

LUCIFER

THE LIGHT-BEARER.

NEW SERIES, VOL. 4, No. 17.

VALLEY FALLS, KANSAS, JULY 23, E. M. 280.

WHOLE No. 150

LUCIFER

PUBLISHED WEEKLY.

TERMS:

One copy, one year, - - - \$1.25
One copy, six months, - - - 65
SPECIMEN COPIES FREE.

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

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

Each writer is alone responsible for the opinions 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 sumpnary 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 McCammon's Hall.

C. H. GILLMAN.
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, 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 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.

SPEAK ALL THY THOUGHTS.

Speak all thy thoughts, oh! Thinker, howsoever they float the speculation of the age, its pet conceits or fantasies; speak on, Marshall thy thoughts like phalanxes of horse; Scatter the idle dreamers of the time. The phantom host of popular ignorance Shall strike their cloudy tents, and silently Shrink to their own noontide again. The age needs plainness and simplicity; To mystify the people is the trick Of painted barlequins thro' out the land. Be true, oh! Thinker, to thy nature's law, And borrow not another's style, but speak Thine own brave thoughts in thine own spirit's tongue. Call things by their right names, right minds shall hear.

FOR LUCIFER.

"RENT, INTEREST AND PROFIT."

Man kind once bowed with reverential awe Before the Trinity that faith ordained To hold the mind in slavery and enchained To priestly tyranny, and calmly saw Their ignorance ingrafted into law: When mind its freedom from this creed attained.

Rent, Interest and Profit rose and gained The vacant throne, their title free from flaw. Yet three, not one, when sharing Labor's spoil.

And fiercely strive each other to effect; But one, not three, before the sons of toil. Who vie with priest and levite to respect This Triune God, while Church and State embroll Their lives that they its tribute may collect. —LESL.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH AND WOMEN.

BY MRS. E. CARY STANTON.

From June 25. Concluded.

There is nothing so cheap as womanhood in the commerce of the world. You can scarcely take up a paper that does not herald some outrage on woman, from the dignified matron on her way to church, to the girl of fourteen gathering wild flowers on her way to school. I hold men in high places responsible for the actions of the lower orders. The sentiments and opinions expressed by clergymen and legislators mould the morals of the highway. So long as the Church and the State, in their creeds and codes, make woman an outcast, she will be the sport of the multitude. Whatever can be done to dignify her in the eyes of man will be a shield and helmet for her protection. If the same respect the masses are educated to feel for cathedrals, altars, symbols and sacraments was extended to the mothers of the race, as it should be, all these distracting problems, in which their interests are involved, would be speedily settled. You cannot go so low down in the scale of being as to find men who would enter our churches to desecrate the altars or toss about the emblem of the sacrament, because they have been educated with a holy reverence for these things. But where are any lessons of reverence for woman taught to the multitude?

And yet is she not, as the mother of the race, more exalted than sacraments, symbols, altars, and vast cathedral domes? Are not the eternal principles of justice graven on her heart more sacred than canons, creeds, and codes written on parchment by Jesuits, bishops, cardinals, and popes? Yet where shall we look for lessons of honor and respect for her?

Do our sons in the law schools rise from their studies of the invidious statutes and opinions of jurists in regard to women with a higher respect for their mothers? By no means. Every line of the old common law of England on which the American system of jurisprudence is based, touching the interests of woman, is, in a measure, responsible for the wrongs she suffers to-day.

Do our sons in their theological seminaries rise from their studies of the Bible, and the popular commentaries on the passages of Scripture concerning woman's creation and position in the scale of being, with an added respect for their mothers? By no means. They come oftentimes from the perusal of what they suppose to be God's will and law, fresh from communion with the unseen, perhaps with the dew of inspiration on their lips, to preach anew the subjection of one half the race to the other.

A very striking fact, showing the outrages women patiently endure through the perversion of their religious sentiments by crafty priests, is seen in the treatment of the Hindu widow. The civil law in her case, as in so many others, being practically annulled by theological dogmas.

"The most liberal of the Hindu schools of jurisprudence," says Maine, "that prevailing in Bengal proper, gives a childless widow the enjoyment of her husband's property under certain restrictive conditions during her life;" and in this it agrees with many bodies of unwritten local custom. If there are male children, they succeed at once; but, if there are none, the widow comes in for her life before the collateral relatives. At the present moment marriages among the upper classes of Hindus being very commonly infertile, a considerable portion of the soil of the wealthiest Indian provinces is in the hands of childless widows as tenants for life. But it was exactly in Bengal proper that the English on entering India, found the suttee, or widow-burning, not merely an occasional, but a constant and almost universal practice with the wealthier classes; and, as a rule, it was only the childless widow, and never the widow with minor children, burnt herself on her husband's funeral pyre. There is no question that there was the closest connection between the law and the religious custom; and the widow was made to sacrifice herself, in order that her tenancy for life might be gotten rid of. The anxiety of her family that the rite should be performed, which seemed so striking to the first English observers of the practice, was in fact explained by the coarsest motives; but the Brahmins who exhorted her to the sacrifice were undoubtedly influenced by a purely professional dislike to her enjoyment of property. The ancient rule of the civil law, making her a tenant for life, could not be gotten rid of; but it was combated by the modern institution, which made it her duty to devote herself to a frightful death. The reasoning on this subject, current even in comparatively ancient times, is thus given in the *Mitakshara*: "The wealth of a regenerate man is designed for religious uses; and a woman's succession to such property is unfit, because she is not competent to the performance of religious rites." Thus the liberal provisions of the civil law were disposed of by burning the widow, and she was made willing for the sacrifice by a cultivated sense of religious duty. What is true in this case is true of women in all ages. They have been trained by their religion to sacrifice themselves, body and soul, for the men of their families and to build up the churches. We do not burn the bodies of women to-day; but we humiliate them in a thousand ways, and chiefly by our theologues. So long as the pulpits teach woman's inferiority and subjection, she can never command that honor and respect of the ignorant classes needed

for her safety and protection. There is nothing more pathetic in all history than the hopeless resignation of woman to the outrages she has been taught to believe are ordained of God.

* *Early History of Institutions*, Lecture XI, on the Property of Married Women.

Diogen to Tritogen.

While I can agree with Tritogen in regard to his construction of "humanism," with its relations to the individual; I cannot agree with him in his construction of science and moral obligations. We have here in Kansas two well defined instances of how humanism will trample on the individuals, and how these individuals are ready to bow the neck under the yoke. Those two cases are prohibition, and the suppression of the Police Gazette and other papers of that class.

But why are individuals so ready to bow their necks to the behest of humanity, when promulgated by a few rotten politicians, and why are those politicians so ready to transgress upon the individual? It is simply for the want of conscience and moral obligation. Go all over the earth and study men; study them in their every day relations of life and you will always find that those who do not feel any moral obligation concerning other's rights, do not know their own. They are only fit subjects to be despots or slaves. Show me a man who knows his own rights, and I will show you a man that knows the rights of others. Show me a man who wants to boss everybody, and I will show you a man who cannot stand a feeble suggestion in regard to his own conduct. Show me a woman who takes delight in snubbing her husband or lover, and I will show you a woman who cannot stand the least departure of love and duty in that man. All such conduct, which embitters life, arise from want of clear conscience and moral obligations.

Now I will give to Tritogen my definition of moral obligation in comparison to his own. He thinks that by improving himself according to a "moral standard," he is lessening himself; that by governing himself he is a loser; that he must refrain from certain acts because it would be a detriment to his neighbor, etc. If I took such view of the subject I would also call it "superstition," but I take a different view. I base everything in those relations exclusively upon the individual. His actions must concern him before anybody else. He is not to improve himself for his neighbor, but for his own good, and in doing so does not lessen himself but he augments himself. He is not to refrain from certain acts on account of the other man, but for his own good. In governing himself he is not becoming a slave; he has succeeded in the greatest feat of this life, he is free; and all for his own individual good.

