

LUCIFER.

THE LIGHT-BEARER.

NEW SERIES, VOL. 3, No. 43.

VALLEY FALLS, KANSAS, JANUARY 22, E. M. 286.

Whole No. 133

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

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

E. L. SENTF,
PHYSICIAN and SURGEON,
VALLEY FALLS, KANSAS.
Dr. Sentf uses "Ecclesia Specific Medicine. Office over Evans' Store.

D. B. NORTHRUP,
PHYSICIAN and SURGEON,
VALLEY FALLS, KANSAS.
Office over Coy's Drug Store, corner of Broadway and Sycamore.

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.
Guarantee 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 ISLAND'S OLD
ST. AND 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.

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 unwelcome argument against temperance reform. Price, 10 cents each, the three for 25 cents.
Address, E. C. WALKER, Valley Falls, Kan.
Box 62

PUBLIC BEDAMNED.
When Public Bedamned surrendered,
Like other mortals, and died,
Ten millions to each of his children
He left, and millions besides!
Oh! careless and thoughtless mortals,
Cry any of you declare
How many millions were paupered
To make this millionaire?

Can you tell how much the burden
The laborers have to bear
To pay the annual interest
On each of the children's share?
At four per cent per annum,
The interest every year
On each ten million of dollars,
Is four hundred thousand clear.

Thus unto Bedamned's eight children
Eight times this sum will fall
Each year, or just three millions
Two hundred thousand in all
Divide the wealth of the nation
Up into ten-million shares,
How many would have ten millions,
If they were the nation's heirs?

Its wealth is about sixty billions:
Ten millions unto each soul,
And six hundred thousand people
Would gather in the whole;
And fifty-nine millions four hundred
Thousands of wretched slaves,
Of our sixty millions of people
Would own, not even their graves!

Yet Public Bedamned had his millions
One hundred and ninety or o'er,
And yearly he drew from the toilers
Not far from ten millions of more,
Counting wages per year at five hundred,
Then into his coffers were crammed
The wages of full twenty thousand
To keep old Public Bedamned!

Three thousand five hundred and thirty,
Each owning as much as he,
Would monopolize every farthing
Of the nation's property!
The rest of our sixty millions
Would all be underlings,
Consenting to live in bondage
To those few money kings!

We have twelve million families:
One hundred and ninety to each,
Nearly twenty-three trillions of dollars
The aggregate sum would reach!
Divide our sixty billions
Among our families free
And only five thousand dollars
Would fall to each family.

Oh! citizens—sisters and brothers—
Can none of you see the wrong
Imposed upon you and your children
By Mammon's insidious throng?
If not, then goodbye to your manhood—
To your much boasted freedom, good-by!
To the scattering winds throw your ballots,
You're not fit to live or to die!

- D. D. CURTIS, in the Boycotter.

A Plea for Anarchy.
In the "Truth Seeker Annual" for 285, George McDonald asks the question: "Are we all infants?" then, after portraying a few of the most prominent features of our present social, political and religious systems, leaves the reader to draw his own conclusions. In my opinion, he has made out a case in the affirmative that cannot be successfully refuted. Liberals who imagine themselves free when they have cut loose from the thralls of the church, would do well to study, honestly and earnestly, the portrait above referred to; especially its political feature; then, after a critical examination of the whole programme from the caucus to the highly magnified farce, popularly known as "the Election," let them ask themselves, where does Freedom come in? And whatever the popular notions on the subject may be, the true answer will run like this: "We are free to let a few men smarter than ourselves manipulate the primaries and send our delegates to the county convention, and this convention select delegates to the state convention. Here the interest, and influence of the free people (?) practically ends. The professionals have now taken charge of the machine,

and will, of course run it to our entire satisfaction; we need give ourselves no further concern until our prospective self-sacrificing rulers are selected, and pointed but to us.

O! Happy people! Was ever man so munificently blessed? It now only remains for us to show our gratitude by—What? Well, by just such antics as Mr. McDonald pictured in the article above referred to; then march bravely to the polls and exercise "the dearest right of Free American Citizens," the right to confirm the rulers chosen for us. All that is now required of us is, to pay the bills and surrender ourselves to the care and keeping of our generous and condescending guardians. Therefore, who dare say we are not a favored people? And in the meantime if we fancy we need any legislation for our benefit, have we not the sovereign right to petition? and are not our legislators in duty bound to grant our petition, provided always that the whole time of their brief sessions (only six months of each year) is not fully occupied in looking after the more important interests of their only recognized constituents, the great corporations, by whose sufferance "we live, move and have our being." Then, if in their superior wisdom, they deem it wise to grant our petition, we shall not murmur like naughty children, but take it for granted that they acted for our good.

Cause why? Does not the legally authorized guardian always know what is best for his ward? Yea verily! Even to the extent of prescribing what he shall, and what he shall not eat and drink, what he may, and what he may not manufacture, buy or sell. For such disinterested solicitude in our behalf on the part of our rulers, should we not make a demonstration of our unbounded love and veneration for our noble chieftains, who, the while perched aloft, condescend to vouchsafe their approving smiles? And is not such recognition sufficient reward for all the homage we yield? And is it not in this that the freedom, the Beauty and the Harmony of our political system is made manifest? If not here, then where? Let the "malecontents" answer, for such there are among us, and their number is still increasing. They are known as Nihilists, Socialists, Anarchists and Revolutionists. These names strike terror to the hearts of timid law-bound citizens, and well they may, when these classes openly and boldly avow such "pernicious principles" as the following samples well attest: "That all men (and women too) are by nature free, that they are endowed with the right of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

"That the laborer has a right to enjoy the fruits of his labor" and that "to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

"That when any form of government becomes destructive of these ends it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundations in such principles, and organizing its powers in such forms as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness."

