

LUCIFER

THE LIGHT-BEARER.

NEW SERIES, VOL. 4, No. 13.

VALLEY FALLS, KANSAS, JUNE 25, E. M. 280.

Whole No. 135

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 sump wry methods in temperance reform. Price, 10 cents each, the three for 25 cents. Address, WALKER, & HARMAN, Valley Falls, K.

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

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

E. L. SENFT,
PHYSICIAN and SURGEON,
VALLEY FALLS, KANSAS.
Dr. Senft uses "Ecclectic 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.
—AND—
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 BELAND'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.

FACE TO FACE.

Sad mortal! couldst thou but know
What truly it means to die,
The wings of thy soul would glow,
And the hopes of thy heart beat high;
Thou wouldst turn from the Pyrrhonist schools,
And laugh their jargon to scorn,
As the bubble of midnight fools
Ere the morning of Truth be born;
But I, earth's madness above,
In a kingdom of stormless breath—
I gaze on the glory of love
In the unveiled face of Death.

I tell thee his face is fair
As the moon-bow's amber rings,
And the gleam in his unbound hair
Like the flush of a thousand Springs;
His smile is the fathomless beam
Of the star-shine's sacred light,
When the summers of Southland dream
In the lay of the holy Night;
For I, earth's blindness above,
In a kingdom of halcyon breath—
I gaze on the marvel of love
In the unveiled face of Death.

In eyes a heaven there dwells—
But they hold few mysteries now—
And his pity for earth's farewells
Half furrows that shining brow;
Souls taken from Time's cold tide
He folds to his fostering breast,
And tears of their grief are dried
Ere they enter the courts of rest;
And still, earth's madness above,
In a kingdom of stormless breath,
I gaze on a light that is love
In the unveiled face of death.

—PAUL H. HAYNE in Harper's.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH AND WOMEN.

BY MRS. E. CADY STANTON.

[Continued.]

The offices woman held during the apostolic age she has been gradually deprived of through ecclesiastical enactments. Although, during the first four hundred years of the Christian Church, women were the chosen companions of Jesus and his followers, doing their utmost to spread the new faith, as preachers, elders, deacons, officiating in all the sacraments, yet these facts are carefully excluded from all the English translations of the Scriptures; while woman's depravity, inferiority, and subordination are dwelt upon wherever the text will admit of it. Under all the changes in advancing civilization for the last fifteen hundred years, this one idea of woman has been steadily promulgated; and to-day in the full blaze of the sunlight of the nineteenth century, it is echoed in the pulpit by every sect and in the halls of legislation by every party.

In one of the most essential doctrines of Christianity,—namely, self-sacrifice—women have been carefully trained, until, as John Stuart Mill says, that has come to be their pet virtue. This is nowhere better illustrated than in their religion. There is no depth of personal degradation they have not touched in the religious worship and sacrifice of ancient civilizations, and no humiliations of the spirit that mortals can suffer, when ostracized by those in no way superior to themselves, that educated women in our day have not endured. Seeing this, I have endeavored at many of our suffrage conventions to pass some resolutions embodying the idea that woman's first duty was self-development; and at last, after a prolonged struggle and much opposition, even by women themselves, the following resolutions were passed at our thirtieth anniversary, held in Rochester, July, 1878:—
Resolved, That, as the first duty of every individual is self-development, the loss of self-sacrifice and obedience taught woman by the Christian Church have been fatal, not only to her own vital interests, but through her to those of the race.
Resolved, that the great principle of the Protestant Reformation, the right of individ-

ual conscience and judgment, heretofore exercised by man alone, should now be claimed by woman; that, in the interpretation of Scripture, she should be guided by her own reason, and not the authority of the Church.

Resolved, that it is through the perversion of the religious element in woman, playing upon her hopes and fears of the future, holding this life with all its high duties in abeyance to that which is to come, that she and the children she has trained have been so completely subjugated by priestcraft and superstition.

The following Sunday, the Rev. A. H. Strong, D. D., President of the Baptist Theological Seminary of that city, preached a sermon especially directed against these resolutions, which met strong clerical criticism and opposition by all the fraternity in the State who chanced to see reports of the proceedings.

One amusing episode in that convention is worthy of note. Frederick Douglass, who has always done noble service in our cause, was present. But his intellectual vision being a little obscured that warm afternoon, he opposed the resolutions, speaking with a great deal of feeling and sentiment of the beautiful Christian doctrine of self-sacrifice. When he finished, Mrs. Lucy Coleman, always keen in picking bubbles, arose and said: "Well, Mr. Douglass, all you may say may be true; but allow me to ask you why did you not remain a slave in Maryland, and sacrifice yourself like a Christian to your master, instead of running off to Canada to secure your liberty like a man? We shall judge your faith, Frederick, by your deeds." The time has come when women, too, would rather run to Canada to taste some of the sweets of liberty than to sacrifice themselves forever in the thorny paths marked out to them by man.

Whatever oppressions man has suffered, they have invariably fallen more heavily on woman. Whatever new liberties advancing civilization has brought to man, ever the smallest measure has been accorded to woman, as a result of church teaching. The effect of this is seen in every department of life.—The Index, (Boston, Mass.)

CO-OPERATION.

It is one of the encouraging signs of the times that men of large capital are taking interest in co-operative schemes for working men and women. We quote from the advance sheets of Demorest's Monthly for July:

Still the gravity of the labor crisis is starting up new co-operative enterprises. We hear of Knights of Labor co-operative shoe factories in Lynn, Massachusetts. The well known Waltham watch factory has never had a strike, though wages have often been reduced, for the reason that many of the employees were stockholders, and it would have been absurd for them to have struck against themselves. It is now announced that John Jarrett, a leading member of a labor organization, and Andrew Carnegie, the millionaire steel manufacturer, have agreed upon a scheme which has vast possibilities. The following is the outline of this far-reaching project:

"No one but workmen or members of labor organizations will be permitted to take stock, and no man can hold more than \$200 worth. If a man desires to go into the company and has not the money required, he can deposit a portion of his earnings in the bank. On those deposits he will receive eight per cent. interest. Bankers say that money is going a begging at five per cent., and I cannot understand how they can afford to pay that amount. Of course, Mr. Jarrett and Mr. Carnegie would not go into a thing of this kind blindly, and believe that they will be able to keep their part of the agreement. When a sufficient fund has been secured to start the bank and store they will be established in this city. A central and convenient location will be secured.

