

158427

complete

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS

EUGENICS— . . . the doctrine of progress or evolution, especially in the human race, through improved conditions in the relations of the sexes.
—THE CENTURY DICTIONARY.

JULY, 1907.

In This Number:

OPPOSITION TO FREEDOM OF THE PRESS. THEODORE SCHROEDER,
Attorney for the Free Speech League

AN APPALLING STATE OF AFFAIRS. EDGAR L. LARKIN

PATERNAL IMPRESSIONS. E. B. FOOTE, JR., M. D.

REPRODUCTION OF THE UNFIT. JONATHAN MAYO CRANE

MARRIAGE AS A BUSINESS PROPOSITION. EDWIN C. WALKER

THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD AND EUGENICS. . M. FLORENCE JOHNSON

MEDICAL INTEREST IN SEXUAL PROBLEMS. . HULDA L. POTTER-LOOMIS

EDITORIAL: Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow.
Eugenics.
Angel City Notes.

THE WIND IS IN THE EAST WITH ANN

CAREFUL THOUGHTS OF A CARELESS FELLOW. JAMES ARMSTRONG
HAYWOOD'S SQUARE DEAL.

THE YOUNG PEOPLE: Gleams (a Poem). Mary's Bicycle Ride.
AT THE DESK.

M. HARMAN:
500 FULTON STREET, CHICAGO.
EASTERN REPRESENTATIVE: E. O. WALKER, 246 W. 142D STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

Price 10 Cents

Vol. I No. 1.

\$1.00 a Year

Wisconsin Historical

Library.

ANCIENT SOCIETY:

OR, RESEARCHES IN THE LINES OF HUMAN PROGRESS; FROM SAVAGERY THROUGH BARBARISM TO CIVILIZATION. BY LEWIS H. MORGAN, LL. D. CLOTH, \$1.50.

There is one American, and one only, whose name is known in every great European center of learning as one of the world's greatest scientists, and that man is Lewis H. Morgan. What Darwin's "Origin of Species" is to biology, what Marx's "Capital" is to economics, that Morgan's "Ancient Society" is to anthropology. Every textbook on the history of institutions which has been written during the last generation is based upon this great work. Yet, because this logic is destructive of the existing order, his work has been ignored and belittled even by those who have built upon the foundation it laid. Marx was one of the first to recognize its merits, and Engels thought it of so great value that he popularized some of its principal positions in his "Origin of the Family." It is a fundamental part of the Marxian system, applying to the prehistoric period the same principles which Marx applied to the stage of capitalism. Morgan shows that the evolution of society in the pre-capitalistic stage obeys the same laws as in the present society. The first division of the book shows how the social stages may be classified by the form of production employed, and his classification remains the base of all subsequent ones. The second part deals with the "Arts of Subsistence," and traces the development of the powers of production until the stage of a possible surplus is reached. Man, unlike any other animal, finally reaches that control over his environment which the possession of such a surplus implies, and this fact determines many social institutions.

The second part traces the "Growth of the Idea of Government," which he shows to have originated in the sex relation. It is this portion, tracing the evolution of the gens, tribe, and phratry into the beginnings of modern government, that constitutes the most famous portion of the work. Morgan had lived for many years as an adopted member of the Iroquois tribe of Indians, and it was the knowledge which he thus gained that gave him the clew to the laws of institutional evolution. He further elaborates the facts thus gained in the third part, on the "Growth of the Idea of the Family," a portion of the work which rivals the second part in its epoch-making character. Since it was written, no discussion of the family has ever appeared which is not founded upon it. The fourth part, the "Growth of the Idea of Property," is more directly connected with the Socialist philosophy, although it is really but the logical conclusion of the book. Here is traced the relation of property to different industrial stages, and to other social institutions, especially the marriage relation.

Hitherto this work has been sold only at a price which made it practically inaccessible to the working-class reader. This largely accounts for the unfamiliarity of most Socialists with its contents, save as they have gained them indirectly. This edition for the first time places this work within the reach of every student of Socialism and makes possible a wide diffusion of its contents.

Mailed promptly on receipt of price, \$1.50. Socialist Book Bulletin sent free if this magazine is mentioned. Address

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY,
264 EAST KINZIE STREET, CHICAGO.

HQ
756
A 1
A45
v. 1.

~~RDX~~
A512

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS

SUCCESSOR TO LUCIFER THE LIGHT-BEARER.

Published Monthly at 500 Fulton Street, Chicago, Ill. \$1 a Year.

M. Harman, Editor and Publisher.

Vol. I. No. 1.

JULY, 1907.

Whole No. 1094

Opposition to Freedom of the Press.

BY THEODORE SCHROEDER,
ATTORNEY FOR THE FREE SPEECH LEAGUE.

Eugenics, as a science, has scarcely been born. Practically all the pioneer work of systematically gathering and classifying the materials for study needs yet to be undertaken, and these facts must consist very largely of isolated experiences and observations of the common people. Their crude interpretations of the facts are of no special value, and will soon be replaced by the explanations of trained scientists, who, through an application of the processes of synthesis and analysis, will evolve for us those more accurate general statements of natural law by adjustment to which human betterment must be accomplished. This, in turn, will be closely followed by a continuous diffusion of intelligence from the closet of the few learned ones to the great mass in whose personal lives and reproductive activities rest the future of our race.

To the accomplishment of this great work, the most essential element is freedom of the press for the publication of all the factors which *might* contribute toward the development of this new science. That we do not now have such essential freedom of the press for the collection and spread of sexual intelligence is known to all the readers of this journal. I am not going to open that discussion. Having in many places written upon that theme, I shall here devote myself briefly to the expression of thoughts suggested by my critics as exhibiting some impediments to a realization of the freedom of the press.

The first and greatest obstacle to a progressive development of any phase of freedom is the fact that even its friends and advocates have no clear conception of what liberty is, and therefore cannot discern which wind will carry them to this peaceful haven. Most "liberals," I fear, are such, not because their intellectual capacities are adequate to a rational comprehension of the value of liberty in general, but solely because they have some emotional aversion to some particular tyranny which affects them personally, and such cannot conceive of protecting the un-

limited right of others to disagree with themselves as well as with Mr. Comstock. Here I can only hint at one illustration of this truth.

The very inception of liberty comes when arbitrary governmental authority is limited by general rules of law. It took many centuries of agitation and much bloodshed to get to the point where it was conceded by the comparatively intelligent powerful few that it was an insufferable tyranny to punish a man for an act which had not theretofore been made criminal by a proper legislative authority and publicly proclaimed in language so plain that every person of ordinary intelligence might know, from a mere reading of the statute, whether his act was a violation of it. The guarantee of this was included in the "due process of law" clauses of our American constitutions.

Centuries ago comparatively ignorant men saw the necessity for such limitation on the autocratic power of the king and his judicial tribunals. It is for this same principle that the benighted peasants of Russia are now battling. Yet, strange as it may seem, "liberal" lawyers who have been employed to defend obscenity cases, and the literary advocates of "sane radicalism," have not yet discovered its application to our present laws against obscene literature. This is so because they lack intelligence as to the meaning of "liberty" and know very little of the history of its progress.

Innumerable times has it been observed that no one can tell with certainty whether a particular publication is criminally "obscene" or not, until after a jury has brought in its verdict, and even then no one can know what conclusion another jury may reach in considering the obscenity of the same publication. All this comes from the fact that neither science nor common knowledge can furnish us any natural test by which to determine what is "obscene," and the legislature has furnished no artificial tests because of the erroneous assumption, ignorantly made, that we all possess an innate and therefore uniform sense of modesty and obscenity.

From this it results that every conviction is made pursuant to standards of judgment which come into being after the act to be punished, and which could not have been discovered by the person charged with the crime merely by a reading of the criminal statutes upon the subject. This, of course, is the very essence of lawless and arbitrary power, and the very crux of most of the struggle for liberty.

Now then, what do our "liberal" friends do with this situation when confronted by a conviction which displeases them? Do they attack the arbitrariness of the power to punish? Not they! They call Mr. Comstock an "ignoramus" and other illuminating names, and tell us he might do more good if he exercised his discretionary power as they think such power to punish ought to be exercised. In defense of their respectability

they "draw the line very decidedly" against all "truly obscene" literature,—they only differ with the courts *emotionally* as to what is "truly obscene," while agreeing with them that the freedom of the press may properly be limited. These "radicals" then inform us that I "would do the cause of free press much greater service, if you [I] admitted openly that you [I] draw the line"—where *they think that they think* it ought to be drawn, instead of where Mr. Comstock and the courts draw it. I oppose the existence of all arbitrary power to determine *ex post facto* what shall be punished as crime; while they are willing that the arbitrariness shall remain, if the tyrannical discretion could be exercised by themselves instead of by Mr. Comstock. That is the difference between liberty and an "intelligent despotism," though ever so many lack the capacity for understanding it, and in their denseness conceive themselves to be libertarians.

What matters it to me if the arbitrary judgment of guilt is inflicted at the instigation of a Comstock or of a "sane radical"? If the fact remains that an ordinary citizen cannot know in advance, with mathematical certainty, that his act is a punishable crime, then as to that subject-matter we have despotic, governmental absolutism—the worst possible form of tyranny.

This, then, presents the issue. I believe "sane radicals," in ignorance of the meaning of liberty, in its name are defending the worst phase of oppressive government, while they say of persons like myself that they are "wasting their time and energy in the wrong directions and hurting the cause of a free press [which these "radicals" don't want to make wholly free] by a lack of discriminating reason or by an excess of misdirected zeal." I am not primarily opposing the manner in which Mr. Comstock exercises an arbitrary power, but rather am I *opposed to the very existence of that power*, which owes its existence to a criminal statute so uncertain as to leave it a matter of discretion what is to be punished under it. Which of us has the most "discriminating reason" as to what freedom means, I leave for others to judge.

All knowledge is relative. We cannot know heat or cold in themselves, but know them only in their relation to us through our sense organs. Neither is there such a thing as absolute heat or cold, but relative degrees of these are accurately measurable by means which do not vary according to temperamental and emotional conditions of different individuals.

Many sane but poorly educated people still believe that some things are *per se* obscene. I have never made an argument against this contention, though there is need for it. I have written several arguments to prove that there is no such thing as "obscenity" in a book or picture, and have repeatedly asserted that there *is* such a thing as "obscenity," which,

however, resides wholly in the mind and emotions of the contemplating persons, and, therefore, unlike our concept of odors, heat or cold, etc., the shock to modesty is not a mere registration of a sense impression, but a condition superadded by a special mental predisposition, and that therefore the only unifying element which is generalized by the word "obscene" is subjective, and not in the sense-perceived qualities of the book or picture. These arguments I have made to demonstrate and explain the uncertainty of the obscenity laws. It seems to me that any person with the least scientific training should be able to see that this is not at all a discussion of the question as to whether or not anything is obscene *per se*. Neither is it a denial that there is no such thing as obscenity. On the contrary, it is the assertion that it does exist, but exists only in the contemplating mind, and not in the thing contemplated.

Now let me quote a "sane radical" who has the credentials and a few of the attainments of a scientist, and see how he fails to understand every single point that I make, just as completely as the untutored plowboy. It is not for me to say whether this is due to lack of intellect in him who tries to read me, or my intellectual incapacity for clear reasoning or clear statement of my contention. It must be one or the other. However, this is the manner in which he misstates my contention and answers what I did not argue:

One of the strongest points that Mr. Schroeder thinks that he makes is when he asserts that there is no such thing as obscenity *per se*. . . . This argument is an exceedingly childish one, for of course [!] no sane person will claim that a thing can in itself be obscene or chaste. But doesn't Mr. S. know the kindergarten fact that there isn't such a thing as *beautiful or ugly per se*? . . . Nevertheless we speak of beautiful and ugly things. If nine out of every ten people consider a thing beautiful, that thing is beautiful; and what the majority of people consider ugly is ugly. . . . And so it is in regard to obscenity. The thing in itself is not obscene; . . . but if it disgusts and shocks the feeling of 99 out of every 100 people, and if it induces some people, however small a number, to commit indecent, unhealthy things, then that thing is indecent, and no amount of sophistry can do away with the fact.

Thus our "sane radical" indorses all of the present uncertain tests of obscenity as the law is now administered. His words here quoted are almost a verbatim repetition of a verbal defense which Mr. Comstock once made to me, and no book has ever been suppressed in England or America except by the application of the test which "sane radicals" now approve. I cannot discover the slightest difference between "sane radicalism" and Comstockery, except in the label. Yet editorially one calls the other an "ignoramus," and I am wondering if this is not a mere case where the kettle calls the pot black.

Not only does this quotation show a total lack of understanding of

what I am trying to present, but it also evinces a very strange confusion of ideas between the concepts of obscenity, beauty, etc., and the objective realities which the words may or may not stand for. To say that *things* are beautiful, ugly, obscene or chaste, according to majority votes, is ridiculous. Decisions of the mob can make them so only for those who already believe with the majority. Votes cannot make the *thing* beautiful, ugly, chaste or obscene for the dissenting minority.

This same "sane radical" similarly confuses the concept of a thing with the thing itself in another portion of his criticism of my attitude, and then misconceives his intellectual shortcoming as my inconsistency. Let me illustrate:

Ingersoll, after announcing himself an agnostic, innumerable times, without an accompanying denial, used the word "God." Moderately intelligent persons generally know that he did not thereby admit the existence of a God as a thing outside the minds of those who believe in such a "God."

We all understand that when a disbeliever speaks of "God" he means the God-concept of others, and his speech does not at all imply that the avowed disbeliever really admits the existence of an objective entity corresponding to the God-concept of his religious neighbor.