It will be remembered by some, at least, that the above anarchistic, socialist principles were once firmly believed in, and heroically defended by such old time anarchists and revolutionists as Paine, Jefferson, Adams, Franklin, Hancock, Warren, Patrick Henry, and hosts of others too numerous to mention, and that these principles triumphed in the war of the Revolution, but were

strangled in the secret session in the constitutional convention that followed, by a vote of the majority of the delegates in that convention who were inclined towards aristocracy, under the leadership of Alexander Hamilton; adopting for their basic principle this motto, viz: "That in all civilized countries the people are necessarily and naturally divided into two classes; the one: The few, the rich, the well-born; the other: The many, the poor, the laboring masses."

Here we have two antagonistic principles, as old as the race itself, contending for the supremacy. The first means Equal Rights and Liberty and Equal Justice for all; the latter means wealth, power and influence for the few; slavery and degradation for the many, or in brief,archy, or government from without, versus anarchy, its opposite, or government within—self-government, as understood and defined by anarchists themselves.

I need not be told that these definitions are at variance with the lexicons in general use, and as accepted by popular consent. I have known this for a long time. As for the dictionaries I find instances where words are defined according to popular prejudice, and in some cases according to the origin or etymology, and as for popularity, or popular sentiment she is too fickle a jade to be a reliable guide in any matter whatever. This is too self-evident to need argument.

From the earliest date of man's history to the present hour not a single advance in any direction, whether in science, in philosophy, in literature, in ethics, in art, in mechanics, in agriculture or politics, has ever been made but had to fight its way through popular prejudice, always led or seconded by her mother, the prevailing religion of the period, whatever that may have been.

I have intimated that the principles of the revolutionists triumphed in the Revolutionary war but were defeated in council, and that those principles are identical with those of the anarchists of to-day. To trace and bring to view the subtle influences that worked for their defeat would be a task too long for this article. I will here name but one, and that one, in my opinion is the most important of all, and I call it, "Ignorance of the masses." I do not mean by this merely illiteracy, for I find in my vocabulary such a seeming paradox as "learned ignorance," but I mean ignorance of our proper functions in the order of nature, of which we are a part. Ignorance of the adaptability of means to ends. Ignorance of our relation to our own and other species, and ignorance on general principles. Had our ancestors had the intelligence to found this government on the principles they fought for and won, such social disorder as we now witness would never have occurred. Such an anomaly as over-production and the starvation of the producers, would never have been heard of. But why should we censure those people? Justice forbid, while we, with the example of both their wisdom and their folly before us, besides a century of experience and tuition, with increased facilities for obtaining knowledge—er with those superior advantages, have not yet discovered that we have been cheated, and year after year, not only perpetrate the old fraud but keep adding new ones to it.

And now my fellow working men who are the real power in the land, and the men and women of America generally, no matter what may be

your creed, age, rank or calling, do you wish to see a genuine Democracy such as your grand-sires intended you should have? Then join hands with the Anarchists, for this is their mission.—John A. Broadbeck, in Free-thinker's Magazine.

From Flora W. Fox.

EDITOR LUCIFER: Enclosed find stamps, for which please send me copies of No. 41 of your valuable paper.

A writer in a late number of LUCIFER, seems to think ownership in marriage begets true love. I beg to differ with him. Full liberty, coupled with moral education, never degrades a human being, but rather becomes their savior, and it is surely woman's savior.

"I have no use for rented women, * * because there are no decent women for rent." For aha! on a society that permits one-half of humanity to become the prey of the "Lords of creation!"

Woman has an individuality, as well as man, and should not be treated as a nonentity,—as a bushel of potatoes! If her husband through the laws of the country and the law of ownership in marriage, does not treat her as the said "bushel of potatoes" was treated, then I say, he behaved better than the law allows.

Abuse comes through ownership, and it is not time when a woman is to refuse to be any man's potato-property? Women will testify that men, as lovers, are better behaved than as husbands. Why is it? The word ownership answers.

I do hope the Liberals will hold a convention. And let every man consider it his bounden duty to take his wife and children—those who are not so blessed, take some one's sisters or aunts or cousins.

Success be yours. I am decidedly in favor of anti-ownership.
Rochester, Minn. Flora W. Fox.

"The Point of Flesh."

It may perhaps be thought incredible that the condition of working girls is as bad as I have represented. It is even worse! It can never be told but must be endured to be understood! Human speech cannot voice the long drawn out agony of a life, robbed of all the hopes and pleasures that make up the joy of living, and forced into a treadmill of constant toil for a bare subsistence. The best years of my life have been dragged out in a New Hampshire cotton mill, so I know what I am talking about. New England people are naturally proud of their manufactories, and many of them seem to think these are run by water power alone. This is a mistake; the water power only propels the machinery. Another force is requisite to make the machinery effective. A deep, full current of human life is constantly pouring in, as freely as the water and almost as fast. Women and children especially, are being used up and worn out with a rapidity unthought of by those who look only on the surface of things. If the blood of all the victims, whose lives have been crushed and broken in the mills that stand on its banks, were spilled in its tide, the Merimac river would flow on towards the Atlantic, as red as were the waters of the Seine on the morning of St. Bartholomew. But blood-spilling is barbarous, and puritanical New England never tolerates barbarism. She freely grants to Capital a "bond" that enables it to take from Labor the "point of flesh," but, because of her pious, puritan faith in her own righteousness, bloodshed is forbidden. The Yankee Shylock, however, has more inventive genius than the old Jew, and finds a way to enforce his bond without either breaking the law or shocking public sentiment. Human strength and endurance are put to work against tireless machinery, in gas-poisoned rooms, until the flesh wastes and the cheek pales as the red blood is gradually transmuted into sweat and tears, and a used up operative quietly passes away to make room for a fresh hand. All the proprieties observed, and every thing done "decently and in order".—Prodigal Daughter by Rachel Campbell, Grass Valley, Cal.

WANTED, A purchaser for good hotel property in Lawrence, Kan. Will trade for farm lands. Address, JOHN ANDERSON, Lawrence, Kan.

LUCIFER

VALLEY FALLS, KAN., JANUARY 22, 1886.