The man who is a slave to the popular mob, to lucre, to lust, to fashion, to vanity, always remains one of a dog who is wagged by his own tail. If each individual had a good sense of moral obligation he would be benefited, and it necessarily follows that social life would improve. Man instead of being the "unhappy animal," would find life to be a festival. Taking life as it is, if a man can govern himself he has gained one point, but it is only a half conquest if he has to dwell among those who are destitute of conscience, and who only know fear or force as the criterion of conduct. Therefore as Liberals we strive to improve the moral tone of men, we are seeking our own good, which must react to the good of others.

Although it is possible and beneficial for the individual to govern himself in what society has not stolen from his individual realm, we are yet forced to admit that he is governed in a general way from some laws outside and superior to himself. The atmosphere, the topography of the country, the surroundings, wild nature or tame nature, will shape in some measure not only his moral force, but his physical aspect also.

All the planets are deflected from their orbits by the force and integrity of other

planets, and the same it must be with man in social life. The course of each individual must be modified on account of another individual.

Let us suppose that Diogen goes down to Galveston, and says: "I am free, I kick the beam of excellence, I owe no duty to anybody." He then meets Tritogen on the sidewalk which is already crowded. Instead of giving a part of the remaining space to Tritogen, he spreads himself and the two come in contact. Diogen then says: "I owe you no moral obligation for a space on this sidewalk." Tritogen would have a right to say; this is also my "ticket," and the question would have to be settled by brute force. After Tritogen would have limped to his office, and while he would rub limiment upon his bruises, I believe that he would conclude that duty and moral obligation are necessary for men in the social state; that they are good and compatible with individual freedom. —DIOGEN.

Contraceptives.

DEAR MRS. WHITEHEAD: I have carefully read thine in LUCIFER of June 25th, and while I admire that stern uncompromising rigidity that clings to what is highest and best; I must also grant to poor human Nature some favors, privileges and rights. We must have charity for all.

We are not all alike, nor are we all situated alike; what will satisfy one will not another. There may be where there can live Alphaism in all its completeness, without any severing of family ties, or any serious cross to the Personal Nature. But there are hundreds of husbands and wives who cannot. Yes, wives, for passion is not all confined to one sex, and thousands of women are sexually temperate from heredity and false training just as well as men are.

But man having the power and strength far more often makes the act a compulsory one, and demands gratification when it is repulsive to the woman, than she does, and hence arises the bitter cry (from all over the land) of outraged sexuality on her part. While granting that continence, save for procreation, is safest, wisest and best, as a rule; I do not condemn all deviations from the rule as wholly wrong or absolutely injurious.

Nor do I say to a wife, deny your loving husband at the risk of discord, dissension and perhaps separation. Suppose we had power to enforce Alpha Continence from this hour upon all men and women, would not the outcome be misery and unhappiness incalculable?

We must first educate them sexually and morally, and prepare them by careful, slow and sure steps.

We must teach them to train love into other channels and to find its perfection in other ends.

Meanwhile, ere we can reach the countless millions who are perpetually increasing and multiplying, perpetually bringing into the world unwise, diseased, and deformed children, and teach them that continence is the best contraceptive, we must allow them something simpler—something they can comprehend and see the utility of, and that is a sure and yet not a health destroying preventive—as well as a lawful one. The call for this is loud and imperative and ever increasing. I have never "come down" one step. I've always advocated contraceptives as preventives of still worse evils.

Just as I would confuse a thief or a murderer to prevent his further outrages upon human rights. Just as I would warn the drunkard from his wine by giving him coffee as the lesser stimulant.

Just as I would gladly give every Catholic the Protestant Religion as a Lesser Evil than his own is, and to the Protestant give Spiritualism as the still lesser one, and finally bring all up into the Clear, Bright fields of Materialistic Atheism, as highest and best, surest and most firm, because Bed-Rock Fact and Truth, just as Alpha Continence is Bed-Rock Sexual Philosophy and Truth.

Affectionately,
ELMIRA DRAKE SLENKER

J. L. Rensburg is now at work in Nebraska. His appointments for that State, as far as arranged, are as follows. Salina, July 15; Humboldt, 16; Liberty, 17, 18; Mission Creek, 18; Wilber, 19, 20, 21; Waverly, 22, 23; Greenwood, 24, 25; Louisville, 26, 27; Arlington, 28, 29, 30; Osceola, 31, and August 1; Omaha, 2; Palmyra, 3, 4; Edgar, 5, 6, 7, 8; Indianapolis, 10, 11, 12; Central City, 11, 15; Cral Orchard, 17, 18.

LUCIFER

VALLEY FALLS, KAN., July 23, 1896.

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. H. Galloway.
Hear City, Kan.—Dr. J. B. Cooper.
Seamonsville, 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. Smith.
Hurlington, "—Chris. Brown.
Garet, "—C. Gregg.
Ottawa, "—W. W. Penzer.
Cedar Junction, Kan.—J. O. Collins.
Hurlington, Iowa.—Werner Becklin.
West Hurlington, Iowa.—James Tott.
Success, Kan.—Chas. Dindley.
Salina, Kan.—J. M. Hottel.
Scranton, Kan.—John F. Young.
Corbould, Kan.—Jesse S. McDaniel.
Preston, Iowa.—John Durnett.
M. O. Hicks, Silom Springs, Ark.

Among deferred articles are "Transition," by Kellogg; "The Proposed Liberal Meeting," by D. C. Seymour; Modesty and Sex, by Dagmar Mariager; "The Chicago Bomb," by John A. Broadbeck; Force versus Scabs, by H. H. Hutcherson; The State, a poem, by David A. Andraue; etc.

We hope our friends who always pay promptly and in advance will not think we mean them. We mean those who are now in arrears from six months to two years or more. If there be any of these who do not wish the paper continued to their address we ask them, as a matter of common honesty in business, to send us the amount of arrearage and notify us to stop sending the paper to them. Do not leave us in doubt as to what your intention and wishes really are, in regard to the paper. We need all that is justly due us on subscription to meet the weekly expenses of publication.

PUTNAM COMING.

As many of our readers have doubtless already seen from the Truth Seeker and Investigator, Samuel P. Putnam is booked for Valley Falls, Aug. 21, 25, 26 and 27. Mr. Putnam is the Campaign Lecturer of the American Secular Union of the United States and Canada. Mr. Putnam's fame as a lecturer and author is equaled by few men now living on the American continent. Among the more notable of his works are Problem of the Universe; Golden Throne; Ingersoll and Jesus; Prometheus, a Poem; Waifs and Wanderings, etc.

Mr. Putnam is now in Utah—has just closed a very successful series of engagements in Montana. We hope our Kansas and Missouri Liberals will make a note of this and make arrangements at once to meet Mr. P. at Valley Falls. The committee of arrangements will doubtless be heard from next week. H.

Local Trials.

Call in and look over our stock of radical reformatory books.

The Lutheran brethren have the foundation of their new church completed.

No rain for nearly four weeks, but the corn seems not to be suffering much as yet.

A. D. Kendall has nearly completed, what will be, the finest residence in the city.

Mrs. J. Vandruft is erecting a large and handsome residence containing all the latest conveniences.

N. A. Puderbaugh, of Osnawkie, made this office a pleasant call this week and renewed his subscription to the paper.

This city is having quite a building boom this summer. Prominent among the new buildings in course of erection is the Hillier Hotel on Broadway. When completed this will be one of the largest and best appointed hotels in this part of Kansas; and nowhere in the state will be found a more genial and popular landlord than the corpulent proprietor, R. D. Simpson.

Telephone connection from Mitchell's Meat Market to Pinzels's Mill and Elevator. Leave orders for flour, corn meal, bran and shorts, chop feed, corn, oats and feed of all kinds, at reduced prices—delivered promptly and free of charge to any part of the city.

Step in and order what you want.

Pinzels & Hayward.

BRIEF COMMENT.

On Saturday evening last "A Grand Prohibition Rally" came off at the Opera House in Valley Falls. The chief speaker was H. J. Fanning, one of the editors of the New York "Voice," organ of the National Prohibition party. The motto of that party, as stated in the bills is: "The Political Trinity—Prohibition, Anti-monopoly and Woman Suffrage." Press of other matter has crowded out our notes taken at his rally. If possible they will appear in our next.

