

EUGENICS



VOL. III--Nos. 5-6

SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER

Whole Nos. 1116-17

To reform a man we must begin with his grandmother. —Holmes.

We must begin in the Creatory if we would benefit the race, and woman must rescue herself and consciously assume all responsibility of maternity on behalf of the children. —Massey.

There is but one hope. Science must make woman the mistress, the owner, of her own person. —Ingersoll.

The Economic Panacea must fail.
The Educational Panacea must fail—as a panacea.
The Eugenic Panacea may not fail. —Saleeby.

EUGENICS—The Doctrine of Progress, or Evolution, especially in the Human Race, through improved Conditions in the Relations of the Sexes. —Century Dictionary.

1319 Kellam Avenue, Los Angeles, Cal., U. S. A.

M. HARMAN, Editor and Publisher
New York Agent, E. C. Walker, 244 W. 143d Street

15 CENTS A COPY. BY MAIL, \$1.00 A YEAR

REMOVAL

EUGENICS is now at 1319 Kellan Avenue — not at 649 South Main. Our exchanges please take notice.

Contents of This Number

EDITORIAL

Explanatory and Personal.
Taft and His Tariff-Tinkering Congress.
The Harriman Comet.
The Bonding Pointer.
Dr. Holland's Pointer.
Robert G. Ingersoll's Pointer.
Henry B. Blackwell and Lucy Stone.
Emile Zola's Private Life.
Sustaining Fund.
Getting Down to Business.
Ella Wheeler Wilcox on Legitimacy.
An Autumnal Greeting.
Dry Farming and Poultry Raising in California.
An Earnest Word to Readers and Subscribers.
There Is No Wealth But Life.
A Free Press Anthology.

CONTRIBUTED

Socialism and Marriage—Bedborough.
A Plea For Variety in Love—Kerr.
Love Is Variety, Love Is Unlimited—F. G. DeStone, M. D.
A Little Land and a Little Living—Bolton Hall.
Short Letters From Many Friends.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS

SUCCESSOR TO LUCIFER THE LIGHT-BEARER

Published Monthly at 1319 Kellam Avenue, Los Angeles, Cal.

Subscription Rates, One Year \$1.00. 15 Cents a Copy

M. HARMAN, Editor and Publisher

Vol. III--Nos. 5-6

SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER

Whole Nos. 1116-17

EXPLANATORY AND PERSONAL.

The friends and patrons of *Eugenics* are wondering what has become of the promised July-August number. The chief cause of non-appearance has been a recurrence of the editor's old-time and too familiar friend, variously called "Nervous Prostration," "Neurasthenia," etc. For more than forty years he has been subject to spells of this kind, more or less severe, usually lasting several weeks, if not months, and generally occurring in the months of August and September. The chief cause of this last nervous failure was doubtless the very unusual weather of the latter half of August and first part of September.

The greater part of matter for the July-August *EUGENICS* was in type when this hot spell set in, but the editorial work was not near done, and it was not thought best to go to press without the editorials.

Now, with the fine September weather, the work is going forward with reasonable speed, so that the magazine will probably get into the mail before the lapse of many days, but instead of July-August, will now be dated September-October.

A LECTURE TOUR PROPOSED.

After due deliberation it has been decided to accept the invitation of friends at various places on or near the coast, north of Los Angeles, for a series of lectures by the editor in behalf of the cause nearest his heart.

The first of the series will probably be given at the Auditorium Annex, in San Francisco, on Friday, October the 8th,—subject: The American Inquisition, or Our National Crusade Against Freedom of Speech and of Press—the Enforcement of Ignorance and the Suppression of Saving Knowledge by Authority of the United States Government.

If inducements should offer, this lecture will be followed by four or five more on subjects like these:

- (1) Economics in Relation to Eugenics.
- (2) Dietetics in Relation to Eugenics—The Food Question.
- (3) Athletics—Physical Culture in Its Relation to Eugenics.
- (4) A Grandfather's Talk to Men Only, in regard to Right Preparation for Fatherhood.
- (5) A Grandfather's Talk to Women Only, in regard to Right Preparation for Motherhood.

Prompt correspondence solicited from such as may wish a course of lectures by,

Yours faithfully and hopefully,

M. HARMAN.

POINTERS.

In the constellation Ursa Major—the “Great Bear”—are two large stars called **pointers**, because they point unerringly to the Pole star, which star, as most people know, is by no means a brilliant luminary. Hence the importance of knowing how to locate the Great Bear and his pointers, in the physical heavens.

Likewise, in finding our bearings in the intellectual and moral world, it is well to be able to locate the pointers—to be able to read correctly the events that stand out with prominence in the moral and intellectual horizons.