Similarly is it with me. I have often written that witches and obscenity exist only in the minds of those who believe in them, and upon ceasing to believe in their existence they will cease to find either. If, after that statement, I mention witches or bawdy literature and art, I am not thereby admitting that either witches or obscenity have any existence outside the believing mind. On the contrary, I can only be speaking of the subjective condition, which, according to my announced theory, is all that those words can possibly symbolize.

It is a universal characteristic of very uncultivated minds to assume that we have a direct knowledge of things in themselves, and because of this misinformation such crude thinkers never differentiate between the thought-concept and its corresponding objective verity. Only to such a mind does an agnostic who uses the word "God" admit the error of his agnosticism, and a disbeliever in the objective reality of obscenity and witches admit the error of his theory by writing of bawdy literature and art or of witches.

Now, in the light of this comment, let me again quote my friend the "sane radical," who tells me that by not accepting his and Comstock's test of obscenity I am injuring the cause of the freedom of the press. This "radical" says: "But that there is such a thing as obscene and bawdy art and literature Mr. Schroeder himself admits, in an unguarded moment. . . . He [I] says, 'All morbid curiosity will then be dis-

pelled, and thus [by general sexual intelligence] the dealer in bawdy art and literature will be bankrupted.' And so there is 'bawdy' art and literature? Now look up in the dictionary the word 'bawdy' and you will see it defined as 'obscene, lewd, indecent.' And with the admission by yourself, Mr. Schroeder, that there is such a thing as obscene literature and art, I could really stop the discussion." Really? Dr. Wiseacre, please rise and explain how that in the least contradicts my oft-repeated statement that there does exist such a thing as obscenity in relation to literature, but that one must understand that the only element of unification which warrants the general classification as "obscene" is subjective, and that by removing this obscenity from our own mind and thus ceasing to believe in its objective reality, obscenity will cease to exist for us.

It seems to me that this whole matter, because of the general ignorance of psychology, and the moral sentimentalizing, will not be solved for a long, long time. My critic, whom I have quoted and tried to answer, it seems to me, is of the class who are the greatest hindrance to a free press and to liberty in general. On the other hand, he has the same opinion of me and my work. As a practicing physician and literary worker in his profession, he has the *credentials* for a scientific training. His words carry with them the weight of great authority with minds less informed than his own, even though he unintentionally misinforms his readers as to my contentions, and upon such false premises insinuates that I am ignorant of "kindergarten facts." Whether it is my intellectual incapacity or his which induced the criticisms I have quoted, is a question which I would rather submit to the judgment of real scientists than to accept his verdict as final.

To me, freedom of the press is still far off, and of course must remain thus so long as the victims of all superstitions can enforce their obscenity superstitions upon a suffering public with the help of "sane radicals" who, like the religionist, mistake a stupid moral sentimentalizing for rational ethics, and who believe in investing juries with a legislative discretion to pass *ex post facto* laws, because they have no conception of the meaning of that civil liberty to which they erringly give an empty verbal indorsement. I stand for a free press, and therein differ from all "sane radicals" who do not believe in freedom of the press (or general liberty, for that matter), but who "draw the line decidedly" at some distance on this side of freedom.

An Appalling State of Affairs.

BY EDGAR L. LARKIN.

And now THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS is about to appear, rising up out of *Lucifer the Light-Bearer*. And at no period in the history of man has the need of such a journal been so apparent. Science is advancing hour by hour, but man, so far as his physical body is concerned, is at a standstill in some nations and in the process of decline in others. To have minds capable of expansion they must be in healthy brains, and these fed by strong and vigorous bodies. But that a body may be strong it must be well born. How to be born well is the problem that must be solved, and solved correctly. This is imperative if the human species is to have a long career on earth and enjoy happiness.

I wandered all through Luther Burbank's wonderful gardens, in a state of complete happiness, wandering and wondering. The sensation was remarkable, for everything in this floral paradise was changing before my eyes. It was hard to realize that at the end of a year every plant and flowering splendor would be changed into a higher and more beautiful thing. Change, incessant change, always for the better. It seems that "eternal progress" is on display in these wondrous gardens. And it is, for there is not a trace of unharmonic thing within the splendid area. It seemed that genuine harmony—that is, love—reigned. Mr. Burbank adores his magnificent creations, and sweet, blessed peace hovers like a dove over the garden, a place cut out of paradise. I have visited places where they were taking extreme care with many kinds of animals and they were "watched and tended" by skilled attendants. Animals of the highest types are developed in Hagenback's zoölogical stations. But hundreds of millions of human beings have far less care than the lowest of these cherished creatures, for he makes the most diverse kinds,—decreed by nature to fight,—to love each other and lie down in peace. But no diverse races of men can be made to stop fighting; and the experiment so far has been a total failure. Men will yet, even in the twentieth century, kill one another in a more ferocious manner than tigers.

My assertion that "One-half of all the married pairs who have visited this observatory during seven years simply hate each other. One-half of the remaining couples are indifferent to each other, and half of the second remainder are beginning to lose their love," has been widely copied. And then the flood of letters began. Some denounce this conclusion of seven years' careful study, others are almost willing to admit its truth, but the majority of all so far received to date (June 7, 1907) says that the dread-

ful statement is literally true. I found it to be true four years ago, but did not think it wise to send it to any magazine. So I waited three years longer, but kept on studying this national, vital and capital problem,—one that directly affects every inhabitant of the United States, one pressing for solution, a mighty question that must be solved in the near future or society will disrupt and disintegrate. Those well versed in anthropology can already see the signs of overthrow of the existing order of things relating to marriage, and the destruction of our present very anomalous social structure—an artificial edifice not based on the rock—the laws of Nature. My natural study is that of astronomy and the physical sciences. But it was impossible not to see the effects and suffering caused in women by sex-slavery—slaves merely because they are women. Analyze my awful statement, which, if true, shows that $87\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of all the married pairs in the United States, or at least of those I have watched and studied for more than twenty years, suffered the horrors of unharmonious marriage. I was startled when I made the discovery; and it was with a feeling of dismay that I heard the letter containing the fearful assertion drop into our little mountain postbox on its way to *Lucifer*. When it was speeding on its way, not too late to recall, I asked a physician if it was true. He said: "It is, with one exception: it is under rather than over estimated. I have practiced in about 15,000 families and know what I am saying." He would make nine-tenths of our people unhappily married. To be within bounds, I will call the ratio 85 per cent. Now, this condition of affairs must be faced by the American people. I disliked to use the word "hate"; it is dreadful; so I sent a word to a magazine to be substituted. And this word was "loathe." For those who could not endure this I sent along the term "disgusted with each other." To get this down real fine it is as well to say that 85 out of every hundred married couples in the United States now regret that they are married. But this is also terrible to think of, for the set and changeless law of nature is that children of such parents are not well born. This is what now appalls scientific eugenic teachers. The task to right this enormous wrong seems to be so great that hope almost expires at once. Rich and poor, old and young, are now whirling in this terrific vortex of unhappiness. I know nothing of statesmanship, and cannot see a way out. How would it work to have the National Senate and House made up of scientific men and women, as in Finland, instead of multi-millionaires, warriors, fighters, and professional politicians who never heard of that majestic modern science, Eugenics? Finland is the first civilized nation. Will the United States be the next, or will it lag behind, say, England, France or Germany?

Yes, this peak is one of the favored spots of the world in which to study stars and "just human things" as well. A sex-slave is one of the

world's chief sufferers. But you ought to see the letters. Hundreds thank me for calling attention to this suffering, more horrible than anything that has appeared on this planet. Many letters are pathetic indeed, and would move hearts of flint. Others are from women in a defiant mode, saying "that they will soon own their bodies and be slaves no longer." And others expect to obey the Apostle Paul in abject meekness and die slaves. Indescribable agony is endured by nervous, worn-out, weak and bloodless women, especially those married to drunken men. Two letters contained prayers for death. Perhaps the cases of women married to gold lepers were as sad as any. I have had four gold lepers up here,—men in such agony that it was impossible for them to think of anything but gold. Their sufferings were equal to those of real lepers in Hawaii. One smoked four huge black cigars in two hours, and stormed because no car would make descent until 4 p. m. His very pores exuded the horrible odor of nicotine; and his delicate wife was nauseated for life, and his own children did not like him. He may keep his gold, and I will clutch my poverty. None of these four lepers could see anything beautiful, sweet and pure in the mountains or plains below. Their wives would be as happy chained to corpses "for life." Genuine love as designed by Nature is scarcer than diamonds, and far more beautiful.

The Hideous Hindu Menace.

In the midst of my studies of this complex problem of world-wide unharmonics, frightful suffering, pain that leads to death, came a missionary who had been with the child wives of India eighteen years. Now I wish to astonish every reader who has not made this terrific thing a special study. It took this missionary six hours to tell me the unutterable horrors she had seen with her own eyes. I thought I had heard of everything, but this recital required the wildest flights of imagination. Dante and Jonathan Edwards with their infernal words could not describe the pains endured by the little Hindu girls between the ages of four years and sixteen. Many cannot walk, and thousands become mothers at the age of nine years. I do not speak of educated and literary Hindus, but there are without doubt from 150,000,000 to 200,000,000 men so fiendish that word painting of the typical orthodox devil is incompetent to describe their tearing baby girls into shreds. I heard an Englishman who lives in India say that he wished the bubonic plague would slay 200,000,000 of these blackened imps.

India is the one vast reeking cancer of the world. For thirty centuries it was not open to the Western nations. Would that England had not entered this inferno. See this horror: the hundreds of millions are troubled by that appalling disease called obsession. But they are all

obsessed by sex perversion. Look at this double horror: the roots of this cancer are spreading into other nations, now that the doors are open. An accursed root has reached London. Little baby girls from six to ten are now horribly abused in rooms heavily padded so that their screams may not be heard. These dreadful Hindu obsessed fiends are now entering the ports of Seattle and Portland. Nautch girls are dancing to human monsters in the shape of besotted men in every great American city. The putrid Hindu cancer is securing roots and fibers here in the United States. New York is so appalling that all human words are incapable of describing its sex obsession. Here is a distortion of Nature's laws. These Hindus of whom I am speaking—not the descendants of those mighty men who elaborated the great systems of philosophy, the Vedanta Samkhya and Yoga—have festered in sex debasement so many centuries that, by the law of influence, girls reach puberty at the age of four to six years in many instances. Then incredible horrors begin. They are subjected to the lust of full-grown men fiends. This obsession has spread over the white races, with this blood and brain curdling result: a girl aged ten years is higher priced in some markets than one of twenty. Traffic in girls is a vast commercial industry now. Parents of girls: watch for kid-napping soon in the streets. Once in a den, you forever lose all traces of them.

Can it be possible that Hindu obsession of sex will submerge Europe and America? It is now, at a rapid rate. To the amazement of the reader, I hereby assert that this cancer is eating here. I try hard to see a bright light somewhere, but I frankly admit that I cannot see a thing but gloom. All the good and pure people on earth have simply to bind themselves into a solid body or they will be obsessed by this awful wave of sex perversion. Who is wise enough to save the Caucasian race? Now is the time for a leader to appear. Appalling specters are looming up with hideous mein.

Lowe Observatory, Echo Mountain, Calif., June, 1907.

Paternal Impressions.

BY E. B. FOOTE, JR., M. D.

Maternal impressions and their prenatal influences on the development of the human embryo and the later fortunes of the coming man or woman, have afforded a favorite and fertile field for writers both in and out of the medical profession, until there is little chance to say anything new on the subject. Many instances occur from time to time worth citing as illustrations of the truth of "birth-marking," and such facts have accumulated until the doubters must be very few. Books full of them are ready for those who are interested in such matters, and it must be a rare prospective mother who reads anything in the line of periodical literature who will not come across now and then an urgent plea for so ordering her life during the gestative period as to make conditions favorable to the welfare of the unborn. These are the things with which we are all familiar, so that if such conditions are not always for the best it is not so much for the lack of knowing what they should be, as from the difficulties in the way of making them so. Among the illiterate masses ignorance of such matters is of course a great factor, but even among them, or more especially there, it is not easy for women to be ever thoughtful of "the rights of the unborn." Generally there are too many already born that require their immediate attention during every waking hour.

Our present purpose is to rest content with what has been said concerning the importance of providing the best possible maternal impressions, and to insist on the equally important factor of paternal impressions. At the outset it is well to admit that the cases are not quite parallel. The moment conception occurs in the impregnation of the ovule the new being called an embryo is charged with all its true hereditary qualities, a combination of tendencies, or propensities to development which it acquires from both the female and male elements of which it has been generated, and from this time, during its intra-uterine life, and may be even after, all the new impressions made upon it must be through the mother, and these are what are spoken of as maternal impressions. Whether they shall be for good or ill will depend largely on certain paternal impressions, or the conduct of the father so far as it can affect the life of the wife and mother. It is not, however, this sort of paternal influence which I propose to lay emphasis upon, since it is merely part of the subject of maternal impressions, one factor in determining what they shall be.

In the attempt to awaken mothers to an appreciation of their conduct during child-bearing, there has been some overshadowing of the fact that

the mother's state of health preceding conception has much to do with settling the child's fate, for it is scarcely to be doubted that the ovule itself is packed full of possibilities, and that these depend on the previous condition of the mother; so that the most perfect life during gestation, with most fortunate sequence of maternal impressions, cannot entirely make amends for evil hereditary impulses imparted to the constitution of the embryo at the time of conception "from the mother's side." She should not be permitted to forget the *preparatory* period, the months and years before the event of maternity, during which her powers of motherhood are being established, and of course this dates so far back that even her mother must have looked out for the normal development of the daughter from birth in order to have prepared her for even an approximation of "perfect motherhood."

