes, Circulars, Pamphlets, &c. Satisfaction guaranteed. Please send in your orders.

THE PUBLIC LANDS.

So vitally important to a right solution of the labor troubles is the right solution of the land question, that we reproduce from last issue the following extracts from a circular issued by the "Land Reform League" of New York. We do this not because we think that President Cleveland is the first and "only" man to point out a legal remedy for the whole curse of monopoly, but because Mr. Devyr shows most clearly that monopoly can have no legal title to the lands held by it; and also that he who "holds his home by natural right and possession and improvements" is the only man who can rightfully and legally lay claim to land. Mr. Devyr says:

It is passing strange that President Cleveland should be first, indeed the only man to point out a Legal Remedy for the whole curse of Monopoly. In his Message to Congress he drags up this forgotten truth, "The condition on which the several States" ceded the lands to the General Government was that they should be administered for the public good." And he added, "Will any man contend that giving them away to large monopolies has been administering them for the public good?" Here we have it declared by the first Magistrate of the Nation that such "giving away" was, and is, in violation of the Original Contract, on which the States ceded, and the United States accepted those lands.

Let our lawyers follow up this solemn Contract between those two Supreme Powers and see where it will lead to. If Monopoly titles rest on a violation of that Contract, does not that violation sweep them all out of legal existence? Then comes the question of Fraud. All juriconsults agree that if fraud enters into the procurement of a title such title is null and void. And behind both stands Blackstone. Even that high tort commentator speaks to us in this way. "An act that violates Natural Justice is not Law. It is an unauthorized Proceeding." If this be so, and for these reasons if there be no legal title to Monopoly lands, it greatly simplifies the work before us. But what about the man who paid his money to the monopolist and holds title from him? Such man cannot be disturbed. He holds his home by natural right and possession and improvements. The work to be done is to furnish homes for the homeless and deprive no man of his possession.

MORE LIGHT!!

So obvious, so simple, so all-embracing is this remedy that President Cleveland, when appealed to enforce the "Eight Hour Law," said, "Certainly it must be enforced in our government works, but I see no permanent relief except employing the laborers on the public lands. And I would approve of any feasible means adopted by Congress to aid that purpose by grant or loans from the National Treasury," or words to that effect. It is not a little encouraging to find that the first man of note to give voice to this truth is the first Magistrate of the Nation—"The Public Lands," by Thomas A. Devyr.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH.

In last week's issue we spoke incidentally of the suppression of the right of free speech and free press in Chicago. A friend has sent us the following "Open Letter to the American Press," taken from the "New York Volkszeitung," a moderate socialistic paper and bitterly opposed to the rantings of Spies, Most, Parsons, etc." We think this open letter takes the only sensible and logical ground that an American, and secularist, can take in the matter. It has been urged, on the contrary, that although the Constitution forbids Congress to make any "law abridging the freedom of speech and of the press," it does not prohibit states and municipalities from doing so. With equal truth and point it might be argued that Congress cannot make laws abridging or denying the right of equal suffrage or the right of trial by jury, but that because Congress cannot do these things it does not follow that states and municipalities may not thus abridge the rights of the citizen. To us it appears evident that the design of this constitutional provision is to make it the duty of Congress to see that the right of free speech and free press shall not be abridged by the states and the municipalities.

For ourselves, however, as autonomists, rather than as governmentists, we would make our argument from the stand-point of equal justice, rather than from that of statute law. Under equal justice no man can deny to another the right or freedom to use threatening language. Words are not deeds, and it is not the province of civil law to take preventive measures against remote or possible consequences of words, no matter how violent or "incendiary." If crime is committed against person or property, it might, perhaps, be legitimate for the jury or judge to inquire how much of the responsibility for such crime rests on the shoulders of him who by word incited to deeds of violence. But the attempt to prevent crime by suppressing speech and press would lead to all the despotic and cruel measures of European inquisitions. Again: We should look to the effect upon the individual himself—of thus damming up the natural currents of free speech. If a man has had thoughts in his heart or brain it is better that these thoughts should find vent in words rather than in deeds. The utterance of these thoughts in words often has the effect of bringing about a reaction or revulsion of feeling in the thinker himself; besides putting others on their guard against him.