Every thing that is used by a working-man and his family will be kept in the store. Prices will be lower than at other stores, but there will be a profit for the stockholders, and dividends will be paid every six months or deposited to the credit of the stockholders in the bank. A number of delivery wagons will be sent all over the cities daily for the purpose of receiving and delivering orders. These stores will be established in all the leading cities of the country as soon as possible. After this scheme has been tested, building and loan associations will be organized, the main object being to erect homes for the members. In time there will spring out of this movement co-operative rolling mills, steel mills, foundries, factories, and machine shops. Workmen will soon become interested in the movement, and instead of spending money in saloons, or for pleasure, will deposit all they can spare in their bank. With men like Andrew Carnegie and John Jarrett behind the scheme, there is hardly any possibility of a failure."

Every well-wisher of his kind will hope that this or similar projects will succeed, for the future looks gloomy enough if the working-classes remain discontented. The possession of the land makes the tiller of the soil conservative. A share in a thriving industry and a voice in its management would make the mechanic and the artisan an upholder of the rights of property and a foe to the anarchist. It may be that our working-classes or at least some of them have become sufficiently intelligent to form wise co-operative unions, at any rate the experiment is worth trying.—From Demorest's Monthly for July.

Of course the above writer uses the word "Anarchist" in its popular but false sense. It is the communist, not the Anarchist, that is the foe to the "rights of property." Co-operation in business, co-operation in government for defence, these are anarchistic principles rather than archistic.

Wanted—Liberalism.

Mr. Editor: A day does not pass that for some reason the above heading does not occur to me—Liberalism is wanted among Liberals—wanted among Radicals, wanted among Free Thinkers, wanted among Truth Seekers.

If we could but realize that our ideas are as necessary to our life and growth as food to growth and preservation of the outward body, and that expression is as important as respiration, should we not more carefully abstain from the dogmatic criticism that asserts what must be the mental and moral character of a person who holds views not quite according to our own?

Dogmatists in reform are even greater stumbling blocks than conservatives.

Knowing that a creedist dwells within walls of defined limits, we expect to adjust ourselves to the fixed space, and repress our mental activity if we hold converse with them. We can withhold and reserve, and shut up any number of thought-doors that are requisite, and sit down quietly in the little room and dim light, as we will in the chamber of sickness where activeness and abandon of life are out of place and out of order; but, when souls claim freedom, expansion, liberality, this is entirely unexpected.

We suppose we have entered Nature's boundless domain, where each unit is free to reach in every direction, with all its powers of investigation, to breathe the unlimited atmosphere of life, to bask in the fullest sunshine of light, and to grow as only human faculties can, by expressing the ideas that experience and investigation evolve in us.

Indeed, does not liberalism need a more thorough definition?

It is a mistake to think we are Liberals simply because we repudiate a set of dogmas.

"If I could both financially and morally afford to, I would like to publish an immense magazine in which everybody, the most dogmatic, and also the

most illiterate might present their opinion on human affairs. That would be a symposium that would furnish rich material from which to formulate natural and progressive conditions in human society." Thus writes Dr. Foote, the Prince of Liberals; and the thought implies a correct estimate of the true basis of social construction.

"Give me liberty or give me death," is not merely an utterance of a free soul. It states an absolute fact. Without liberty we are in death, we are without vitality, for repression is a suspension of vitality. The powers of mind are constantly revived by expression.

Moreover, the still deeper more vital love life is ever seeking an outlet and expression that is a source of life.

The social bond that either as a religious or legal force pronounces customs, usages, statutes, ceremonies, the ultimatum of wisdom, and the only possible method of conserving order, purity, good morals, and health, is a despotism that true liberalism cannot accept or defend.

If a man or woman has not experienced a quality of love that has no need of statute, or official, or church ceremony, to make it sacred, and loyal, and pure, and as binding upon one's conscience and tender devotion as any requirements that church or state can formulate, let such man or woman forever hold their peace concerning the judgment and experiences of those who feel that these are not requisite.

It is better to seek more knowledge and light for ourselves than to exercise narrow judgment upon others.

A Liberalism that does not save us from piercing others with the stony darts of misjudgment,—of a sharp and censorious antagonism,—of a narrow, overbearing spirit, is unworthy of the name, and has no advantage over creedal dogmatism and bigotry.

Human organization and experience are too complex and profound problems to be pronounced upon by any person.

A Liberal mind and heart will sit down reverently before any individual entity as a miniature Deity, of too vast proportions and possibilities to be compassed, weighed and judged by any other mind whose organization, experience and environment have not been precisely the same.

LUCINDA B. CHANDLER.

Men seem to regard Government in the same light the most devout christian does his God. They act as if the laws were rulings of some superhuman power. They quake and tremble in fear of what? Simply themselves, for does not one man in reality constitute as much of the government as any other one? They do not seem to realize that what the laws of man are as inevitable as those of nature,—Equity.

A Hard Fact.

It is a hard fact that our present common schools educate our youth away from the workshop; that they inculcate into the minds of those whose parents can afford to let them go through the course, an aversion, a repugnance for work, and engender a contempt for the workingman. Therefore, our present common school course is vicious—it is immoral.—Reflector, (N. Y.)

Rev. Brintnall, of Sheldon, calls cyclone caves "God dodgers." We opine the reverend gentleman would "hunt his hole" as quick as any one if he would see a genuine twister coming toward him.—Sutherland, (Iowa) Courier.

There are only two things in which the false professors of all religions have agreed—to persecute all other sects and to plunder their own.

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.
- Wear City, Kans.—Dr. J. B. Cooper.
- Seamonsville, Kan.—J. McLaughlin.
- Omaha, Neb.—James Griffith, 1712 Dodge St.
- Lawrence, Kan.—H. H. Hutchinson.
- Joplin, Mo.—J. Hendrich & Bro.
- Joplin, Mo.—(East)—Geo. H. Hutchinson.
- Humboldt, Kan.—Wm. R. R. R.
- Burlington, Kan.—Chris. Brown.
- Garnett, Kan.—O. Gregg.
- Ottawa, Kan.—W. W. Frazer.
- Cedar Junction, Kan.—J. C. Collins.
- Durlington, Iowa.—Werner Becklin.
- West Burlington, Iowa.—James Toft.
- Success, Kan.—Chas. Dinnity.
- Salina, Kan.—J. M. Allen.
- Seranton, Kan.—John E. Young.
- Carbondale, Kan.—James S. McDaniel.
- Preston, Iowa.—John Durant.
- M. O. Hicks, Sil m Springs, Ark.