Our thanks are due to Bro. Hull, editor of the New Thought, Des Moines, Iowa, for favorable notice of Lucifer's struggle for the right to use plain scientific language, as against the despotism of church and state moralists. We also tender sincere thanks to Bro. Huggaman, of the Blade, Concordia, Kan. for reproducing our article on true and false morality, or "What is obscenity?"

After some three weeks spent in getting a jury the Chicago socialists, Spies, Parsons, Fielden, Schwab, etc. were put upon trial about a week ago. If we may judge from the tone of the press dispatches there is but little chance of a fair trial for the accused men. The Galveston Daily News in speaking of this trial, very sensibly remarks:

This case is being handled with possibly an injurious prejudice and parade of vindictiveness, so that the effect is to create distrust of the criminal law, its judges and the police among large numbers of law-abiding men who also have their prejudices and suspicions, and consequently a fear is created that a conviction of these men is sought irrespective of their guilt. Such is the general tendency of opinion expressed in several weekly papers among the organs of the wage-working class.

Unless more true discrimination and just feeling are shown about such matters, the present trials will be apt to produce much greater antagonism to government than they will allay.

And now the news comes from from Kansas City that the train-wreckers who ditched a train at Wyandotte on the M. P. R. R., some months ago, have been captured—six in all, and all Knights of Labor. This will be a sad revelation to members of that order everywhere. We doubt not, however, that the District and Local assemblies will be able to show that the organization as such is free from all complicity in such deeds of violence.

TAXATION AND THE BALLOT.

Concluded from last week.

In answer to mine, published last week Lucifer says: "The state cannot and should not own the land, and if it cannot own the land it can have no right to tax it." If this is admitted correct, that ownership gives power to tax, then how can government tax personal property and incomes, which it does not own, and which it nevertheless contends are the very thing to be taxed if government requires a revenue?

THOMAS ROESSLER.

We reply, Government now claims ownership not only of "personal property and incomes" but of the service—the life itself—of every citizen. In time of war it assumes the right to take whatever it needs for its own preservation, both of men and their substance, and takes its own time and way to make recompense or restitution. This assumed right of government we, as autonomists, of course, deny.

Friend Roessler will doubtless reply that we had already committed ourselves to the plan of taxing incomes and personal property to defray expenses of government. Yes, but only the necessary expenses of a truly co-operative self-government, and even then we would have nothing compulsory about it. If neighbor A does not wish to pay taxes to help hire a policeman or constable, let him stand guard over his own property, and when his horse is stolen he will have no claim on his neighbors for help to recover the lost animal and to punish the thief. All taxes should be voluntary, not compulsory.

It may be that a convention now called to revise and improve the Constitution of the U. S., would do precisely what the convention of 1787 did,—produce something entirely different from what they were convened to do.

Very true, Bro. Roessler, and it is because of this danger that we are not now urging a call for a constitutional convention. The convention of '87 was elected and convened to form a constitution that would embody the principles of the

Declaration of Independence. That document had declared that all men were created [born] free and equal.—"If free" then they have or should have no rulers; if "equal" there should be no privileged classes. But the constitution formulated by these representatives of the people provides for the election of rulers. It empowers the legislators, governors and presidents to exercise rule—authority, over the citizen, far beyond the power or authority possessed by the citizen himself; thereby showing or declaring that the citizen is not the ruler—not the governor—not free—but only allowed the right to choose his rulers!

But this right to choose their rulers is exercised, in some way, by every nation or people on earth. The subjects of a monarchy choose to submit to be ruled by a king, or a dynasty of kings, until that king or dynasty becomes unbearable, then they dethrone the ruler and choose another.

So then the chief difference between our American nation, and those the old world, is that we go through the form of choosing our rulers oftener than they do. But after all, not so often, not so promptly or effectively as the people of England do—as witness the late appeal to the people by the Gladstone ministry. The English government with a queen for a figure head is to-day a more truly popular government than is ours with its one popular branch of government against three monarchic and aristocratic branches, viz: the president, the senate, and the supreme court (appointed by the two former). By this arrangement of a tripartite or quadruplex government the will of the people is perpetually balked and set aside, and yet it is all done in a legal and Constitutional way!

But the ballot! "The ballot is a panacea for all political evils," says Mr. Roessler. Let us see. The ballot or "equal suffrage" means, under our constitution and laws, "majority rule." But is majority rule, provided such a thing is possible, a "panacea for all political evils"? Majorities necessarily contain and comprise the ignorant, the selfish and the vicious on the gross or animal plane, while the wise, the good, the benevolent, the self-sacrificing are always in the minority. The fact is, majority rule like kingly rule finds its chief bulwark in superstition, not in nature or reason. "There's a divinity doth hedge a king," and "the king can do no wrong," are maxims on a par with "vox populi vox dei"—"the voice of the people is the voice of God."

But admitting for the argument that the ballot, or majority rule, is a "panacea for all political evils," we maintain that pure majority rule is a practical impossibility. Take our primary elections, whether preceded by a caucus or not. Suppose every voter of the ward or precinct turns out and deposits a vote, what then? Is it really the man himself who votes? Leaving out of the consideration such factors as bribes and intimidation or undue influence of employers, we maintain that the great majority of voters never vote at all! It is the politician, the wire-puller who "votes" them as so many cattle! The common voter has not the brain to comprehend intricate political problems, he has not the time nor the means to inform himself if he possesses the brains; beyond the local, township officers he cannot know the men for whom his vote is asked. He depends for everything on his party leaders. How often do we hear the "whippers-in," the local politicians use language like this: "I can vote you so many at such and such a precinct; I've counted the noses; I've brought my battery [his professional wind-bag] to bear on them, and know just what I can do." So, then it is really minority and not majority rule that we now have, and always must have under our present system.

To sum up: In order that majority rule be better than minority rule, the majority must be composed of better and wiser materials than the minority. This we know to be impossible in the nature of things. The desire to be on the popular or winning side will always attract the selfish, the covetous, the ambitious, the unprincipled, while the wise, the progressive, the far-seeing man will always be in the minority, from the fact that he occupies a

plane of thought and feeling so far in advance of the masses that he is sure to be misunderstood if not hated and persecuted by them. Again: On the supposition that the majority contains the best elements of society we must also suppose that this majority is manipulated and controlled by its own best members, else majority rule cannot be a "panacea for all political evils"—but this latter supposition, as we have already seen, is practically an impossibility.

But I want to know what its [Lucifer's] system, with which it would displace the present one, really is, as well as the manner of its introduction.

A very pertinent inquiry, friend R. Something more is needed than to show the falsity of the old system. We must be able to show something better. We have often been asked this question before: "If you want neither majority rule nor minority rule, what sort of rule would you have?" There is evidently but one answer possible to this question, and that is: WE WANT NO RULE AT ALL!!!—that is, no rule of man by man.

"Then why don't you urge the calling of conventions, state and national, to abolish all constitutions and all laws that authorize the government of man by man?"

Ans. Because the people are not ready for that yet, and will probably not be ready for it during the lifetime of this generation. Nearly all men are born-and-reared worshippers of the fetish called government—government with rulers, elective or otherwise. Take these rulers away and the people would cry out as did Micah of old: "O where are my gods! ye have taken away my gods, and what have I more?" The people have not suffered enough from their rulers—from the operation of invasive laws. They still cry out for more law! more law, and still more law! They have not yet learned that law-making and law-enforcing is a kind of mania, a disease that grows the more malignant the more it is humored and fed. They have not learned that the truly noble man seeks not to rule over his fellow men, neither will he consent to be ruled by them.

LUCIFER'S "system" therefore, friend Roessler,—LUCIFER'S work is like that of John the Precursor. Ours is the "voice of one crying in the wilderness" of accumulating laws, Repent for the reign of Autonomy (self-rule) is at hand. Our mission is to show that our governmental theories and practices are no less despotic—no less invasive of natural and personal rights than are those of the monarchies of the old world. Our mission is to show that the despotism of majority-rule is precisely the same thing as the despotism of minorities, or of one-man-rule; and even more dangerous still, because people have so long been taught that majority rule means free government. When these lessons shall have been learned it will be comparatively easy to eliminate the despotic features of our government and get back to fundamental principles as enunciated in the famous saying that all men by nature have "equal right to life liberty and pursuit of happiness."