MORIS HARMAN & E. C. WALKER
EDITORS.
M. HARMAN AND GEO. H. 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.

Leavenworth, Kan.—H. H. Hutchenson.
Weir City, Kan.—Dr. J. B. Cooper.
Seamonsville, Kan.—J. McLaughlin.
Omaha, Neb.—James Griffith, 1712 Dodge St.
Carthage, Mo.—Watson Heston.
Joplin, Mo.—J. Henrichs & Bro.
Joplin, Mo.—(Enat)—Geo. H. Hutchinson.
Humboldt, Kan.—Wm. Rath.
Burlington, Kan.—Chris. Brown.
Garnett, Kan.—O. Greer.
Ottawa, Kan.—W. W. Prizer.
Cedar Junction, Kan.—J. C. Collins.
Burlington, Iowa.—Werner Backlin.
West Burlington, Iowa.—James Toft.
Bucross, Kan.—Chas. Dinunty.
Salina, Kan.—J. M. Itten.
Serranito, Kan.—John E. Young.
Carbondale, Kan.—James S. McDaniel.
Preston, Iowa.—John Durant.

THIS PAPER may be found on file at Geo. T. Jewell & Co's Newspaper Advertising Bureau, 66 Broadway, N. Y., where advertising contracts may be made for in NEW YORK.

RECEIPTS ON PRESS FUND.

The following persons have sent in their subscriptions to the press fund:
Previously acknowledged.....\$221.50
A Friend, 5.00

BRIEF COMMENT.

Congressman Toller gets in some telling points against the financial policy of the banker's government whose figure head is one Grover Cleveland. It makes comparatively little difference, however, so far as the interests of justice are concerned, whether mono-metalism or bi-metalism prevails in the national councils. The great wrong consists in making one, two or more metals the only basis of the nation's currency. The most gigantic crime of the age, perhaps, is the putting of the debt paying money of the country into the hands of professionals—into the hands of money-lenders who through the means afforded by the misfortune (or crime) of civil war have been enabled to impoverish the real producers and thereby enrich themselves to the tune of many thousands of millions of dollars. The saddest and most hopeless feature of the whole wretched business is that the great mass of the people cannot or will not see how it is that they have been robbed. They can not or will not see that the money sharks would have but little power for evil were it not for the machine called Government. They will not see that so long as government controls the currency just so long will the professional money-lender control both government and currency in his own interest.

Winter is the time to plan work for the coming season. A most important part of spring work is the setting out of trees, vines, bulbs etc., for fruit, shelter and ornament. One of the oldest and best known nurserymen of Kansas, is D. W. Cozad of LaCygne. We are in receipt of his catalogue for spring planting. He asks all who need anything in his line, to send him a list of what they need and let him give prices. He "guarantees perfect satisfaction in every deal."

If possible, call and examine his stock.

The leading article on first page, though rather long, will well repay a careful perusal by all who feel an interest in the discussion of principles underlying the problem of government.

When our Treasury officials yielded to the clamor of the bondholders, and violated the law by admitting their right to refuse silver received at the custom house in payment of the interest or principal of their bonds they degraded our standard silver dollar by depriving it of its most important function as a legal tender; and now having captured the executive branch of the government, the bondholders and their attorneys are besieging congress to enforce demand for gold alone in settlement of their claims, all law, justice and equity to the contrary notwithstanding, by striking down the silver of the value of July, 1870, which they then demanded and inserted in the face of every bond they hold as one of the coins in which the bonds should be paid. It is hard to do justice to their audacity in temperate language, I hardly think I am equal to the task and will not attempt it.—Senator Dick.

CIVIL MURDERS.

Last Friday seems to have been a red letter day in the judicial murder business—at least seven hangings according to law, being reported by the papers for that day. The details of these hangings are, to one reader at least, shocking and disgusting to the last degree. In one instance it is related that after the trap was sprung and the victim was supposed to be dead, or nearly so, he began to struggle violently, loosed his own hands and seized the rope above his head, so that it required the strength of the two attending physicians to hold down his hands till he could be legally choked to death! The killing of a human being under any circumstances is doubtless a shocking sight, but under no circumstances can it be more revolting to the sensitive mind than when it is done by the state and under the so called forms of law. In most cases of illegal or non-legal murder the killing is attended by some mitigating circumstance. The murderer acts in self-defense, or thinks he does; or, at least and worst, he commits the deed while under the influence of rage, of cupidity, of jealousy or of revenge. But murders by the state, such as the hangings alluded to, can claim no such mitigations. A public execution is a deliberate, a cold-blooded murder, without a single mitigating circumstance to plead its justification. To say that the deed is done in self-defense is to acknowledge that the state is not able to restrain the criminal from committing a like offense in the future. But this would be a confession of weakness or of cowardice. That public executions do not prevent the tendency to crime, but on the contrary rather aggravate it, is the experience of all time.

The Sunday Journal, (Kan. City, Mo.) in an editorial on these hangings, says:

Public executions have no effect in deterring crime, but rather encourage it in a few cases by hardening the sensibilities of the witnesses of the death, and again by inciting the weak minded and criminally disposed to crime because of the not infrequent boasts in which these cold orator indulges. There may, too, be thought by some that crime is the avenue to eternal reward, for there is never a victim on the scaffold who does not declare that through the trap-door of the scaffold he expects to enter into the kingdom of heaven.

As the Journal plainly indicates, it would certainly be legitimate to ask, in this connection, how much the clergy are responsible for the prevalence of crime, by preaching their moral-bankruptcy scheme, and by their habit of giving passports to heaven to those who are considered too bad to live any longer in this world.

Very truthfully and pertinently the Journal elsewhere remarks:

Friday's hangings were numerous, and there wasn't an exception where the victim did not assure the multitude that he was sure of spiritual elevation as soon as he was dropped. In this respect the victims of the law had and always do have, an advantage over the criminals' victims, for the law's mercy allows the criminal time to repent, while the criminal gives his victim no sort of a show.