But this hereditary impulse should be of even more interest to prospective fathers, for it is his only opportunity of imparting any notable paternal impress upon the child which he will hope to proudly point to as "my child." It is found to be more or less a "chip of the old block," and here is where the chipping occurs. In that little chip which the father imparts, the microscopic spermatozoon, is contained all that he can directly contribute to the make-up of the embryo, and what the impressions, meaning impulses, propensities, proclivities, powers, packed so miraculously in this chip of the old block, shall be, must depend upon the history of that block "from away back." The father confers much, of course, that he is not responsible for, currents of force which came down to him from his parents, but these inherent talents, capacities, powers, may be greatly modified for better or worse by his own course of life. Has he dissipated his patrimonial endowment of vital force, or augmented it by right living? That will determine whether he has or has not properly prepared himself for conferring a paternal impress upon an embryo which will give it a place among the "well-born."

One writer, in the effort to explain the unexplainable, has said that "if we consider the individual as a book, each spermatozoon is an index to the contents; but how printed, is a conundrum precisely on a level with how facts or ideas are recorded in memory, and we can conceive no material method for the performance of that function." The father's chip, being fully equipped, at the moment of conception, with all his characteristics, is his contribution to the newly formed organism. More he cannot give it, and if it carry impresses to be regretted they cannot be recalled. If the father has saturated himself with tobacco or alcohol the chip by which he becomes born again in his child will leave upon it some unfortunate paternal impression in the line of nervous instability, and possibly this flaw will amount to a tendency to imbecility or epilepsy. It may be noth-

ing more than general incapacity, that "good-for-nothing boy" being the product of the father's brain-benumbing habits. If the father has, in "sowing his wild oats," come in contact with the briars of noxious weeds and become inoculated with that worst of all blood poisons which has earned the right to be called "the disease," then the chip will be freighted with some of the worst possible heritage, and the child will be doomed to suffer one or more of innumerable blights. There are physicians who claim that a syphilitic man cannot be the father of an unpolluted child, and that all such should be urgently advised against propagating their kind. Professor R. A. F. Penrose, of the University of Pennsylvania, in a lecture to the students for their own personal welfare, said:

When the superintendent of a building wishes to rear a structure that shall be an honor to his name, he selects the best materials for its construction. From poisoned syphilitic bodies you cannot raise up sons and daughters that shall be an honor to yourself and a benefit to the race. For God's sake, young men, keep your building material first class.

Our only amendment to this advice would be to write instead of "for God's sake" *for our new humanity's sake*, or to so interpret the writer's phrase. This sort of advice could be greatly simplified by calling to mind the many ways in which young men go astray and dissipate their vital endowments, robbing to some extent their own progeny of that vitality which is essential to longevity and health. It suffices our present purpose to leave this part of our subject here; a word to the wise suffices. A stream can rise no higher than its source, and the chip can be no better than the block. "Ye cannot gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles," is one of the greatest truths of scripture.

The subject of paternal impressions is not, however, exhausted. It has a curious indirect relation which gives much sanction to Sam Weller's advice, "Beware of widders." The chip of the old block not only goes on in its evolution to determine the fate of the embryo of which it has become a part, but during the nine months of its occupancy of the mother's womb it reacts upon her organism, and confers upon her something of the paternal impressions with which it is charged. How it occurs we may not know, but the facts prove it. They are often cited in books upon breeding, heredity, etc., and a new instance is well told by Dr. Cullen in the *Provincial Medical Journal* (1894): "A friend possessed a fine female dog of pure Dalmatian breed. Accidentally she mated with another that was no choice of her master, and, to the latter's supreme disgust, presented him with a brood of collie mongrels. In course of time he had her warded by a pure male dog of her own breed, and on this occasion she dropped six puppies—three of them, however, being perfect collies, to such details even as the claws." Here it is evident that the mother not only impresses the conception, but the conception retaliates with the

paternal impress. The same law holds good with cattle, horses, swine and other animals. Nisbet, in *Heredity and Marriage*, refers to it as occurring among widows who have married a second time, and borne children resembling those by their first husbands. . . . That the male element has an influence on the female organism over and above that of fertilization is incontrovertible; her first impregnation has literally a double result; with the conjunction of the respective elements there develops a mutual product whose resemblance to the male organism would be infinitesimal were its initial activities not potent enough to affect, and afterwards modify, those of the mother.

Here is double reason why women should be more particular as to who they accept in marriage, for if, through pity for or propinquity with some mongrel man or puny specimen, he is accepted as "number one," and dies leaving her with a few unfortunate reminders of his deficiencies, then if she should attract a better specimen as "number two," she may be disappointed to see this finer stock mongrelled by the persisting paternal impressions of her first mistake, and be as distressed as the hen that hatched ducklings; but what must be the feelings of her second spouse when discovering this depreciation of the second brood to which he must stand as father?

Therefore the well-preserved man who has taken thought and duly prepared himself for paternity may well beware of widows, and yield only to the allurements of one who can proudly say, "know me by my fruits"—offering living pictures of her success in motherhood, and also showing no mean fatherhood; while, on the other hand, the man of small caliber or vitality will be fortunate if he can discover such a woman to mother his progeny and endow them with some of the superior attributes of the "dear departed," whose portrait, still hanging on the wall, may serve to fortify the power of his lingering impressions. Thus we see that while a child can have only one mother, he may place his heredity to two or more fathers, and so discover in different paternal impressions the sources of the hickory, the oak and the dog-wood chips that constitute his materials.

But there are widows without children, who have never conceived, and the query arises whether such an one may receive any impress from mere association with number one that would influence the nature of children born to number two. I have never seen any facts or cases helping to throw light on this problem, and should like to hear from any one who has.

Reproduction of the Unfit.

BY JONATHAN MAYO CRANE.

Sociologists and scientists the world over recognize the importance of the problems of eugenics. That the race can be improved and the proportion of degenerate and defective children can be greatly diminished is undisputed. That poverty and crime are due in great measure to unchecked reproduction of the unfit is admitted by most of the students of social conditions. The great problem is to discover the best method of improving the quality of the children brought into existence.

Many men of eminence—among them Professor E. Ray Lankester, Professor Edgar L. Larkin and Dr. G. Frank Lydston—have advanced the idea that persons who desire to marry should submit to physical and mental examinations by medical and psychological experts, who shall determine whether or not they are adapted to each other and are likely to produce sound and healthy children. Some of these specialists insist that a consumptive, a criminal or a person affected by any hereditary disease should not be permitted to marry.

But will this solve the problem? Is it not extremely probable that the men who for any cause may be forbidden to marry will indulge in illicit relations, which not only will increase the percentage of illegitimate children, but also will transmit to those children the defects of the parents, which the well-meaning advocates of restricted matrimony desire to eliminate?

The importance of eliminating congenital diseases is ably set forth by Professor Lankester, who also foresees that the elimination of diseases will tend to the overpopulation of the world unless some measures are taken to restrict population. He says:

Whilst there is a certainty of man's power to remove all disease from his life, a difficulty which he has already created for himself will be thereby increased. That difficulty is the increase of human population beyond the capacity of the earth's surface to provide food and the other necessities of life. By rebelling against nature's method, man has made himself the only animal which constantly increases in numbers. Whenever disease is controlled his increase will be still more rapid than at present. At the same time no attempt at present has been made by the more advanced communities of civilized men to prevent the multiplication of the weakly or of those liable to congenital disease.

Already something like a panic on this subject has appeared in this country.* Inquiries have been conducted by public authorities. But the only possible method of dealing with this matter, and in the first place of estimating its importance as immediate or remote, has not been applied.

*England.

Man can only deal with this difficulty created by his own departure from nature—to which he can never return—by thoroughly investigating the laws of breeding and heredity, and proceeding to apply a control to human multiplication based on certain and indisputable knowledge.

As to the advisability of the investigation of the laws of breeding and heredity there is little if any dispute. The trouble will come when attempts are made by any persons, except the parents themselves, to decide just who shall and who shall not bring children into existence. Professor Lankester thinks when humanity sees the necessity for checking the increase of population it will submit to a "restriction by the community in respect of the right to multiply with as good a grace as it has given up the right to murder and steal." But millions of persons, even in so-called civilized countries, have not given up their right to murder and steal. As the number of criminals increases in proportion to the advance of civilization, it seems to me to be more than probable that when legal restriction of the right to propagate is established there will be a constant tendency to an increase of the number of persons who will dispute the right of the community to exercise such control.

The presumption that there will come a time when legal restriction of propagation will be necessary seems to be based on the prior assumption that all children are voluntarily brought into existence by their parents; yet with notable inconsistency the very persons who make the strongest demands for the examination of candidates for matrimony and for the prohibition of marriages of the unfit are the ones who support the laws which are now responsible for bringing so many undesired children into the world. I mean the laws which make it a penitentiary offense to inform any person how he or she can avoid having undesired children.

Wealthy and educated persons have no difficulty in obtaining such information, and the result is that the families of the wealthy and the intelligent, as a rule, are not excessively large. On the contrary, there is an excessive production of children by the poor and ignorant, from which the great majority of criminals—made criminals by economic as well as prenatal or congenital conditions—is recruited. The poor and the ignorant are unscathed by fulminations against the tendency to "race suicide." They are more than doing their "duty" in bringing into existence "toilers, cannon food and gallows fruit." Under present conditions, and considering the fate of their progeny, it is the refinement of heartless irony to urge upon the poor "the importance of serving their country by begetting large families." Quality, not number, is the aim of the eugenic movement—better children, better adapted for membership in the brotherhood of man, rather than a greater number of recklessly begotten children.

Attempts to restrict vice and crime have been made for thousands of years with little beneficial effect. The evil effects of restriction, as a rule, have more than outbalanced the good effects. The eradication of the "red light" districts in New York city possibly ameliorated the condition of a few hundred white slaves, but it greatly increased the number of shopgirls who have illicit relations with men. Attempts to dam the great stream of sex—"the procreant urge of the universe," as Whitman calls it—always have resulted in its finding other outlets. Prostitution will exist in spite of laws so long as the conditions which cause it exist. It is one of the problems of eugenics to discover and eliminate this cause. The attitude of most reformers in regard to the social evil is well described by Professor Lankester in these words:

They still attach little or no importance to the acquirement of a knowledge of nature; they remain fixed in the old ruts of traditional ignorance and obstinately turn their faces to the past, still believing that the teachings and sayings of antiquity and the contemplation, not to say the detailed enumeration, of the blunders and crimes of its ancestors can furnish mankind with the knowledge necessary for its future progress.

The fact stands out clearly that the poor and the ignorant produce the greatest proportion of criminal and defective children. The fact that an enormous majority of these children were unwillingly brought into existence, were recklessly and imprudently begotten, is also indisputable. It is extremely improbable that the poor have a greater desire for large families than the rich. Taking into consideration these two facts and the strongly probable assumption that large families are not desired by the poor, is it not evident that crime, disease and misery would be greatly reduced if the poor were not kept in ignorance?

Eugenics furnishes the only key to the problem. Its cardinal doctrine, which must be held until substantial reasons are given for abandoning it, is this:

Woman must be the sole person to decide when and under what conditions she will give birth to children.

This means the emancipation of woman from sexual slavery. It means that she shall have the control of her own person, within wedlock as well as out of it. The science of eugenics can make no progress until this basic demand is granted. Woman will never obtain this control so long as she is kept in ignorance. It follows then that obstacles to the spread of knowledge in regard to human reproduction must be removed.

The disgraceful law which seeks to perpetuate the ignorance of women and hold them in slavery by making it a penitentiary offense for any one to tell them how they may avoid having undesired children should be wiped off the statute books. When every young woman shall know how she may

avoid having undesired children there will be little need of laws to prevent the marriages of criminals and the unfit. As a rule, criminals have no desire to be burdened with children. If they knew how to avoid reproduction they would, to a great extent, cease to reproduce their kind and nature itself would solve the crime problem. The poverty problem would be greatly simplified by the same means.

The time is ripe for sociologists and others interested in the uplift of humanity to face the facts that ignorance and sexual slavery are the greatest causes of social evils. Interest in the study of eugenics should result in a higher morality which will lift the problems of sex and parenthood out of the filth and muck to which they have been consigned by persons who still are held in sway by medieval asceticism.

Marriage as a Business Proposition; And Related Subjects.

BY EDWIN C. WALKER.

The implied contract to receive support for life from the husband for personal services that would not have been rendered by the wife save on these terms, is recognized by custom, law, and current ethics. Whatever sentiment may be connected with marriage in particular cases, or at certain periods during the association, as at the beginning, the union at its foundation is essentially a business arrangement. Whatever part her brains may be assumed to be of the capital she puts into the business, the dividends she receives are not calculated upon her mentality as the principal but upon other parts of her contribution to the capital of the concern. If her husband sues another man for the alienation of his wife's affections, the facts alleged as the basis of the suit are physical, sexual, not intellectual. You do not traverse the terms of the marital contract by conversing with the woman-partner concerning the orbit of Saturn or the incidence of the Dingley tariff; you are liable for damages only when you touch the erotic shares of the corporation. When the wife retires from active business, by suing for a separation or for a divorce, she expects, as does a man retiring from his active pursuits, to live for the rest of her life (or until she enters a new partnership) upon her earnings during her first business venture, or ventures. Yesterday's dailies report a New York woman, who is preparing to sue her husband for a separation and

alimony, as saying "I do not want a divorce; I shall never again marry, but I want enough from Mr. Blank to live on." Exactly. She expects to clip coupons for an indefinite time from the life-bonds she bought with her body during eight years of married service. Had she been collaborating with Mr. Blank in writing books, and not married to him, she would never have thought of suing him for support for life, and the law would not have recognized her claim had she been so foolish as to file an application. But writing books is not a sexual service. Incidentally, this woman combines revenge with business by asking for a separation only, thus preventing her husband marrying again. Incidentally, again, note the superiority of the marriage business as a money-getter over ordinary business transactions. When the partners in, say, the grocery trade, wind up their affairs and go their separate ways, neither can be mulcted by the other for alimony or an annuity.

