



# LUCIFER.

## THE LIGHT-BEARER.

NEW SERIES, VOL. 5, No. 17.

VALLEY FALLS, KANSAS, FRIDAY, AUGUST 12, E. M. 287.

WHOLE No. 211.

### LUCIFER--THE LIGHT-BEARER.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY.

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

All letters should be addressed to LUCIFER, Valley Falls, Kansas.  
No communications inserted unless accompanied by the real name of the author.  
Each writer is alone responsible for the opinions, advice or statements made by him.

### Bible Temperance.

THE BIBLE AND THE WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION.  
AN EXAMINATION

OF THE CLAIM OF MODERN CHRISTIANS THAT THE BIBLE IS A TEMPERANCE WORK.  
By E. O. WALKER.

CONTENTS:  
Prefatory Note; Introduction; List A.—Passages Unequivocally Condemning the use of Wine. List B.—Passages Commending or Endorsing the use of Wine or Strong Drink, or both, or including a Plentiful supply of Wine among the Blessings to be bestowed upon favored individuals or tribes, etc., or including the deprivation of it among the punishments inflicted upon the disobedient. List C.—Passages Conditionally Condemning the use of Wine, etc., upon Stated Occasions, by Certain Persons upon Certain Occasions, etc. List D.—Passages which incidentally mention the use of Wine and Strong Drink without either Condemning or Commending Them. List E.—Passages Showing that Scripture Wine Was Intoxicant. Conclusion.

"Every honest and rational movement in favor of temperance is to be commended, but this nauseating stuff called 'Bible Temperance' is unbearable. I have long felt that this sham ought to be punctured. It has been done at last, and most effectively done by the logical pen of E. O. Walker."  
JOHN E. REMSDUNG.

Price, per copy..... \$0.10  
Per dozen..... \$1.00

Address, WALKER & HARMAN  
Valley Falls, Kans.

### FOWLER'S PAMPHLETS!

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

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

PROHIBITION. An unanswerable argument against summary methods in temperance reform.

CORPORATIONS. With Special Reference to Railroads. The difference between Corporations and Co-operation.

CO-OPERATIVE HOMES. Status of the family; sexual ethics of marriage; mission of the co-operative home; influence upon maternity; status of children; children's rights; material richness; cost of consumption; division of labor; social economy; sickness; woman's status; the dividing line; practical considerations; associated homes, etc., etc.

Land Tenure. The government's relation to the land; commercial rents, interest rent, utility of arbitrary legislation, policy of natural methods, colonization, country rents, use of equal liberty, equal right, usury, vs. administration, size and character of cities, land tenure the index or civilization, list of land grants.

Price, 7 cents each, the six for 35 cents.  
Address, WALKER & HARMAN,  
Valley Falls, Ka.

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

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

E. L. SENFT,  
PHYSICIAN AND SURGEON.  
Valley Falls, Kan.

Dr. Senft uses "Electric Specific Medicine," Office over Evans & Kemper's store.  
Westrup's Financial Problem, price 15 cts. For sale here.

THE COMING DAWN.  
Not yet the night of superstition's error  
Bath wholly faded from our brightening skies;  
Old vague beliefs still hold the world in terror,  
Still through the darkness rise earth's wailing cries.

Still is the influence of a falsehood sending  
Its baneful poison through the human mind;  
And stricken hearts, 'neath weight of sorrow  
bending,  
Implore a phantom, deaf, and dumb and blind.  
Still man gropes blindly, on his knees, yet  
seeking  
For some reversal of unerring laws;  
Still do the unreasoning hug their idol,  
keeping  
"The faith that rested in a 'first great cause.'"

Still does the church deplore thought's  
revolution,  
Denouncing still the growing light she fears;  
The coals of hate, the fires of persecution,  
Still smolder through the ashes of the years.

A book is still held paramount to nature;  
Judges coerced, and statutes passed through  
fear;  
And wild tradition, with each trembling  
creature  
Outweighs all evidence, all reason clear.

But we can faintly see the first gleams  
breaking  
Across our way, as darkness disappears,  
And read at last, from error's sleep awaking,  
Hope's promise written in the coming years.  
The right must triumph; every chain that  
fetters  
The mind's full freedom shall dissolve at last.  
And on time's scroll the truth shall shine in  
clear  
Brighter for all the darkness of the past.

And thus our ears can catch the growing  
murmur,  
"The onward voice of all the centuries past;  
The rising sea, that, stretching stronger,  
triumphs,  
Shall roll resistless in its pride at last.

The flood-tide coming from thought's bound-  
less ocean,  
That drenches touches every age and clime;  
The faint, low wash of waves in constant  
motion,  
Still beating, beating, on the shore of time!

When man lays by the long-borne imposition  
That makes of him a wretched trembling  
slave,  
And falsehood's creed, and ignorant super-  
stition  
Find in oblivion their dishonored grave;

When led by truth to discard ancient errors  
That serpent-like, have crushed us fold on  
fold,  
We leave behind our priest taught childish  
terrors,  
Then shall we clearly life's true end behold.

Then shall we rise to grander heights, and  
giving  
Humanity the love we have denied it, find  
In the world's work, and justice to the living,  
Nobler employment for our heart and mind.

Then shall we gladly hail our new existence,  
And looking backward from our heights at  
last,  
Shudder to see, along the growing distance,  
The desert waste through which the race  
has passed.

And turning thence our gaze shall linger  
longer—  
The light of joy and progress on each brow—  
Where on foundations broader, deeper,  
stronger,  
The temple of our hope is building now.

The temple of the future, where, rejoicing,  
A race redeemed from mental slavery's  
blight,  
Shall celebrate the people's advent, voicing  
Humanity's religion, truth and right.

Two world still moves, the clearing sky grows  
brighter,  
Creeds die, kings rot, thrones crumble into  
dust,  
But the great heart of hope is beating lighter,  
Inspired by higher works of love and trust.

Slowly before the rising sun of science  
The mist that cloud man's intellect move  
on,  
And radiant with conviction's calm reliance  
We hail the brightness of the Coming Dawn!

By LOUIS BOND,  
In Truth Seeker Annual, 287.

### Unity of Reform.

The effort to obtain social reform has gone hand in hand with that for political and religious freedom; the victors in the latter have been the soldiers in the former. Discussion on the Population Question is not yet safe; legal penalty threatens those who advocate the restriction of birth instead of the destruction of life; the same penalty was braved by our leaders in the last generation, and we have only to follow in their steps in order to conquer as they conquered and become sharers of their crown. We work for the redemption of the poor, for the salvation of the wretched; the cause of the people is the sacreddest of all causes, and is the one which is the most certain to triumph, however sharp may be the struggle for the victory. —Annie Besant, "The Law of Population."

### Is Anarchy Inevitable?

"In these days there was no king in Israel; every man did that which was right in his own eyes" (Judges xxi, 25).

Here we find Israel in a complete state of Anarchy; and, perhaps, entirely unable to account for it. Nor do we find from the meager account that blood flowed more freely at that time than when kings with iron tyranny swayed to and fro the submissive Israelites.

Now, these questions I ask, and in good faith: Are we unconsciously drifting toward Anarchy? Is it a natural result of social evolution? Can the individual check the natural course of social evolution, any more than society can exist without the individual? Why I ask this is, that just now so many individuals are making the grandest efforts of their lives to shoo away Anarchy. It is the natural result of social evolution, then I, for one, do not intend wasting energy on the inevitable; or, in common parlance, shall refuse to be one of the shoosers.

Look into the past, and what do we see? It is not yet a decade of years since two hundred thousand people made an unprecedented appeal to have a law revoked that cast D. M. Bennett and E. H. Heywood in dungeons. More than twelve thousand letters were addressed to the president, beseeching him to pardon the former. This was an earnest appeal for the Anarchy of individual morality; that is, the right to print and circulate thoughts on morality as entertained by the individual. "No restrictive laws," was the cry.

When we cry too much law, as thousands, yes, hundreds of thousands do; when we succeed in repealing just one obnoxious statute; when we tell people to violate the law to do away with it—as, for instance, the hotel-keepers of your city were recently advised by eminent counsel to do—has not just one more step been taken toward Anarchy?

Has it not been said, and wisely, too, that the advance of nations lies in the repealing of laws, not in their enactment? Then must not nations advance through what seems to be but a kind of Anarchal evolution?

If the time comes—and who says it will not come—when more laws are repealed than enacted, Anarchy then must be inevitable.

Some of our most brilliant and logical minds have almost as much as intimated this. Col. Robert G. Ingersoll, whose thorough knowledge of law no one will deny, has said, in one of his heartfelt sermons to the struggling masses of laborers, that, after all, with every recourse to law, they soon will discover how little can be accomplished by it.

Now, I do not mean to infer that Mr. Ingersoll has ever as much as intimated the dilute aroma of Anarchy, but does he not intimate that a greater, a grander sense of justice must exist among men than that which law can give, before men will cease stealing each other's labor by a system in whose shadows the faded reflections of chattel slavery are totally lost, when alongside this huge monster—white slavery?

Is it not possible that he in the dim distance sees that coveted haven of human love, plenty, and rest, whither our colossal social ship is quietly drifting, yet cannot name it?