The perils of society do not come from freedom of expression but rather from repression and suppression.

The "Open letter to the American Press," is as follows:

NEW OR COWARDS.

On Tuesday last the Chicago police dispersed a meeting without warrant of law. An unknown person threw a dynamite bomb, killing a number of policemen. The next morning every paper in the United States brought the news that not only all the editors and compositors of the anarchistic newspaper Arbeiter-Zeitung had been arrested, but that by order of the mayor that paper had been placed under the censorship of the chief of police, without whose permission nothing was allowed to be published.

This censorship was carried on for two days by the chief of police—Ebersold is the name of the fellow—who, like the murdering Mayor Trautman, of Milwaukee, is a German-American, praised be the Lord on high! This censorship would be enforced to-day if the proprietors of printing establishments in Chicago had not refused, through sheer fright, to print the paper, on which account its future publication became impossible.

How the chief police ruffian of Chicago carried on his censorship may be seen in the following special Herald dispatch of yesterday: "Ever since the troubles of last Thursday night the paper has been under the censorship of Superintendent of Police Ebersold, and its proof sheets have been carefully examined. Neche argued that the police would not dare to interfere with his editorials. When the paper was ready to be printed Chief Ebersold inspected it. He used his blue pencil in earnest. Among the matters forbidden were the following paragraphs:

"The capitalistic press has been full of gloating over the temporary suppression of the workmen's organ and has damned it in the most forcible language. Nevertheless the Arbeiter-Zeitung, during its ten years' existence, has not been so full of brutality as the capitalistic papers within the last two days. If the public will wait they will see that the apparent crime will ultimately appear in a different light.

"In all the discussions concerning the affair of Tuesday night the capitalistic press has not been able to show that the police had one whit of authority under the law to disperse the gathering on the Haymarket. The Herald on Wednesday morning stated that even

when the police crossed Randolph street they seized their clubs with a tighter grasp, preparatory for an assault on that little assemblage, which was composed in greater part of innocent spectators. Comment is unnecessary."

Chief Ebersold objected to the term "apparent crime" in the first editorial and to the general tone of the second.

One thing we will say right here to our censored comrades of the American press, and that is, that the excluded parts would not have been objected to by the press censors of Germany, or even Russia.

But how this chief of police carried on his censorship is immaterial. That he did carry it on, that a servant of the sovereign and free people, acting under the constitution of the United States, should have lent himself to such a gross infraction of that fundamental law, that is the main issue.

Article I, of the amendments to the constitution of the United States, says:

"Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press."

As long as this article is in the constitution every one who interferes with the liberty of the press or establishes a censorship over it is guilty of high treason against the personal rights and liberties of the citizen.

It may be urged that at the time there existed an exceptional state of affairs in Chicago, and that the continued appearance of the "anarchistic incendiary sheet" would have endangered the peace of the entire city. What a wretched argument. In the first place, it is not true that in Chicago the conditions are such that a general uprising could have taken place in consequence of the explosion of a single dynamite bomb. That is the old argument which has been used from time immemorial by all oppressors and tyrants in order to crush every move for liberty. "The maintenance of order requires it," was the cry, even of those against whom your ancestors have raised the bulwark of your own constitution.

Just herein should lie the strength of free institutions, that they are sustained, even in stormy times, and do not tumble down like a card house. When the latter takes place, the temple of liberty rests on a foundation of sand and can be toppled over at the first occasion by any "country savor" that may see fit to do so.

Are you not aware of that you representatives of "public opinion" of this country? Or, if you know it, are you afraid to speak out? Are you still free men, or has the curse of wage writing, or of habitual intellectual prostitution, changed you into cowards?

We know it and call your attention publicly to the fact that the latter is the case, that your liberty has become a lie long ago, a mere thin disguise, a fraud and a sham, under which you protect your business interests and which is thrown aside the moment there is the least danger to those interests.