Another phase of the sordidness so common in marriage is revealed on the screen in vivid word-pictures by Richard Hovey in his "The King's Son," in *Songs from Vagabondia*:

"Daughter, daughter, marry no man,
Though a King's son come to woo,
If he be not more than blessing or ban
To the secret soul of you."

" 'Tis the King's son, indeed, I ween,
And he left me even but now,
And he shall make me a dazzling queen,
With a gold crown on my brow."

"And are you one that a golden crown,
Or the lust of a name can lure?
You had better wed with a country clown,
And keep your young heart pure."

"Mother, the King has sworn, and said
That his son shall wed but me;
And I must gang to the prince's bed,
Or a traitor I shall be."

"Oh, what care you for an old man's wrath?
Or what care you for a King?
I had rather you fled on an outlaw's path,
A rebel, a hunted thing."

"Mother, it is my father's will,
For the King has promised him fair
A goodly earldom of hollow and hill,
And a coronet to wear."

"Then woe is worth a father's name,
For it names your dourest foe!
I had rather you came the child of shame
Than to have you fathered so."

"Mother, I shall have gold enow,
Though love be never mine,
To buy all else that the world can show
Of good and fair and fine."

"Oh, what care you for a prince's gold,
Or the key of a kingdom's till?
I had rather see you a harlot bold
That sins of her own free will.

"For I have been wife for the stomach's sake,
And I know whereof I say;
A harlot is sold for a passing slake,
But a wife is sold for aye.

"Body and soul for a lifetime sell,
And the price of the sale shall be
That you shall be harlot and slave as well
Until Death set you free."

All very good indeed, except that the harlot does *not* sin "of her own free will." The slave of the "man behind the bank-roll," the victim of caprice, the votive offering on the altar of desire without respect or tenderness, with no veto against the intrusion of the chance buyer, plunged into the seething whirlpool of alcoholic dissipation, eaten up with loathsome and agonizing diseases, there is nothing in the life of the harlot to excite the envy of the wife save its greater brevity, the swifter passage to oblivion. Those doctrinaire enthusiasts who, in publications of a kind, and sometimes on the platform, talk of the "freedom" of the unfortunate women of the streets, speak without thought, are mere surface skimmers of the unfathomed deeps of sociology. Intelligent social radicals know that marriage is deplorable just in the ratio that it resembles prostitution of the ordinary illegal sort, and that our work is so to change beliefs and economic conditions that prostitution, whatever special name it may bear here or there, shall be eliminated as nearly as is humanly possible.

Underlying all changes in biology and sociology has been and is the struggle for food and love, for except the organism *is* it cannot *express*. But this struggle always has been modified, in the ratio of organic and social complexity, by the conterminous struggle for expression. In the human family alone, uncounted millions have risked the loss of food and love and life for the right and opportunity to express; they have not only risked the loss of food and love and life, but millions after millions have lost all these rather than give up the struggle to express their lives, their thoughts, their emotions, in ways that to them seemed better than other ways that could have been theirs without risk and struggle. This is a key: Whenever and wherever men and women have been willing to lose the food and love that sustained and continued life and the life itself that

was not the life they most wanted, that did not permit the expression they craved, *then* and *there* has been religious or political or social or ethical change, or all these movements. But whenever men have had full stomachs and satiated passions and have not cared what the religious and ethical and political creeds were, then "economic determinism" has taken a vacation. Organisms so simple in structure that food and mating complete the list of their wants are factors in the continuance but not in the evolution of forms. Themselves and their institutions are examples of arrested development.

More and more through the ages down to our own, ethical issues have engaged the attention of thinkers and men of social action. After all, the conduct of individuals in relation to other individuals is what concerns us more than aught else, in the very nature of things, for we are gregarious beings. Religions, governments, and societies are good or bad in the degree that they safeguard or fail to safeguard the equal rights and liberties of individuals. Keen, close reasoners, masters of logic, men who lived in fact or now dwell in thought in the metaphysical, pre-evolutionary period, may demonstrate to their own entire satisfaction that "right" and "wrong" are dreams, that "might" is king, but ever the race in its aspirations and ideals and increasingly in its practice finds less and less secure resting place in their conclusions. The ideals change in detail, for all relations are relative to one another, and the averages must vary as evolution adds or withdraws factors, enlarges or diminishes those that remain, but century by century actions once deemed even godlike have come under the ban of the augmenting and sharpening sense of justice of mankind. "Might" answers no questions, solves no problems, makes no peace that is permanent. A nation with right on its side may conquer another that was in the wrong, but the resulting cessation of hostilities is only an armistice unless, before the conquered nation becomes strong enough to fight again, its people and government have perceived the wrongfulness of their former aggressions and voluntarily refrain from renewing them. The scholarly theorists who smile so derisively at mention of "right" and "wrong," and blithely consign "conscience" to the dust-heap of antiquity, show very clearly by their indignant denunciation of outrages inflicted upon weak peoples and persons, that all their elaborate and forcible arguments about the glory of "might" and the futility of ethics are purely academic, that their ingenious speculations have taken no real hold on their lives. Unfortunately, men and women of weaker intellects and less useful knowledge of the world often have shown the demoralizing effects upon them of these delusive philosophies. Largely speaking, however, unceasingly the touchstones are "right" and "wrong." The supernatural

sanction has gone or is going; the natural sanction has come or is coming. It varies, of course, in its pronouncements, for all in life is mutable, but this variation is what makes it superior to the old god-sanction, which was declared to be unchanging and unchangeable. The new authority is adaptable to the growing knowledge, to the diverse and multiplying needs of our race.

The Scientific Method and Eugenics.

BY M. FLORENCE JOHNSON.

I would like to ask a few questions on the "List of Subjects for Study in Eugenics," as given in *Lucifer* June 6.

To investigate and report on heredity in the human family.

How is one to investigate and report on heredity?

Prenatal conditions.

In handling this subject, how is one supposed to distinguish between heredity and prenatal conditions? Half the talkers and writers on these subjects confound them.

To emphasize the value of superior blood and the menace of inferior blood.

What is "superior blood," and who knows enough to even advise regarding proper mating?

Why is the subject of eugenics the most scientific and majestic problem of the day?

It is the most majestic problem because it is as yet the most unscientific problem, and because all the religious teachings and customs of society have cultivated "sacred" feelings regarding sex and will oppose its being made a scientific subject. Webster defines Science as

knowledge; penetrating and comprehensive information, skill, expertness and the like. Truth *ascertained*; that which is known; hence, specifically, knowledge duly arranged and referred to general truths and principles on which it is founded and from which it is derived; a branch of learning considered as having a certain completeness; philosophical knowledge, profound knowledge, complete knowledge, true knowledge; and Scientific as

agreeing with or depending on the rules or principles of science; used in science; evincing profound and systematic knowledge.

The students of eugenics must study many years before eugenics can be called a science. Students in eugenics can claim only to be investigating scientifically. By claiming too much they belittle themselves in the consideration of scientists. In fact, there are few who are taking up this study who know how to go to work in a really scientific manner. For instance, "To *emphasize* the value of superior blood and the menace to all of inferior blood." Here is already a *preaching* and an *emphasizing* of *my* idea, without a real knowledge of what is "inferior blood." Every writer will emphasize what he or she considers superior. One will prefer "the best families," the "blue blood" of aristocracy; others will prefer "physically" good blood. But from my observation I would not dare to advocate even the latter, as some of the most healthy children I have ever known are descended from parents with hereditary records of venereal disease. If these "scientific" persons were to "judge by the fruits" they would certainly pick out those of whom I speak as of "superior" blood. "To *emphasize* the value" of something that is in the very infancy of scientific investigation is hardly the scientific method. Rather *emphasize study and investigation*.

What has caused the romantic and sentimental wave that has commenced to operate in the past year? And what are its effects?

I did not know there was such a wave. It has not reached here. What is its manifestation? I would like to watch it. When it is pointed out to me I will try to guess what the effect will be.

But I intended to write on only two questions:

What are the great sexual needs of this age?

What tends more to the higher intellect, greater success and better health of the coming race?

For one, I would like to see individuals allowed natural selection in sex. We read that "men pay more attention to breeding cattle than to breeding children," and of their wonderful success. Men breed cattle to serve them. But I do not want to see *breeding* of children in that way. There is already too much breeding for the pretended good of the child in homes of sanctity.

If we could remove all notions of respectability in sex, and have the sex life of one as moral as the sex life of another, with no stigma attached to it in any way, even in thought, we might learn something. As Theodore Schroeder so ably points out, "Obscenity exists only in the minds and emotions of those who believe in the superstition." So does morality exist only in the imagination. The world must be educated out of the "sacred" before it can get at the truth of any subject. Because it was a sacred truth that this was the only world, Bruno was burned for declaring a

plurality of worlds. Because the world was sacredly stationary, Galileo was persecuted for declaring it moved. Because comets were sacred warnings of the wrath of God, and were caused by the "emanation of sin from the wicked" and set on fire by God, professors in universities were not allowed to present the idea that comets were bodies moving in accordance with natural law. Every idea that threatens the "sacred" has its martyrs. Church and state are sacred and are the controlling power over individuals. They are sacred and *protect sacred things*. Sex is sacred when legal and hidden, no matter what the evil effect on children or mothers; but obscene and indecent, obnoxious and impure, when talked about as a natural part of life, no matter how good the results;—sacred when blessed by church or law; vile and impure when simply an expression of natural impulse. E. H. Heywood and Moses Harman were both imprisoned for daring to inquire into the sacred subject.

So the greatest need of sex is to release it from religion and law, and let it be free for science to observe. Remove all sacredness from the subject and let each individual try for a solution of the question, so free from censure that those interested dare let results be known. Observers who were not prejudiced have seen fine children as the result of unions that, from the viewpoint of those ready to choose mates for others or to advise against such mating, should have been prohibited.

As students of eugenics, we might advise against self-imposed submission to a promise made under an emotion of the past; but let us for a few years—at least until we get a few results—try not to insist on anything but freedom. "Make your own choice; I will protect you what I can from sacred persecution, and watch for to see what a desire can do."

Scientific investigation is content to see all the investigators' ideas of life and ethics demolished if untrue, and arrive at a true, a fact basis for things. History shows us that the scientific basis has given greater satisfaction than the religious basis, and that religion has always opposed the scientific method of investigation, fearing the destruction of all that was good if sacred things were thus profaned.

Milford, Mass.

Medical Interest in Sexual Problems.

BY HULDA L. POTTER-LOOMIS.

That the medical fraternity is becoming awakened to the fact that the "sex problem" is the most vital problem of our present-day civilization is evidenced by the papers devoted to sex, its use and abuse, which have been read and discussed before the different medical societies within the past year or two.

Perhaps the most active and enthusiastic of these societies is the American Society of Sanitary and Moral Prophylaxis, which was organized in February, 1905, at the New York Academy of Medicine. The transactions of this society for the year ending May 31, 1906, have been published in a pamphlet, which contains twenty or more papers, some of them by lay members of the society, nearly all of which concede the importance of educating the public in sexual science, and in some instances the demand comes in strong, clear notes, that sex and all that pertains to it shall be recognized as proper and legitimate subjects for discussion, and that the youth especially shall be educated in these hitherto forbidden matters.

At a meeting held April 12, 1906, at the New York Academy of Medicine, Prince A. Morrow, M. D., president of the society, speaking of the manifold difficulties connected with this work, said that

in the education of the youth, the existing system made no provision for imparting this particular knowledge. It was therefore necessary to enlist the coöperation of the teaching fraternity, and get the advice of the best pedagogists as to how this feature of the work could be best undertaken. A large majority of the teachers were heartily in sympathy with the work, as was evidenced by the numerous communications received from teachers, instructors in physical training and the heads of various settlements.

It would be interesting to know to what extent this interest of teachers and instructors in their various lines has been aroused or prompted by the demand for this knowledge from the youth themselves. It is not long since the young women students at Wellesley College appeared before the faculty of that institution of learning and petitioned that they might receive instruction from women physicians in matters pertaining to sex and maternity. Doubtless this is not an exceptional case, and such demands for knowledge of sexual science upon the part of the future fathers and mothers of the race cannot wisely be ignored. In regard to widespread public education, Dr. Morrow had this to say:

In the education of the general public, we have had to encounter and overcome, in the first place, the situation that the general public was indifferent, and in cer-

tain quarters actively hostile. Then, the ordinary means of communication with the public were not available. The newspapers and magazines, which had been such powerful agencies in the enlightenment of the public in regard to tuberculosis, were closed to the important work of this society. Indirect methods of communication had to be sought, and the work was now being carried on along the lines of least resistance on the part of public prejudice.

The advent of THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS will doubtless be welcomed by the members of the American Society of Sanitary and Moral Prophylaxis, since the same evils and the necessity for education and enlightenment have called them both into life and activity, and it is true, as Dr. Morrow said, that while the general public has not been reached to any effective extent, yet proof is not lacking that there are a large number of serious-minded men and women in this country who recognise the real importance of this work.

While Dr. Morrow did not name the sources of active hostility against this work of enlightenment, it is not necessary to call them by name to the readers of this magazine, whose loved and honored editor so recently suffered imprisonment at the hands of these same hostile forces.

But the cause for which this aged man has suffered so unjustly is bound to prevail and the clouds of sexual "ignorance, perversion and degeneracy" be dispelled, and in order to accomplish this great effort the medieval cobwebs, which to a great extent befog our intellects, must be swept aside.

Whoever would grapple with the sex problems, for which ignorance alone is responsible, should possess sufficient courage to refute the erroneous teachings of past ages, and fearlessly proclaim this truth: that in the construction of the human body nature has made no errors,—that it is pure and beautiful and worthy of our utmost admiration and respect; that each and every organ has its own particular function to perform, and it is an error to single out any particular portion of our anatomy and label it "vile and unclean," and discuss its functions only in whispers, behind closed doors and with curtains drawn. Let those who are determined to label any part of their body "vile and unclean" attach the label to their brains, where the idea had its conception, and never presume to mention their brains in polite society again.