RECEIPTS ON PRESS FUND.
Previously acknowledged \$522.20
No additions this week.

The Junior lectured at Elkton, Dak., June 18. He is now in Minnesota, and will be glad of engagements in that State and Iowa during July and August. Address him at this office.

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.

It will be seen that we are giving large space to the discussion of the "population question." Some of our friends think that it is a mistake to give so much time and kindred space on this and kindred questions until the land, labor and money questions are settled on the basis of equity and right. In our humble view, however, no subject can take precedence of the population question in importance; and so believing we ask our contributors who are again deferred to make room for this discussion, to have patience with us, and in time we hope to give all a hearing.

THE CHICAGO TRIAL.

From Chicago comes a call for aid to secure a fair trial for the indicted Socialists. It is in these words:

Funds are urgently needed to make a fair defense for the indicted socialists—Spies, Schwab, Fielden, Parsons, etc. At the present time public opinion is so excited and prejudices are so strong that it is feared a fair and impartial trial is almost impossible. A committee composed of men who have no connection with the I. W. P. A., and who do not even agree with their views and objects, have established a Fair Trial Fund. The prosecution have the wealth of the State, the influence of the press, and all other means essential (except evidence) which they have but little to get a conviction. On the other hand are a body of men without funds or support other than that voluntary support given by friends of liberty. The attorney for defense will receive all money for the fund if sent to Capt. Black, 116 Dearborn Street, Chicago.

It will be remembered perhaps that we condemned the throwing of the dynamite bomb at the Haymarket riot, so-called, and if the press dispatches first sent out, gave a correct account of the affair, we still condemn the act.

The Socialists, however maintain that they were violating no law, but were simply claiming and exercising their rights as American citizens when attacked by the police, and that the throwing of the bomb was strictly an act of self-defense. We hope this trial will bring out the real facts in this case; and whether the charges against Spies, Parsons &c. be true or false, of course we most earnestly desire that they have a fair and impartial trial. We therefore heartily second this call for funds to defray the expense of defending the prisoners.

Whatever may be the fate in store for one of the accused, at least, A. H. Parsons, we feel sure that his voluntary return to Chicago and surrender of himself to the prosecution, will challenge the respect and sympathy of every brave and honorable man.

WHAT IS MORALITY?

Obscene Literature.

We earnestly urge upon free-thinkers of the United States the duty of associating together in local leagues, auxiliary to the National League, for the purpose of defending themselves against the wiles of the Church, and preserving the regularity of the National Convention, at Watkins, N.Y.

We know you mean by the wiles of the Church, Christian morality. You are organized to defend yourselves against the law restraining the circulation of obscene literature, the law of Christian marriage, our prohibition and Sabbath laws, etc. The energies of the Christian Church are employed to maintain these laws, and your opposition will only rouse the Christian sentiment of the nation to the importance of changing our secular Constitution, so that it shall be put squarely on the side of Christian morality.—[M. A. Gault in Christian Statesman, May 20.]

If Christian morality is the genuine article—if after a trial of some eighteen centuries it has demonstrated its genuineness, then, by all means let it be encouraged in every legitimate way.

But what is morality? and how does Christian morality differ from any other kind of morality? The etymology of the word refers to the conduct or actions of human beings towards each other. "Relating to the practice, manners or conduct of men as social beings in relation to each other as respects right or wrong," says Webster. But then the question arises, where do we get our standards of right and wrong?

Churchmen, like Mr. Gault, maintain that the standard of right and wrong is to be found only in the Jewish and Christian Bible. But since the teachings of this book or rather of these books, are so contradictory that no two sects, and we may say, scarcely any two persons can agree as to what they do teach, we must look elsewhere for a standard of morality. Human experience, which is older than any or all written codes, has formulated a rule or standard that has always commanded the respect and confidence of mankind viz: "The tree is known by its fruits." If the fruit is good, if it promotes human happiness, then the tree must be good; but if the fruit is bad, if its results are unhappiness and misery, then the tree must be bad.

What then is Christian morality? Mr. Gault mentions the law "restraining the circulation of obscene literature" as one feature or outcome of Christian morality, and represents Liberals or free-thinkers as organized to defend themselves against that law, and by inference, that Liberals are in favor of the circulation of obscene literature.

Let us see how much of truth there is in this statement. "Obscene" means, literally, offensive to the sight, but is used to include words, acts or pictures that are "offensive to chastity and decency." Then in order to have laws to punish obscenity we must have an authority of some sort, to define what particular words, acts or pictures are really obscene. And right here comes in the trouble; just as in the case of morality itself. We have no infallible standard; we have no pope, no king, no court of final appeal, and hence any laws made to regulate these matters are very liable to be arbitrary, partial, unjust and tyrannous. General laws can be made and enforced to restrain crimes, such as robbery and murder, but these acts can easily be defined—all condemn them—not so in the realm of morals. In a land of equal rights no man can rightfully compel his neighbor by law to conform to his own code of morals, any more than he can rightfully compel that neighbor to conform to his own religious observances. And the attempt to compel conformity in the realm of morals will doubtless result as disastrously to the peace and happiness of nations and communities as has the attempt to compel conformity in religious creeds and observances.

But to be more explicit: Christian morality, if we understand the term, condemns as obscene the nude human body, also condemns words and pictures describing the organs of sex in the human, and prohibits under various penalties, the exhibition of the nude person, or statues and pictures that show the sex nature; and also condemns as obscene such words or phrases as describe these sex-organs.

But why should nudity of the human form be condemned as immoral or obscene? Science does not condemn it; art does not condemn it; human development on the physical plane, does not condemn it. All these encourage and require rather than condemn nudity. Clothing is an incumbrance, a hindrance

to development, unless protection be needed against natural elements. The ancient Greeks excelled all other known nations in development of their physical forms. In their national games their young men contended for the prize without the encumbrance of clothing. Hence the word *gymnasium*—naked. The Greek matrons while fulfilling the function of maternity, thought it necessary that they should daily look upon models of the most perfect human forms, so that their own offspring might be moulded on the same plane of beauty and high development.