Quite Suggestive.

\$700 REWARD:—This reward is offered for information leading to the capture of one Hiram C. Rider and Lolla Rollins, who left this city, McCook, Nebraska, about Christmas eve, 1885. Lolla Rollins is married, being the wife of the undersigned, who offers the reward.

Description of Rider: Age between 30 and 60 years, weight about 150 pounds, 5 feet 11 inches in height, heavy set, gray eyes, light gray hair, dark gray beard, slightly stooping, swaggering walk, always inclined to whittling. Description of woman: Brunette, weight 140 pounds, height medium, scar under one eye (mule kick), age 21 years, rather pretty—dressed: One purple satin dress, one dark cashmere. Address all information to W. M. ROLLINS McCook, Nebraska.

The Capital states that the above advertisement was sent to Marshal Sherman, of Topeka.

Had this adv. been preceded by a cut representing a woman with a bundle under her arm and accompanied by a man fleeing as for dear life, with a few bloodhounds in close pursuit, the whole would have been curiously suggestive, especially to those good people who believe that the only way to prevent a woman from "renting" herself is for her to be "owned" by some man. Let us pray, brothers and sisters, Bro. Searl will please invoke the divine blessing upon the dear old "institution."

Read to this office for the "Prodigal Daughter". Price, only ten cents.

THE CHINESE.

In the Burlington (Iowa) Justice of a few days ago, the editor, Max Poppe criticises "the Chinese," an editorial contributor who, in the same issue, gave a synopsis of Gertrude B. Keiley's article upon the Chinese question, which appeared in a recent Liberty, and of which mention was made in these columns. The editor concludes as follows:

The law of self-preservation is the first and most powerful impulse that controls humanity, and that law tells that the Chinese must go. There can be no compromise in this matter the Chinaman is a powerful weapon in the hands of American monopoly. And that weapon must be wrenched from its grasp.

On one side are arrayed the columns of organized labor, on the other combined capital, willing and anxious to open the flood-gates and overwhelm the country with countless hordes of Asiatic slaves. The gates must be kept closed.

There is no desire to fight, slay and burn capitalists. It is only necessary to break their power, to force them to grant to labor a just fair share of the wealth it creates, to force them to arbitrate the differences arising between them and the wage-workers. And to do this it is of the utmost importance that they be deprived of the means of forcing labor into submission, by cutting off the supply of the imported article. The Chinese must go.

It is true that the law of self-preservation is the primary and most powerful influence that directs the actions of men, but it may be most woefully mis-directed, and when it is used to impel to a crusade against the Chinese it is certain that we have an instance of such misdirection. The law of self-preservation declares that we must make common cause with our laboring brothers the world over if we would save ourselves from utter and abject subjection to the lords of land and money. Granting, for argument's sake, what we deny as a matter of fact, that Chinese immigration is, per se, an evil, yet our quarrel is not with the Chinese but with those who are instrumental in bringing them here. But Justice must not forget that the laborers of the world have been enslaved, are enslaved, by themselves, not as competitors in the labor market, but as foes upon the field of battle, ranked in opposing armies, under the banners of race, religion and nationality, by the scheming and unscrupulous kings and usurpers who live and riot upon their life blood. Mr. Poppe must accept one of the two propositions as true, either the world is over-populated and the men must fight like wild beasts for a foothold and food, or there is at present room for all, and the cause of the prevailing misery is rank injustice, to the overthrow of which our every energy should be directed.

This war against the Chinese is nothing but criminal folly, simply another example of how easily the people can be blinded and led to their own destruction. While it may be true, as Justice avers, that "There is no desire to fight, and slay capitalists," it is much to be feared that this is not because of any clear perception on the part of the laborers of the fact that there is a better way, but rather because they have yet a superstitious fear of authority; and this opinion is strengthened by the fact that so many of these same men are willing to "fight, slay and burn" the Chinese.

"Laborers of the world, unite!" Yes, unite, not against any particular division of your grand army, but against the common enslaver and robber of you all, Caucasian and Mongolian alike. Destroy the state, the keystone in the arch of oppression and monopoly.

Notes.

Henry Appleton is now editing the Newsman, organ of the Mutual News Company, Boston.

It is a query in the minds of some earnest prohibitionists why Attorney General Bradford, who has been so actively crusading against the saloons in Leavenworth and other large places, makes no attempt to close those in his own town and county. And while he was Prosecuting Attorney of that county the same state of affairs prevailed; the law was openly and continually violated.

It looks as though Mr. Bradford is in pursuit of great glory, and thinks that it is more easily to be found upon the nation-seen fields of Dodge City and Leavenworth than in the little towns of Osage county. His action and non-action alike illustrate the force, folly and criminality of prohibition.

Kansas has been severely afflicted so far this winter with the traveling

revivalist. He comes into town, fixes up his stage, employs his "supporters," and goes to work to earn his salary of fifty dollars or more per week. He'll fire, loud talk, violent gestures, magnetic manipulation, promises of pardon for all past transgressions,—win hundreds of the morally bankrupt, of the simple-minded, of the young, and his fame spreads far and wide.

Children are taught in these meetings that it is meritorious for them to disobey and persecute their parents for the dear Jesus' sake. Where the father is a Freethinker, the preacher-crazed mother and children annoy him in every way possible, burning his Liberal papers and books, and generally manifesting the intolerant and persecuting spirit of the true Christian.

E. C. Walker has resumed the junior editorship of Lucifer. Mr. Walker is an interesting, and, on subjects where his premises are correct, a logical, writer.—Truth Seeker.

Shure, now, Mither Macdonald, an' yees a soine pictyuro taker! Bedad, an if yerright, our own mithers woul'dn't know me from yer honor, from the illigant porthrait yees been afther drawing!

One revivalist was receiving fifty dollars per week; after several weeks' work, he decided to go away. The brethren offered him forty dollars if he would stay one week longer, but the lover of souls positively refused; he was agonizing to save the miserable sinners of from hell, but for the want of a paltry ten dollars they might go and be damned!