We know that, and we know that our appeal will not be noticed because you would have shamed to answer. And yet we appeal to you. Will you quietly stand by and see that in this country, at the first pretext, the whip of censorship is swung over you? Do you want it so? Very well then! Then the working classes will know what to expect of you and what to think of you. The hypocritical mask will be torn from your "liberty" forever and she will stand there not as the goddess, but as a prostitute to mammon!

OWNERSHIP OF LAND.

It seems very hard to make our readers understand Lucifer's position on the land question. Meeting an old subscriber on the street the other day his first salutation was something like this:

"Well, friend H., I guess I'll settle up for the paper and have it discontinued. I cannot endorse your teachings on many points, and do not think it is doing quite right to give countenance to such sentiments by helping to support the paper."

"But what is it," we asked, "that you find so very wrong about the paper?"

"Why your Communism, Free-lovinism, Anarchism etc. In your last issue you recommend to those that have no land that they should take forcible possession of the farms of such men as myself and neighbors who have toiled long and hard to make homes for ourselves and families."

"What did we say that was anything like this?"

"Why, you oppose private ownership of land, calling it 'land-monopoly.' What encouragement can I have to build a good house, a good barn, good fences, or make other improvements on land that I am never to have the ownership of?"

"Why, my dear sir, the very best encouragement possible in this world. The 'inalienable homestead,' held by right of possession and of use, gives far greater security against forcible ejection than does a money right to land. Under the latter right you may be driven from your home by the sheriff for taxes, or debt under mortgage; or the paternal state may put a money value on your farm, without your consent, and condemn it to public use. On the contrary, by the law of 'right by possession and use' you are really 'monarch of all you survey' on your own premises—because your right to those premises rests upon a basis that cannot be

disputed by any man or by any government.

"But I do not expect to live always. What is to become of these improvements when I no longer need them?"

"The right of possession and of use naturally includes the right of entail. Your children will have the same right to this home that you now have."

"But I may want to leave my home for a few months or years, and take my family with me. What is to prevent some interloper taking possession in our absence?"

"You can have your agent to look after your interests, and until it is proved that you have abandoned your home and made a home elsewhere, it would be the duty of the township trustees—the co-operative home government—to defend your right against all comers."

"But how about your advice to the landless to seize the land of the monopolists? These men have paid their money for their lands."

"Some of them have paid a merely nominal price; others have paid nothing at all. The government has assumed a right it did not possess, and is therefore itself a robber. Even President Cleveland—servant of Capitalism as he is, on the money question—admits that the people have been robbed of their right to land, by the general government. [See article, 'Light, Light, in this and last issues of LUCIFER.] It is always lawful for an owner to reclaim his own, no matter how often it has changed hands among a brotherhood of thieves. Then let the people assert their right to this stolen domain. If government has simply made a mistake, let it correct that mistake at once, and settle with the monopolists as best it can. But if the government will not compel these land thieves to surrender their ill-gotten booty, then let the landless people assert their inalienable right to the use of enough soil to sustain life. Let them get possession of this land, 'peaceably if they can, forcibly if they must.' Whenever any government proves traitor to the trusts reposed in it by its authors, the people, then that government forfeits its right to exist."

Such is the substance of a brief conversation with an "old subscriber"—one who has hitherto shown himself a true friend of Free-thought in Valley Falls. At its close he simply said, "Well, send on the paper!"

A RADICAL REMEDY.

Among recent contributions to the literature of Social Science in the very important department of reproduction, none, perhaps, ranks higher than Dr. E. B. Foote, Jr.'s, "The Radical Remedy in Social Science, or Borning Better Babies through Regulating Reproduction by Controlling Conception." This is a somewhat extended and quite alliterative title, and looks formidable, but it exactly expresses in brief the ideas which the author elaborates in the body of work, and it would seem that no better one could have been selected.