The many sexual evils which now confront us have arisen largely, if not entirely, from ignorant interference in the most intimate human relation. In order to overcome these evils we must draw aside the curtain of mystery and superstition behind which the cosmic principle of love and life, hope and happiness, has for ages been concealed from human intellect and understanding. The justification for this effort, if justification is needed, lies in the certainty of the unpalatable truths regarding our false standards of morality and virtue which we shall uncover, chief

of which will be that which reveals our much-vaunted "social purity" in its true aspect of social plague. But if we are in earnest in this matter, and are determined to "out with the damned spot" which is polluting our civilization and imperiling the welfare of the coming generation, we cannot avoid using some heroic measures, and at this stage of the advance movement it is not unlikely that great heroism and courage will be developed in the earnest men and women who are recognizing the gravity and importance of the present situation. That the American Society for Sanitary and Moral Prophylaxis has the right conception of the magnitude of the work it has organized to undertake may best be shown by submitting the titles of some of the papers read and discussed at their meetings, upon some of which I hope to make more extended comment in future issues of *THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS*:

"Should the Youth of This Country Be Instructed in a Knowledge of Sexual Physiology and Hygiene?" by Prince A. Morrow, A. M., M. D.

"If Education Upon Sexual Matters Is to Be Offered to Youth, What Should Be Its Nature and Scope and at What Age Should It Commence?" by E. L. Keyes, M. D.

"Should Sex Instruction Be Given to Young Men of the Working Classes?" by J. Duncan Bulkley, A. M., M. D.

"Should Education in Sexual Hygiene Be Given to Young Working Women?" by Margaret A. Cleaves, M. D.

"Should This Instruction Be Individual or Collective, Through Pamphlets, Tracts, Lectures, Talks to Young Men, Etc.?" by Rev. John J. Wynne, S. J.

"Should the Great Body of the General Public Be Enlightened as to the Extent and Danger of Venereal Diseases and Their Modes of Contagion, Direct or Indirect?" by L. Bolton Bangs, M. D., and Egbert H. Grandin, M. D.

"The Sexual Necessity," by E. L. Keyes, M. D., LL. D.

"Ignorance, Perversion and Degeneracy," by Frank Moss, Esq.

"Should Legislative Action Be Invoked to Penalize the Transmission of Sexual Infection in Marriage?" by William Lindsay, Esq., ex-United States Senator of Michigan.

"The Best Way to Treat the Social Evil," by Howard A. Kelly, M. D.

The society has many lay members and seemingly is not averse to receiving suggestions as to best methods of procedure in its work,—at least the authors of these papers have asked questions and I presume will not be offended if the readers of *THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS* try to give them the answer. The subjects are broad and will bear wide discussion, and the right of discussion should not be denied.

Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow.

All time, all duration, is conveniently divisible into past, present and future. It may be that these terms are merely relative, conventional or artificial, as some maintain, and that to the mind that comprehends nature in the universal, nature in the absolute, there is neither past nor future, but simply "one eternal now"!

But however this may be, the average woman or man must continue to use these three terms in order to be understood.

In this brief article I shall confine myself to what are generally accepted as the demonstrated facts of experience and observation, not forgetting that what is experience and observation to one is not experience and observation to another.

I begin by saying that the most interesting, the most profoundly interesting of all the problems that have confronted the human animal in the past and present is the problem of its origin, its genesis—the question, "How came I here, and to whom or to what am I responsible for my acts?"

In other words, Is man, and the universe he inhabits, the creation of a consciously intelligent, a consciously omniscient, omnipresent and omnipotent Creator, or is he and it the product of a "fortuitous concurrence of atoms," as the phrase is?

Or, thirdly, is man and the visible universe the product of Nature, which term may be defined as a combination of unconsciously intelligent forces (not omniscient nor omnipotent forces), working by crude *adaptations* of means to ends—the chief end sought being, apparently, to "keep the ball of life rolling," rather than to preserve and magnify the life of any individual organism.

I am not a dogmatist; I do not pretend to know the secrets of the visible universe, much less the secrets of the *invisible* universe. I am simply an inquirer, an honest investigator, a hungry pupil in life's great school. I have been investigating these perplexing problems more than half a century and, with a mind still open to conviction by evidence from any and every source, I confess to a strong leaning towards the last named hypothesis.

Some of my reasons for such leaning are the following:

To predicate or postulate a consciously intelligent creative force—an all-powerful, all-wise force, or personality—as the creator and arbitrary ruler of the universe, as is done by many theologians, is to me a most disheartening, a most discouraging thought; a *stupefying* thought, so full

of contradictions, paradoxes, impossibilities, that many an honestly inquiring mind gives it up in despair, and, swinging to the other extreme, settles down into the belief that "it is all the work of blind chance," and therefore, as there is and can be no moral government of the universe, no cosmic force that "tends to righteousness," the best thing for man to do is to "take good care of number one" by any and every means in his power,—to selfishly exploit physical nature to the utmost, including, as part of nature, his fellow human beings, regardless of the welfare of any but himself.

To prove that the creative force of the universe is not consciously intelligent, take a few familiar illustrations:

A colony of bees has one queen mother, one fully developed female, that needs fertilization but once in her life of three or four years; and yet to secure the fertilization of this one female a multitude of otherwise useless drones are created, who consume the stores of the colony for months, and then, at the approach of winter, are killed by the worker bees to prevent the destruction of the colony by famine.

What would be thought of the intelligence of a farmer or stock-breeder who should adopt such wasteful methods?

A rapidly growing apple-tree throws out but few fruit-buds, but let a worm attack the root and at once the tree is loaded with fruit, hastening the death of the tree by overbearing, and insuring an inferior quality of seed for reproduction of the species.

Among the mammalia, millions of sperm cells are prepared to fertilize but *one ovum*, or germ cell, when only one sperm cell is needed.

A multitude of similar illustrations of Nature's processes could be given, in which her intelligence is shown, but intelligence far below that exhibited by the evolved human animal.

I am confining my illustrations to the realm of reproduction of species, or of race, because this magazine is to be devoted to the work of dispelling the fogs and clouds of superstition, of supernaturalism, that for countless ages have obscured the light of nature and of reason, and filled the prisons and asylums of so-called civilized lands with the degenerate products of bad generation, of ignorant, haphazard, reckless generation. It is chiefly the doctrine that there is something supernatural, something *miraculous*, attending the conception and birth of every human being, that causes women, the mothers of the race, to shrink from demanding their natural right to self-ownership, their natural right to decide whether they will or will not become mothers, and their right to the best possible conditions—including best fatherhood—before entering upon the work of child-building.

Whether or not our marriage laws and customs were formulated for the express purpose of producing an inferior endowment of mind and body for the great mass of mankind, may be an open question; but that such has been the result of the operation of these laws and customs I do most firmly believe.

I believe, moreover, that it is demonstrable that these marriage laws and customs are directly and indirectly responsible for most of the idiocy, the lunacy, the incompetency, the poverty, the vice, the crimes, the wars and the miseries generally that now afflict and have afflicted the human race in all the ages of the past, in lands called civilized and enlightened.

I well know that these are serious charges, and such as should not be made rashly or lightly, but believing with the poet Mackay that

All conviction should be valiant,

I give these thoughts for what they are worth, and expect in future numbers of THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS to tell its readers how or why I have come to place the chief responsibility for the crimes and miseries, the inequalities and slaveries of our so-called civilization upon our oldest, most cherished, most revered social institution.

In making these charges I make no fight upon the clergy as such, nor upon religion as such, nor upon civil law as such. I have many friends among the clergy, all over the country, who believe with me that the time has come for a thorough overhauling of our inherited code of ethics in regard to eugenics, our time-honored standards of morality concerning sex and reproduction of the race.

I am constantly urged by friends to say less of the evils of our present systems—urged to be less iconoclastic, less destructive, and to do a little more in the way of constructive work. "What do you propose to give us instead of institutional marriage?" I am often asked.

To this my uniform answer is LIBERTY! Liberty to choose and to refuse. Liberty joined with responsibility for one's own acts, is the only panacea I know anything about, for the evils of our present marriage system.

The attempt to make people conform to *any* given standard of marital or conjugal ethics is the cause of nearly all the failures, the crimes and miseries of mortal life.

When asked to stop pulling down the old and go to work upon the new, so that people can judge by comparison which is best, I reply that so long as men and women are sent to prison or compelled to pay heavy fines, simply for an expression of honest difference of opinion, simply for publishing the honest opinions of others in regard to eugenics, it is hardly

fair to ask us to show the superiority of the new over the old by practical illustration and comparison.

When people were sent to prison, hanged, or burned at the stake for a difference of opinion on religious matters, was it fair to the heretics to ask them to show by practical illustration and comparison the superiority of their religious beliefs?

As in the past, our journal will probably be individualistic in the true sense of that word; each writer being responsible for the opinions advanced by her or him; no one having the right to speak *ex cathedra* for THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS.

M. HARMAN.

Eugenics.

Of all sciences, that called "eugenics"—in plain English, *right generation*—easily takes first place in point of importance. The husbandman's first concern is the *seed*. Experience has taught him that he cannot expect a paying crop of corn, of potatoes, of melons, or what not, from inferior seed, bulbs or grafts.

First the seed; then the soil; then heat, light and moisture, and lastly the cultivation, stirring the soil, etc.

The seed stands for *heredity*. The other factors may be included under the general term *environment*.

So likewise the live-stock raiser. The breeder of horses, cattle, pigs, dogs, fowls, etc., looks well to the parentage, the *pedigree* of the quadrupeds, the birds, he purposes to invest his time, labor and money in, else he knows he cannot expect satisfactory returns.

And so likewise in raising human beings. Common sense and the experience of all time show us that human beings are no exception to the rule that like begets like, and that although the human is a much more complex and differentiated animal than is the horse, the dog, the pig, the barnyard fowl, yet to the eye of the expert the influence of heredity in the formation of character is as marked, is as all-powerful, as universal on the human plane as on that of the so-called lower animal, or in the vegetable, the plant world.

Human beings are simply quadrupeds erected on their hind legs; neither more nor less. Whatever of intellect or of psychic power is found

among women and men is found also, in different degree, among horses, dogs, birds, reptiles, etc.

I well know that these views are called materialistic and pessimistic by many; not only by those who still uphold the special creation theory, but by some who claim to have broken the fetters of medieval superstitions and accepted, in a general way, the evolution theory of the cosmos; but, as I see it, there is nothing pessimistic, nothing sad or degrading in the philosophy that makes man a "brother to the worm." The chief difference between man and the worm, between man and the quadruped, between man and certain tribes of insects—bees, ants, etc., etc.—seems to be that the so-called lower orders possess more of the psychic, more of the intuitional, a closer rapport with the "soul of things," with the unseen and unheard *spirit* side of life, than do the arrogant "lords of creation," the human bipeds.

This is not the place to elaborate the arguments pro or con between those who adhere to the theory of a special creation and special attributes for man, and the evolutionists or naturalists. I prefer simply to state that, while not dogmatically asserting the *oneness of all life*, I do most emphatically accept the "monistic" theory of the cosmos; the theory that whatever applies to life on the quadruped plane, the insect plane, or even the vegetable plane, applies to man also,—the homo,—only differing in degree, and hence I come back to the time-honored maxim that "like begets like," and to the statement that if we would improve organized forms of life on *any* plane we must look first to *heredity*—that is, to the *seed*; and to the conditions surrounding prenatal life—the *sprouting* of the seed; which sprouting or quickening is the connecting link between heredity and environment.

And this means EUGENICS.

M. H.

Angel City Notes.

The Los Angeles Eugenic Club continues to hold regular weekly meetings. Last Tuesday evening the first speaker was "yours truly." His subject, as advertised, was "Marriage as It Is, as It Was, and as It Will Be—as It Must Be if ever we are to eliminate the evils, political, religious, economic, social and sexual, that now afflict us."

The attendance was good; hall nearly full, though not equal in numbers to some of the earlier meetings of the club. The opening address

consumed something over an hour, followed by discussion by the chairman, Harry Hutcheson, an old-time friend from Leavenworth, Kan.; by Charles Caryll, of the New Life Institute of this city; also by Mrs. Caryll; by Dr. Tanner, of "forty-day fast" fame; by G. Major Taber, writer and lecturer on prison reform, and by other speakers. Tomorrow night Professor N. F. W. Hazeldine will lecture before the Eugenic Club on the "Psychology of Sex."

Another Postponement.

Two weeks ago I wrote home that I would probably go to San Diego soon after the fifteenth of this month. It is well that the word "probably" was used. Now I have decided upon a still further postponement of my departure. Most forceful among the reasons for this postponement is the circumstance that I have been attending the lectures and classes of Professor Windsor, and feel that I am deriving great benefit from them. This is a course which I desire to continue for another month. Also, as stated in previous letters, I am cordially and urgently invited to visit several towns near to Los Angeles, by friends interested in sex reform. Naturally I feel loth to lose these opportunities for extending the work of THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS.

If these invitations be accepted my departure from Los Angeles will be still further postponed, as will be my promised visits to various cities of the Pacific slope. My return to Chicago would also be indefinitely postponed. And this brings me to speak of the plan of

A Home in California.