Among the provisions of the Edmund's Bill is one disfranchising the women of Utah. "A free ballot and fair count," has long been one of the battle cries of the Republican chiefs and their henchmen, and I suppose that to take the ballot from the women of the Territory of Utah and prevent any count at all, is a practical commentary thereon which should call forth our unqualified admiration. But some way it don't. It is another evidence of the rank dishonesty of politicians. In this case, Democrat and Republican vie with each other in baseness. W.

From H. A. Van Winkle.

AMUNGO, Kan., Jan. 4, A. D. 1886.
Anarchist seems to find "cheek, modesty, tyrants, fanatics, bigots, in almost every line I wrote;" about as near the truth as the claim that he has refuted a single allegation I made. I hope you and Anarchist will show you are not understood when your vagaries are exposed and that you do not assume to know more than others, that wisdom can only be found in your crowd, that you are the only reformers in the true sense of that word. I showed if you did away with the State you left everything in the hands of the local mob, and the most detestable and most unmitigated despotism that could exist; that the primitive condition of man was savage and brutal, that such an idea as rights in property did not exist, that when family ties began to be respected progress and civilization became a possibility and until then woman had no rights that men were bound to respect. That the State was the child of civilization and also the law of marriage by which woman received all the protection that man ever conceded to woman. That each and every nation and people have decided that individual ownership of land was a necessity; if mistakes had been made in that respect they could be corrected; that the production of raw material does not require near the amount of labor that the preparation of the same for use to mankind required, yet in all the above you claim your conclusions are superior to that of the civilized world. Anarchist by one sweep of his pious hand demolishes the verdict of civilized man (is he not a modest man?) and Lucifer claims Paine and Jefferson as favoring Anarchism. Did they live a lie all their lives by owning land and other property, and devise and dispose of the same by will? What a libel on those great men has Lucifer published to an intelligent world.

That when the State allows an individual to speculate in land, or it monopolizes the issuing of the currency or charters transportation, manufacturing and mining companies, it invades the rights and interests of every man, woman and child in the land. The gentleman is anxious to write himself an ignorant, and after this he should certainly adorn himself with a very large pair of ears

As to charters for the above purposes in Kansas it is a free thing, when any member of persons who wish may draw a charter for any of the purposes above named, file it in the office of the secretary of state, and when they comply with the law they then can open books for stock in said company; any one who wishes to can subscribe stock; when enough stock has been taken and paid up they can proceed to business, gives no more rights to those thus combined than any one person who may be able to go into said business, so nobody's rights are invaded. Corporations have done more to promote civilization than all other factors in operation among men, enable Kansas to send her bread stuffs, beef, pork, &c., to any portion of the world; the telegraph and telephones to communicate with the whole world. If it were not for them Kansas would not be the home of more than a million of prosperous, happy people, but would be cut off from a busy commercial world, poor, disconsolate and worthless, hanging on the ragged edge of despair. As to the money question, the word has decided the case against free money; let every fellow try his hand at money making, would it not be glorious? We would soon have wagon loads of it, handle it by the scoopful, and then dump it and the authors thereof in the nearest mill pond, both being too worthless for any use whatever.

(To be concluded next week.)

REMARKS.

In a previous letter friend Van Winkle said: "You have formed yourselves into a mutual admiration society." The best answer to this charge is the fact that we admit to our columns such articles as the above. If "admiration" or adulation were our chief desire we should certainly exclude all correspondents who so persistently and glaringly misrepresent our teachings as does our venerable Arringtonian. Were it not that courtesy to all, both friend and foe, is one of our cardinal rules of conduct we should be tempted to designate these misrepresentations of anarchism and apologies for governmentalism, as did Prince Hal when rebuking Falstaff's "men-in-Buckram" stories: "gross as a mountain, open, palpable!" So open and palpable, indeed, that we think no answer is really needed for those of our readers who have carefully read the teachings of Lucifer in regard to Anarchism and co-operative self government. Inasmuch, however, as so many have given little or no attention to those principles and arguments—inasmuch as most of those who have been emancipated from the thralldom of religious creeds, still worship at the shrine of that child of the Church—the State—we propose, as time and space permit, to continue to show what it is that Anarchism, as we understand the word, really teaches. In doing this we shall probably use parts of this Arrington letter as a text. For the present we respectfully refer friend Van Winkle, to the very able article of comrade Broadbeck, on first page of this issue, as our answer, in a general way, to his criticisms. H.

The Whisky Question.

Ed's Letter: In yours of Jan. 1st, Mr. E. C. Walker, in reply to some questions proposed by the writer, says, "The Anarchist is laboring to take away the causes that lead to all forms of drunkenness by making men free and responsible. ... Scientific limitation of human reproduction. ... Making woman sovereign of herself." We differ then about the remedial agents to be employed to remove the disease from human society, but both have the same object in view—the elevation of mankind. Mr. Walker, with his anarchistic and socialist theory, concludes that the fault is all with our mode of government. Or rather that we have too much government and, that the true remedy is to "make men free and responsible." He concludes that men have inherent goodness enough to act right without any government of force. Mr. Walker would open up the saloons again in Valley Falls, let whisky men be "free" to dish out their slop beer and drugged whisky even to boys only nine years old, as they have done, but make them "responsible"? How would he make men responsible whose morals are of the lowest grade, mean, sneaking contemptible liars, thugs and gamblers! Have such men got any conscience? To keep up their trade they would drag an angel down!

Mr. Walker would abolish the "Sly System," he would let down the bars completely, let these men go on in their own way educating our young men and boys to become drunkards from nine years old, up! Oh, it is so sneaking and contemptible to have any system of police or detective or public protection at all. Leave the screens half open and hot-house flowers blooming on each side the billiard balls rattling, the beer glasses clinking, the loud gaffaws, coarse ruffianism

onaths and blackguard jokes go on! little boys and youths being contaminated every hour! Make them responsible you say. How?