Then as to the effect of such nude exhibitions upon what is known as chastity, or self-control over the amative propensity. We learn from Caesar's commentaries that the ancient Germans, men and women, were in the habit of bathing together in rivers while in a nude condition, and yet these same Germans were noted for their chastity and constancy in sex-relations. Judged by the rule, a tree is known by its fruit, the customs of the ancient Germans must be reckoned as having been good, inasmuch as these Teutons have ever since been in the front rank as strong, brave, liberty-loving people. It was the Germans under Hermann (Arminius) that first broke the power of the, till then, invincible Roman legions, and in later times it was the German Luther, though himself a despot in his way, who first effectually broke the power of the Roman spiritual despotism.

With our much esteemed contributor, Elmina D. Slenker, we have long been of the opinion that if boys and girls, and women and men too, were accustomed to the sight of the nude human form there would be much less sex-abuse than under our present system of concealment and mystery. The natural effect of this concealment and mystery is to excite morbid curiosity and to cultivate abnormal amative desires. As a pointer in the right direction we are glad to learn that in the Zoological Gardens of London there are to be seen nude statues of men and women—sex organs and all—and that the students of art, including the most refined and fashionable young ladies and accompanied by their gentleman friends, are in the habit of sitting for hours to sketch these nude statues.

All that we have said in regard to the nude human form applies with equal force to words—that is, to what is called obscene language and literature. The cure for these is not in repression or prohibition, but in the opposite. As soon as children are old enough to understand they should be encouraged to ask questions, and should be told all that is known in regard to the facts of generation, or the origin of life. They should be taught to call the sex-organs by their proper, scientific names; then they would never have any use for language now called "smutty" or obscene. Such language would never have any attraction for them. Neither would they have any desire to read the low, lecherous and demoralizing stories that fill most of the prohibited papers and books. Students at school should have the anatomy of the reproductive system delineated on the black board and on colored plates, just as they now have the anatomy of the muscular system, the digestive, and circulatory systems illustrated on the board and by colored plates. This method of instruction to mixed schools, in the hands of judicious instructors, would, in our honest opinion, be the very best antidote both for the sickly and disgusting prudishness and mock-modesty that afflicts so many young persons of both sexes, and also for counteracting the abnormally active amativens of others.

This then, is in part, our answer to the charge constantly made by Christians that we as Free-thinkers are advocates of immorality because we oppose the prohibitory laws against the circulation of obscene literature. Knowledge is the child's birthright. Knowledge is its best friend, while ignorance is its worst enemy. Those who would dam up the streams of knowledge in order that they may divert it into their own selfish channels, as churchmen do, are themselves the greatest enemies of that purity whose special champions they profess to be. Tried by the rule "the tree is known by its fruits," we maintain that Christian morality is a sham, a fraud and a snare. Like the fabled "apples of Sodom" it is fair to the eye but turns to bitter ashes in the mouth. It boasts the same relation to true morality that the paint and powder on the face of the fashionable belle bear to the genuine hues of health as nature gives them to her loquacious votaries.

PARENTAL PRUDENCE.

Kelley Criticizes Walker.

EDP. LUCIFER:—I am sorry to have to again intrude upon your limited space with a long letter, but the subject is important and in his last article W. has succeeded in confusing it more than ever. Consciously or unconsciously he has resorted to the trick of calling two things by the same name, making an elaborate defence of one, which nobody attacked, and then assuming that he has justified the other. It was in order to prevent this confusion of ideas that, at the beginning of my previous letter I gave a definition of Malthusianism as I understood it. W. does not say that my definition is wrong, incorrect, or incomplete, but he proceeds to mix up the question of population with that of the size of individual families. Now, if he is simply an advocate of small families, as a matter of domestic economy he is not Malthusian and there were no grounds for his attack on the author and translator of the article—The Malthusians. Proudhon was, as Tucker is, as I am, an advocate of small families, and it may be worth while noting that Proudhon's family was much smaller than that of Malthus. Proudhon recognized, as Tucker and I recognize, that even were the earning capacity of each individual multiplied one hundred-fold and were the food supply unlimited, there would still remain good and sufficient reasons for reducing the size of families. But this is all new, for in the note which called forth my letter, W. speaks enthusiastically of the sound common sense of P. Proudhon Malthus, and what the object of Malthus' teachings was I shall show immediately.

W. is over upon me because I declared for this social revolution, and further asserted that the revolution and Malthusianism are irreconcilable. And yet I repeated what but W's friends have declared time and again. It is a question of definitions once more, and it may be well to explain what the revolution means to us revolutionists, and why we and the Malthusians are agreed that we can have nothing in common. Thorold Rogers, Professor of Oxford University, Member of the British Parliament, and highly respectable generally, sums up his studies of English history thus: "I have attempted to show that the pauperism and degradation of the English laborer were the result of a series of acts of parliament, and acts of government, which were designed or adopted with the express purpose of compelling the laborer to work at the lowest rate of wages possible, and which succeeded at last in effecting their purpose." (Six Centuries of Work and Wages.) I think that even W., if he will only examine the evidence collected by Rogers, will admit that the thesis is fully sustained. What conclusion must we draw from such evidence? Why simply that to make the laborer free, to elevate him mentally, morally and physically, the causes which produced his degradation, and which now in a more or less modified form serve to maintain that degradation, must be utterly swept away, or, to use the language of a work which W. himself recommends to his patrons,—"In a word, we reject all legislation, all authority and all privileged, licensed, official and legal influence, even though arising from universal suffrage, convinced that it can turn only to the advantage of a dominant minority of exploiters against the interests of the immense majority in subjection to them." (Hakunine, God and the State.) Consequently we substitute usufruct in the bounties of nature for absolute ownership, recognizing property only when based on and existing through labor. Such being the position of the revolutionists, let us see what W's Malthusian friends think of them. Mr. Bradlaugh said recently that all socialists were "poets, fools or worse." As I am not a poet, I do not think there is much room for my reconciliation with Mr. Bradlaugh. Mr. C. L. James, gallantly coming to W's aid, informs the readers of LUCIFER that Malthus' essay was written to overthrow the perfectibilist doctrines of Godwin, and that what one gains the other loses. Mr. Kirkup in the Encyclopaedia Britannica writes as follows: "Malthus' Essay on Population grew out of some discussion which he had with his father respecting the perfectibility of society. His father shared the theories of Condorcet and Godwin, and the son combated them on the ground that the realization of a happy society will always be hindered by the miseries consequent on the tendency of population to increase faster than the means of subsistence." In fact the title of the first edition declared that it was answer to Godwin and Condorcet. Dr. Palfrey is referred to by W. as one of the Neo-Malthusians. Unfortunately I have not his work by me, so I cannot cite his own words, but I remember quite well that he declared against all forms of socialism, and he logically should, and that he was an ardent defender of the existing system of property, and to crown all, the English Malthusians in chorus call on us to look at India and see what has been done by improvements in the government and in society. They declare that all recent famines are the result of improved conditions. Does W. think so?