NOTES.

Liberty of July 3rd is unusually interesting. Among its best articles is one by Dyer D. Lum in criticism of S. P. Putnam's attack upon the co-operative system of the Mormon church. He convicts Mr. Putnam of a total want of understanding of the subject he was treating. After all, anti-religious does not differ much from religious obliquity of vision.

Our good subscriber and contributor, Victor C. Yarros, has something to say about the Kelly-Walker controversy on the population question. Among other assertions is one to the effect that it is the system, the government that produces the "reckless, hap hazard," sort of people of whom I had spoken as being largely responsible for the present unhappy state of affairs. "It is the system that breeds and fosters this sort of people," says Mr. Y. And it is also more true that it was this sort of people that made the system possible. Mr. Y. has reversed the order of the sociological genesis. His statement is answered by the reply to the question, Which was first, people or the State? All gods, all bibles, all governments, all social systems, were created by the people whom

they afterwards still further degraded and enslaved.

Mr. Y. himself accepted this truth when he accepted the principles of Autonomy. As such, he says to the people: Abstain from voting; passively resist taxation; establish the free bank; Co-operate; eliminate the state by making it unnecessary, & you can render it unnecessary only by improving yourselves. This is the watch word of all reformatory work.

It is very true that we aim at the destruction of the State, and that such destruction will bring in its train greater liberty, wider justice, deeper and more enduring prosperity. But this reform will never be brought about by a vicious, superstitious, flippant people. This reform, like every other, must begin with the individual, else it comes not at all.

That Mr. Y. realizes this is proven by the fact that he is an Autonomist. Were he an Authoritarian, he would believe that only through the state could the people be improved, and so he would favor more law, not less. But he is an Autonomist, and hence believes in individual and associative reform work, and in none other. He believes that each evil can be remedied by "the absorbent substitution of the opposite good," and not otherwise. The reason that he puts the cart before the horse in his letter to LUCIFER is because his vision is blinded by a seeming party necessity to attack Malthusianism.

A certain Iowa Journal is trying to emulate Eli Perkins by the statement that its publishers always pay full fare on the railroads. This inexactitude may possibly pass current with those who know comparatively little of the difficulties in the way of canvassing for liberal papers.

"Plus Encore" tells "H." that his chief advantage over Rev. Taylor is that he (H.) is a Christian while Taylor is merely a churchman. This is the last echo of the old false cry that is churchism, not Christianity that is the evil thing. What strange logical twists some men's brains will take! The heart, the core, the essence, the central principle of Christianity is Authority, and it has always been such. Intolerance and persecution are germane to Christianity, and the nearer men come to being true Christians the more uncomfortable neighbors and cruel masters they are. It is only when men begin to doubt the truth of Christianity that they begin to lose faith in the beauty and utility of persecution for opinion's sake.

"The worst feature about our so-called Christianity of to-day is its consummate hypocrisy," says "Plus Encore." True, but in a different sense from that intended by "Plus Encore." Naught but hypocrisy could you expect as the fruit of the Christian teachings. 1st, Because "he" taught that the earth and its joys and duties should be despised. "My kingdom is not of this world." "Take no thought for the morrow," etc., etc. To obey his instructions men must believe themselves, must suppress every healthy natural instinct of their beings. His disciples who honestly tried to do this were the self-torturers, the "emaciated ruminants," the mendicant friars, the men and the women who, by their earnest attempts to be Christians, gave to the world the impenetrable midnight gloom of the Dark Ages. And those who do not try to be like Christ and to obey his teachings, but yet call themselves Christians, the men who are not prone to persecute and whose thoughts are chiefly of this world, are much more tolerable than were the real Christ-followers of the ages gone.

2nd, To find another reason why we could expect only hypocrisy among men of weak courage but fair intelligence, we have but to examine the teachings of the reputed "Christ." In the book wherein is found all that is known of him, granting, for argument's sake that "he" was, we cannot find a single instance where, when he was confronted with those who doubted his mission or questioned his teachings, he did not turn upon his questioners with threatenings and revilings, with imprecations of both earthly and "heavenly" vengeance. He was an intolerant fanatic on his theological side, and those who have been most nearly like him have been the cruellest persecutors of their fellows. From the dogma of the virtue of belief and the sin of unbelief has flowed a river of blood.

As to his ethical teachings, in so far as

they were practicable and good they were not original with him, and those that were original with him were neither practicable nor good; they were of the kind that could only result in making hypocrites of intelligent men who should pretend to accept them. And more than this, it must not be forgotten that religions are distinguished one from another by their theological tenets, not by their ethical codes, the latter having their source in the common experience and necessities of the race.

"Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live," the Old Testament has declared, and in all the record of the ministry of Jesus there is found nothing to show that he had the least doubt of the existence of witches. On the contrary, he seems to have been especially imbued with the witchcraft superstition. In this regard he was not one step in advance of the ignorant masses around him. We all know what part this delusion has had in the development of Christianity, historically. John Wesley said that to give up belief in witchcraft was to give up the Bible, and I will add that to give up belief in a Jesus who accepted witchcraft as a fact is to give up belief in Jesus as a person, for of the two negatives it is a thousand-fold easier to prove that he did not exist, than it is to prove that if he did exist he did not believe in witchcraft.

Let every man who seeks to be an innovator, a reformer, bear ever in mind that whatever he says that can be in any way construed into sanction of persecution will live long after all else that he has said has perished from the memory of man. The lust of power in the hearts of his followers will keep alive every sentiment of that kind. Does "Plus Encore" believe that there will ever be any doubt in regard to what Thomas Paine taught in regard to toleration of differing opinions? How different it is in the case of Jesus.

John A. Broadbeck, writing in the Nonconformist, says that that journal "is as yet the only paper that I have seen that was not frightened out of its wits, shaken out of joint, by the explosion of that bomb, that terrible bomb!" Permit me to remark that had Mr. B. stopped to think calmly for one moment he too would have been "shaken," else he is not the thorough-going Autonomist he calls himself.

The Chicago bomb was thrown by a State Socialist, most ludicrously and falsely called an Anarchist, and had a revolution been thus precipitated it would have been a State Socialist revolution and it successful, would have resulted in the establishment of a despotism ten-fold more odious and oppressive than is that of the present State. Of two evils I prefer the least, and so between the State as it is and State Socialism it is very easy for me to choose. Give me the same or less tyranny, not more.

And war of any kind and for any cause is to be avoided by every means that does not involve actual slavery. I must earnestly protest against being hurried into a conflict which can result only in useless carnage and in the sovereignty of the fondest ties, in agony unutterable. And all this simply to establish a Trade Unionist's State.

No, Comrade Broadbeck, we are not "frightened out of our wits," but I know many excellent people who seem to be enthused out of theirs. Almost if not every reform cause has been more injured by the indiscriminating partisanship of its friends than by the malice of its open enemies.

B. A. Cleveland, in his recent letter regarding prohibition in Kansas, says that in Ft. Scott and Wichita he saw enough to convince him that prohibition does prohibit. I hope that the next time Bro. Cleveland writes a letter to the New Thought he will tell us something of his method of investigation. Certainly he has reached a conclusion not justified by the facts.

WHITEWASHED CHRISTIANS.
Annie Besant wrote: "What is Liberty? Not, as some seem to fancy, a power to impose upon others a political constitution of which they do not approve, or a form of government which they do not desire. Not that our own opinion is uppermost, and our own ideas triumphant. Not the discovery that we have grown strong enough to bend the wills of others to our will, and to make the world as we would wish to see it."