There are others, who are ever active in the struggle against law. Mrs. Foote, Sr. and Jr., in making their able appeal to the legislature of this state not to pass another of Comstock's infamous bills, bitterly fought law; and, if successful, they have but scored another victory for Anarchy. Though they may be displeased, or even still more, disgusted, with my attempt to paint their acts with Anarchy, yet to prevent the enactment, to rescind, to condemn, to violate a law, is it not Anarchal? Perhaps I do not rightly understand Anarchy, but the general diagnosis of it is the

gradual doing away with law, when finally that state shall be reached, as in Israel; "Every man did that which was right in his own eyes."

From Kansas what do we hear? Well, only that the individual and law cannot harmonize. E. O. Walker and Lillian Harman recognized the priority of natural law to man's. To elaborate further: that divine and artificial law are powerless to change natural law. Hence, their autonomic marriage, which is but a struggle for Anarchy.

Later still, and what do we hear from Virginia? That law is justice and justice is law? No; but that law has invaded the most sacred right of the individual—the right to tell to another the opinions held on sex matters, under seal. Mrs. Elmina D. Slenker is a human sex evolutionist, and has the same right to express herself in understandable English—yes, just as much so—as the fish, bird, or dog sex evolutionist has to express himself.

Here, there—yes, almost everywhere—comes the unison cry: "Defend her against the tyranny of law with thought and action, pen and purse." This cry, though a supremely just one, is but the cry of Anarchy. It is the struggle against law by a combination of individuals determined to hold forever the inviolability of individuality. Here the Anarchist and individualist have fraternally locked arms to rescue individuality from the destroyer—law. Am I right?

Dr. McGlynn, who scorns the pope and his church law, and bravely accepts excommunication rather than yield up his cherished individuality, has dodged law, seeking freedom through the same Anarchal road that leads to a future as bleak as the past.

As I said before, these few questions are asked in good faith, and from a desire for information. It is possible that a few people have discovered the direction in which we are drifting, and hanging men, imprisoning women, and crushing babies will no more arrest the natural course of things than it can restrain the earth from making its daily revolutions. RAY D. CHAPMAN,  
In Truth Seeker.

### Traveling to Royalty.

The exhibition of sycophancy and fetich worship which has taken place in Great Britain this week is a spectacle for gods and men. It is a doleful commentary upon the advance of civilization and the diffusion of education that in almost the last decade of the nineteenth century the great body of the English people (it would be unfair to suppose that there are not many Englishmen to whom all this is utterly disgusting) should go into spasms of adulation over a woman of whom the very best that can truthfully be said is that she has never flagrantly outraged any of the obvious proprieties of life.

Victoria Guelph is, as well as her personality can be got at, a greedy, grasping, narrow-minded, commonplace woman, who never did a useful thing in her life, unless to serve the purpose of a legal fiction that might just a well have been served by a wax figure from Madame Tussaud's show. Yet a great people hasten to prostrate themselves before her, and to thank her with honors that fall little short of adoration for having permitted them so long to support her and her family, and rejoice over the fiftieth anniversary of her accession to the position of royal figurehead, as though it marked some great national deliverance. —N. Y. Standard.

Exactly as formerly at the South the whole white race imposed the same on the negro slaves and other low trash, engendered there by slavery, so now we have swarms of native American men, in town and country—strong, able-bodied men—who live by cheap office-holding or office-seeking, which somehow seems to pay with many, who can manage to be on the winning side. Such, or similar, do nothing useful or needful, with brain or hand; teach nothing necessary; produce nothing valuable; aspire to nothing honorable; but seem to despise good, honest, productive work, and those who do it, and thus keep them in their worthless existence. —Parker Pillsbury, Plague and Peril of Monopoly.

They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety. —Ben. Franklin.

### Agnostic "Conversions."

Strange, is it not, that nearly all alleged conversions of Agnostics evaporate when you come to examine them closely. We have all heard of thousands of cases, but few (if any) have ever been verified or verifiable. I have often myself tried to verify some of these stories of alleged conversions, but always with the same result. The Agnostic who was said to have recanted turned out to have been no Agnostic at all. He was generally a person who had lived his life up to the time of his conversion without religion of any kind; had never given his mind to religion; was usually dissipated and of worthless moral character. When he is finally converted, the trumpet proclaims that an Infidel is reclaimed. Is it needless to point out that there is a mighty difference between the dissipated nondescript and the educated Agnostic? I don't believe a single instance can be shown where the latter has recanted his heresy and returned to the Christian fold. He knows the character of the creed he has forsaken too well. He knows its foundations of superstition, its superstructure of charity and hypocrisy, its greed of place and power, its remorseless and yawning gulf of selfishness and jealousy. Knowing these so well he is never desirous of committing an act of mental suicide by deliberately renouncing liberty and freedom for the old thralldom. When we hear of a case where he has done so it is generally away off in some foreign country, and consequently not readily verifiable. An educated Agnostic embracing the superstition of Christianity would be a phenomenon well worthy of being carefully examined. —"Alasius," in Secular Thought.

### Social Ethics.

For every evil there is a remedy. And it is our proper business to find the remedies and apply them. Yes. Well the faults of our social system are in our institutions more than in man's depraved nature. Yes. Well, we should have heaven, or a state of happiness, on earth, if the conditions were all favorable? I suppose so. But any child or any other person in a proper condition, and he will do right. When the horse balks and goes backwards when we want him to go forwards, shall we say his nature was depraved? And try to get God to change it? No.

And is not man's nature as good as that of a horse? Your team is faulty—so is your social system. Your wagon and its load are an institution gotten up by man. Your load may be too heavy, or a shoulder may be sore, or a knot or a rope may be hurting the poor animal; but its nature is well enough, for it is the nature of a horse to go forward.

So it is the nature of man, woman and child to go forward. And our natures must be right if a good being made us. No, it is not our original nature that is depraved; but our habits that have become a kind of secondary nature, are some of them wrong, and that mostly on account of the wrong condition that we are in. Then let us turn our attention to the correcting and improving our condition. Bulky horses can be cured. So can balky men. But how? Would you harness any one with another human and compel them to live in close relation, night and day, all their lives? We would not do so with any of our domestic animals. —W. G., in Boston Investigator.

### In Brief, And To The Point.

Dyspepsia is dreadful. Disordered liver is misery. Indigestion is a foe to good nature. The human digestive apparatus is one of the most complicated and wonderful things in existence. It is easily put out of order. Greasy food, tough food, sloppy food, bad cookery, mental worry, late hours, irregular habits, and many other things which ought not to be, have made the American people a nation of dyspeptics. But Green's August Flower has done a wonderful work in reforming this sad business and making the American people so healthy that they can enjoy their meals and be happy. Remember—No happiness without health. Let Green's August Flower bring health and happiness to the dyspeptic. Ask your druggist for a bottle. Seventy-five cents.

# LUCIFER

VALLEY FALLS, KAN., Aug. 12, 1897.

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.

## LIST OF OUR AUTHORIZED AGENTS

Carthage, Mo.—E. S. Galloway.  
Weir City, Kans.—Dr. J. B. Cooper.  
Hannibal, Mo.—J. McLaughlin.  
Omaha, Neb.—James Griffith, 1712 Dodge St.  
Leavenworth, Kan.—H. H. Hutchinson.  
Joplin, Mo.—J. H. Richards & Bro.  
Joplin, Mo. (East)—Geo. L. Hatchinson.  
Humboldt, Kan.—Wm. Rath.  
Hurlington, Kan.—Chris. Brown.  
Garnett, " " C. Grege.  
Ottawa, " " W. W. Frazor.  
Cedar Junction, Kan.—J. C. Collins.  
Hurlington, Iowa.—Werner Booklin.  
West Burlington, Iowa.—James Tott.  
Success, Kan.—Chas. Dinkley.  
Salina, Kan.—J. M. Hiten.  
Keranton, Kan.—John F. Young.  
Corbould, Kan.—James S. McDaniel.  
Preston, Iowa.—John Durant.  
M. O. Hleke, Siloam Springs, Ark.  
H. T. Joslin, Mankato, Minn.  
T. E. Palmer, Manning, Iowa.  
Kansas City, Mo., Dr. C. Lona Marsters.

We date from the First of January, 1691. This era is called the Era of Man, (E. M.), to distinguish it from the theological epoch that preceded it. In that epoch the earth was supposed to be flat, the sun was its attendant light revolving about it. Above was heaven where God ruled supreme over all potentates and powers; on earth ruled the Pope as the vicegerent of God; below was the kingdom of the Devil, Hell. So taught the Bible. Then came the New Astronomy, the astronomy of Copernicus, Galileo and Bruno. It demonstrated that the earth is a globe revolving about the sun; that the stars are worlds and suns; that there is no "up" and "down" in space. Vanished the old heaven, vanished the old hell; the earth became the home of man. Bruno sealed his devotion to the new truth with his life on the 17th day of February, 1600. During the 17th century Grotius wrote the first work upon international law. This was the herald of the Arbitration which is to supplant war in the settlement of national differences.

Carlyle says: "Tell me what a man thinks of this universe, and I will tell you what his religion is." When the modern Cosmogony came, the Bible and the Church, as infallible oracles, had to go, for they had taught that regarding the universe which was now shown to be untrue in almost every particular. So we take the beginning of the 17th century as an appropriate and a convenient starting point from which to date the Era of Man.