Perhaps the best way of exhibiting the real object of Malthus' teachings is to show what the perfectibilists against whom he wrote, taught. First as to Godwin, hear Reginald James: "For years Godwin has been satisfied that monarchy was a species of government unavoidably corrupt, and from desiring a government of the simplest construction he gradually came to consider that government by its very nature counteracts the improvement of the original mind." Believing in the perfectibility of the race, that there are no innate principles, and therefore no original propensity to evil, he considered that our virtues and our vices may be traced to the incidents which make the history of our lives, and if these incidents could be divested of every improper tendency, vice would be extirpated from the world. All control of man by man was more or less intolerable, and the day would come when each man, doing what seems right in his own mind, would also be doing what is best for the community, because all will be guided by principles of pure reason. But all was to be done by discussion and natural change resulting from discussion." No wonder Mr. James is rejoiced at having such doctrines crushed in the germ by society's savior Malthus, but why should he ex-

pect me, as an anarchist, to embrace Malthusianism? Let Condorcet speak for himself, and I can only regret that space will not allow me to quote the whole of the section dealing with the tenth stage in the evolution of humanity; as I know of but few works of its size which contain so many original ideas, and are so likely to provoke thought as the *Progres de l'Esprit Humain*.

Our hopes as to the coming state of the human species may be reduced to these three important points: the destruction of inequality between nations, the progress of equality in each people, and the perfectionment of the individual man.

"The time will come then, when the sun will light on this earth free men only, recognizing no other master than their reason; when tyrants and slaves, priests and their stupid or hypocritical instruments will exist only in history, or in the drama, when we shall concern ourselves no more about them save to lament their victims and dupes; to keep ourselves, through horror of their excesses, in a useful vigilance, to know how to recognize and to stifle, under the weight of reason, the first germs of superstition and tyranny, if ever they dare reappear."

"These differences have three principal causes: the inequality of riches, the inequality of talents, and the inequality of means of subsistence as assured and who can transmit these to his family, and him for whom these means are dependent on the duration of his life or rather of that portion of his life in which he is capable of working, and lastly, inequality of education."

"It is necessary then to show that these three real inequalities ought to diminish continually, yet without ever actually disappearing, for they have many and necessary causes, which, if not absurd and dangerous to attack to destroy, and one could not even attempt to make their effects entirely disappear, without opening the sources of more fecund inequalities, without striking at the rights of man blows more direct and baleful."

"It is easy to prove that fortunes tend naturally to equality, and that their excessive disproportion either could not exist, or would promptly disappear. If the civil laws, by their facilities means of perpetuating and consolidating them; if freedom of commerce and industry made disappear the advantage that every prohibitive law, every impost gives to acquired wealth; if the taxes on contracts, the restriction put on their liberty, their subjection to troublesome formalities, and lastly the incertitude and the expenses necessary to obtain their execution did not arrest the means of the poor man and all that his little capital could do, the administration did not open to some abundant sources of opulence closed to the rest of the citizens; if the prejudices and the spirit of avarice belonging to advanced age did not preside over marriage; and lastly if, through the simplicity of manners and the wisdom of institutions, riches were no longer the means of satisfying vanity and ambition, without having an ill-advised austerity by which of enjoyment, and the preservation of those once accumulated."

"We shall point out other means of attaining this equality, either by preventing credit from being any longer a privilege exclusively attached to large fortunes, giving it, however, a no less solid basis, or by rendering the progress of industry and the activity of commerce more independent of the existence of great capitalists."

"The equality of instruction which we may hope to attain, but which ought to suffice for that which excludes all dependence forced or voluntary. We shall show in the actual state of human knowledge, easy means of arriving at this end even for those who can give to study only a few of their early years, and throughout the remainder of their life only a few hours of leisure."

"Condorcet has shown that the progress of civilization no longer distinguished from each other by the use of a more coarse or a more refined language, being equally able to govern themselves by their own lights, being equally capable of acquiring the knowledge of the processes of an art, and the routine of a profession; dependent no longer either for the smallest affairs or for the procuring of the least necessities on the aid of another, and each man by a necessary equality, there ought to result a real equality, since the difference of light or of talents can no longer elevate a barrier between men whose sentiments, ideas and language present to understand each other of whom some may desire to be instructed by others, but who have no need of being conducted by them; of the enlightened the wish of governing them, but not to be forced to abandon them to their own blind conduct."

"It is then that this superiority becomes an advantage, and that it is not to be feared that it exists for them and not against them. The natural difference of faculties between men whose understanding has not been cultivated by the study of the sciences, and who are ignorant of the order, and the means to use to develop the same difference exists without doubt amongst a people whose education is truly general, but it is only the difference of the enlightened the wish of governing them, but not to be forced to abandon them to their own blind conduct."

It is necessary to quote any more in order to show what Malthus' object was? Condorcet, Godwin and their colleagues were suppling the foundations of the existing order, and it was necessary to invoke the dogma of divine right against them as they were unbelievers. A new argument was needed and Malthus at the critical moment came forward and declared that the existing order was doomed to misery by nature; that the organization of society was in no way responsible; that on the contrary an improvement in the form of society would increase the population. No wonder that this theory, coming as it did when the reactionary party in England was mad with rage and fear, was so successful. Malthus promised them a new lease of life. But the time has come to strip this Malthus of his borrowed plumes. His criticisms of Condorcet are of the same character as those of the orthodox commentators on Darwin make a great cry about the weak points he has discovered in his theory—weak points he himself has admitted as such, and which for his aid his critics would probably have never noticed. It was so with Malthus and Condorcet. The grain of wheat in Malthus' bushel of chaff, which has many well-deserved enemies, is not on him who is apt to be seen, but on him who is apt to be seen, to us whom he sought to destroy.

Walker Rejoins.

I hope that Mr. Kelley and our readers will forgive me for the long delay in beginning the publication of this discussion. In the first place,

Mr. K's article was unavoidably delayed in the *LUCIFER* office, then, after it was forwarded to me it was delayed for another week by not reaching the office to which it was sent in time to reach me at that place, and, thirdly, it has been delayed still longer by the pressure of canvassing work, which has prevented me from reading it, even, and I write this much on June 18, before I have read anything more than the first paragraph. And it may be several days more before this first installment will be answered, for I have less than an hour to devote to the work now.