The Anarchist is opposed to a government of force or authority. Moral suasion is his antidote for all the ills of humanity.

As to making women "sovereigns" and queens of themselves, that may come when men are kings and conquerors of their own passions.

As to "scientific limitation of the population," you will have to make the whole human race scientific first; which at least is a big job and a long way off.

Bro. Walker insinuates that I am a Christian; I plead not guilty, I am also as far from being an Anarchist. Please put me down as a Free-thinker who has no wild, impracticable theory.

J. W. GIBSON.

IT IS NEEDLESS to go over the ground before traversed step by step. My protest against all forms of legislative meddling is the protest of nature against whatever interferes with her processes of growth and elimination. Viciousness has entrenched itself behind the ramparts of Authority, and through the fostering care of law has survived the vicissitudes of time and the warfare of good men. These men are depraved? Yes. Liars? Yes, often. Have such men got any conscience? Yes, and more, they are oftentimes the first and most generous in their response to the cry of suffering. They are not refined, it is true, but neither are they covered over with a thin veneer of culture, which illy serves to cover the rottenness beneath. Their vices are of the same kind as those of so many of their active persecutors, but they assume a conser form and partake more of the lusty rankness of untamed nature. Of course it is not so aesthetically to drink beer out of a "schooner" at the bar of a saloon, as it is to sip wine at the communion service or take it at one's own sideboard.

These men can be influenced for good, as has been proven time and again, but you have never, through all the ages, succeeded in suppressing by the terrors and rigors of the law, the evils of which they are the active victims. Legislation has been your panacea, from century to century, and yet, by your own confession, these men are here and they baffle you at every turn. Suppose that you set self-esteem to one side long enough to permit some other method of reform to be tried. Governmentalists have had practical control of this planet so long that we are justified in attributing a great portion of human ills to their system, so-called.

Mr. Gibson is very careful not to touch upon any of the other great causes of misery of which I made mention. In this he is more worldly wise than fair. If one vice may rightfully be suppressed by law, then all may, and so we have no possible limit to the surveillance of law in the domain of private affairs.

Moral suasion is only one of the factors which the Anarchist regards as potential in the development of a nobler type of manhood. Education—physical, mental and moral—industrial independence, freedom of social conditions, destruction of superstition, hope, regret,—these are all essential to the improvement of the race, and none of them nor any other beneficial agency can do much when trammelled by and subordinate to the crippling and killing letter of the law.

If all that Mr. G. can say against woman's sovereignty of herself is that men are not kings and conquerors of their own passions, then he must admit that the case is here, for so long as men can not control themselves the greater is the need that woman should be absolute mistress of herself, and simply as a matter of self-defense. While there was nothing in this "argument" of Mr. G.'s against liberty, it is equally true of all that has been or can be said in antagonism to the freedom of man and woman.

Yes, so far as Mr. G.'s methods of reform are concerned, he is a Christian. He may not accept the Christian doctrine of total depravity, but he believes in human depravity to such an extent that, to his mind, a club is the best of all agencies for the suppression of vice.

In view of the indisputable fact that law has been relied upon as the chief means whereby to make men better and has proved itself a lamentable failure; and in view of the further fact that Mr. G. still believes in this played-out cure-all, I think that I am justified in saying that he does have a "wild, impracticable theory."

W.

Erratum.

In Comrade James' last article, in the 42nd line "social vices" should have been "vicious vices."

* Any person wishing to trade lands in Kansas for property in Southern California can hear of a chance to do so by addressing B. F. Hilliker, Lawrence, Kan.

Dr. Severance On "Ownership."

EDITOR LUCIFER: In your paper of January 1st, Mr. Searl makes some very frank confessions; one is that he "knows of nothing but that would suffer by comparison with Free Love." That is just what I think. Nothing suffers by comparison with a thing unless that thing be infinitely itself its superior.

He however goes back on that assertion when he writes in favor of our marriage system, which he says "is a civil contract in which husband and wife have and hold a mutual ownership in each other." Such is not the fact; but a man owns his wife without her owning him, as is plainly set forth by the following decision of a case by Judge Dodge of Ohio, who in his decision uses this language: "A husband has a pecuniary, a property interest in his wife; a father in his children. A father can recover damages against a man who seduces his daughter, but a mother can not. She has no property in her, is not entitled to her wages. The father is the head of the family, but the wife does not own the husband, the child does not own the father. I hold the child can not sue for an injury to the father, nor a wife for an injury to the husband; but he can sue any one who takes her away from him, who harbors her, or injures her, because she is his own. The husband enforces his claim to his wife by striking down every one who interferes with his right to her. He owns her, and dars the world to meddle with her. The law protects him in holding her. But the wife looks to the husband. The law does not permit her to go forth to smite the seducer of her husband nor the man or woman who entices him away."

So Mr. Searl may learn what he never knew before, that it is no mutual ownership. A Southern slave holder might as justly have made the claim that he and his slave mutually owned each other, as does the man who claims that husbands and wives mutually own each other. Besides, what right has any human being to own another? Humanity is not a merchantable commodity, and any such pretended ownership is a tyranny that no person should tolerate for a moment.