WINONA, MINN., Aug. 8.—The tent in which the Revs. Hopton and Schmitz, Seventh-day Adventists from Nebraska, were holding revival services was attacked by a mob of 200 Germans and Poles last night and pulled down. The congregation scattered, and a free fight ensued, in which several persons were hurt.

The villagers objected to religious observance of Saturday instead of Sunday.

These villagers must be very religious indeed when they undertake to break up "revival services" because held on the Seventh day or Jewish Sabbath instead of the Christian Sunday. Is this to be one of the outgrowths of the agitation now going on whose avowed object is to establish Sunday as the national Sabbath, viz: that we are to have religious wars such as those which desolated Europe for so many centuries? This little affair at Winona seems to be a flounder to show which way the religious tide is drifting.

## Wide Awake.

This is generally acknowledged to be the best children's magazine published. The August number is before us; it is bound in antique covers, superbly printed on the best of paper and profusely illustrated.

Among the prose articles and poems in this number, are: As I Would Have It, Gertrude Hall; A Dark Night's Work, Ingh Mitchell; Where Peppermints Grow, Martha H. Barnham; My Lady Daffodil, Clara Doty Bates; Concord; Her Highways and Byways, Margaret Sidney; The Story of Reddon Bluffs, Charles Egbert Cradock; Bird-Talk; Adeline D. T. Whitney; How Ned Sealed Mt. Washington, Mary Rebecca Hart; Summer Sports, Elbridge S. Brooks; The Secrets at Roseladies, Mary Hartwell Catherwood; "Fairy Folk All," Louise Imogen Guiney; In War Times at La Rosa Blanca, M. E. M. Davis; The Locust, Will H. Haynes; The Lost Medicine of the Utes, Lizzie W. Champney; The contributors and the children's Tangles, F. E. Seville. A Young Prince in Commerce, Selden R. Hopkins; Some Successful Women, Sarah K. Bottom Wonder-Wings, Mullingouga, Colossus and Others, O. F. Holder; Search-Questions in Greek History, Oscar Fay Adams; C. Y. F. R. U.; Wide Awake Post Office.

Editors: Charles Stuart Pratt; Ella Furman Pratt. D. Lothrop Company, Publishers, Boston, Mass. Price, 20c a number.

## "A CONSTITUTIONAL REPUBLIC"

It is constantly urged by the opponents of Individualism, that is to say, of Anarchism, that "this is a constitutional Republic," and that it makes provisions for needed changes without the necessity of "rejecting conformity to its laws." Let us look at this a little.

In the first place we would ask, what is the difference between a constitutional government and one that is not constitutional? The British government is said to be a constitutional monarchy while that of Russia is called an absolute or autocratic monarchy. But England has no written or formulated document, called its Constitution, as have the United States. Its constitution consists of certain checks upon the arbitrary will of the monarch, a certain uncertain division of power between King, Lords and Commons. Of Russia it was once said that "the dagger is the constitution"—but this was before the days of dynamite—the meaning evidently being that force, physical force, is the constitution, the umpire, before whose court the final appeal must be made for redress of grievances.

And such we opine will be found to be the truth of the matter in all cases or kinds of so-called civil government. In England a large standing army is kept constantly on guard, not simply to defend the nation against foreign invasion, but to suppress insurrection at home. And so it is here to a very great extent. We have a written constitution guaranteeing equal rights and privileges to all, and yet the history of this government shows that the guarantee is an empty boast, a fraud, a monumental lie. The citizen has often far less liberty, far less of equal right than he would have if we had no constitution—no written laws, but every man depended on his good right arm and the common sense of justice, to give him his equal share of rights. Before and during the war each party claimed to have the constitution on its side, but this umpire did not prevent one of the bloodiest and most expensive wars recorded in human history.

"Constitutions" are, at best, the expressions of men's opinions upon governmental questions, and often they are not the expression of their authors' most honest, and truest thoughts. Constitutions are generally if not always the result of a compromise between principle and expediency, between right and wrong, between truth and falsehood. This is eminently true in regard to the history of the Constitution of the United States of America, as every one knows or can know, who cares to inform himself. The Declaration that asserted the Independence of the colonies, though by no means free from inconsistencies, was a grand strike for the principles of self-government—of Autonomy or Anarchism, as against all governments based on Authority—but when victory crowned the revolt, of which this Declaration was the battle-cry, nearly all was lost by the time-serving compromisers who framed the Constitution of the United States.

Constitutions have ever been the enemies of human progress. They have been the sarcophagi that smothered and entombed the spirit of human liberty, from which tombs it has been liberated only by the convulsions of violent revolution; then—alas that it should be so—only liberated to be caught and smothered again in other "constitutional" sarcophagi.

"Constitutional Republics make provision for needed changes." Perhaps so, but history shows that it is far more easy to get a bad law enacted than it is to get it repealed. And we think we are safe in saying that very few laws were ever repealed so long as people acquiesced in their enforcement. In other words, in order to get a law repealed it must first be made a dead letter, people must ignore it—refuse to obey it. The tendency of the mania for law-making is to become more and more rabid. A law-making, a law-enforcing, a law-expounding and a law-worshipping spirit grows by that upon which it feeds—hence he who asks for repeal of laws is at once regarded with suspicion; he is malign, misrepresented and ostracized by those whose craft it is to live and fatten upon the "law"—its enlargement, its enforcement, its aggrandizement.

## CHRISTIAN OUTLOOK.

We learn from the *Christian Statesman*, organ of the Christian Amendment movement, and one of the most able of the "Prohibition" journals, that the National Reform Summer Assembly, met at Ocean Grove, N. J., on Monday the 25th. ult. The audience is reported to have exceeded one thousand in the evening. Among the resolutions voted upon and passed by the assembly, was the following:

We rejoice in the progress of the Temperance reformation, and in the fact that it has become, to so large an extent, a distinctive Christian movement. We hail its fast approaching triumph as a step of repentance toward God and the enthronement, so far, of the law of Christ in our national life.

The "Temperance reformation" so far as it is a "Christian movement" means statute prohibition. The abstinence movement was mainly inaugurated by infidels or skeptics. The first temperance periodical, so far as we can remember, was edited and published by a Free-thinker. But how the God-in-the-constitution movement can claim prohibition, or total abstinence either, as a part of the "law of Christ" is one of the "mysteries of godliness," we reasonably suppose. Jesus not only did not preach abstinence from wine but he and his apostles both used it and recommended it to others.

All the gold given to this cause (Christian Amendment of the U. S. Constitution) goes into the diadem of King Jesus. We shall find it there when we behold his glory.—*Rev. McPheeters in Christian Statesman.*

If Jesus still retains his human body, as most, if not all Christians believe, is there not some danger, Bro. McPheeters, that the diadem will get so heavy that it will be a fearful load for poor (rich) King Jesus to carry? Just consider a moment! From reports of the Treasurer, this "cause" receives an average of at least \$300 per month, or \$3600 per year, if we understand him rightly. This sum in gold would weigh over 200 lbs. In ten years only at this rate it would weigh at least a ton! Hadn't you better hurry up the exhibition of fireworks that old Peter says is to precede the Millennium—the time when King Jesus is to come and reign as a temporal monarch for a thousand years?

We would not jest with sacred things, but such bald superstition as this of the *Statesman*—for this utterance of McPheeters is warmly indorsed by the editor—does not belong to the category of sacred things. It is worthy only of the ignorant idolaters of Western Asia where the Christian superstitions originated, or rather, where they took many if not most of their present forms.

## "SOCIETY AND CIVIL GOVERNMENT."

REPLY TO W. BAKER, M. D.

The discussion involving and defining the relations subsisting between the individual and the collectivity called society—the amenability of the unit of society to the law, so-called—may be getting stale and uninteresting to some of our readers, and yet if we may judge from the constant recurrence of questions and criticisms like those of Dr. Baker in this issue, this subject or this class of subjects has by no means been exhausted.

On our part, although the discussion has lost, to some extent, the attraction that freshness or novelty gives, we are by no means loath to keep it before the readers of *LUCIFER*, believing it to be a basic or fundamental issue, upon the right solution or adjustment of which hangs all our hopes of bettering the present unsatisfactory condition of human society, and, indeed, upon which rest all our hopes of preventing our present acknowledged evils from going rapidly from the bad to the incalculably worse.

First, then, let us understand each other as to terms. Dr. Baker says:

The editorials claim that Society does not exist, that it is not a unit or person, and therefore, as such, can have no rights nor duties.

And again:

But the idea with the editorial criticism is to discard Society because all rights, duties, crimes and punishments are individual—that Society, as such, has no rights, no duties, crimes or punishments.

Here the Doctor represents us first as saying that "Society does not exist," and then that it does exist, but that we regard it as an evil to be discarded. If he will read again what we have said from time to time on this subject he will see that, while we discard the popular notions as to the rights, powers and duties of society, we accept this word in the sense of a voluntary association of indi-

viduals for mutual benefit—for mutual defense. Society, in its true and good sense, means an arrangement, partly natural and partly artificial, by which the rights, powers and privileges of the individual may be protected, increased and confirmed. An arrangement that never demands nor necessitates the surrender of a single natural right of any individual. In this sense, society is the creature, the servant, the friend, but also the inferior of the individual, and whenever it assumes the role of creator, master or superior, it becomes an enemy, a usurper, a tyrant, to be de-throned, abolished or reconstructed. Society is made or was made for the individual, not the individual for society.