Those few lines of mine, weeks ago, seem to have made a fatal leak in the dykes that confined the waters of anti-Malthusian eloquence, and the whole flood is pouring into the narrow compass of *Liberty* and *LUCIFER*'s columns.

It is useless for Mr. K. to attempt to disassociate the population question and the prudential limitation of the size of families. To speak of "domestic economy" as though it were something that could be considered apart from so-called National economic, is confusing and unautonomous. We say that there can be no "public good" which is secured at the expense of the individual, at the sacrifice of the private good. So, by a parity of reasoning, we reach the conclusion that the "population question," so called,—is nothing but a question of the wisdom or unwisdom and the consequent happiness or unhappiness of individuals and of families, primarily, of course, of individuals. Were Mr. Kelley and his confederates not standing, as I conceive them to be, and as I have previously said that they were, upon State Socialistic ground, they would never think of advancing such a Collectivist argument as this Mr. K. has just given us. Should any governmental say to Mr. K. that the "public good" required so and so and that the individual must waive his rights when confronted with the greater right of the majority, that gentleman would proceed to show his opponent that there was no such thing as the "public good," save as it was the aggregation of the individual goods, and what was required to augment the "public good" was to jealously preserve the rights and liberties of the individual. And in this Mr. K. would be right, and for the same reason that he is wrong now. I repeat: "The Population Question" is simply a question of "domestic economy" this and nothing more, just as "national temperance" is personal temperance, just as "National virtue" is personal virtue, just as a nation is a "Christian nation" precisely to the extent that its component units are believers in the Christian religion. As an individualist, an autonomist, I refuse to accept the sophism that one can be a believer in the "domestic economy of small families and yet logically deride the basic principles of Malthus, and especially those of the Neo-Malthusians of our own time.

Mr. K. says that he and Mr. Tucker and other anti-Malthusians are in favor of small families. Why? Presumably because small families are, to a greater extent than large ones, conducive to individual prosperity and happiness. Curiously enough, this is precisely the reason why I am in favor of small families. Mr. K. and Mr. T. and the writer of this all claim that when the units are wise, healthy and happy, the community which they compose will be the same, because it cannot be anything else, because "it" is a rhetorical fiction, and they the only realities. No, Mr. K., it will not do, you are out of your natural environments, for you believe in the remedy of the Malthusians, and you should not array yourself in argument against them. And especially should you not adopt the governmental and State Socialistic fallacy that there are other duties, rights and responsibilities than those of the individual. Be assured that when the man and the woman shall practice that "domestic economy" in reproduction of which you pronounce yourself the advocate, the "Population Question" will be settled, and settled in just the way and manner that Malthusians say that it must be settled if settled at all.

Granting cheerfully all that Thorold Rogers, Bakewell and Mr. K. have charged against government and legislation, yet I must remind the latter gentleman of my stated and often insisted upon argument that, while the people have been the slaves of the law-makers, the cause is found in the fact that they have first been the slaves of their own

procreative organs, binding themselves down to the task of supporting families so large that, after providing for their scanty subsistence, they have had neither the means nor the time to improve their own and their children's minds, nor to search for the causes of their political and industrial enslavement. Their families bind them in chains to the universe. Never has this truth impressed itself more forcibly upon my mind than when traveling in the newer settlements of the West. Quite likely you are ready to say that surely I do not think that the West is over-populated, whatever may be my opinion regarding other portions of the world, and that I cannot regard as an evil that rapid reproduction which has compelled the settlement of vast areas of prairie which a few years ago were in the almost undisputed possession of the Indian, the buffalo and the coyote. But that is precisely my thought. Better by far that the settlement of the West had been so much slower that the whistle of the locomotive should not have been heard on the banks of the Platte for fifty years to come. The rich soil of these States of the West is being washed by rivulet and creek and river into the all-swallowing waters of the Gulf, and yet this waste, prodigious as it is, is but a trifle compared to the tribute that we pay to the insatiable octopus of Greed who holds us in his hundred arms of monopoly and usury and continually sucks from our famishing farmers the richest elements of the soil they till. The farms of the West are blanketed with mortgages. The old man in the East could have given two or three children a fair start in life, but he had six, and so he must pull up and come west with them where land is cheap and disinterested philanthropists will furnish money at two or three percent a month. He gets into the toils and generally stays there, and his boys after him, for as soon as they are old enough, they begin the production of children, and these are generally a surer crop than anything else that they attempt to raise. These are the peoples these are the men and women who probably never heard of the "Law of Population," upon whom the "Lomb, collection and claim agent,"—whose shingle meets the eye at the foot of almost every stairway and at every street corner in the frontier town,—looks with a gloating eye, for they are "his men," in the expressive vernacular of the region. They are nice picking, too, for the regular banker. But the young man and woman who settle down upon a new farm and postpone a family until they have their place paid for, are not very likely to pay tribute, save indirectly, to these cormorants. The more closely we look into the causes that have produced the almost universal indebtedness of the Western farmers, the more clearly shall we see that large families were and are, primarily or secondarily chief among them.

In debt, not having the means necessary for the procurement of more than the simplest of food, clothing and shelter, these people have not the money wherewith to purchase books and papers, they have not the leisure for study and recreation. They readily vote for rich men and measures as the political bosses see fit to nominate in the oneness and charmpion in the other. And so they tie their own hands, and steal from their own pockets to give to the privileged ones. And this is the germ of the people's enslavement. Varying under different conditions and in different lands, it is always true that when the father has so large a family that he can only barely support it, he has no time to watch the actions of the law-makers, to thwart their schemes, to enlarge the bounds of liberty, to establish the tribunal of justice. As I said in substance some paragraphs back, to reach the conclusion does not necessitate us to deny a single statement of Rogers or of any other writer who ascribes the sufferings of the working people to the acts of the legislators. But the legislators enslave the people because they, the people, do not know how to help themselves, and the chief cause of that ignorance is their lack of "domestic economy" in the matter of children. And vice versa.