Alas! that so many who call themselves Liberals do have just this false idea of Liberty. Alas! that there are so many whitewashed Christians, so few genuine Freethinkers in the hosts of Secularism. In the closing chapter of his History of the United States, Prof. Clark Kipling says:

The proscriptive vices of the Middle Ages have flowed down and tainted the life that now is with a suspicion and a distrust of freedom. In the minds of most, freedom has meant simply the right to agree with the majority. This is true even of the majority of those who call themselves, and who doubtless think that they are, Liberals. That dark inheritance of thirteen centuries of priestly rule, of anti-naturalism and cruel intolerance, has become a part of their inmost beings and dominates them even when they think that they have forever outgrown the teachings of the Church. Fear of new ideas, hatred of innovation, distrust of the truth are regnant in their brains and direct their actions. Lack of power is all that prevents them from being as remorselessly cruel in their treatment of those whom they regard as heretics as were Torquemada and Alva and Calvin and Mather in their persecutions of those whom they conceived to be false teachers and perverters of morals. Put into the hands of G. H. Walser, C. W. Stewart and their henchmen the levers of power and the machinery of law possessed by the murderers and torturers of the Church in her supremacy, and blood would flow ankle deep in their dominions, the shrieks of the tortured would ring out upon every breeze, and behind the grated windows of the stone cells of their prison tombs Thought and Virtue would languish in chains.

The town of Liberal was founded ostensibly to become the abiding place of free men and free women, an example of practical Liberalism. But from the first the spirit that directed its destiny has been narrow, sectarian, intolerant. From the first there has been a gag between the lips of Free Speech, a ball and chain upon the feet of Free Action. The edict of perpetual banishment went out against churches and saloons, and numbers of those even of those who possess a broader Liberalism than did the King, heartily seconded his efforts in this direction, and among these were some who now feel upon their own throats or those of their friends the heavy stifling hands of its Autocrat. About two years ago a lady, now in exile, grew highly indignant because, in a conversation with her, I took strong ground against the proscription of churches and saloons. But an evil principle bears evil fruit and though it may at times seem that we profit by the trampling down of the right of Free Choice, it is only a question of time when our unwise and unjust shall recoil with ten-fold force upon us and ours. In Liberal this intemperate denial of the fundamental principles of Free-thought has culminated in incipient mob violence. From the beginning the atmosphere of this "Only Liberal town in the world" has been heavy and malarial-laden. One by one the lungs of its freer men and women have been choked in that mephitic air and they have been compelled to seek among Christians the freedom of speech denied them there. Such a financial and social pressure was brought to bear upon them that they could find no comfort. Only at rarest intervals and for the shortest spaces of time, has the legend, "Universal Mental Liberty," emblazoned upon the wall of its hall been less than a manifest lie. There have always been true women and men there, but they could remain but a very short time, most of them; though a very few have "held the fort" through all these years. Some even of those in the clutch of the Autocrat have retained their love of truth and justice, their manhood and womanhood and their chivalrous loyalty to the cause of the weak and oppressed, under and through every storm of obloquy and persecution. But year by year the struggle has developed new elements of bitterness and hateful intolerance. All are somewhat acquainted with the disgraceful persecutions of last year, when the Lyons, the Replegles, Henry Youmans, Lambotte and perhaps others, were forced directly or indirectly, to leave the town.

A few months ago Henry and Georgia Replegle returned to Liberal and established the little paper, Equity. Some weeks since Henry Youmans came there on a visit. The smouldering fires of persecution had been quietly launed ever since the starting of Equity. One woman had declared that she would give ten dollars and the best feather bed in

her house to tar and feather the Free Lovers in town. This incitement to cowardly mob violence had received the applause of the lord of the manor, 'tis said. And this was aimed chiefly at another woman, one of the truest and whitest-souled and noblest women that ever stepped upon the bigotry-cursed soil of Liberal. At a recent meeting in the Hall, (June 27) most incendiary and riot-provoking speeches were made by chiefs of the star-chamber faction. The "hoot-toe" and "shot-gun" arguments were openly and shamelessly advocated as the best wherewith to answer the advocates of social freedom. The majority god was called upon and by an overwhelming vote of those present the illiberal and mobocratic utterances were endorsed. The very few who stood for Liberty were howled down, it manifestly being the intention to prevent, if possible, all freedom of expression, just as the same element was seeking to crush all freedom of action. But the dissentients though few, were plucky, and finally made themselves partially heard, though amid great confusion and the continual cries of Walser and his whippers-in to "sit down," "Shut up," etc. etc. Mrs. Youmans is somewhat deaf and so, misunderstanding the motive and intent of her son Henry's action, (the voting and speaking with the brave minority) she made a terrible scene, arousing to much higher pitch the feeling against the radicals and threats of lynching were freely made. Walser in his report in the Liberal, took the unfair but most characteristic advantage of this misunderstanding of Mrs. Youmans to still further deepen and intensify the prejudice against Henry Y. and his friends.

En passant, I will mention the fact that Jay Chappel, then editor of the Liberal, and a radical of many years standing, did not dare to make any mention of Equity when it was first issued. He was told by the Autocrat that he must not do so. It is due to Mr. Chappel to say that he has since left the Liberal and Liberal. So, one by one are the men of brains and progressive thought driven out by the "Only Liberal town in the world."

The teachings of Walser, Stewart & Co. bore fruit on Tuesday morning, June 29. At about 2 A. M. a mob visited the house of C. K. Moore, (who is a man of peace, principles) and demanded of Henry Youmans, who was stopping there, an explanation of his conduct at the Hall on Sunday night. Receiving an independent answer, they stoned the house, fired several shots at and into it, gave Mr. Youmans twenty-four hours in which to leave the town, and left a dirk at the gate.

These, Liberals of the United States, are samples of the "Universal mental liberty" prevailing at the much-advertised town of Liberal, Missouri. For years I have hoped against hope that a broader spirit would ultimately inspire its founders and its people, and so I have remained silent whilst the greatly exaggerated reports of its material and educational advantages, its liberty, etc., have been sent out to the world, desperately hoping that the ideal would in time become the real, that the town Liberal in name and pretensions would at last be so in fact. But it seems foolish to longer indulge in this pleasing fancy. The courage, devotion and honest labor of its few true men and women are pitted in an unequal contest against the combined forces of ignorance, bigotry, hypocrisy, and great wealth.

Mind you! the present battle is not for Social Freedom, *per se*, but for freedom of Speech and Press. Of those who are arrayed in defense of the latter, the majority are not champions of the former. But they are true Liberals, men who realize that he only is a Liberal who defends the right of his neighbor to differ from him. The veriest bigot will zealously contend for the right of another to agree with him. I have hesitated long before making this statement of facts, and for thereon that I would not recklessly throw cold water on any attempt at Liberal organization, no matter how limited in purpose and ill-advised in action it might be, so long as there was the smallest reasonable hope that it would result in any real advance of the cause. And then, again, I realize that no attempt would be made by the incriminated parties to disprove any facts or answer any arguments, but that personal defamation and the most objectionable language would be the only weapons used. But true comradeship and the interests of the Cause imperatively demanded that these words should be written.

Family Secrets.
[Dudes, prudes and "patent outside" moralists, of the Comstock and Prohibitionist persuasion, are kindly cautioned not to read what follows. It is too utterly, utterly shocking! not to say impious and "obscene."—Ed.]

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

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

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

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

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

Husband.—No, dear, you begin.

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

Husband.—No! you know, my love, Paul says husbands have the right to command their wives. It is your duty as a Christian to obey your husband and the father of your children; so begin, love.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Wife.—Well, then, Johnny our youngest—

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

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

Husband.—Merciful Lord! Is that so? In the name of the Savior, who's he?

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

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

UNCLE TOM.

ESSAYS ON DEATH AND FUNERALS.

PART III. THE RESPECT FOR THE DEAD.

(Continued from page 17.)

"Their wishes [of the dying Liberals] were not complied with, as their religious families interfered and prevented the fulfillment of their wishes."

So says the Investigator, who must know what he says. We admit the fact, "of course, but why are those monstrous violations" taking place? Because first, individual liberty and the sentiment of human dignity are not yet understood sufficiently. The pernicious influence of Politics, Religion, and Morality, i. e. Patriotism, (inherited) are yet popular and revered things by authoritarians and Mrs. Grundy. The full respect for the dead presupposes some ethical sentiment and reform. The respect for the individual, male or female, living or dead, is but an outgrowth of the development of humanitarian education, and it cannot be perfect and true except when Science, Justice and Altruism shall have replaced Error, Iniquity and Egoism upon which society is built, and which produced the gigantic, Babylonian confusion which exists everywhere, and in everything in the old Authoritarian system, producing parties, sects and nationalities and other crimes of Lezoo-Humanity.