The popular idea, on the contrary, is that Society (big S!) is a sort of divinity, vastly superior, in power and rights, to the individual man or woman. That the individual was made for Society, and that he has no rights as against the rights of Society. Organized Society (the State) may take the money, the property and the life itself of the individual if needed for its own preservation or aggrandizement. Taxes for the support of the government take precedence of all other claims, and when danger threatens the life of the state the individual is driven to the frontiers—more as a criminal than as an equal sovereign—a gun is placed in his hands and he is compelled to commit murder or submit to be murdered,—usually it is both!

This, in brief, is the popular view or definition of society, and against this definition we take most decided issue. We repeat again and again that Society—organized society, or the State—is not a person, not an entity, not a thing against which a crime can be committed, nor a thing that can commit a crime. All the crimes that ever were or that ever can be committed were or will be the acts of individual human beings against individual human beings. Rights, duties, crimes, punishments, virtues, vices, can only be predicated of living, breathing, sentient beings, and Society, in the sense commonly used, is not a living, breathing, sentient being—it is simply an abstraction, a personification, a creature of man that can be destroyed without spilling any blood or committing any real crime.

Dr. B. asks us if we "hold the idea of any necessity for political compacts, or any form of civil governments to hold individuals responsible to the public good." If our friend will state an instance in which the "public good" can be anything but individual or personal good then it will be time enough to correct our definition of Society.

Again and again we repeat that we are in favor of any and all "compacts" that may be necessary for mutual defense against those who cannot or will not keep themselves within their own sphere of rights; that is to say, we advocate the enactment of all laws necessary to and for the restraint of evil-doers. But this is not government, civil or uncivil. Government means control; it means directing power. In order to have civil government, as commonly understood, we must have governors, rulers, a governing or ruling class—elected, appointed or born to that position, matters but little which method of getting the rulers is adopted. As individualists, Anarchists, Self-rulers, we want no governors, no rulers, no governing or ruling class. We want a few—very few, policemen, and a very few umpires or judges to decide in disputed cases. But these should always be regarded as the servants, not the masters, of the citizen. As a policeman, as a judge, the officer is less, not greater, than the citizen. Judges should be chosen for the position because of their large common sense and because of their personal record for integrity and uprightness of character, not because of their extended acquaintance with statute law and legal precedents. "No statute, no legal precedent should ever be allowed to invalidate the claims of natural justice," is a saying attributed to Blackstone, we believe. Then, the best and true qualification of a judge is that he shall know what the claims of natural justice are, not that he has been a good lawyer. Under this system we would have no use for the present army of lawyers with their mountainous piles of books filled with statutes, made often by ignorant, scheming and corrupt politicians, and with legal precedents made often to becloud, obscure and defeat, rather than to elucidate and simplify the application of the principles of justice. Under this system we would need no state legislatures, no national congress to make laws

and to take paternal control of the citizens. We should need simply a few boards of arbitration, composed of men, like the local judges, distinguished only for their good sense, their love of right and natural justice, and for their disregard of the musty precedents of an ignorant and barbarous past.

Once more only, for this article, already too long. Dr. Baker deems it "best to reject Autonomy"—"individuality," self-law—because humanity is still imperfect. That is to say, the individual man or woman is not wise enough nor good enough to govern himself or herself and therefore he or she must submit to be governed by others equally imperfect. Under paternalistic systems of government the rejection of Autonomy because of human imperfection is all right and logical enough, but on the theory of self-government by the people themselves and not by kings, lords or nobles, we must assume that the individual citizen is able to govern himself, else it will be impossible to find a basis for a self-governing republic. The stream cannot rise higher than its source. If the units cannot govern themselves it is stupidly illogical to expect the aggregate or the collectivity to govern itself. Human beings are not like spokes in a wheel or bricks in an arch, useless unless braced up by a certain number of kindred integers. Each citizen must be able not only to stand alone but to help hold up the edifice designed to protect those who are not yet strong enough to stand alone,—the imbeciles by nature or those made so by vicious indulgence.

## HYPERCRITICISM.

As usual, Zeno is finical, giving himself to details and avoiding wide deductions and extended observations from general principles. It is an unfortunate peculiarity of his that when an opponent shows that an assumed result is logically deducible from a principle accepted by Zeno the latter will turn about and with an air of triumph inquire whether this particular thing is named in the general principle. Of course it is not, and no intelligent man expects to find a bill of particulars in a statement of basic principles. To illustrate: I affirm, "Slavery is wrong." A neighbor of mine accepts this as a just principle. But pretty soon I find him engaged in the purchase of a man in the market place. I upbraid him for his action and his renunciation of a principle previously accepted. He retorts: "I am not violating that principle; I challenge you to find anything in it about buying men!" Foolish and improbable, you say? Yes, foolish, but as to its being improbable that an otherwise sensible man should meet an opponent in this way, why, Zeno makes a practice of discussing State Socialism along just this line of sophistry.

I have never attributed to State Socialism any probable results which I did not then and do not now think the natural and legitimate outcome of the teaching of its founders and apostles, Marx, Lassalle, Engel, et al. The existing State assumes the right to do many things which individualists regard as matters for purely private enterprise, and it interferes with the freedom of persons in scores of ways essentially wrong. It prohibits, by means of taxes, licenses, tariffs, etc., freedom of exchange; it largely monopolizes education and almost wholly monopolizes the mail-carrying business; it decides what the citizen shall drink, what physician he shall employ when sick; it punishes him if he works or plays on a certain day, and it says that he shall not buy the books or pictures it condemns. It gives the land and mines to favored persons and cliques and cripples industry and enslaves the masses by monopolization of money. And so on. Now comes State Socialism and demands that the land shall become the "common property of the people, not free land" (vide "G. M." in *Workmen's Advocate*, organ of the Socialist Labor Party). It says that all great industries "are to be administered by a central committee elected by the people," (ibid) and it is known to all intelligent people that it would regulate production and limit the hours of labor according to the decision of the majority. All this follows naturally from the initiative of the existing state, and it is a fair and logical inference that the individual will be, when State Socialism shall be in the ascendant, completely under the control of the majority. If the hours in which I may work can rightfully be fixed at eight or ten or any other number by any external power, that power can also with equal right fix the hour at which I shall retire at night or get up



in the morning. All that is required is that "the greatest good to the greatest number" shall be involved, said "greatest number" being sole judges for themselves and all others. It is useless for Zeno to say that these invasions, these tyrannies, are "not nominated in the bond," for they are there, latent, but none the less ready to spring into vicious life whenever the majority of the day takes a notion that they are essential to the well-being of the "greatest number."

The fact is, Zeno is not a full-fledged Socialist, although he grows very warm in its defense and accuses Lucrifer of misrepresenting it. He is about half State Socialist and half Anarchist. This State Socialist writer in the *Workmen's Advocate*, just quoted, tells him: "You claim to be a Socialist, Zeno, and yet you are propagating Anarchistic principles, which mean destruction and reconstruction."

The State Socialism which is in Zeno's mind is touched with the sunlight of Liberty and would like to be on good terms with Anarchism; the State Socialism contemplated by its founders and all its logical defenders knows nothing of individual rights and is at the antipodes from Anarchism.

#### REPLIES TO OBJECTIONS.

Briefly in more particular reply to Zeno's observations:

1. Zeno said: "If he make his own laws he is a despot." This was the agent. Zeno meant if he made his own laws for others he was a despot. I understood him to mean if he made his own laws for himself. My mistake. But how does it help Zeno? If a man is a despot (as Zeno says he is) who makes laws for others, are not two men who make laws for another, despots? Hence, are not the majority who make laws for the minority, despots? The agent is not a law maker and he cannot exceed the instructions of his principals, but, on the other hand, the principals must not step beyond the pretty clearly defined lines which mark the boundaries of their domain. They may hire an agent to guard their flocks and herds from the thief, but when the majority of them combine and command their agent to collect a compulsory tax from all members of the association, the persons who constitute this majority have themselves become thieves.

2. When one man makes laws for others it is despotism, and it is equally despotism when three men make laws for two. In the first instance, State Socialism and Zeno admit that it is despotism while in the second they deny it. I am not responsible for the irreconcilable contradiction. Anarchism affirms that it is despotism in both cases and all the time, and the argument is that the individual may fix his own hour for rising and defend his rights so to do, but he may not "judge and punish" others who do the same for themselves.

3. As above stated, the Anarchist does not say that "the agent" must punish as his whim dictates. "Punishment" is foreign to the ideas of the true Naturalist, he will seek only to defend himself against aggressions and will have no opinions or schemes to force upon others, through either personal or majority despotism.

#### AN INCIDENT.

The writer of this sometimes borrows a ride from some one of his neighbors when going to town. An instance of this happened one day last week, the next morning after the great storm. The neighbor with whom I rode was an old citizen, one who had grown up with the country so to speak, and as fortune has greatly favored him he has no room to quarrel with his lot in life. The storm had touched him kindly as compared to what it did to others; the rain was in time to help his late crops and hence it is not strange the conversation ran in easy and pleasant grooves till we neared the ruins of the church destroyed by lightning, some account of which calamity is given in another place. At this juncture I unluckily ventured the remark that it was fortunate the lightning struck a church instead of a dwelling, in which latter case there might have been loss of life as well as loss of property. All at once the manner of my hitherto genial neighbor suffered a change. His geniality seemed suddenly congealed. Looking me squarely in the face he said: "I don't like you, Mr. H., repeating his remark with emphasis, 'I don't like you Mr. H.' The doctrines you teach in your paper if carried out in practice would take us back to feudalism, to barbarism. Your teachings, your opinions in regard to government are ridiculous in the extreme, to say the

least of them. And then your religious views are worse yet. Why, I am not a churchman, as that word is commonly used, but I would not part with my convictions, my hope of a future life, for any consideration whatever."