To sweep away all legal privilege, all monopoly, all the machinery of the robbing and tyrannizing State, is my ideal of true reform, as it is Mr. K's. But you cannot put the vehicle before the equine quadruped and make any satisfactory progress. Sweep away, as my friend says, by violent revolution, all of the present iniquitous systems, and what is accomplished? First, the murder of some hundreds of thousands or millions of the people. Second, the strengthening by the bloody and demoralizing influences born of war and in their turn creative of other wars, of the evil passions of the race—the perpetration, through horridity, of the spirit of murder and all the lesser crimes that war creates, or increases and intensifies. Third, the establishment of a new system of spoliation and despotism. From similar causes flow similar results, ignorance plants the same seed and raises the same crop century after century. At the most, revolution can only carry away the dead of evolution. Until men and women learn to produce fewer and better children, revolution will come periodically to let out some of the bad blood. But blood-

letting brings only a temporary relief, and revolution probably brings nearly if not quite as much of wrong as it destroys.

Mr. K. says that Dr. Palfrey "declared against all forms of socialism, as he logically should." Italics are mine. But, sir, Dr. P. was under no logical necessity, because of his being a Neo-Malthusian, to declare against all forms of socialism. Malthusians are believers in self-help, and hence are logically and warmly espouse voluntary socialism, as I do, and as does many other Malthusians. Mr. K. is supposed to belong to the same school of Socialists, realizing that liberty and intelligence are essential in the work of organizing a better society. Can he not also realize that the intelligence and liberty will both be lacking in a group of men who do not, individually, practice that "domestic economy" of which even he accepts, anti-Malthusian though he is? If he does realize this—and it would be an unwarranted imputation upon his intelligence to aver that he can not—why does he say that a Malthusian can not, logically, be a Socialist? A Socialist of the voluntary school, I mean, always.

When Mr. K. asks me if I believe that all the recent famines in India have been caused by improvements in government and in society, as he asseverates that all the English Malthusians declare, I am compelled to ask him what he means. Honestly, I do not understand the question, as he asks it. From my own somewhat limited reading of the English Malthusians, I have not gathered the idea that they ascribe the famines in India to "improved conditions." Using the words in their ordinary sense, I fail to see how "improved conditions" can produce famines. Perhaps, though, Mr. K. means "alleged" "improved conditions."

In so far as Mr. K.'s article is a reply to C. L. James, I shall not criticize it, leaving those gentlemen to settle their own argumentative differences. Very good and very interesting are the lengthy extracts from Condorcet, but I do not think it was necessary for Mr. K. to take so much pains to reveal to us the motives of Malthus. As I have said, we are not so very particularly concerned about the motives of a writer, the crucial question being, is it the truth that he is telling us? It well may be that there is but a single grain of wheat in the writings of Malthus but I opine that Mr. K. is not blessed with the best of eyesight in this instance. That population tends to outrun subsistence, that when the preventive check of family limitation is not applied, the positive check of war, famine, prostitution, etc., are sure to play their parts, may safely be taken to be axiomatic truths, and those truths are two of the grains that we find in the "chaff" of the English clergyman. And they are the essential parts of what he taught, they are the laws which give the name to the philosophy that is to-day known as Neo-Malthusianism.

The conclusion of Mr. K.'s article and of my rejoinder thereto will appear in a subsequent issue of *LUCIFER*.

Mrs. Whitehead to Elmina.

Ed. *LUCIFER*: Several weeks ago I saw the book—"Borning Better Babies," etc.—alluded to by Elmina D. Stenker in the last issue of your paper. At the time, and afterwards when seeing reviews of it, I felt moved to write somewhat thereon, but refrained, thinking—There is some one else, Elmina D. Stenker, who will take it up and handle it as it deserves.

How my hopes died within me when I read her views on the subject of preventing conception. I cannot say anything that I have not said before. The subject—not of conception but of prevention—fills me with the same loathing that I felt on hearing of a dyspeptic old lady who would eat her fill "because vitamins tasted so good" and then go out around the corner of the house, run her finger down her throat and throw up her dinner.

Elmina Stenker says—"The one question of how to prevent conception is of more real interest to the world than any or all others." This statement needs modification. It is apparent to everybody and anybody who knows how a child is conceived knows how to prevent conception.

Further on we are told, "If we had 'Contracepts' of the best and most harmless kinds and the law should turn about and furnish these 'free gratis' to every woman, what a grand thing it would be."

Now I cannot put into intelligible language the feeling this gives me, but as nearly as I can, let me interpret what the language of such a law would be. It would virtually be saying to women—you are the lawful prey of the sexual passions of men. Formerly you have made your masters uncomfortable because when they would follow the lead of their lusts, you, for fear of burdening them and yourselves with children, have protested against their gratification. Protesting slaves are a dangerous class. No slavery is hopelessly slavery until the slaves are willing slaves. We have seen that more and more women were revolting against sexual slavery; therefore we have resolved, in order to make their degradation sure and their bondage perpetual, to take away from them all excuse for not yielding to the sexual demands of their masters. Hereafter you, may, for their benefit (?) allow all that is noble and refined in your nature to be absorbed in sexualism with no danger of harming the selfish enjoyment of your lords and masters by allowing the natural results of sexual intercourse. We have furnished you the means of contravening nature's laws; now go and remain contented slaves forever. Nature designed you for free mothers,

but we will that instead you shall learn that you were made for man. We intend to deepen the impression that "continence is torture," and so put far off the day when humanity's forces will be directed into higher channels.

Stambly and imperfectly as it is done I believe the above truly interprets the language of "preventives." I do not wish to be understood as attributing these motives to those who advocate preventive measures but I cannot help feeling that they do not realize how terribly the weapon of defence they offer to woman would be turned against her.

It is not alone the bearing of children that ruins the health of women. I know in my limited acquaintance several "barren" women but they are made sick by sexual intercourse. Every physician of extended practice must know a great many. Where is any "preventive" for this state of things? I am sorry, exceedingly sorry, that Elmina D. Stenker has come down from her high position as an inspirer of belief in continence and stooped to become an apologist for "physical necessity;" for surely there were already enough engaged in that work.

CELIA B. WHITEHEAD.
Southampton, Conn., June 3, 1896.

Dianna Continence.

"I do not believe the author of *Dianna* would have come to the conclusion he did, from his correspondence, had he not favored that side before he commenced getting in his facts. I do not think there is much in your idea that mystery is the cause of lust. People are lustful if they are lustful, the same after the mystery is removed as before."—A.