But these infamous violations of the wishes of dying Liberals, acknowledged and lamented by the Investigator, could surely not have taken place if it were not for the indifference, cowardice and hypocrisy of so-called Liberals and the neglect of the dying to take suitable precautions against such violations. In such cases the cowardice of Liberals is rather to be feared than the bigotry of Christians.

Not long since a Nationalist, a man of settled convictions on all such questions, died in Minnesota. His family did not make any preparation for a religious funeral at all, but a boasted Liberal, a friend of the deceased, goes to call a priest's services for the occasion; but the latter, honest and conscientious enough, found an excuse to be absent from the funeral, which, in consequence was secular. This priest is a Catholic, and by no means a "Liberal," as the Methodist preacher called upon lately by the Liberals to conduct the funeral of an old Liberal who died friendless, not far from Salina, and over whose grave improper and stupid remarks

were uttered by the "Liberal preacher."

These violations, these monstrous, anomalies which happen so often in spite of liberty of conscience and contrary to the Constitution of this great free Republic, are now very scarce in France and Belgium. The stealing of corpses does not happen there anymore, except in case of some noted idol, as Laitro or Boncel, when Catholicism uses all its great influence to secure the prize. The rights of the dying are now understood and respected even in the smallest villages. The Christians there understand that they have no more right to violate or defeat the last wishes of the dead Liberals in regard to funeral rites and ceremonies than Liberals have to violate and defeat the last requests of Christians in regard to the final disposition of their mortal remains.

Thus we see how *Respect for the Dead* is secured in our days; and we see every day that funerals are often only an occasion or a pretext to give free course to vanity, frivolity and foolishness, by expensive, extravagant and ridiculous exhibitions, ceremonies and memorial rites, performed often over the grave of one who repudiated them while living.

Let those who understand these things differently, those who are not careless of human dignity and liberty of conscience try to be honest and logical at the supreme moment at last.

JOSEPH HENRY, the proletarian.
Salina Kas., July 1st, A. S. 286.

PARSONS SPEAKS.

But few of the capitalist papers have had the fairness, so far as we know, to publish entire the letter of A. R. Parsons, as given in the Chicago News of July the 6th. While by no means agreeing with all the utterances of Mr. P., we recognize in him an able and, we believe, sincere and honest champion of the rights of labor as against the usurpations, the robberies and murders constantly committed by concentrated capital. Whether innocent or guilty of the charges upon which he is now being tried he has at least earned the sympathy and respect of all brave and noble-minded men by his voluntary return to Chicago and surrender of himself to the officers who had for weeks vainly sought to capture him.

Though our own contributors are urgent in their demands for space in LUCIFER we here reproduce entire the letter just alluded to:

COOK COUNTY HARBOR, CHICAGO, Mo. 100, July 1st, 1892. Dear Editor: I have read yesterday's paper an official statement from district assembly No. 24, Knights of Labor of Chicago, denouncing myself and others as advocates of riot and murder, and as being in the hands of the great nation to be expelled from the Knights of Labor in company with every other workman "who follows the red flag and upholds the doctrines of socialism."

Will you permit me, through the columns of your widely read newspaper, to submit for public consideration a few facts of general interest, and to make a few remarks upon the district assembly No. 24, which has thus assumed in the name of labor to condemn without a hearing certain workmen because they "believe in the doctrine of socialism and follow the red flag," and to expel them from the Knights of Labor in company with every other workman "who follows the red flag and upholds the doctrines of socialism."

Will you permit me, through the columns of your widely read newspaper, to submit for public consideration a few facts of general interest, and to make a few remarks upon the district assembly No. 24, which has thus assumed in the name of labor to condemn without a hearing certain workmen because they "believe in the doctrine of socialism and follow the red flag," and to expel them from the Knights of Labor in company with every other workman "who follows the red flag and upholds the doctrines of socialism."

In addition to the above the order also proclaims that "among the higher duties that should be taught in every local assembly are the following: Liberty and right to share, for use of the soil, and that the right to life carries with it the means of living; and that all statutes (laws) that obstruct or violate these rights are wrong, unjust and must give way."

After reading the above I submit to a candid and intelligent public to decide if there are not the most obvious and plain and undeniable facts proclaimed for the past thirty years and advocated by socialists and anarchists all over the world? Such being the case, the Knights of Labor is a body of men who for so long a time have been intelligent persons understand full well. Monopoly of capital means compulsory labor; by it the free and equal right to use the means of life is taken from the masses and a privileged class exists and is enabled to live in luxury and idleness upon the labor of others; monopoly of capital is created and sustained by statute law.

No doubt intelligent people smile audibly at the periclitous efforts of district assembly No. 24, Knights of Labor, to hide their identity from the public by the use of the name of the Knights of Labor, and to do this by denouncing "socialism" and the followers of the red flag as the advocates of "riot and murder."

To be Continued.

TIME CARD

ATCHISON, TOPICA & SANTA FE.

Alfonia & Mexico	No. 1,	11:08 a m
Express & Mail	No. 3,	11:20 p m
Colorado Express	No. 9,	10:03 p m
Through Freight	No. 13,	9:59 a m
Way Freight	GOING EAST.	
Atlantic Express	No. 2,	4:23 p m
New York Express	No. 4,	4:20 a m
Way Freight	No. 10,	3:15 a m
Way Freight	No. 14,	9:58 a m

KANSAS CENTRAL DIVISION U. P. R. R.	GOING WEST.	
Passenger and Mail	12:54 p m	
Local Freight	8:20 a m	
	GOING EAST.	
Passenger and Mail	11:09 a m	
Local Freight	3:15 p m	

Through tickets for sale, and baggage checked through to all points on the Missouri River Rates, H. D. Burt, Agent.

May I reach

That purest heaven, be to other souls
The cup of strength in some great agony
Enkindle generous ardor, feed pure love,
Forget the smiles that have no cruelty--

Be the sweet presence of a good diffused
And in diffusion ever more intense.
So shall I join the choir invisible
Whose music is the gladness of the world.
--GEORGE ELIOT.

This is true liberty, when free-born men,
Having to advise the public, may speak free;
Which he who can and will deserves high
praise,
Who neither can nor will may hold his peace,
What can be juster in a state than this?
--MILTON.

You see you birkie, e'ad a Lord,
Who struts and stores an' a' that;
Though hundreds worship at his word,
He's but a coof for a that,
For a that and a' that,
His ribband, star, and a' that,
The man of independent mind,
He looks and laughs at a' that.
--BURKE.

Orthodox Morality

EDITOR LUCIFER: On reading Mrs. Whitehead to Elminia, in LUCIFER of June 25th, I am moved to offer a few words of friendly criticism. While I have the highest respect for, and cordially indorse the sentiment of Celia B. Whitehead, yet the great mass of mankind are so thoroughly steeped in ignorance and animal propensities that they are not capable of appreciating or stepping at once on to that high plane which she, surrounded with better conditions, has only reached through long years of growth and development, her position is not only sound, but she can preach nothing else. As the law of cause and effect is a fixed fact in the universe of matter, and every word or act of the human race in the past ages have been the effect of some natural cause, which bears as directly on her in her highly cultivated and well developed intellect, as it does upon those who are in the lowest deep of ignorance and animal propensities, and who will require long years, perhaps ages of education and growth, to reach her advanced plane--to these myriads of people Elminia's preventive appliances furnished by law free to every woman, would be a great relief. It would give them a rest, and time to think, which is the key to that growth and unfoldment absolutely necessary before they can appreciate and put in practice her advanced theories.