Here I ventured to ask if he had read our paper enough to know what it is that we really do advocate.

Yes, he had read the paper, at least he had read a few articles therein and had seen the heading of some more and knew all there was in them at a glance. He took some eight or ten papers and had no time to read such stuff as that published in *Lucrifer*.

I then briefly gave an outline of our teachings as to government and asked him how it was possible that such doctrines could take us back to feudalism when our principles led in the exactly opposite direction. I asked him to point to an article in our paper whose aim was to destroy any rational hope of a future life. This he could not do, of course, and as we were about to part, I asked him to allow me to continue to send him an occasional copy of our paper and requested him further to do us the simple justice to hear before condemning us. To this he gave a partial assent, "but," said he, "do you know what becomes of the papers you send us?"

"Why, I suppose it is quite possible that you treat them as I hear many others do—you burn them!"

"Well, I do not burn them, but there is a little woman there who gathers them up and puts them in the stove."

"Yes, and by so doing she proves herself a good Christian! If I may judge from the utterances of many Christians they would like to serve me in the same way."

And my genial neighbor frankly acknowledged that he presumed they would; and thus we parted.

This man is far above the average of farmers in general information and intelligence, and if he, with his opportunities of knowing us and judging us fairly—if this man shoots so wide of the mark in estimating the character of the objects for which we are working, we should not, perhaps, think strange that so many people misunderstand and misjudge us. The greater part of this almost universal misapprehension and deep-seated prejudice is owing to the persistent misrepresentation, exaggeration and downright falsehood so freely promulgated from the pulpit and from the Christian press; and perhaps we should add, the office-hunting and office-holding class. The clergy, the office-holders and the editors whose income depends largely upon the success of machine politics and church ascendancy, all these oppose the doctrines taught by *Lucrifer* for the same reason that the craftsmen of Ephesus opposed Paul, viz: They know that their craft is in danger. Once let Individualism, Autonomism, supplant government in church and state, and the occupation of these human drones, or rather these human leeches, will be gone.

#### CURRENT COMMENTS.

"Pride goeth before destruction, And a haughty spirit before a fall." Last week Valley Falls and vicinity were visited by a furious tempest of wind, rain and electric discharges. The rain was very welcome, for the earth had been parched by hot sunshine and scorching winds for many long days. But the wind and the lightning were not so welcome; the former blew down many stacks of hay and grain and demolished many fruit and other trees, and the latter set fire to and destroyed the finest church building in Valley Falls. This church had lately been finished, at a cost, it is said, of five thousand dollars. Its windows were gothic and of stained glass, and its spire was so towering in height that it could be seen for miles around.

It was this feature of the church—its spire—doubtless, that caused its destruction. If the Lutheran brethren had been content with a plain, unostentatious chapel, with no spire to challenge the admiration of the passer by, or to excite the envy of other sects who were not able to build so fine a church, their house of worship would probably be standing to-day. There was no insurance on this church, not even a lightning rod, its builders and owners doubtless thinking that having "dedicated" it to the service of God, he would not be so stupid as to strike it with his own lightning nor allow it to be destroyed by enemies of any sort. Its pastor, Mr. Geiger, is reported to have "cried like a child," when he saw his church in flames, his beautiful and commodious place of

business that he himself had been chiefly instrumental in causing to be erected. We say causing to be erected, for though Mr. G. had doubtless spent many days and weeks in soliciting aid, in urging others to give their money and their labor to help along the structure, it is not likely that he put in a single day or a single hour in hard manual labor upon it, from the laying of the corner stone to the placing of the gilded ball on the tower. Like certain parties we read of, he laid upon the shoulders of other men burdens heavy and grievous to be borne, but he himself scarcely touched these burdens with one of his little fingers.

Let us not be misunderstood. Though there is one temple of superstition less in Valley Falls than there was one week ago—one less building dedicated to the inculcation of Christianity, the religion that has ever proved itself to be more the religion of hate, of bigotry and intolerance than of peace, of love and of good will—although its pastor, if reports be true, has done much to urge onward the inhuman persecutions to which the *Lucrifer* band has been subjected within the past year, notwithstanding all this we do not rejoice over the misfortune of our Christian neighbors. We do not "laugh at their calamity nor mock when their fear cometh," as the Jewish and Christian deity is said to do.

We only hope that their bitter experience will teach them a few useful lessons. Among these lessons we may perhaps be allowed to suggest the following:

(1) Reliance on physical science, as taught by that non-Christian scientist, Benjamin Franklin, and by others of the same school, is better than reliance on the unscientific teachings of the books called the Bible.

(2) Work is better than prayer. Work built the church, but all the dedication sermons and all the prayers of pastors and flock (sheep?) could not keep it from being destroyed by nature's forces—and all the prayers of all the churches combined will not build it up again without work.

(3) If the time, labor and money now spent in building and furnishing costly, untaxed churches devoted to the superstitious rites, ceremonies and teachings of the dead past, could be spent in building and furnishing halls of science, lecture rooms and reading rooms, where free investigation into all subjects that promote human welfare in this world—in the here and now—were the aim and object—then such time, labor and money would be far more profitably expended.

JACKSONVILLE, WIS., Aug. 7.—Great excitement has been caused here by the eloquent of the Rev. Dr. Seymour, pastor of the M. E. church, and Mrs. Fanny J. Henry, wife of the editor of the "Argus." The lady has for years been the organizer and leading member of the church. She leaves a husband and two children, while Seymour deserts a wife and three children.

In the same issue of the city daily paper from which we clip the above extract we have a statement that "Rev. J. P. Farmer, Pastor of the Baptist Church at Hudson, Mich.," had been charged with having "appropriated at least one thousand dollars of funds raised for remodeling the church, and leaves in addition known debts to tradesmen and merchants of \$1200 more. He is also suspected of undue intimacy with women in his flock. He left Hudson last week and his present whereabouts are unknown."

We are well aware that newspaper reports are often very unreliable, and we insert these notices here, not because we have any desire to hold up to public view the crimes and frailties of our fellow mortals, but rather to call attention to the fact—a fact that becomes more and more patent and notorious as the years roll on—that Christian training does not always develop moral muscle. It is well-known that the press as well as all other society agencies, is very tender, lenient and forgiving when dealing with the reputations of those social pets, the clergy, and therefore when so many cases of clerical dereliction get into the newspapers we are forced to the conviction that the business of "preaching the gospel" must be a very demoralizing occupation.

The prohibition campaign in Texas has stirred up more bad feeling than ever before on election issues. Prohibitionists were rottenegged at San Antonio, Horner G. Mills was hanged in effigy by Prohibitionists at Grockett, the speaker of the House of Representatives has been turned out of church because he opposes prohibition, and anti-prohibitionists have been denounced from the pulpit, personal encounters have been common, and wordy denunciations have occurred without number.

The above, clipped from an exchange, is a fair sample of the reports that come to us from the Texas conflict over the question of state-prohibition against

the liquor traffic. And now the news is sent over the wires that notwithstanding all the prayers of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and of nearly all the Churches, notwithstanding the vast expenditure of time, labor, money, eloquence, wind and temper—in spite of all these, the prohibitionists—the intemperate prohibitionists of Texas, have been defeated by a majority of not less than one hundred thousand!

We are free to say that we are glad to know that this appeal to the ballot as a means of promoting true temperance, has failed—signally, ingloriously, failed. When men learn that true temperance is a growth from within, and that it cannot be injected into the subject from without, then, and probably not till then, will they cease to appeal to force to make men temperate. Force must be resorted to in order to punish crime and restrain criminals, but liquor-making and liquor-drinking are not crimes in themselves considered, and no amount of human legislation can make them such. While we have not the slightest sympathy with the liquor traffic, as commonly conducted, we congratulate the defenders of personal rights on their victory over their enemies—over those whom we must consider the worst foes that true temperance, and true progress, have now to do battle with.

#### II.

##### The Valley Falls Debate.

Moses Hull's Fourth Speech in Reply to Eld. Clark Braden.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

#### Continued.

Mr. Braden next affirms that "Christianity reveals sin as a fact." I deny it; to reveal is to make known. Sin was revealed as a fact away back as far, at least, as the twelfth chapter of Genesis, where an old Egyptian king told Abraham what sin was; and old Abimelech, a heathen king, plead with Abraham "the father of the faithful," and "the friend of God," to not bring upon him and his nation a "great sin." Thus Christianity came over two thousand years too late to "reveal sin as a fact," or to tell the world what sin is; the world had all Christianity's revelations thousands of years before.