Dianna has for years well studied both sides of this question, and if in circulating his book, he finds one in a hundred of his readers who can be content with *Dianna Continence*, it is sufficient to prove that under proper heredity environment and education, there would probably be 50, 75, or even a larger per cent. who would be so satisfied.

All great changes come slowly. If we teach people that lust and sexual intemperance ruins mind, body and morals just as surely as liquor intemperance does, they would then shun the one as certainly as they now do the other.

True, there would be worklings who would be incapable of self-control, who would find appetite and passion too strong to withstand temptation, but these would become gradually fewer and fewer as education and social customs removed the causes producing them. *Alpha Continence* is founded upon bed-rock principles.

The one fact that when we desire fine stock, fine fruit or fine flowers, we always repress over-production, is enough to prove that generation is taking away life-force from the generator. We remove nearly all the fruit and flowers if we desire splendid specimens.

If we work for the highest perfection of the tree or plant itself, we never let it bloom or bear at all. Perfection of specimens depends upon repressing fruitage.

But where desires and appetites are too strong, and there is not knowledge to rightly change or direct them into other channels, we must allow some personal gratification rather than risk too great suffering through conquering or repressing. The fact that unfolding all the mystery of reproduction, and teaching the truths of sex in animal life the same as you would in vegetable life would not remove lust, has never been tried. But I firmly believe it would result in such an ocean of cleanliness and purity as the world has never yet known.

Were it just as common for boys and girls and men and women to see each other nude, as it now is to see only clothed people, the sight of the human form would no more lustfully affect us than the sight of uncovered animals and of flowers now does.

All are connected by one chain, from a speck of protoplasm on up to animals, monkeys, baboons, anthropoid, apes and man, one sexual plan runs through all, culminating in humanity as its present highest.

It would, no doubt, be just as it would were all our rivers to run milk punch. In time the result would work for temperance, though at first there would be a great increase of drinking, and therefore we would not wish for the rivers of milk to come all at once, deluging the land with drunkenness, and neither would we remove all restraints from sexual intimacies thus filling the world with a still greater avalanche of lust.

It would be too vast a sacrifice of the present generation, in the hope of better conditions for the coming race. So we only plead for the privilege of placing the best before the people, letting those who can accept it, and the rest wait for further development.

Knowledge never harms. No one can know too much.
ELMINA D. STENKER.

Land Reform.
MR. LIGHT-BEARD: I have just read in a paper that the land-sharks in Poland are giving up their large tracts of land, and the government is giving it in farm lots to its rightful owners, those who want it to cultivate. This is good news and a good example for all land-grabbers and governments to follow, and is it not a pity that our country, with all its boasted institutions and pretended home of justice cannot do as well as a nation that we regard as but little above barbarism? Our country is now slumbering over a terrible volcano. The numerous strikes in all parts of the country, by starving men, for higher wages and against cut-downs in present prices, and the cries for work from idle men are but the rumblings of the volcano, but our drunken congress and the land-grabbers are too dead to hear or too idiotic to understand it.

There are many dreamers living in luxury and dissipation, on the half paid toil of the workers; but the workers are yet in the majority, and if they would bid adieu to their old parties that have so long deceived and plundered them, and would unite and vote for honest men, there would soon be a revolution, a bloodless one, and the land would soon be restored to the people, when millions of them who are working at starvation wages, would go to work on their own acres and enjoy all they would earn, and this would give those who might choose to remain in other employments the power to set their own price on their labor.

This is the way the trouble between capital and labor ought to be settled; but before the laboring classes can be instructed in regard to their birth-right to land, and be prepared to unite and act together, hunger and desperation will probably blow up our capital, and the land-sharks go flying through the air in fragments before they have time to awake. I have been laboring forty years, in various papers, to get all the unsettled lands made free to actual settlers, and did get it free in Maine many years ago, and helped to get our present national homestead law, and have been hoping to see a law that will cover all railroad land, but believe now that the grabbers will cling to their stolen possessions till dynamite breaks their grasp, and if they do, they will have nobody to blame but themselves, but it will be a most terrible scene, and we should all labor to avert it.
J. HACKETT.
Berlin, N. J.

The Despotism of Trade Unions.

The following extract clipped from an exchange graphically illustrates one of the despotic features that unfortunately inhere in trade-unionism. If these unions could or would adhere to the strictly voluntary system their usefulness would be conceded by all.

"So the earnest laborers who 'order out' thousands of other workmen in order to gain a disputed point with their own particular employer consider not the privation that act brings to many homes. Under the decree of a very large proportion of laboring men of this country, the individual laborer has a hard and risky time of it. He must join a union and so ordered in and out at the pleasure of men whom he does not know and for reasons he does not understand, or he is ostracized as a 'scab' and perhaps he is compelled to beg, steal or starve. The strength that is in this union of muscle and brains cannot be over estimated, and the power for good or evil is incalculable. Unfortunately for those whom such a union might benefit, it is not always wisely directed. Individual and private rights must be observed. When they are wantonly and forcibly violated by laboring organizations, the wrong is just as palpably wrong as if the violations were committed by capitalists or criminals. This may be accepted as a cardinal principle.—Charles T. Murray in *Pittsburg Dispatch*.

AN INDISPENSIBLE BOOK.

By Dr. E. B. FORT, JR.

THE RADICAL REMEDY IN SOCIAL SCIENCE

—OR—
BORNING BETTER BABIES
Through Regulating Reproduction by Controlling Conception.

An Earnest Essay on Preserving Progeny, 124 pp. Price, 25 cents.

To each present subscriber to *LUCIFER* who shall pay up all arrearsages and for one year in advance (\$1.25 per year) we will send, postage paid, one copy of this most valuable book.

To each new subscriber to *LUCIFER* who shall send us \$1.25 for one year in advance we will send, free of cost, one copy of this book. This offer is good until Sept. 1st, '96. Send at once and get one of the best books ever published.

OTHER EXTRAORDINARY OFFERS!
Forty-Three Lectures by Col. R. G. Ingersoll. Bound in cloth. Lettered in gilt on back and sides. More of the Colonel's sayings and writings than you can get in any other form for the money. Price, \$1.50.
This Large Book, together with Dr. Fort's "Infant Homicide," for \$2.00.
To each old subscriber to *LUCIFER* who shall send amount of arrearsages and two dollars and thirty cents (\$2.30) we will receive \$1.00 for another year and both of the above books.
This offer is good until Sept. 1st, 1896. Do not delay sending your orders.
Address, WALKER & HAYMAN, Valley Falls, Kans.