Still another reason for my prolonged stay in Los Angeles is the long-cherished hope that some day there will materialize a home in California. I fully appreciate and realize the difficulties attending the realization of this dream. But it occurs to me that a California branch office might not be impossible, while continuing the Chicago house as chief headquarters of our magazine. With this thought uppermost I have made two trips of exploration eastward to look at the lay of the land within a radius of twenty miles of Los Angeles. Saturday last I was driven by our old-time friend J. H. Kallmeyer, of San Gabriel, for several hours over what seems to me the garden spot of California, so far as seen. This tract includes the old Spanish town of San Gabriel, ten miles from Los Angeles, and immediately adjoining Pasadena. Nowhere have I seen better conditions for a home, including climate, fertility of soil, high and rolling land, not mountainous but near to the mountains, and near enough to a great and growing city—the most rapidly growing city, perhaps, on the American continent.

A goodly number of our friends have written concerning a plan of this

nature, and now that I have decided to remain here another month I shall be glad to hear further from any who may be interested.

For the present my address is 518 W. Fifth street, Los Angeles, Calif.

M. HARMAN.

Los Angeles, Calif., June 10, '07.

Haywood's Square Deal.

The trial of William D. Haywood for complicity in the murder of ex-Governor Steunenberg is in progress at Boise, Idaho. Clarence S. Darrow, of Chicago, is chief counsel for the defense, assisted by Mr. Richardson, of Denver, and other able lawyers. Senator Borah, of Idaho, and Mr. Hawley are the prosecuting attorneys. The confession of Orchard, the real murderer, shows him to be a human fiend. He testified he has committed numerous murders and many lesser crimes, and always for a consideration. Under the constitution of Idaho the testimony of an accomplice cannot convict unless substantiated by corroborative evidence. No such evidence has yet been tendered by the prosecution. Characteristic of the methods pursued by the Mine Owners' Association in its effort to manufacture public opinion against the Western Federation of Miners and their officials, was a statement that Pettibone, one of the indicted men, was a Pinkerton detective and would take the stand and corroborate Orchard's confession. This was denied by Pettibone and his counsel, who state they will prove that a conspiracy was formed by Governor Gooding, Attorney Hawley and the Pinkertons to convict innocent persons of Orchard's crime. Eugene V. Debs was to have reported the trial for a syndicate of Socialist newspapers, but the defendant's counsel thought it unwise for him to do so, as a persistent campaign of lies and mis-

representation has inflamed the residents of the state against Socialists in general and the Western Federation of Miners in particular, and his presence might give the imported "bad men" a chance to make trouble. That their fears were well grounded is evidenced by the slugging of one of the defense's witnesses last week by two notorious thugs imported by the Mine Owners' Association from Colorado. They were arrested and heavily fined.

General Isaac R. Sherwood, member of Congress from the Ninth District of Ohio, commenting recently on the miners' trial at Boise, Idaho, said:

"In three startling innovations this case is without a precedent. What are these innovations? First, by the coöperation of the governors of two sovereign states, Colorado and Idaho, three duly elected leading officials of the Western Federation of Miners—Charles Moyer, William D. Haywood and George Pettibone—were arrested late on Saturday night over a year ago, with no opportunity to see counsel; were seized and overpowered, put on board a special train prepared for the occasion, and railroaded a thousand miles to Idaho, placed in prison, where they have been kept for over fourteen months. This is the first time in the history of the United States where two governors have jointly conspired to criminally violate the constitution and laws they are sworn to uphold. If anarchy means anything

dangerous anywhere, it means defiance to law, and those who practice anarchy must be held responsible for the spread of anarchy not bearing the official brand.

"The second departure from all law and precedent happened in the selection of the jury. Clearly the sheriff in this case was determined that Haywood should not be tried by a jury of his peers. Every student of this free government knows what this means, especially those who have read with ordinary care the struggle of the American colonists during the decade preceding the war of the revolution. And every student of English history knows what was involved when the English barons met King John on the field of Runnymede. The struggle was to be tried by their equals, or peers, and not by those who had an all-absorbing interest in their death.

"How was it at Boise, Idaho? How was that jury, now holding in its will the life of Haywood, selected? Is Haywood being tried by a jury of his peers? Far from it, but of over 300 talesmen and jurors summoned by the sheriff, only five are of Haywood's class

or craft, or a less number than are allowed peremptory challenges by the merciless prosecution. What is meant by a man's peers? There is only one definition. A peer is a man of the same rank, standing and qualities—in other words, an equal or mate. Why did the sheriff summon no men (with five exceptions) of Haywood's class? There can be but one answer.

"And now to the third innovation of all precedents. Neither England, nor Germany, nor Austria, nor Russia even, has ever been cursed by a king, or queen, or emperor, or czar who has publicly voiced his convictions denouncing a suspected subject on trial for his life—trials for treason excepted. It has remained for the United States to produce the official, in the dawn of the twentieth century of humane Christian civilization, in the person of President Roosevelt. Every God-loving American citizen, every human being who believes in fair play will regret in humiliation, deep and sorrowful, this lamentable violation of the traditions of all Christian nations."

The Wind Is in the East

WITH ANN.

Dr. Clark, of Brooklyn, has a contrite and broken heart because he married a divorced man to an actress the other day. He handed back the thousand-dollar fee and held his job,—only grasping it, though, by the very tail-feathers, as it were. Such degradation of the offices of "holy" church was truly scandalous. Now, the papers of a week or two ago were telling us about a wealthy man down East about to become the husband of a girl whose age would rather

have fitted her for the position of his granddaughter; and the thing got into print, not because it was unusual, but because Methuselah wished to place some queer restrictions on the liberty of his young wife. You don't suppose that any clergyman would take a hand in such a "vile, abhorrent, licentious and unnatural affair" as this?—to quote the language of Dr. Clark's ecclesiastical superior relative to the Corey-Gilman proceeding, as nearly as I can remember

it. I say there's not a churchman in New York who would tie the knot—for less than \$2.50 hard, spot cash, and there are plenty of them who wouldn't do it under twice that sum.

Lately I saw something in a newspaper book-review about a certain woman who possessed a fund of downright "masculine common sense and perception of a joke." Now, can you guess the gender of the author of that line? Ann gives it up, but oh, the shrinking modesty that dominates the minds of some folk in this world!

"If we give up the Christian creed," proceeded this same writer of the book review, "we must remember that the Christian ethics will go, too." Well, so they will, we hope; we can't get anything much worse, and maybe we might hit on something fine and true. By the way, which sex was "logical" enough to invent a hell? The "religion" of Mrs. Eddy has almost no originality, of course, but at least the underlying ideas are humane, and that is always something, I believe.

A general chorus of approbation greeted the New York clergyman who opposed the establishing of a bar in a woman's clubhouse opposite his church. Likewise, most men of the middle classes are shocked into an epileptic fit at a woman with effrontery enough to enjoy an after-dinner cigarette. Bad for the coming generation, very bad! But I know a charming and intelligent woman, gently bred, who is condemned to spend a good share of her time under surveillance in a sanitarium because her wealthy father drank too heavily at his club; and two daughters of an inveterate smoker, who cannot join the runners in the gymnasium because their hearts are very weak. It really works both ways, you know; but a general recognition of the fact would never do. Pater-familias wants his wife to represent the total-abstinence portion of the firm, just as

she is to stand for all the other virtues that he doesn't want himself. This may not be the most logical arrangement in the world, but it is an extremely pleasant one for pater, is it not?

Will the state tell us how much exercise to take today? Will it inform us what and how much we shall eat tonight for dinner? If we are out of work, will it take care of us? Will it see that we are all engaged in occupations suitable to health? Mercy, no; that would be paternalism of the rankest kind; 'twould never do for free-born citizens like us. Oh, very well; but then I want to know why it should have a right to regulate the constitution of the family and the most personal affairs that any of us have.

The exact age of Ann is known to all her friends, but modesty forbids the thought that she is a sufficiently great man to make her natal day or the department store where she procures her collar buttons matters of interest to the world at large. However, she is open to conviction on this point, Mr. Li.

Do you know any place in this world, except the "sacred" institution termed the home, where men and women are at liberty to call each other liars, rogues and thieves, without considerable danger of having to support the allegation with the fist? 'Tis said that men and women who are the very pink of courtesy abroad, need but a little scratching in the home to come out Cossacks to the very bone. Just read the divorce column in the daily paper for a day or two, if you really want to see what devils folks can be. Matrimony is a divine institution, all marked with a celestial seal, and exported straight from glory by the Lord, says Mr. Dix, as he cheerfully collects the tariff and drops it in the pocket of his jeans. Oh, well, America and American products for the Americans, says Ann!

Careful Thoughts of a Careless Fellow.

BY JAMES ARMSTRONG.

You have heard it said, "Liberty, but not license"; but perhaps you've never thought that there would be no license were it not for your foolish efforts to keep liberty from becoming license. If liberty did not insist on becoming the very thing you are determined it shall not become, there would be no liberty!

It is a hard thing to call one a liar when his lying happens to help us,—just as hard, I imagine, as it would be to attack the sanity of a rich relative for having mentioned us in his will. Yet we can never be free until we have learned to do hard things.

Notwithstanding every one is free to violate the laws of grammar, no one does so intentionally. Pass a law, however, penalizing ungrammatical speech and you would soon hear nothing but "criminal" talk. The point is: Let us mate as we talk. There is a tendency in every one to be sexually happy the same as to speak correctly, and the laws of love, like the rules of speech, will not be violated to hurt if we only leave the lovers alone.

A free person is one whose conduct is determined by his own motives, regardless of anything save voluntary respect for the motives of another or others. There is no danger in such a person, for he never interferes with your will until you interfere with his. He is not foolish enough to set an example for his own enslavement.

Any one can succeed who is able to make others believe he is succeeding. Indeed, it is enough if others only pretend to believe. Such is the secret of

the success of all tyrannies, and especially the sex-slavery of woman. Thus the difficulty of her emancipation is not in making woman see that she is enslaved, so much as it is in making her cease to pretend that she does not see. As with women, so also with men.

If we lie once we must lie twice; first lie and then deny that we have lied. Thus the difficult thing in spreading truth is not in making people see it, but in making them acknowledge it.

We treat truth not unlike an acquaintance. If he is a popular and influential fellow we make much ado over him, give him our time and money, and grow hoarse in praising him. But let him lose prestige and we find it hard to remember even that we knew him.

Every generation has its peculiar lies the same as its peculiar fashions, hence Truthseeker Harman looks as fantastic to the twentieth century multitude as though dressed in sixteenth century clothes.

We talk for the most part to please others, just as we act for the most part to please ourselves.

Don't find fault with logic. It is like gunpowder, everything depending upon your knowledge of how to use it.

The sultan of Turkey has many wives, the pope of Rome has none, the president of the United States has one. And now, as to whether a man's wives are many, one or none, ceremoniously or unceremoniously, with palaver or without palaver, is the affair of no one except the persons immediately concerned.

The Young People.

"What will become of the children?"

CONDUCTED BY WINIFRED.

When I was a very small girl, it was one of my dreams to edit a Children's Column. Fortunately my mother favored that idea, and told me that when I was old enough I might do that. About a year ago she gave me her final permission, and now I am ready to start what I hope will be a success.

One of the objects of this department, aside from making the magazine more interesting, is to encourage youthful writers. I want all the stories that appear in this department to come from the pens of the young readers of this page. Don't you think it more interesting to know that the stories you read come from girls and boys like you? I know we all like to see productions of our own brains in print. I want to get something from *every one* of you. Isn't there some story in your head you want to get on paper,—or perhaps it is already there. Isn't there some interesting essay you wrote in school that was commended by your teacher? Well, I want all those.

I cannot say whether this plan will be successful, but don't be bashful. Don't depend on some one else to write, for you might all do that, and then where would we be?

Another thing. Besides these stories, I want to have a Correspondence Column, so we can get acquainted with each other. Perhaps some of you read *The Truth Seeker*, in which Miss Wixon edits such an interesting juvenile column. I have not seen any correspondence lately, but there were formerly some very interesting letters from all parts of America.

We all want to have this page as in-

GLEAMS.

[From *Songs of a Child*. Written by "Darling" (Lady Florence Dixie) before she was fourteen years old.]

We see bright gleams in springtime,
And during winters cold;
Gleams there are in summer clime,
And gleams in autumns old.

Then the gleams of hope and joy,
Which drive despair away,
They are gleams which pain alloy,
And greet a brighter day.

Hope and joy are human gleams,
And both bring happiness;
Many are the golden dreams
Which their lips caress.

They are cherubs young and fair,
Hovering o'er our lives,
Casting gleams out here and there
Keen as cutting knives.

Oh! those little angel gleams,
Wandering where we roam,
Ever may their loving beams
In human hearts find home.

teresting as possible, so we must all get out our pens and set to work *right away*.

MARY'S BICYCLE RIDE.

Little Mary Wilbur lived out West with her brother Dick and her mother. Her home was on the side of a steep mountain, fifteen miles from the nearest town. Her father had been killed by a mining accident, a few years after he had taken his family West, ten years before. Her mother lived quite comfortably on the money from some property in the East, and as she owned her home, she had no difficulty in keeping in good circumstances.

As they lived so far from any other children, Dick and Mary had played to-

gether all their short lives, and had got on a good deal better than most brothers and sisters do. We might be led to think that because they had been together so much they would quarrel often, but they knew that if they did quarrel they would have no one to play with until they decided to "forgive and forget," so, although they of course had a few tiffs, they really got along very well.

One day a man came to the house with a large crate addressed to "Mr. Richard Wilbur." They thought there must be some mistake, as they could not imagine what it could be. But, looking closer, they saw on the box the name of one of their father's old friends. So, dismissing the man, they opened the box,

You could not imagine in a year what was inside it, so I suppose I must tell you. It was a bicycle! To say that Dick was both surprised and pleased would be putting it very mildly. Although he had always wanted a wheel (as what boy does not?), he was never able to see the way clear to get one. And here was one, dropped from the skies, as it were.