Beside all this, the "standard" in the bible is not "perfect," as Bro. Braden's proposition says. In one instance the "standard" says, "thou shalt not kill," and in another it says, "kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman that hath," &c. Now which of these "standards" is perfect? If you must decide, then your own reason—your own judgment, is, after all, the standard which not only tries what is right and wrong but by which the Bible itself must be tried. On this matter of right and wrong the New Testament is no more "perfect" as a standard than the Old. If in one place it commands husbands to "love" their "wives," and "be not bitter against them," in another it says: "If any man come unto me, and hate not his father and mother and wife and children and brethren and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." Luke, xiv. 26. Which of these two is the "perfect standard." If you are left to decide, then your reason and not the Bible is your guide.

Bro. Braden's proposition goes further and says: "It [sin] consists in rebellion against the supreme authority and law of God—in selfishness and self-hatred of holiness and justice."

And so the Bible redeems the world from "selfishness and self." Where and when did it redeem anybody from self? Neither Jesus, any apostle, or a minister or Christian ever did anything that was not stimulated by selfishness, and nothing else. Even Jesus did all he did—endured the cross and all—"for the joy that was set before him." That is the thing every sinner works for; pleasure, happiness, joy—selfish joy. Paul preached the gospel, as he himself said, because, "Woe abides me if I preach not the gospel." Thus Jesus worked for "joy," and Paul to escape "woe." Could anything be more selfish?

Bro. Braden never made an appeal in his life to anything but the selfishness of those of whom he would make Christians. He tells them of the peace, the happiness, the prosperity, the pleasure and the eternal reward of selfish bliss that will attend and follow their self-sacrifice here; that, in short, it will pay to be a Christian. When that argument fails, he appeals to another set of selfish facilities; he tells of the degradation, the doubt, the despair, the misery, of Infidels and other non-Christians, and finally of the eternal "weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth" of those who do not come to Christ, and finally exhorts,—"For your own soul's sake, for your own eternal good, do come and let me baptize you!"

In the face of all this it is not absurd for Mr. Braden to tell his audience that Christianity is a rebellion against "selfishness and a love of self?"

#### MR. HULL'S FIFTH REPLY.

So far, Ladies and Gentlemen, we have had a pleasant discussion. My opponent has presented a great many propositions,

and but little proof. His propositions may go down with some of you, with no other proof than his unsupported assertion, but the age of reason is dawning and some of you will question the mere *ipse dixit* of even ministers.

Beside reading and re-reading his propositions, which amount to but little more than a play upon words to see in how many ways a couple of propositions may be stated, Mr. Braden has done little beside scolding. He has accused me of many naughty things; indeed, I'm guilty of about everything except making an argument. I have noted down a few things I have done if "mine accuser" is correct in his charges.

My first argument, according to the scolding we have just had, is "gammone," whatever that may mean. Next I am heard "cackling;" you see I have not got very far into the animal kingdom yet; have started from the genus fowl, but not so far out of their reach as not to "cackle" back. Then the next thing I know I am "chattering." You see, do you not, that I am progressing—I have got as far along as the ape family. Anon I drop back, and the next thing my respected opponent knows I am "howling," and then I "bark" and occasionally "snarl." It is humiliating to such a gentleman and scholar as my opponent to come down to reply to such noises, but the worst is not yet reached. I "sneak," then again I don't in "gammone," and anon I approach as near the genus homo that I reach the altitude of the "quibbler." But not once have I reasoned, argued or presented a thought. The audience, doomed to listen to all this evidence that I have not yet evolved out of the kingdom of lower animals, is to be pitted, or would be were it not for the fact that it is occasionally relieved by the eloquence of my learned and respected opponent, who, if his liver were in order and his digestive apparatus were all right, would be indeed a first-class debater.

Once in a while in my prehensile moments, when feeling my way up toward the pinnacle on which my opponent stands, I am half inclined to give him a liver prescription, but then I remember my position as a cackler and chatterer, and drop back into my normal state.

The next statement of Mr. Braden, is as follows:

"Christianity teaches that God manifested himself in miracles, giving evidence of his presence, and credentials of a revelation, by making a higher use and display of nature and nature's laws than man could make, thus cultivating man's religious awe and veneration."

Notwithstanding the argument in the above proposition is about the weakest that even a Christian could make, it contains the stock in-trade of the usual Christian arguments, and I expected to hear it earlier in the debate than I did.

His main point is that miracles prove Christianity, or to put it in his own language, "Miracles give evidence of God's presence." Do they? And now will Bro. Braden please tell us what gives evidence of the miracles? We have no miracles, and so we have no evidence of "God's presence." The evidence of the miracles, my learned adversary will say, is in the Bible.

That is an accommodating logic! The evidence of the truthfulness of the Biblical record of the Christian religion, is, that interpersed through these stories are tales told of miracles having been performed.

2. The evidence that miracles actually occurred, and thus that they "had the living presence of a God," was that the stories are told in that holy book, the Bible. If that is not making one Christian hand wash the other, I do not know how such a work could be done.

My friend boasts of his knowledge of logic, and fears that in my "cackling," "chattering" and "howling," I may violate the rules of logic, yet I will venture to try to put his proposition into logical formulae.

1. Miracles prove the presence of the living God.

2. Christianity, in its origin, had miracles.

3. Therefore, Christianity, as a system, contains evidence "of his presence, and credentials of his revelations," thus cultivating man's religious awe and veneration."

Let us now make this logic of our friend wash the other hand.

Whatever contains a record of miracles is true.

2. The Bible contains a record of miracles.

3. Therefore, the Bible contains "the credentials" of God's "revelations," and is true.

Now I submit that this old fallacy about miracles has lived long enough. There never was a point in its lot us abandon it for something sensible.

Now supposing a miracle ever occurred, which cannot be proved; what does it prove? Why, only that the one who wrought a miracle is a miracle worker, and could probably under the same conditions make another miracle. What connection is there between the miracle and the stories of the Old and New Testament? None whatever. Supposing Jonah lived three days and three nights in the stomach of a great fish; does it prove that his story was true? No, it does not, for his story was true, but it is now washed away by everybody. Nineveh was not overthrown in forty days as Jonah prophesied. I ask again, what does this miracle of Jonah's being impervious to gastric juices prove? Why it proves that a man can live three days in the stomach of a fish, and come out undamaged, that is all. I don't think it leaves us to infer that, under certain conditions, he might remain three weeks in the stomach of a fish that had not a very strong digestive apparatus; or possibly under very favorable circumstances he might take up his permanent residence there! Not one miracle in the Bible proves more or less than this one.

#### Continued Next Week.

The Coal Creek camp-meeting has closed. There were twelve ministers in attendance. "In the sweet by-and-by" "what shall the harvest be?"

THE DYING AGNOSTIC.  
Nay, weeping friends, I want no priest,  
To mar my peace with bootless strife,  
Ere Death's cold kindness hath released  
Me from the prison-house of life.  
Too oft his craft to scorn I've laughed  
To send him now a suppliant cry.  
Serenely I drain the welcome draught,  
And, smiling, tell you, "Thus I die!"

Yes, though the darkness shades of death  
Are closing fast around my head—  
Through well I know my falling breath  
Will leave me soon with half unsaid—  
My brain is clear, my will is strong,  
My spirit undimmed by pain or fear,  
No paralytic eye nor interling tongue  
Shall wring one recreant word from me.

Nay, wherefore weep? Your God, you say,  
Is love supreme, enthroned above,  
Can the mistakes of life's short day  
Then separate me from that love?  
Your creed you mock with idle fears  
When mourning o'er my future lot;  
You do but waste your bitter tears  
On one who knows he needs them not.

And when beneath the daisied sod  
You lay away my worn-out frame,  
Pray let no black-robed "priest of God"  
Advance for me to heaven a claim.  
Hither let one who shared my faith  
Tell of the truth I lived and died,  
How Reason's lamp illumined my path,  
How "to do good" was all my creed.

And eye the stars will shine as clear,  
The grass grow green, the loud wind swell,  
As o'er the saint God holds most dear,  
O'er me whom men dub "Infidel."  
And whether life or naught may be  
Beyond the grave is matter of no gate,  
Guarded by Death, awaiting me,  
I bow submissive to my fate.

GRACIOUS GENTLEMEN,  
In the Secular Thought.

#### Father McGlynn.

How funny it all reads, the "excommunication" cursing McGlynn inside and out! What a string of heavenly celebrities are invoked! Quite new to this generation. But not a terror, it would seem. Nobody's afraid. McGlynn goes on serenely, and the thousands who packed the Opera House in Philadelphia last Sunday night, mostly Catholic, rose en masse to cheer him. He was their hero. Why? Because he would not go to Rome. He withstands the pope and defies him; tells the Head of the Church that he has no right to do this and that. Curious. What sort of a Head has the Church got in these modern days that common priests and their flock can say: "O Head, you have no right," etc.? What right have priests or people to say this? Verily, no right as Roman Catholics. Only the poor right of human beings. But that they have waived by their membership of a church that does not recognize it, permit it or have ought to do with it, except to put it down.

"Ah!" the reply comes from these McGlynn "Roman Catholics," "in all matters of religion concerning the church we submit. But not as to our politics in America, or our views on social problems here."

But, alas for them, the Roman Church knows no such distinction. It is all "religion" with the Roman Church. Could it maintain the power, verily, little else would be left to a world that the Christ is to bring to his feet by means of this his Church, as the Church claims.

But Father McGlynn insists that it is not so, and he is still as good a Roman Catholic as ever.