Our author calls the Scientific Method the "art of civilization," and in this connection I quote him:

"It is therefore important to have a thorough understanding of the Scientific Method, the essence of which in the domain of applied social science is to

"LEARN WHAT IS TRUE IN ORDER TO DO WHAT IS RIGHT,"

a maxim of Descartes, and which is, as I take it, the essence of Herbert Spencer's summing up of the utility of all philosophy in his book entitled, "The Data of Ethics." Science seeks the true for its own sake, and having found it, takes it unto itself without fear of consequences. Science argues-eyed, searches in all directions for truth, accepts it from any and every source, and assimilates everything which will bear investigation. True social science studies all sorts of men, their manners and their customs, virtues and vices, and reports them impartially, without fear or favor, without prejudice or disgust. It regards with interest all problems relating to the improvement and welfare of mankind, and treats each according to its importance. The thorough social scientist will not hesitate to enter upon the study of any social evil because it is tabooed by amateur philanthropists, and if there be anything that has been neglected by others who fear to

soil their dainty hands with it, he will pursue the noisome evil to its source, drag it from its hidden retreat and expose it to the disinfecting sunlight of publicity. He will be apt to discover the forbidding fields and low-lying grounds the foul brooding places of fatal physical, moral and social epidemics. If he be a practical man and a consistent advocate of the scientific method in all things, he will apply it to the solution of those social science problems in an effective way which will strike deep down at the root of all evil. In looking about for remedies for social science evils he will be broad and liberal-minded, and will no more expect to find a universal panacea than he would to discover the balm of perpetual youth. But neither would he, in his reach for remedies permit himself to be turned aside from the consideration of any remedy which could receive the endorsement of science and give fair promise of usefulness, merely because it could not find favor in the eyes of antiquarians. He will be frightened away by no scarecrow of ancient superstition set up in the path of progress, nor will he be deterred from favoring a remedy because some one raises the cry that it is "unnatural"—meaning that it is not in accord with what nature intended, or that it will interfere with nature's processes and results. From one point of view all our material progress has been due to thwarting nature—evading nature's decree—but the scientist really takes advantage of one natural law to protect himself against another, manipulates natural forces within his control so as to make them protect him from those beyond his control.

SCIENCE APPLIED TO NATURE'S FORCES.

The ancient's first impertinence in the eyes of the gods was the stealing of the fire of Heaven and putting it to his own use, which man has done in innumerable ways, until he now makes steam do the greater part of the labor of the world—the more civilized world. The modern man has been vastly more audacious in stealing the fire of Heaven, for since the example of our great philosopher, Benjamin Franklin, who went fishing for chained-lightning and caught it, the inventions of man have saddled this swift steed and tamed him for our use. Other modern discoveries now recognized to be of great value have given us wonderful control over pain, one of the oldest and most natural evils, but to relieve pain is to stifle the voice of nature; and when anaesthetics were proposed for the relief of the pains of childbirth, it was seriously opposed by those who quoted the ancient scriptural injunction which reads, "In sorrow thou shalt bring forth children." This opposition was of no avail; Anaesthesia was the child of science, and in the face of all opposition has become a universal remedy for human pain.

In future numbers of LUCIFER I shall continue the examination of this excellent book. In the meantime, those of our readers who desire to possess it can do so by sending 25 cents to LUCIFER or Walker & Harman.

NOTES.

Comrade Tucker thinks that J. F. Kelley and Gertrude B. Kelley have driven me "into a corner" on the population question, and a small corner, at that. Well, maybe, but I do not feel surrounded. It has been my steadfast conviction ever since this problem attracted my attention, that it could not be successfully disputed that population tends to outrun subsistence, and that so long as men have no more practical sense than to bring a greater number of children into the world than they can care for under existing conditions, they have not the sense necessary to create better conditions.

Waiving the first for the time being, I am prepared to maintain the truth and logic of the second of the above propositions, even though my friend Tucker does make a strained attempt to be witty at its expense and mine. Mr. Tucker believes in personal initiative, and so do I, and to me it seems reasonable, however it may appear to him, that men who do not begin by reforming themselves are not very well calculated to reform the world, and that the men who are so cruelly and recklessly imprudent as to bewail the father of more

Address, MUNN & CO., Office SCIENTIFIC
AMERICAN, 261 Broadway, New York.

BY THE LATE HUGH CONWAY.

NG CO., 129 E. 25th St., New York City, N.Y.