Of course, he learned to ride it immediately. But Mary was rather afraid of it, and could not be persuaded to go near it. She could not understand how Dick could balance himself on two wheels, and whenever he rode near her it seemed as if it was always about to run into her. Then, too, she was somewhat jealous of the bicycle, as Dick spent so much time on it that he used to spend with her. And things went on in this way for the next six months, and Dick was as fond of his wheel as ever.

One afternoon Dick set out on his wheel to go to a neighbor's house on an errand. He had promised to be back in a couple of hours, and as evening approached, and there was no sign of Dick, his mother began to get worried. So she sent Mary down the road to see if he was coming. As she saw no one, she thought she had better walk down the

road a little way. When she had walked about a mile, she saw something black lying in the road. It was too dark to see it clearly until she was almost up to it, and there in the faint light she saw the pale, still face of Dick. She was stunned for a moment, and then she ran home, and, with the aid of her mother, carried Dick into the house.

In a short while he revived and told them how this accident befell him. As he was going down the steep slope of the mountain his brake gave way and he was pitched against a tree. He became unconscious and did not recover until he was in the house.

It was plain that something must be done, as Dick was suffering greatly, and they were afraid he had received some internal injuries. But nothing could be done, for the doctor lived in the town, and there was no way to get there except by means of their feet, and this was impossible.

But something *could* be done! "Is there anything the matter with your wheel, Dick?" asked Mary, anxiously.

"No, the wheel isn't hurt, but lots of good that will do me," answered Dick, gloomily.

"Yes, it will do you lots of good."

"Why, Mary, what do you mean?" asked her mother, astonished.

"I mean that Dick is going to have his doctor, and the wheel is going to do it, because I'm going to ride the wheel."

"Why, Mary, you will never be able to do that. Don't you know that you are afraid of it, even when some one else is on it?"

"Well, I'm going to ride it this time, anyway—or die in the attempt," said Mary, firmly.

And ride she did!

How she ever got through that night not even she can tell you. Her mother put her on the wheel and gave her a start and Mary went flying down the mountain-side. Sometimes she would be so frightened that she would just shut her eyes and let the bicycle go of itself.

When she finally reached the doctor's house, he listened to the story gravely and then harnessed his horse and took Mary home with him, and she was not sorry to leave the wheel behind.

Under the doctor's skillful care Dick soon recovered, but although Mary has children of her own now, she will never forget that bicycle ride.

WINIFRED.

At the Desk.

Well, what do you think of *our* magazine? Ever so much room for improvement, of course—and we hope to improve with age.

"Wine, women and song," without the love for which man is classed as a fool by Solomon, improve with age—or ought to do so—and why not a magazine as well?

What suggestions can you make for improvement? Of course we can't adopt *all* the suggestions that are offered, but in "multiplicity of counsel there is wisdom"—and quarreling, too, sometimes, but let us hope it will not be so in this instance. Plans have changed and ideas developed greatly, even in the short time which has elapsed since the decision to change the name and form was reached. At first we thought we would have a *magasinelet* about the shape of the pamphlets which we have issued recently. Of course we wanted a real magazine, but the way was not clear. Then we declared we *WILL* make a real magazine and make a success, if it takes everything we can earn, borrow, or even beg! And though it has cost, even before a letter of type has been put in place, more than enough to publish two numbers of *Lucifer* in the old way, the outlook is so favorable that I really believe it will almost pay expenses from the start. Certainly it will if it meets with the enthusiasm *after* the appearance of the first issue that it does *before*.

Many of the old friends of *Lucifer* express deep regret for the passing of the name, but say they will remain with us just the same. So far only one subscription has been canceled, and though I deeply regret her decision—for she was one of our oldest and best friends—I think she will reconsider it when she sees the magazine. Don't you?

I wanted to say my little say on several questions in the first number of the magazine, but so many good things have come to us from other writers that I will act the censor and suppress my own. Have written an account of our trip to the Spirit Fruit Home at Ingle-side, on the occasion of the "house-warming" of the "House That Just Happened." Maybe there will be room in August *EUGENICS*, though that will be rather late. I won't promise, but perhaps—

"The way to get rid of a temptation is to yield to it," said Oscar Wilde. That would be rather a dangerous rule to always follow; but, used with discretion, it is of use. I have sometimes found it helpful in dealing with the children whom "Providence" has seen fit to place in my care. I did not approve of my daughter's desire to ride a bicycle—too much danger in the city streets to please me. So, several years ago, when she wanted a bicycle I permitted her to have one, thinking she would be less likely to desire it if in

her possession. The plan worked satisfactorily until recently. Then she learned to ride, and I don't know what will be the outcome. However, I'm not worrying.

For another illustration: At the dinner-table a few days ago we were discussing "stage-struck" girls. Some one said all girls experienced a "stage-struck" period. "I didn't," daughter remarked, "for mamma always said I could go on the stage if I wanted to!" And now she comes for the fulfillment of a promise of long ago—that she should have a Children's Department when she should want it. Perhaps in this case possession will destroy desire. Time will tell.

Uphill work it is, getting advertisements for a magazine which is not even in existence. People want ocular demonstration. And having seen the publication, it is even more essential that they see results. I would not ask any one to investigate anything advertised in our columns if not interested, nor to buy anything merely because by so doing they will help the magazine. I would rather ask for a straight gift, and be done with it! But I know that we have the circulation among intelligent people which will make advertising *pay* the advertiser, the purchaser and the magazine. Do you see the point? Of course you do.

And now to work to increase the circulation. The magazine needs readers—and the readers need the magazine!

LILLIAN.

Though statistics do not show that "college men fail," but rather the contrary, you quote an article under that title from the *Stuffed Club* in your April 11 number:

What is the matter with the man who can't hold his temper? What is the matter with the man who is jealous, envious, dishonest; who won't pay his debts; who is excessively selfish; who eats too much,

BOOKS AND PERIODICALS FOR THINKERS AND DOERS. SCARCE WORKS FOUND.

Especial Attention Given to Old and New Publications in the Field of Freethought, Secularism, Evolutionary Science, Economics, Ethics, Sex, Sociology, and Free Press. Old Works on Slavery Constitute a Leading Line. Also, Radical Fiction. What do you offer me in rare works in these departments? What do you want me to find for you?

If in your reading, you come across a rational, progressive book, new or old, let me know about it. Many a good work lies hidden for years in the enormous mass of rubbish.

Send for lists and circulars.

EDWIN C. WALKER,
244 W. 143d St., Manhattan, New York City

J. FRANCIS RUGGLES,
BIBLIOEXPERTO,
BRONSON, MICHIGAN.
Any Book "I. P." or "O. P."
ODD LIST FREE.

OLLIE M. STEDMAN,
500 FULTON STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.
Piano, Harmony, Mandolin.
Special Attention Given to Beginners.

C. J. ZEITINGER,
Water-Power Expert, River Improvement Engineer, Promoter of All Public Utilities, and Real-Estate and Business Broker. Investigation and reports for financial institutions and municipalities. Public utilities improved and made valuable by judicious and energetic management.
NO. 40 BENTON PLACE, ST. LOUIS, MO.

GOLD. SILVER. COPPER.
CHARLES FRANCIS BLACKBURN,
MINING GEOLOGIST.
Mines and Mining; 33 years' experience. Can make big money for you on mining investments.
Victorville, San Bernardino Co., Cal.

WALTER BREEN,
RENTALS AND REAL ESTATE.
Rents Collected and Property Cared For.
613 BEE BUILDING, OMAHA, NEBR.

PHILIP G. PEABODY,
Attorney and Counsellor at Law.
15 COURT SQUARE, ROOM 61, BOSTON, MASS.

DR. JOHN A. WELSCH,
Scientific Home Treatment for Diseases of Women, with Advice, \$3.50 per Month.
Home Treatment for Gonor, Eczema and Piles.
LOCK BOX 14, Farber, Mo.

DR. OGILVIE RICE,
DENTIST.
1556 Milwaukee avenue, near Western, Chicago.

drinks too much, is extravagant in supplying his own wants; who is willing that all the world shall suffer, provided he can usurp their rights to life and their pursuit of happiness? He is a neurotic who is a sex pervert.

I think that is pernicious stuff. To attribute all selfishness and lack of self-control to abnormal sex is as absurd as to attribute it all to an outgrown land system, and can only alienate the assent and support of ordinary intelligent persons from your valuable teachings, just as, I think, the name *Lucifer* did.

Yours,
BOLTON HALL.

I think you are making a good strike in changing name and form of your publication. I trust everybody with the "Evergreen habit" will get the "EUGENICS habit" as well. Yours for a grand success, and most cordially withal,

L. E. RADER, Editor *Soundview*.
Olalla, Wash.

I inclose \$1 to extend subscription, and congratulate you on the new name. I think Christianity is capable of a different interpretation from that given

TO-MORROW'S CHANGE OF POLICY.

To-Morrow Magazine announces that, commencing with the August number, it will add a Health and Rational Food Department; that is, while continuing as an exponent of Rational Life and Thought, it will bring its philosophy to bear in a practical way, and not only teach the gospel of Rational Food, Rational Dress, and Rational Exercise, but will manufacture and supply the trade with *tested foods* and conduct a Health Home for patients on Rational *To-Morrow* lines.

The Editor will accept pupils by mail and in class in *The Scientific Interpretation of Life*, either for the purpose of cure or for study, and the entire space in the magazine will be taken up by the Staff Editors, so that very little if any room will be left for outside contributors.

The Editor and Assistants are athletes, non-meat-eaters and abstemious in all ways, lead the *Simple Life*, know the philosophy of fasting, and by rational Nature Methods they declare that they can bring any patient back to health and happiness who is not already so completely broken down that there is nothing left to build upon.

by some of your recent correspondents and should be sorry to have the excellent movement the paper stands for become known or thought of as necessarily anti-Christian. Sincerely yours,

CHARLES HARDON.

Contocook, N. H.

I think the change of name a good one; not that the name is any better than *Lucifer*, but it is well to respect people's prejudices sometimes. No one of *Lucifer's* friends will ever forget the "Little Giant." Just as the soldier boys in camp—each "thought of the girl he loved, but all sang 'Annie Laurie.' " So we will all read the new journal with pleasure and profit, and at the same time think of *Lucifer*. Making it a monthly is also a good move.

During the editor's previous visit to Los Angeles I spent a most pleasant afternoon with him and party in South Pasadena at the foot of Mount Lowe. The day was perfect. God was in his

DR. MORRIS LYCHENHEIM, OSTEOPATH.

39 STATE STREET,
Suite 507 Burton Bldg., Chicago.

TELEPHONE: CENTRAL 3670.

Osteopathic Treatment, inclusive of the Electric Sun-Bath, the Horizontal Jet (External Water) Douche Baths, Healing (Medical) Exercise; Vibratory Treatment, Dietetics, Respiration, and Hygiene.

THE FREE SPEECH LEAGUE

Invites correspondence, co-operation, and membership of all who claim rights, and dare maintain them.

Join us. Help us.

Get our list of books.

Read them—pass them on.

Liberty tracts by Ingersoll, Wakeman, Walker, Pentecost, Darrow, Post, and Schroeder. Read *Our Vanishing Liberty of Press*, 5c, and *Do You Want Free Speech?* 10c, and so learn why you should act with us.

FREE SPEECH LEAGUE,
120 LEXINGTON AV., NEW YORK.

best mood. We had a feast of reason
and a flow of soul such as is rarely at-
tainable.

P. E. OAKLEY.

Boston, Mass.

THE WOMAN'S TRIBUNE.

Edited and Published by CLARA BEWICK COLBY for twenty-four years in the interest of Woman Suffrage.

The *Woman's Tribune*, founded in 1883 in Nebraska, was moved to Washington, D. C., where it was first published as the daily organ of the First International Council of Women in March, 1888. Moved to Portland, Ore., in 1894.

The *Woman's Tribune* is in touch with and reports all national and international phases of the movement which is of immediate moment as one of the vital issues in every civilized nation.

The *Woman's Tribune* is the organ of the Federal Woman's Equality Association, which has for its object the securing of an Act of Congress—according to its constitutional power—making women eligible to vote for Members of the House of Representatives.

The *Woman's Tribune*, as a special feature, is giving sketches of earlier women prominent in the Woman's Rights Movement.

Send ten cents for five sample copies. If desired, the four papers giving portrait sketch of Margaret Fuller will be sent with current number.

Subscription, \$1.00 a year. Published fortnightly. Send to

CLARA BEWICK COLBY, Portland, Ore.

"BLOW YOUR OWN HORN." WE ARE BLOWING OURS.

Let's get them in tune and have a concert.

Our horn sounds the merits of Weltmer's Magazine and Journal of Suggestive Therapeutics. Yours should sound a call for just such a magazine; just what you need; one which will teach you how to get well and stay well, live better and be more useful. We shall have no trouble in playing together if you will get in tune by sending a postal for a sample copy.

WELTMER'S MAGAZINE,
NEVADA, MO.

THERE ARE ALL KINDS OF CURES,
and There Is Good in All, but

A STUFFED CLUB

Is Unique in Teaching Rational Thinking
on These Lines.

PRICE \$1.00 PER YEAR.

Send 10c for sample copy to
A STUFFED CLUB, DENVER, COLO.

YOUR ATTENTION

IS CALLED TO

THE STELLAR RAY

A magazine of universal thought for thinking people. It is seeking for its readers those who are in pursuit of

Twentieth Century Thought Currents

Currents of thought that do not flow between stone walls of prejudice, but are free to search through all scientific methods for solutions of life's meaning.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: In the United States, Mexico, Cuba and Island possessions of the United States, \$1.00. Foreign, except as noted above (six shillings), \$1.50.

ASTRO PUBLISHING COMPANY

HODGES BLDG.

DETROIT, MICH.