At the same time both he and Mr. George dwell upon the fact that the great social struggle now begun for the industrial emancipation of the people is prominently a religious one. In all their meetings they sing, "Nearer, try God to thee," and other religious hymns. You cannot, they affirm, divorce religion from life.

Now, all Pope Leo has done is to say, "Just so, and therefore I propose, as Christ's vicar, to regulate your life, the whole of it."

What remains for Father McGlynn? Simply to fall back upon his own human right to regulate his own life for himself and let the Church go. What he appears to be trying to do is to reduce the Church to a mere salvation-insurance agency for the future world, denying it all prerogative for dealing with the world that now is.

But everybody sees in this age of approaching common sense that the Church, so bereft of function, would become speedily an affair of very little import. No! Pope Leo has no such suicidal vision before his eyes. The church is political and social. It is quite as much for this world as for any other; yes, more so. How much more Father McGlynn and his insurgent brethren must learn by experience. And is not the Church consistent? If it can claim divine authority over Father McGlynn's soul, why not also over the body that for the time being holds that soul? How can the Great Shepherd guide the flock into heaven, if he lose sight of its most perilous wanderings on earth?

Verily, the Good Shepherd is not so remote in his duty.

It seems, then, that Father McGlynn must submit wholly, or not at all.

As an American, as a man, let the decision be, "not at all."

Neither to popes nor to kings, far or near, let him submit. His only refuge is in the Sovereignty of the Individual, the individual and supreme control of his own affairs.—H., in Liberty.

It is not enough that you are praised by the good; you have failed somehow here in your duty if you are not cursed by the bad.

No one can be a great thinker who does not recognize that, as a thinker, it is his first duty to follow his intellect to whatever conclusion it may lead.—John Stuart Mill.

#### FREE PLATFORM.

Stirs: Have read "Irene" and think it excellent. Will lend it to every one I can.

Respectfully,  
LEONOR HENRY.

Kokomo, Ind., 7-30-'87.

Editors Lucifer: I want to see what so-called Free Lovers advocate; at present I have no plan to remedy this social sexual evil, but I am sure knowledge, education, on this subject can do no harm and will do great good.

Yours for Truth, Justice and Freedom,  
W. L. WILLIS, M. D.

Kokomo, Ind., 7-22-'87.

Messrs. Harman & Walker: I somehow understood that Geo. F. Train was imprisoned for obscenity, blasphemy or something of the sort for publishing or mailing obscene extracts from the Bible. If so, how can you expect another editor to publish extracts you may select from the same book? Do you expect to catch the editor in his own trap?

D.

Tulare, Cal., 7-23-'87.

Dear Friend Walker: Still in the clutches of the law and the victim of a lawyer. Can't get bail of \$1500 for want of premium of \$150 to hire it. This is the speedy trial I am entitled to. Shall have to suffer incarceration until August or September, whenever the Dist. Attorney condescends to call my case. Accept my grateful acknowledgments for your sympathy. I notice the prosecution is putting you to all the trouble and expense it can. Many thanks for your brotherly solicitude for my welfare. Cannot you give us a list of some of the laws that should be repealed, second Ingersoll's motion, and urge an immediate crusade for their repeal? Call upon all your readers to enroll their names as crusaders. It will be a test of their worth and force of character in a good cause, something practical.

Your sincere friend,  
T. R. KINROT, M. D.

Address 3001 6th Ave., N. Y. City.

M. Harman & Son: Your sample copy came to hand last month. I intended to answer right away but owing to my being away from home and coming home sick, and press of business, it has been neglected until now.

I now enclose to you 25cts. for the paper three months. Only wish I could send you \$5.00 instead of so small an amount; you should have it willingly. I sympathize with you all in your persecutions and hope you will come out of it without too much suffering. I will try to take your paper as long as it is published, so you can reckon on me as a regular subscriber from this on. I like your paper and the independent stand you have taken.

Where is Lois Waisbrooker, and what is she doing? How I would like to hear from her.

Believe me, ever your friend,  
SARAH M. CHITSON.

Pokegon, Mich., 7-26-'87.

Editors Lucifer: Though I spoke of an agent executing the laws of his principal, "W." makes me say, "that if an individual makes his own laws he is a despot." (1.) Then, under Anarchy, "W." will have the agent who deals with crime, punish as he sees fit, any act that he may call a crime. That is what a State Socialist would call absolute authority, or despotism; an Anarchist thinks it freedom; and the argument is that if a man may fix his own hour for rising, he may also judge and punish the acts of others. (2.)

"W." has been unjustly punished for an act which nine out of ten call a crime, yet he says: "There is no serious difference of opinion in regard to natural crimes." Were this true, there are still a variety of opinions regarding punishment. Every man's penalty cannot be executed, a code would be law, therefore, says the Anarchist, the "agent" must punish as his whim dictates. (3.) But there is no general, uniform idea of what crime is, nor what proper punishment. It is not true that this country is equal to Russia in respect to invasion of the personal sphere. I said the plan of this government was equal to Socialism, Anarchy, etc. The plan is not yet realized.

I have never seen in Lucifer a correct statement, or a fair criticism, of State Socialism from its opponents; and would suggest that "W." explore the field a little, for his misrepresentations are more damaging than those of the common enemy.

ZENO.

#### The Opponent of Romanism.

Editors Lucifer: Some weeks ago the associated press informed us that the Rev. Justin D. Fulton, of Brooklyn, N. Y., had put on armor to do battle against the Church of Rome, from Passamaquoddy, to the Golden Gate. On March 21st, he bade farewell to his quondam flock as a pastor and struck out. To-day he put in an appearance in this city and has spoken three times. Never allowing a curiosity to slip by without seeing it if possible, I entered one of God's numerous houses in this place and saw the much advertised opponent of popery and Romanism. Mr. Fulton is not what can be called a free and easy speaker, though assisted by God in this important work; but his faculty for telling pathetic stories to touch the fountain of tears, seems good, and he can also stretch the truth if necessary to make out a good story. His arguments against Romanism are unimpeachable, and

did he stop after combatting the "Mother of Harlots," his mission would be a grand one, but he would enplant Romanism with Protestantism—which as a mind-paralyzer is nearly as bad, and contains nothing essential or important to the well-being of any person here or hereafter. I found no trouble in indorsing his remarks against Romanism, and any Infidel would delight in seeing this exponent of one Christian sect arrayed against another, for we have Bible authority that "a house divided against itself cannot stand," so a move agreeable combat cannot be seen than that of Christians fighting among themselves. Let the good work go on and give praise to God "who doeth all things well." In appearance there is nothing striking about Mr. Fulton, and his newspaper reputation is bigger than his mental caliber. He can probably talk about three times in a place before he pumps himself dry, and this accounts for his rapid trip from Passamaquoddy to the Golden Gate. However, as before stated, every Infidel will be glad to see and hear that an opponent of one branch of Christianity has been found in another and the followers of Jesus are showing up the foolishness and errors of each other. All these things are helps to mental freedom, and to get a good big doubt in a man's mind, will do his religious nature a permanent damage, even if he changes one church for another, and sooner or later he will find himself outside all churches, and wondering how in sheol he was ever fool enough to be a dupe of any.

C. SEYERANCE.

Los Angeles, Cal., 7-17-'87.

#### Society and Civil Law.

It is the idea that Liberal views are not hide-bound under a dogmatic creed of politics, religion or science; but an associated alliance whereby tolerance becomes a theory and natural rights the object. With this view, we here notice the editorial criticisms in Lucifer in regard to our views in an article on Society and civil government. The editorials claim that Society does not exist, that it is not an entity or person, and therefore, as such, can have no rights or duties. We admit Society is not a person, but as regards its not being an entity and having no existence, we submit the following concession by the editors: They say, "when we speak of Society we mean simply a large number of individuals having the rights and duties of individuals, only." The editors here speak of what they mean by Society and give it all the entity, existence and definition we ask. Webster, however, adds the words, "interest" and "fraternity" to society. But the idea with the editorial criticism is to discard Society because all rights, duties, crimes, and punishments, are individual,—that Society, as such, has no rights, duties, crimes, or punishments. We might say, with equal reason, that there are no public duties, crimes, rights, or punishments—because public means about the same as Society, and both can be rejected by vesting everything in individuals. We ask the editors if they hold the idea of any necessity for political compacts or any form of civil government to hold individuals responsible to the public good? If not, then my studies in Society and politics will have to be discarded. My information is, that civil government grows out of the general law of reciprocity by necessity, and this law is the mutual interests, obligations, rights and duties of individuals as discovered by experience and the corruptions of humanity. So that civil laws are, at best, a necessary evil, like civil government itself. If humanity were perfect, I would be for individuality; but since the wisdom of the past and every day's experience of the present prove the necessity of public alliances to protect natural rights, we deem it best to reject Autonomy as now taught and claimed. But the editorials disclaim the idea that a man is a party to the political government in which he lives, unless he "consents." This, I presume, in one sense is true, for he has the privilege to not exercise free suffrage or go to Salt Lake if he chooses, or he may so act as to be disfranchised from suffrage. But the idea is that every man who votes, or has the right to vote, and through representatives has the privilege to help make the laws, is a party to the government, and if he don't believe it, he can be soundly converted by kicking at the political harness. Therefore, we say, that kicking at the harness is not expedient nor prudent, and that it is not necessary to the Liberal cause to defy civil laws and try to create sympathy for self-martyrs. It is, indeed, an element of weakness to the cause of Liberal reform. But our editorials tell us that Liberals must be leaders in reform—in "intellectual growth, in social, moral and industrial reforms." This may be true, but the idea is about the necessity of being self-martyrs by rejecting civil laws in order to lead in this reform. It is acknowledged by the editors that reason, not force, can finally control the intellectual world, but they say the "State rests on force, not reason" to execute and make its laws. I don't know the penal code of the State of Kansas nor the sense and reason of its law-makers, but I presume, they will try to enforce their laws if it requires "acquiescence by jail and confiscation and bayonets." Again, I say, this is a constitutional Republic and makes provision for needed changes without men rejecting conformity to its laws. If the laws were made without the "consent of the people," the case would be different.