Is it not refreshing to hear a man in the 19th century compare his wife to a field, which, if he owns, he will keep well fenced? Yes, the main business has been for husbands to attend to seeing the fences well kept and as high as possible about their wives, while they on the outside of the field prance about to their liking. If the idea of ownership for life is the thing to insure love, why are our homes, which have always been based upon this ownership principle, so devoid of love as every intelligent observer knows them to be? Our marriage system which friend Searl admires so much, allows a man to abuse his wife in the most fiendish manner, even to committing upon her a crime so atrocious that if he should escape lynching it would consign him to a dungeon cell for years, anywhere else but in marriage. He may commit, under sanction of this infamous law, this crime against his wife every night and the law recognizes it as his "marital right," and her "marital duty" to submit, and I have known innumerable instances where the beginning of a new existence took place when the wife was so indignant at the outrage upon her that she felt as though she could kill the man, and yet she spoke no word, in fact, had no redress, for he owned her. I could fill this paper with accounts that have come to my ears from the lips of these poor victims of this accursed system of slavery, that would make the outrages once committed upon southern slaves pale before them, and in the face of this we are told that no man claims the right to abuse his wife in a civilized country! Every man who advocates our marriage system virtually claims that right, and if he does not abuse his wife he is better than the laws he advocates. When any man calls Free Love prostitution, he writes himself down an ignoramus, for prostitution is, according to Owen, "sexual intercourse without affection," or as Webster defines it, "for a consideration," for some other reason than love and mutual desire; for example, to please a husband, or to prevent him from straying into pastures new, or for a home, and our legal prostitutes are the most numerous, and the most dangerous to society because of their recognized respectability. Does Mr. Searl believe in total depravity, that he assumes that if a woman owned her own body she would be ready to offer it to every man she met, and that without "fencing in" she would riot in excesses? That is a libel on womanhood. And I think if every man knew that instead of owning

the woman he loved she was his only so long as he could call out her affection by his noble character and tender consideration, love relations would be far more enduring than now, because he would be put on his good behavior. The most enduring, tender heavenly relations I have ever known have been based upon this principle, and with no feeling of ownership, and just in proportion as mankind becomes advanced and able to comprehend and live according to the principles advocated by Free Love—not those attributed to them by their enemies—will happy homes become the rule instead of, as now, the exception. The woman will be free, which means neither owned nor rented.

Yours sincerely,
JULIUS H. SEVERANCE, M. D.

Not "Race Prejudice."

HENRI B. ARMAND reports the feeling in California against the Chinese is one of race prejudice. I reiterate—being in a position to know—that it is not. By what authority does he claim to deny what every intelligent person in California knows to be a fact?

He thinks Californians have no right to object to the presence of Chinese because they tolerate or permit land and railroad robberies. It is the presence of Chinese here that facilitates these. Has a person no right to object to the introduction of yellow fever or small pox into his house because some of his family have colds and head aches?

Were Mr. Armand's ideas as to Chinese to be carried out by opening the flood-gates, we should have 100,000,000 here in a few years. And were there but 10,000,000, every effort to break the bonds of the monopolies by asserting natural rights would be most effectively crushed.

Many of us in California are seeking to get rid of the other evils mentioned by Mr. A. with all our might. But where one person can be induced to see the underlying causes of these, a hundred realize the nature of the Chinese pest. And did they not—were they such moral sentimental theorists as Mr. A. seems to be—the Mongolian flood would very soon render any resistance to the encroachments of monopoly, any assertion of the rights of labor, perfectly and utterly hopeless. That this is so we here know, and it is because we know it and others do not, that we stand as a picket-guard. Because our present civilization is bad, it is no reason we try to make it worse, as Mr. A. is doing; but it is a good reason why we should try to make it better, by keeping out elements destitute of even a spark of progress, crushed under the weight of thousands of years of unmitigated oppression.

We pity these poor men, but we can only help them by taking care of ourselves. A man in a vessel or on shore can rescue a drowning man much better by throwing him a rope than by jumping into the sea, with the probable result of being dragged under by the unreasoning grasp of the unfortunate he tries to rescue. So Americans can better help other races by keeping the little ground they have gained than by jumping into the sea of unlimited labor competition to resens them. Let us have a true republic in the United States, through an elevation of labor and a genuine proportional ballot and all other nations must, sooner or later, follow suit. But if we make Chinamen of ourselves and our posterity, we are helpless and hopeless. Eureka, Cal. ARNOLD CHADGE.

"FREE COUNTRY?" SEARCHED.

A hard-working, competent artisan in an eastern State, writes as follows:

"If I possibly can get a subscriber or two I will be only too glad to do it, but don't send any more papers, or other printed matter—as I wrote once before—for my employers would discharge me if they knew I supported them."

I am a slave. I would not be if I were a single man, but I am for the sake of those who look to me for bread."

I note this for the sole purpose of awakening a thought in the brains of those men who call themselves Liberals, but who yet shrink in horrified dismay from the discussion of the living issues of the time. A Liberal paper which does not devote all of its space to the thrashing of the old theological chaff is an object of suspicion with them, if not of private contempt or loathing. Fed from their babyhood upon the life-giving milk of the 10th of July apostles, they really think that we of America are a free people, and shut their eyes to all facts which disprove this assertion.

This man's case is not an isolated one; he is only one of a great army of laborers, held by their affections and duties toward their families in the bonds of an exasperating and degrading slavery. Free country? Scarcely. Truly, W.

ORGANIZATION.

We are in receipt of a rather extended communication on this subject from our good friend and worker in the ranks of Free thought, C. S. Wood, of Sioux City, Iowa. Press of matter prevents the insertion of the entire article in this issue. The following paragraphs give the leading ideas of the writer:

EDITOR LUCIFER: I am very much interested in the organization of Liberals; not for our own pleasure, or to advertise ourselves to the world, but for hard work; to benefit ourselves and humanity; and be protected in so doing. I think it would be best to organize a secret society, with definite objects and aims. We have been tearing down old theology about long enough; it is time we commenced to build something better. The masses will not generally submit to having the old superstitious structures torn down and the rubbish all removed and cleared away before commencing to build anew. They have not the patience to stand out in the cold and storm of the world and wait for the grand results. It is best to build the new before tearing down the old.

Why secrecy is necessary. The laws of nature work silently and immutably. No bulletin-board foretells the dissolution and creation of worlds; neither do the living or the dead reveal the mysteries of life. All a mystery; and mystery gives rise to superstition, superstition to belief, and belief to theories maintained by ignorance. Ignorance in its turn becomes the tool of higher intelligence. The wise keep their own counsel, and profit by the follies of others. The fool, like the hound after its prey, gives mouth to his plans, and by revealing his aims is thwarted in his designs.