PROGRESSIVE PEOPLE

these days have been interested in *Phrenology*, *Occultism*, *New Thought*, *Mental Science*, *Telepathy*, *Theosophy*, *Suggestion*, and kindred powers of Human Consciousness in Experience and over Environment for Realization of Freedom and Satisfaction.

If you would learn more of the *Science of Freedom* and *Message of Truth*, which is the real object of Human Inquiry, you are invited to subscribe for

PROGRESS,

a 16-page *Metaphysical, Illustrated Weekly*, published at \$1 a year. HOWARD CARLETON TRIPP, Editor, assisted by many of the best literary minds of the world. Sample copy 5c; none free.

Try It for Three Months for 35c.

Address H. C. TRIPP,
837½ S. Broadway, Los Angeles, Cal.

PERSONALS.

CORRESPONDENCE CLUB—Open to those who desire to improve, and to discuss subjects of interest with kindred minds. Editor of this magazine says the secretary is worthy of confidence. For particulars inclose stamp to C. A. KIRK, Secretary, Box 733, Mitchell, S. D.

WANTED—To correspond with liberal-minded woman, about 30; object, marriage if mutually adapted; give full description of self, with name; picture preferred. HENRY COLETTI, 609 Julius street, Saginaw, Mich.

A YOUNG MAN, stranger, lately landed, wishes to correspond with a liberal woman. Address LESTER COMPTON, General Delivery, General Post Office, New York City.

WAR!

The Elgin and Waltham Watch Companies have indirectly declared war on John C. Dueber, of the Hampton Watch Co., and small competitors. By continually reducing prices they hope to drive out competitors or force them into a Trust. John C., many times a millionaire, but who employs Union Labor only, will not join them in their nefarious scheme. He promptly meets all reductions made by the older companies, until now watches are actually sold far below value. Note the latest quotations:

23-jeweled "Special Railway" . . . \$26.00
 "New Railway," 23 jewels . . . 20.00
 "John Hancock," 21 jewels . . . 16.50
 "Dueber Watch Co.," 21 jewels, only . . . 15.00

All above in silverine screw case, prepaid.
 In 20-year gold-filled case, \$3 more.
 Every watch new from factory and guaranteed to pass Railway Inspectors.

The 17-jeweled Hampton, adjusted . . . \$8.00
 17-jeweled, not adjusted . . . 7.00
 15-jeweled . . . 6.00
 7-jeweled . . . 4.50

In 20-year gold-filled case, \$3 more. All prepaid, with guaranty. Buy now! When this war is over you will pay 30 per cent more.

OTTO WETTSTEIN,

The Liberal Mail-Order Jeweler.

LA GRANGE, COOK COUNTY, ILL.,

can save you 20 per cent on Watches, Diamonds or anything in the Jeweler's Line.

Write me and receive prices, and my great little tract, "Theism in the Crucible," free.

If You Are Not Hide-Bound in Your THINKING APPARATUS

You ought to subscribe for that peculiar magazine published twelve times a year by the Chief of the Tribe. The little Brown Book is called "The Ghourki" and will be sent you twelve times for 25c. You may not like it, but it will do you good nevertheless. There are several thousand members of the Tribe now. Why not send 25c and join this growing organization, and get *The Ghourki* a year at the same time? Address

THE CHIEF OF THE TRIBE,
 Morgantown, W. Va.

THE MERCANTILE EXCHANGE

is a National Clearing House or exchange agency for real estate, merchandise, services or employment. Send 20 cents for a year's subscription to its official publication,

THE MONTHLY CINCINNATION,
 CINCINNATI, O.

FREE! Interesting literature concerning the science of Astrology and its coincident philosophy will be mailed on receipt of 2c stamp to pay postage. Dr. J. H. Tilden, editor of "Stuffed Club," wrote to the author of this literature: "I have always enjoyed what I have received from you—you are the only man in the line that you are representing that has ever interested me." Ad., Frank Theodore Allen, Box 680, Berlin, N. J.

THE LIFE

Is a high-class New Thought Magazine (monthly), now in its fourteenth year.

It is fully up to date and has on its staff some of the ablest writers and artists of the age. It carries eight distinct departments, one "For the Children."

It will do you good. Send for a free sample. \$1 a year; foreign, 5s.

Address THE LIFE,
 3332 Troost Av., Kansas City, Mo.

TO INTRODUCE OUR LITERATURE
 WE WILL SEND

80c WORTH FOR 25c

"Let There Be Light," 10c.
 "Purity's Greatest Foe," 5c.
 "Bronze Book," 10c.
 "Doctors and Their Medicines," 10c.
 "Right of the Child to Be Well Born," 10c.
 "Heredity," 5c.
 "Private Letter," 5c.
 "Dianism," 25c.

TOTAL, 80c, FOR 25c.

NATIONAL PURITY ASSOCIATION,
 79 FIFTH AV., CHICAGO.

Mention EUGENICS when you order and a copy of Purity Journal will be sent you.

MRS. SEVERANCE'S GOOD HEALTH TABLETS.

An ideal laxative of unsurpassed value. Positively cures constipation and all resultant ailments. Woman's true friend. A perfect safeguard and promoter of the Bloom, Beauty, and Vigor of Health. A healthy body, a clear head, and a calm, harmonious mind.

PRICES: 50 CENTS AND \$1.00.
 A Full Impressional Reading, 50 Cents.
 Money order or register when practicable.

Address TRUMAN M. WATSON,
 1300 MAIN ST., WHITEWATER, WIS.

L. N. SCHMIDT & SON,
 Undertakers and Embalmers.
 CARRIAGES.

1519 MILWAUKEE AVENUE, CHICAGO.
 Telephone Humboldt 2446.

WM. J. MAIWORM,
 COMMERCIAL PRINTER.

LABELS.

BLANK BOOKS, STATIONERY, Telephone:
 CATALOGUES, ETC. Main 3794
 85 FIFTH AV., CHICAGO, ILL.

EVERGREEN EUGENICS.

There is no other publication, except *THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS*, that gives as much consideration to the *Problems of Sex* as

SOUNDVIEW,

Exponent of the Society of Evergreens, composed of *Men-Not-Afraid-of-an-Idea* (and *Women*). A special feature of this magazine of sound views is

A SEX SYMPOSIUM,

being a discussion of this basic question by some of the deepest thinkers and best writers of the present time. The series began in January, 1906, and will continue during 1907 and 1908.

A FEW COMPLETE SETS

containing this interesting discussion can be had for \$3, including a 1907 subscription and a copy of "Wildwood Philosophy" (a cloth-bound book by one of the "Simple Livers"). Regular price \$1 per year, 10 cents the copy. On sale at news stands.

"What Is Purity? A Study of Sex Overvaluation," by Theodore Schroeder, is one of the many grand articles in this series. No *EUGENICS* reader should fail to read this epoch-making article.

Special to Students of Eugenics.

For 50 cents we will send *Soundview* the balance of 1907 and a copy of Mr. Schroeder's article, just issued in book form. We want to get you into the "Evergreen Habit."

The Evergreens, Olalla, Wash., U. S. A.

MAZDAZNAN

A Solution to the Most Perplexing Problems of Life. *The Only Expose of Its Kind*. Disclosing Philosophy, Religion, Sociology, Ancient and Modern.

THE MAZDAZNAN

is the only magazine sowing broadcast the seed of Ancient Thought in Modern Terms.

Comparative relation of Christianity to Zoroastrianism plainly expounded.

Send two cents for *Magazines and Other Valuable Literature*. Send for it today, as this is the acceptable time; this is the day for action. Address

THE MAZDAZNAN,

3016-18 Lake Park Av., Chicago, Ill.

THE MENTION OF

This ad. is good for **50c** in payment for Purity literature, if sent at once. Par turn mail. ticulars by re-

NATIONAL PURITY ASSOCIATION,

79 Fifth Av., Chicago.

Mention this publication when you write.

DIET VS. DRUGS.—"The Dietetic Way to Health and Beauty," 5c. "A Nut and Fruit Dietary for Brain-Workers," 5c. "Sexuality and Vitality"; the average person sacrifices his vital powers on the altar of his passions; cause and cure given; 10c. J. B. BARNHILL, Xenia, Ill.

"THE ABUSE OF THE MARRIAGE RELATION."**Best Book Along Eugenics Ever Written.**

By an experienced physician, who has investigated this subject and has found it to be the origin of most chronic diseases. This is also the cause of so many unhappy marriages. This is a very valuable book for those who are married or intend to get married; it will avoid considerable unhappiness and heart-aches. This book will be sent you prepaid upon receipt of

25 CENTS IN STAMPS OR COIN.

B. LUST, N. D.,

B124 E. 59th St., New York City.

"MEATLESS DISHES"

A COPY FREE!

A unique Cook-Book, giving tested recipes for healthful and appetizing dishes without meats or animal fats. Sent Free, postpaid, as a premium to new subscribers only who remit 25c for three months' subscription to the

VEGETARIAN MAGAZINE.

The only publication of its kind in America. Official Organ of the Vegetarian Society of America and all its branches. Read it and learn how to become stronger, healthier, brainier, happier. Worth many times its cost to any one wanting to better his or her condition in life.

Get the Magazine for 3 months on trial (25c) and "Meatless Dishes" thrown in.

Or, if preferred, a copy of "Cleanliness the First Principle of Hygiene," free with 3 months' subscription.

Or Adelaide Johnson's great book, "Harmony: The Real Secret of Health, Happiness and Success," free with 6 months' subscription (50c).

Or all three of the above Books sent Free upon receipt of \$1.00 for a year's subscription.

These premium offers good for a limited time only. Better remit today. You won't regret it!

VEGETARIAN MAGAZINE,

80 DEARBORN STREET, CHICAGO.

(SAMPLE COPY FREE.)

CAN YOU AFFORD

to be without some recognized authority upon matters relating to your own health? Have you gotten beyond the "Patent Medicine Almanac" stage of living? Have you begun to "think"? Do you recognize the fact that nine-tenths of ALL diseases may be prevented IF you know how? Do you know that the great majority of mankind are not enjoying to the full their possibilities of health and strength? Have you learned all the lesson of pure blood, clear brain and strong muscles? Are you just what you ought to be to fulfill your best endeavor? Quite a lot of questions! Can you answer them to your own complete satisfaction? If you realize your life is not what it ought to be, do you know how to change it? Do you know where to go for help? If you don't know, do you want to know?

Our Proposition Will Cost You Just 50c a Year.

Therefore, there is no doubt that you can afford to take advantage of it. This 50c will make you a subscriber to the GOOD HEALTH CLINIC, a magazine that is "different." It contains the best researches of the members of the International Health League, the only organization in the world having for its object the "prevention of all diseases." If ill, you are shown how to get well; if well, how to make your plans for a long and happy life. Those who know say it is the best Magazine of the kind on earth. Dare you invest 50c and find out? Address

GOOD HEALTH CLINIC

TEN YEARS OLD

405 S. Salina Street

SYRACUSE, N. Y.

A BARGAIN

TO THE READERS OF

The American Journal of Eugenics.

Send 10 cents at once for three months' trial subscription to

TO-MORROW MAGAZINE.

To-Morrow is the prophet of Freedom, Co-operation and Tolerance.

To-Morrow is imbued with the Spirit of Brotherly Love.

To-Morrow promulgates a Rational Philosophy—a combination of the Unification of All Knowledge by Herbert Spencer, and the virile, poetic sentiment of Walt Whitman.

To-Morrow is the representative of the principles of Socialization by Group Organization and Co-operative Life, destructive to Private Ownership, Capitalism, Wage Slavery, and Exploitation.

To-Morrow touches the whole field of life and conduct.

SPECIAL TO YOU!

To the readers of THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS we will send three months' trial subscription to *To-Morrow* for 10c, in stamps or silver, though the regular price is 10c per copy, \$1 per year.

Write at once to **DO IT NOW!**

TO-MORROW PUBLISHING CO.,
2238 Calumet Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF PHRENOLOGY

Incorporated 1866, by special act of the New York Legislature, will open its next session the first Wednesday in September.

The subjects embraced:

PHRENOLOGY,
PHYSIOGNOMY,
ETHNOLOGY,
PSYCHOLOGY,
PHYSIOLOGY,
ANATOMY,
HYGIENE,
ANTHROPOLOGY.

For terms and particulars apply to

M. H. PIERCY, Sec.,
FOWLER & WELLS CO.,
24 E. 22D ST., NEW YORK, N. Y.

DEAR READER:

When writing to advertisers in this magazine kindly cut off one of the six coupons found on the other side of this page and send it with your correspondence.

It costs a great deal of money to publish a magazine, and when we can prove that an announcement in *THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS* pays we will be able to get enough advertisements to put the magazine on a self-sustaining basis.

A great many advertisers **KEY** their advertisements. For instance, the Me-Da-Win Mfg. Co.'s advertisement key in this magazine is "Dept. S." In case "Dept. S" is not put on your answer to this advertisement we get no credit, and this firm will not know that you wrote **BECAUSE** you saw its advertisement in our magazine.

It is impossible for us to personally test the merits of every article advertised, but we will not admit an advertisement to our columns unless we believe it worthy of a fair trial.

We shall be glad to have our friends let us know the result of their experience with our advertisers.

**THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS,
500 FULTON ST., CHICAGO, ILL.**

DEAR

I am writing you as a result of having seen your advertisement in
THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS. Kindly send to

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

ORDER

DEAR

I am writing you as a result of having seen your advertisement in
THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS. Kindly send to

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

ORDER

DEAR

I am writing you as a result of having seen your advertisement in
THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS. Kindly send to

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

ORDER

DEAR

I am writing you as a result of having seen your advertisement in
THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS. Kindly send to

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

ORDER

DEAR

I am writing you as a result of having seen your advertisement in
THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS. Kindly send to

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

ORDER

DEAR

I am writing you as a result of having seen your advertisement in
THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS. Kindly send to

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

ORDER