It has appeared to me that Mrs. Whitehead in her letter, is opposed to granting perfect freedom to all women, lest they should accept Elminia's liberal proposition. Give them freedom, with the right to control their own persons, and many thousands will speedily supply themselves with the best means for preventing conception rather than continue to suffer as the laws of both church and state direct. Those on a lower plane, who have cultivated no other but their sexual organs, are not to be blamed, for their every act is but the effect of some natural cause. No one can do otherwise than use the material of which he or she is composed, and in such use have a right to do, without any violation of the laws of their being, many things which Mrs. Whitehead could neither do nor endorse. If she would reform them, it seems to me she would succeed better by coming down upon their plane and by a sympathetic mingling with them lead them, step by step, up to her highest ideal of perfection. But so long as the cause remains which leads them into vice and immorality, it is worse than useless to denounce them or seek to restrain them by coercive measures. No reform can be advanced or hastened by law, and yet Elminia, and hundreds of our most advanced thinkers, continue hammering away at prohibition to enforce morality by law. Give us freedom to act and think different from others, and we will be in the best possible condition to learn and accept new ideas from choice. Give us unlimited freedom, except for crime

only, and although many will doubtless run into wild extremes on account of the sudden change from orthodox restraint to that of perfect freedom, yet time will speedily bring all into harmony with their free conditions, and we will no longer need to resort to law to enforce orthodox morality, nor would we longer submit to disgraceful Comstock laws which seek to compel all women who have beasty husbands to remain in submission and suffer as both church and state direct.

Yours for free speech, a free press, free men, women and children.
Twin Mound, July 7. HENRY HATT.

Free-thinkers' Picnic.

On Sunday, July fourth, the Free-thinkers of this county, to the number of about one hundred, met at the beautiful grove of Mr. Herford, in the western part of this, Saline county, with well filled baskets, the contents of which were spread on tables set in the grove, where a bountiful and sumptuous dinner was partaken of by all present.

It being an informal gathering, no previous programme had been arranged, but after dinner the audience was pleasantly entertained with music by Dr. Denness and lady, assisted by others, after which there was recitations and reading by Dr. Denness, Mrs. Denness and other ladies, whose names the writer did not learn. Next we had an address from Mrs. Freeman, a liberal christian lady present, which was very interesting to all, as the lady is very liberal and a pleasant and fascinating speaker. After Mrs. Freeman, Mr. Newton Mitchell, a thorough liberal, addressed the assembly with a short but interesting speech, after which the audience dispersed and went home. All seemed well pleased with the manner in which the day had been passed.

J. W. Yount.

Cleveland and Mormonism.

An idea for a cartoon, which "Puck" probably will not utilize: Grover Cleveland in the White House with his new legal wife; to the right, in a companion picture, George Q. Cannon in a prison cell; to the left of the White House, Maria Halpin, Cleveland's illegal wife, and their illegitimate son, dwelling as social outcasts in an abode of wretchedness and want because willfully abandoned by the husband and father; to the right of the prison, Cannon's illegitimate wives and illegitimate children, dwelling in an abode of wretchedness and want because the law has imprisoned the husband and father instead of allowing him to live with and protect them; on the walls of the White House, illuminated texts concerning the purity of the home and exclusiveness of love, taken from the president's message to congress on the Mormon question; on the walls of the prison cell, the constitutional amendment forbidding the passage of laws abridging religious freedom. Title for the cartoon: "Mormonism in Cleveland's eyes, like the tariff in Hancock's, purely local question."--Liberty.

No, Puck, although a very independent paper, in certain directions, will not give us such a cartoon as that. The treatment of the Mormons is the disgrace of our civilization, and the hypocrisy of the crusaders against them is the disgrace of said crusaders.

Lunacy or Knavery.

The authorities are growing madder and madder. The monomaniac Smythe gave Most the full penalty of the law, one year in the penitentiary and \$500 fine, Braunschweig five months and \$250, and Schenck nine months with no fine. In addressing Most the recorder told him that he was the greatest scoundrel that ever disgraced the face of the earth, and he was sorry he could not sentence him to be hanged. Such talk as this is the language of lunacy, or else of knavery bidding for the vote of lunacy.--Liberty.

Most probably the latter; Smythe felt that he had a fine chance to give himself a political boost by striking with the mutilating tomahawk of the savage those who were down and helpless. It is characteristic of his class.

Christian Hypocrisy.

EDITOR LUCIFER: To-day is Monday, July 6th; yesterday was Sunday, so-called Independence day; but here in Maine the day was not celebrated. All over the land we hear complaints because of oppression, but where is the person who will demand that if there is to be a celebration, it take place when it comes, Sunday as well as any other day. How much longer will the people submit to the rule--damnable I should have said--of priestcraft. It is sheer hypocrisy not to celebrate the day because it happens to come on Sunday. Laboring men and women, how much longer will you bow down to the iron rule of priestcraft? SEWARD MITCHELL, Newport, Mo.

The earth belongs in usufruct to the living. The dead have no rights over those who now exist.--[Thomas Jefferson.

A FAMILY AFFAIR.

BY THE LATE HUGH CONWAY.

But they were horribly upset; so upset that they forgot all about Frank's impending visit, or forgot about it until the next morning, when they found it was too late to telegraph.

Frank, with "hope eternal" growing like an eucalyptus, came down as he had forewarned his friends, by the morning train. He was rather surprised at not seeing his two tall cousins on the platform, or any signs of the wagonette outside the station. He secured a hansom, and drove straight to Hazlewood House.

Whittaker opened the door. "All well, Whittaker?" asked Carruthers cheerily. He did not hear the servant's reply, for at that moment Horace and Herbert appeared and shook hands heartily. They took him into the dining-room, and once more the three men shook hands.

"Well, how are you both?" asked Frank. They told him they were quite well, but all the same, Frank knew by their solemn faces that something had gone wrong. He wondered what the cook had been up to.

"And Miss Clauson? Beatrice?" he continued with an assumption of carelessness, but longing for the door to open and admit her. The Talbents exchanged sad glances.

"Beatrice," said Horace, "is not here." His voice was so solemn that Frank's blood ran cold. Horace was not addicted to the use of canting colloquialisms, but the words were spoken in such a way that Frank believed "not here" must inevitably be followed by "but gone above." He was immensely relieved when the speaker stopped short.

"Not here," he said, "gone out, you mean. My greetings must wait."

The brothers' eyes sought counsel of one another. "Beatrice went to London yesterday," said Horace. Frank seemed much astonished.

"To London! She left London only a few days ago. Is she gone back to her father's?" He was already framing excuses for leaving Hazlewood House and returning to town. An ominous silence followed his question. "What is the matter? Is anything wrong?" he asked in great agitation.

"My dear Frank," said Horace, "something strange has happened, but it is so strictly a family affair that we are considering whether we ought to mention it to you. Not but what your advice might be of service to us."

Frank grew seriously alarmed. "But I am one of the family," he said hastily. The Talbents shook their heads doubtfully. They were not sure about it. The family consisted of two, or, counting in Beatrice, three at the outside.

"I have another right to know, a stronger right still," said Carruthers, who was on thorns of suspense. "There is no reason why I should make a secret of it. I have loved Beatrice since the day we met. My one hope is to make her my wife. I claim the right to know anything that concerns her."

The astonishment depicted on the brothers' faces spoke volumes in favor of their trustful natures or Frank's eloquent love-making. "Good heavens, Frank!" ejaculated Horace.

"Yes! I asked her to marry me before I left here last autumn. She refused; I was now going to repeat my offer."

"She refused you?" asked Horace.

"Yes," said Frank, sadly. "But what is the matter? For Heaven's sake tell me."

"Herbert," said Horace, "I believe this gives us the clue to the mystery." Herbert nodded.

"What clue? What mystery? My good fellows, don't you see you are driving me mad?" said Carruthers.

"Beatrice left us yesterday. This morning we received this letter." The letter was handed to Frank, and whilst he read it the brothers drew aside and talked in whispers. Frank's astonishment need not be described. Like his cousins, he could only ejaculate, "What does it mean?"

Horace and Herbert came forward. Herbert spoke. As the romantic side of the question had again turned up, it was felt right for him to be spokesman. "Frank," he said, "we do not wish to misjudge you, but the fact of Beatrice's having refused you, and of your coming down to renew the offer, makes us think that she must have fled to avoid you. We know little about such matters ourselves, but we have heard of young girls flying to get out of the way of distasteful--ahem, what shall I say?"

"Persecution," put in Horace.

"No, the world is too strong--distasteful advances, Frank. This is, of course, a matter entirely between yourself and your conscience."

As the oration proceeded Frank stared from one to the other. Then he burst into a short peal of laughter. In spite of his anxiety about Beatrice, the situation overpowered him.