W. BAKER, M. D.

Eubanks, Ky., 6-12-'87.

Send to us for a catalogue of books.

## Don't Get Married UNTIL YOU HAVE READ IRENE; or, THE ROAD TO FREEDOM.

The "Uncle Tom's Cabin" of Woman Slavery. The Most Wonderful Love Story Ever Written. An Encyclopedia of Heart History. A True Tale of Slave Life—Not of the Black Slave of Long Ago, but of the White SLAVE OF TO-DAY: The Marriage Slave. The Wage Slave. The Free Love Slave

A Startling Exposure of our present inhuman Social System, showing the fetters thrown around the true expression of love. And the thralldom to which woman has ever been subjected in the love relation, both in and out of marriage—with suggestions whereby a more natural love life may be made practical, with greater freedom for woman and better conditions for marriage, more in accord with the important laws of heredity; and whereby the tolling millions may be emancipated from the wage serfdom to which they are now subjected.

A wide-awake book by a wide-awake woman, a resident of Philadelphia, who has been behind the scenes and knows of that which she writes. 612 large pages, new type, good paper, handsomely bound in cloth. Price, ONE DOLLAR. For sale at all first class book stores, or sent post paid by H. N. FOWLER & Co., 1123 Arch st., Philadelphia, Pa.

SPECIAL OFFER:—Until Oct. 1st '87 we will send to all new subscribers, and to present subscribers who pay up all arrears, Lucifer one year and one copy of "Irene" for \$1.50

M. HARMAN & SON, Valley Falls, Kan.

#### ANNIE BESANT'S WORKS.

MARRIAGE; AS IT WAS, AS IT IS, AND AS IT SHOULD BE.

#### THE LAW OF POPULATION

Its Consequences and Its Bearing Upon Human Conduct and Morals.

Books which have had an immense circulation and which are of inestimable value to every thinking man and woman. Price, 15 cents each.

Just received from an earnest co-worker as a donation to the Defense Fund, one hundred copies of the Law of Population, excellently printed on better paper than the above, and containing

A FINE STEEL PORTRAIT of the beautiful and gifted author. Price, 30 cts. Two copies for 25 cts. Address this office.

#### PHOTOGRAPHS

OF Lillian Harman and Edwin C. Walker.

To gratify many friends who have asked for pictures of the "Anatomical pair," and to help defray the expenses incurred in the struggle for freedom of Choice and Contract, and in the present battle for a Free Press and an Inviolable Mail, we offer photographs of Lillian Harman and E. C. Walker, who were imprisoned for more than six months for failing to comply with the statutes of Kansas "regulating" the natural right of marriage.

Cards of E. C. Walker 20c  
Cabinets of " 40c  
The above were taken before the prosecution.

Cards of Lillian Harman 20c  
Cabinets of Lillian Harman 40c  
Walker, taken in one picture 40c  
The last three names were taken since the release from Oskaloosa Jail.

Any two cards 35c  
Any two Cabinets 70c  
Also, Cards of M. Harman 20c  
Address, Lucifer, Valley Falls, Kan.

(CONTRIBUTED FOR DEFENSE FUND.)

#### OUR COMMON CAUSE

By N. K. PEARSON.

An olla podrida of subjects. State Socialism. Price reduced to 35 cts. For sale here.

#### A TRACT FOR THE TIMES.

#### Anarchy.

By C. L. JAMES.

This is, indeed, a book for the times, and every one who desires to keep up with the times should read it. Price, 25 cts.

Address, Lucifer, Valley Falls, Kan.

#### INGERSOLL'S LATEST.

#### "BLASPHEMY!"

Col. R. G. Ingersoll's Great New Jersey Heresy Case in the trial of Charles B. Reynolds for Blasphemy at Morristown, New Jersey, May 22d, 1887.

Chicago Edition: One copy 6 cents; two copies 10 cts. For sale here, \$3 per hundred, delivered. Send to this office.

#### What's to be Done?

(A Nihilistic Romance)

By N. G. TCHERNYCHEVSKY.

With a portrait of the author. Translated by Henry H. Tucker. Written in prison. Suppressed by the Czar. The author over twenty years an exile in Siberia. Russian edition worth \$100 a copy. First American edition exhausted in four days. The novel of the Day. Everybody wants to read it. 350 large pages. Price, paper, 75 cts. cloth, \$1.00. Address, Lucifer, Valley Falls, Kan.

(DONATED FOR DEFENSE FUND.)

#### UTOPIA!

OR: THE HISTORY OF AN EXTINCT PLANET.

Psychometrically obtained by Alfred Benton Clegg. Price, 10 cts. With each copy purchased goes one "Ballot Box" and one "Cent Per Mile," by same author. For sale here.

#### AN OPEN LETTER.

COMMON SENSE ON THE

#### Sexual Question.

By H. W. BOOZER.

We have just received a good supply of this

book, and are disposing of them soon to our truth-seeking readers. Price 10 cts. Lucifer, Valley Falls, Kansas.

#### THE PRODIGAL DAUGHTER.

—OR—

#### The Price of Virtue.

By RACHEL CAMPBELL.

The Greatest LITTLE book of the Century. A fearless uncovering of Social Ugliness. This pamphlet goes right to the heart of our Moral and Sexual ills. Price 10 cts.

## A N T I !

#### ANTI-THEOLOGICAL :

New "Little Lessons" on Science

and Natural History; 40 cts.

Infidel School Teacher; 20 cts.

Studying the Bible; 75 cts.

Clergymen's Victims; 25 cts.

John's Way; 15 cts.

Diana, A Work for the Married; 25 cts.

The Darwins; 50 cts.

The above mentioned seven books for \$2.00. Address,

Mrs. E. D. SLEEKER,

Pulaski Co. Snowville, Va.

#### DR. FOOTE'S HAND-BOOK

#### Health - Hints and Ready Recipes.

COMPRISING Information of the utmost importance to everybody concerning their daily habits of eating, drinking, sleeping, dressing, bathing, working, etc.,

TOGETHER WITH

Many useful suggestions on the management of various diseases; recipes for the relief of common ailments, including some of the private formulae of Dr. Foote and other physicians of high repute, and directions for preparation of delicacies for invalids as pursued in the best hospitals in this country and Europe. Price, 25 cents.

Address, Lucifer, Valley Falls, Kan.

#### PRACTICAL CO-OPERATION.

By E. C. WALKER.

Some hints as to the methods of Self-help and Voluntary Mutualism. Price, 10 cts.

#### Wives! Mothers! Daughters!

BE YOUR OWN PHYSICIAN! A lady who for years suffered from distressing female complaints, weaknesses, etc., so common to her sex, and had despaired of a cure, finally found remedies which completely cured her. Any sufferer can use them and thus cure herself, without the aid of a physician. Two recipes, treatise and full directions free, sealed. Address Mrs. W. C. HOLMES, 639 Broadway, N. Y. (Name this paper.)

English Spain Liniment removes all Hard, Soft, or Calloused Lumps and Blemishes on horse, Blood Spain Curbs, Splints, Sweeney, Stiffes, Sprains Sore and Swollen Throat, Coughs, ect Save \$50 by using one bottle. Every bottle warranted by Beland & Tutt Druggist, Valley Falls, Kansas.

#### DOOLITTLE & CO.

Dealers in

Hardware, Stoves, Tinware, etc

—AND—

#### BARB WIRE.

VALEY FALLS, - - KANSAS.

#### New York Daily Leader.

DAILY, SUNDAY AND WEEKLY.

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE

UNITED LABOR PARTY, CENTRAL LABOR UNION and various K. of L. ASSEMBLIES, representing

250,000 Workers of N.Y. City & Vicinity.

Subscription, \$3.00 per year or \$1 for 4 months. Weekly or Sunday 4 page Edition, 81 per year.

Address The Leader, Box 3678, N.Y. City.

#### STEWART'S

#### HEALING POWDER.

CURES ALL OPEN SORES ON ANIMALS

FROM ANY CAUSE, SORE SHOULDERS,

CUTS, KICKS, ROPE BURNS, SORE

BACKS, SCRATCHES, CUTS FROM

BARB-WIRE FENCES, ETC. NO SMELL

TO ATTRACT FLIES; DOES NOT BURY

A SORE LIKE LINIMENTS; EASILY APPLIED AND ALWAYS READY.

FOR BURNS, CHAFING, SORES OR CUTS ON PERSONS, IT HAS NO EQUAL.

15 and 50 Cents a Box.

AT DRUG OR HARNESS STORES.

STEWART HEALING POWDER CO., ST. LOUIS.