Secrecy is necessary so that every question can be discussed which is of vital importance to ourselves and posterity, to our advancement and development. To right these wrongs we must start at the bottom of the ladder and take them up step by step, must touch the alphabet first; we must be able to show them that our plan of life is best; we must have something superior to the old church method, and old systems of government. But the teachers, the educators must have room for development; a chance to discuss the different methods; in fact to learn before they can teach others, and to do so it must be done in secret, and why? Simply from the fact that the conflicting interests of society compels it. We must of a necessity be working against established religious and governments, and consequently against the interests of the rich monopolists of church and state forces. And if we (like the foolish hound) work openly, they will thwart our every effort and design.

By working in secret the general public will only see the results without knowing the means by which we attain them and will honestly seek to learn our methods, and in joining our societies they will be compelled to commence with "A," and advance step by step, no sudden shocking of opinions or breaking of cherished idols, but everything slowly, surely and in order.

Secrecy is also necessary from the fact that most of us depend more or less upon the patronage of, or association with, the ignorant or prejudiced, our children must have bread, we also must have means with which to carry on the work.

My letter is already getting too long; I will just mention a few of the benefits to be derived, and close.

Education; Mutual Association and Acquaintance; Co-operation; Self-government.

I will be glad to explain many of the advantages more fully if desired; also to correspond with those who wish to discuss the means whereby we may establish a better mode of life here and now, and by the aid of Co-operation and its attendant accumulation and improvement upon nature, to eventually make a paradise upon earth, where poverty shall be unknown, and where the last enemy that shall be conquered is death.

C. S. WOOD.

Teachings of Spiritualists.

Spiritualists want salvation in this world, then in the next world they will have it because they will take it with them. The worst man that ever lived does not deserve unending, hopeless suffering. Give everybody a chance either here or in the hereafter. Be guided in every action more by the inward voice than by any external direction, inasmuch as the external is not the real, and the internal is the true reality. A heaven that is haunted and disturbed by the wails and shrieks of far off or near by misery is not the kind of a place that Spiritualists go to when they leave this world. Our spirit associates, like our earthly companions are of our own choosing. If we prefer the vicious and depraved there will be no trouble in finding such in either world.—Light in the West.

HOME NOTES AND NEWS.

BY THE INFANT.

Mr. J. W. Gibson made this office a pleasant call Friday.

Mr. John McMillenman, of Kansas City, was in town Wednesday.

There has been more good sleighing this winter than for years past.

Mr. C. Denner, one of Oswego's best citizens, was a pleasant caller last Tuesday.

A lecture by an Esquimaux lady was the attraction the first of the week at the Museum—oh no, we mean the M. E. church.

Ottawa has a set of blue laws. The mayor has issued an edict closing butcher shops, barber shops, stores and livery stables, on Sunday. It also prohibits pleasure riding on that day.

The Junior reports good success considering the inclement weather, for his first week's work on his winter campaign as canvasser. For lecture engagements, the friends in Southern Kansas and Missouri, will still address him at Valley Falls.

We like to have our friends call in and see us at any time, but it is a very different thing for people to come in, pick up a paper and commence to read aloud, or get into heated discussions in the office. Of course they do so unwittingly but it is a great annoyance all the same. Our office is always open to our friends to come in and read our exchanges, but please remember that we have to work, and in order to work, must have quiet.

Last Sunday afternoon a pawnbroker, of Kansas City, got a couple of small children to take a sleigh ride, their mother consenting, saying he was only going as far as the post-office, but instead drove to Independence and from there into the woods. After driving over the country till the horse gave out, and turning the sleigh over several times, he left it, and walked to the house of a farmer, some three miles distant. There he told the family that he had left a sleigh and two children somewhere in the woods, but the folks could not get him to state where they were. A young lady and her brother started to find them, although it was then past three o'clock in the morning. They found the children covered up with the robes in the sleigh, and took them to the house. It turns out that the man was insane. The 2nd's reporter says the children were "providentially saved." Strange that providence did not prevent their going, or "save" the men from becoming insane.

Government and Thief.

The New York Truth Seeker makes an effort to answer "X's" editorial, "Institution Hidden." Doubtless "X" will give this effort due and satisfactory attention hereafter. Meanwhile I may remark the Truth Seeker's statement that, when the Anarchist proposes to imprison a thief without his consent, he proposes to set up an institution as really a government as any we now have. Now, it seems to me that just the opposite is the truth, and that the Anarchist, in proposing to imprison the thief without his consent, is fighting precisely on the line of no-government. Why? Because in the supposed case the thief is the government. A government is any power which seeks to impose its will upon others and stand away their rights. The very first act of nearly all governments is precisely that of which the thief is guilty,—the taking of property without the consent of the owner. They who resist the highway-robber are just as truly opposing government as they who resist the tax-collector. And when the compulsory State resists the highway robber and imprisons him, the spectacle is furnished of one thief struggling with and punishing another. When a thief attempts to take the property of another, he undertakes to govern, to impose his will; and if the intended victim and those whom he can get to help him offer any resistance, they become robbers against government, and so far Anarchists. So, when the State attempts to collect a tax, or when it imprisons D. M. Bennett in the Albany penitentiary for expressing his opinions, it undertakes to govern, to impose its will; and the victims of this thief and tyrant are likewise robbers and so far Anarchists, if they resist. The Anarchist is opposed to all thieves and all governments because they are invaders, and against all of them he claims the right of self-defence. To call the exercise of this right government is to betray an entire misapprehension of the nature of government. Those who voluntarily associate to exercise this right are as far removed from the institutions called governments, which assume to control the conduct of everybody within their so-called jurisdictions and to make them pay the cost of this control, as the sun is from the earth. I have pointed this out before to Editor Macdonald in reply to substantially the same objection. And yet he complains that I do not answer him. Really it is he who refuses to answer me,—except, that is, by repeating himself. I cannot undertake to answer the same thing oftener than once in three months, as long as I can find more important matter with which to fill these columns.—Liberty.