"There is nothing to laugh at, Frank," said Horace.

"There is madness, sheer madness in the air, my good men," said Carruthers. "Do I look like a man who would subject a woman to distasteful persecution? Hang it! I am prouder than you are. I had Beatrice's permission to come. Perhaps you may know that it was arranged that we should travel down together."

They remembered that Beatrice had told them this and at once saw the folly of their new theory. They apologized humbly to Frank. No man in this world could apologize more gracefully than our friends. Then they talked the whole matter over again, without any result. Frank did not say much. He wanted solitude and quiet thought. By and by the wagonette came round to the door.

"You must excuse our not having sent to meet you," said Horace. "The truth is the roads are dirty and we could not have had the wagonette cleaned in time to take us out."

"Where are you going for a drive?"

"We are going to make a round of calls," Frank marvelled, and thought that under the circumstances this social amenity might have been postponed.

"It is a painful, a most painful duty," said Horace, "but we feel it must be done. We must go round and indirectly give our friends

to understand that Beatrice has left us under every-day circumstances, to pay a long promised visit in London. We can see no other way of arresting inquiry and scandal."

It was after hearing this that Frank understood how truly great was Horace's nature. The brothers drove off. So far as time would allow they called upon every one they could think of. They called upon Lady Bowker who had known them from boys; they called upon Mrs. Catesby, the stately, yet affable, well-dowered and better connected widow who loved artistic society; they called upon the rector's wife; upon the Partons, upon the Pletchers, upon many aristocratic and a few shuply opulent persons. Being such universal favorites with the ladies they had no scruple in continuing their calls even to the very last moment allowed by society. They they drove home feeling they had done all then could to throw a curtain over Beatrice's extraordinary indiscretion.

CHAPTER XXIV.

AN OUTRAGE ON WHITTAKER.

Carruthers, when Horace and Herbert went forth at the call of duty, had asked that Beatrice's letter might be left with him. As he had fully proved his right to be admitted to the family council his request was readily granted. With the letter in his hand he went into the library and pondered what had happened. The question he had to solve was what motive could have been strong enough to force Beatrice to take such a step?

He had heard from Horace all about the claim made upon the child, and this had explained a matter which had for some days been troubling him greatly, namely, Beatrice's abrupt departure from London. But here he could see no strong motive. The claim was abandoned, or at least lay quiescent. Besides, Beatrice, as he judged her, was far more likely to fight than to fly. He dismissed anything to do with the boy, or at least put it aside to be inquired into collaterally.

Herbert, too, had hinted his idea about an attachment. Frank having ascertained that no shadow of suspicion of such a thing hung over Beatrice, sternly put it out of sight. Besides there were one or two recollections which he carried always with him and which rendered such a vulgar, unworthy explanation something not far short of sacrilege.

He reckoned Beatrice a woman of superior abilities, logical and perfectly able to foresee consequences. He felt that she would not have acted as she had acted without carefully considering what it entailed. No romantic girlish impulse had hurried her away; no eccentricity of character had led her to shape such a course. The reason, whatever it might be, was to her mind amply sufficient.

She was unhappy. Her own words said so. Did some danger overhang her? Did some evil threaten her? What danger? What evil? Why could not he, Frank Carruthers, be at her side to shield and aid? Heaven knows he would do it and seek no reward.

He groaned. He was very miserable and cast down. It was in this very room he had bemoaned his first sorrow. He had recovered from that and had encouraged himself to hope that the woman he loved would, after all, be his. And now to come and find her gone--gone without a word--gone no one knew whither--no one knew why! To feel that she was flying from some menacing evil and yet not know what. He was very unhappy.

He had come down with such news for her--news which even as a friend she would have been glad to hear. He had breathed no word of it to her in London; had resolved to say nothing about it until all was settled. At last he saw his way to giving up the drudgery of teaching what he bitterly called fools. He had for years been a thrifty man and the money he had saved was not a small sum. For years he had dreamed of literature as a profession, and now he saw his way to a realization of that dream. His political articles had attracted attention. He had been offered an important journalistic post. A manuscript from which he expected great things was in the printer's hands. He saw a certain amount of renown if not fortune waiting for him. All this he had come down to tell Beatrice before he went back to Oxford, wound up his affairs, and bade the classic town farewell.

It seemed as if, whenever he counted on draining the cup of joy, it was struck from his lips!

He must find Beatrice. Sacred as her wish not to be traced might be to Horace and Herbert, Frank felt that it did not affect him. He would not of course stoop to eulging in detective aid, but the utmost he could do to solve the mystery should be done. To Frank, Beatrice's flight appeared in a far more serious light than it did to her uncles.

He must go and look at her portrait. There was a fine one in the drawing-room. He went there, stood before it for a long time,

and to the representation of herself vowed that she was the fairest woman on earth, well worthy for a man to live or die for. Then he began to retrace his steps to the library. As he crossed the hall he saw a strange sight.

(To be continued.)

As long as mankind shall continue to bestow more liberal applause on their destroyers than on their benefactors, the thirst of military glory will ever be the voice of the most exalted character.--Gibbon.

Wonderful

cures of Scrofulous diseases continually add to the reputation of Ayer's Sarsaparilla. John McDonald, 124 Suffolk st., Lowell, Mass., says: "For a number of years I was a great sufferer from Scrofula, which manifested itself in early childhood. So virulent and offensive were the sores which appeared on my body, that my parents kept me from school most of the time. I became emaciated, pale, languid, and feeble, and my friends said it was Consumption. A physician in New York state recommended treatment with

AYER'S Sarsaparilla

to remove the Scrofula from my blood. After taking six bottles I was permanently cured."

Sold by all Druggists.

Price \$1; six bottles, \$5.

Prepared by Dr. J. C. Ayer & Co., Lowell, Mass., U. S. A.

HOW TO

BECOME A MEDIUM!

IN YOUR OWN HOME.

I will send you a 16-page Pamphlet containing full instructions, and a Sealed Letter designating all your phases of mediumship, also a copy of The Riddle of the American Spiritual Sphinx, or the Lost Key found, and a sample copy of the N. D. C. Axe and True Key Stone for ONLY 10 CTS., in one or two cent stamps. Address J. ALBERT BLISS, 474 A. Broadway, South Boston, Mass. Blacklock's Magnetized Paper to heal the sick, 10 cents per sheet, or 13 sheets for \$1.00. Developing Paper 15 cents per sheet, or 7 sheets for \$1.00.

ADVERTISERS

can learn the exact cost of any proposed line of advertising in American papers by addressing Geo. P. Rowell & Co.,

Newspaper Advertising Bureau, 10 Spruce St., New York. Send 10cts. for 100-Page Pamphlet

FOUNDATION PRINCIPLES

16 1/2 PAGE SEMI-MONTHLY

EDITED BY LOIS WAISBROOKER.

Advocates a Humanitarian Spiritualism, and holds it as a

FOUNDATION PRINCIPLE

That all gain coming from the use of natural wealth belongs to the party through whose labor it is secured, and not to some other claimant--that no man or set of men has the moral right to hold land not in actual use from those who need it, and that rent taken for the use of such land is robbery, and illegal when measured by the law of natural justice.

Accepts no authority but that of Justice, and alive all through. Send for it; price \$1. per year. Address LOIS WAISBROOKER, Clinton, Iowa.

John Seckler

THE ONE PRICE

CLOTHIER,

Would Respectfully call the attention of all in want of Clothing, Furnishing Goods, Hats, etc., at prices that defy competition!

Men's Suits from \$5.00, to Tailor Made for \$25.00.

Boys' Suits at from \$4.00 to Tailor Made for \$15.00.

Chd's Suits at from \$2.75 up to \$12.00

-UNDERWEAR-O-IN-O-ALL-O-GRADSES-AT-T-C-THE-O-SAME-O-PRCTCTIONS!!

No Misrepresentation Made to Effect Sales, But Represented for Just What They Are.

We also have a fine Merchant Tailoring Establishment and a fine assortment of Piece Goods to select from.

A Call is solicited from Respectfully,

JOHN SECKLER,

LEAVENWORTH KAN.

N. B. A reliable watch (Waterbury) will be presented to every purchaser of \$20.00.