Taft and His Tariff-tinkering Congress

One of the political events of today that rises to the dignity of a pointer, a real Ursa Major pointer, is the spectacular journey lately begun by the present chief magistrate of the United States, one main object of which presidential trip of thirteen thousand miles (at the expense of the taxpayers), would seem to be to recover lost prestige, lost moral standing with the voters who put him in the White House last spring—the prestige that Mr. Taft seems now conscious of having forfeited through the farcical ending of the “tariff-tinkering” congress called by him to redeem his ante-election promise that the tariff schedules should be scaled down.

Naturally the question arises just here:

“Does Mr. Taft expect by his enormous physical proportions—it is reported that no chair was found **wide** enough in Minneapolis to seat him at table until an ax was brought to cut away the arms of a chair that had been built on purpose to accommodate a ‘trick elephant’—naturally we ask, does Mr. Taft expect by the force of his physical presence itself, and by the majesty of his office, ‘the divinity that doth hedge a king,’ to overpower and to convince the

people that a public tariff, like a public debt, is a 'public blessing'? And this in the face of the growing belief that a national tariff is neither more nor less than a **forcibly extorted tax**, by which the producers and consumers are compelled to stand and deliver enormous sums out of their hard-earned incomes, the main part of which sums go—not into the national treasury as the party bosses would have us believe, but into the pockets, the already dangerously inflated pockets, of the privileged corporations called 'the trusts,' 'the interests,' etc?"

Is it not just possible that some of these hard-worked, these lean and hungry ones, looking on while Mr. Taft and his non-working but heavy consuming friends sit at their twenty-five-dollar-a-plate banquets (such is the fare promised them here in Los Angeles)—is it not just possible that some of those who pay the bills but get none of the costly food and costly drinks (some of the wines and brandies are reckoned to be of fabulous age and price), will begin to ask questions, as did the hungry plebeians in Caesar's time:

"Upon what meat doth this our Caesar feed that he hath grown so great?"

Also such questions as these:

"Does this oleaginous son of aristocratic ancestors, this greatly favored son of luxury and privilege who all his life has been feeding at the public crib, does this man really represent the **people**, the working masses of the United States, or does he represent the idle and greedy aristocracy, the parasitic, the privileged classes who now own—or at least control, the greater part of the land, the mines, the forests, the water power, the machinery, the public highways—not to mention the public offices, the law-making and law-administering powers of the nation?"

These and other similar questions are very apt to be asked, and asked out loud, in the not distant future in this country, as they have been asked in all countries just before the coming of great political cataclysms that destroy one set of tyrants, and elevate another set—as in the case of the first French Revolution.

The meteoric passage of this enormous presidential cortege, imitating in many respects the extravagance, the "pomp and circumstance" of royalty, is one only of the ominous pointers that have lately appeared in the horizon of the country once the home of such apostles and exemplars of simplicity and economy in public affairs as Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and Thomas Paine.

The Harriman Comet.

Another pointer of nearly if not quite equal significance was witnessed a few days ago when every wheel on seventy thousand miles of railway was brought to a sudden stand-still when the body of Edward H. Harriman was laid to rest in the bosom of Mother Earth.

Was ever such honor paid to an untitled citizen in this or any other country?

As one proof of the more than baronial power possessed by this railroad magnate it is now stated that an electric railway to connect San Francisco and Los Angeles, projected to pass through vast tracts of land much in need of such commercial highway, has for years been kept from construction simply through fear of the threats of E. H. Harriman,—because this great manipulator of stocks would allow no road to be built that would compete in business with one of his own lines—the Southern Pacific.

Another story is told in connection with this “wizard,” as he is sometimes called, which, if true, may prove a pointer of incalculable value to the landless poor, provided the grip of the “land shark” can be kept off the now desert lands of the “Great West.” Not that Harriman ever *did* anything to help practicalize “dry farming” but that with a thrifty eye towards increase of traffic for his many roads he encouraged immigration and settlement on desert lands adjoining his lines. To a desert farmer who had made a great success by means of deep and thorough fall and winter plowing, Harriman is reported to have said:

“Your discovery will be worth millions of dollars to the country.” But if his railways continue in future as in the past to extort from producer and consumer “all the traffic will bear,” the chief beneficiary of the new method of tilling arid lands will be the railway king and not the landless home-seeker.

The Bonding Pointer.

Speaking of schemes to settle the arid lands of the Great West it is by no means probable that the money kings, the banker trust, will give up their plan to have our Congress authorize the bonding of the entire people to the tune of five billions, ostensibly to furnish water for the sun-baked plains, but primarily and chiefly, without doubt, to furnish the bankers with an unlimited supply of bonds to use as levers to keep the common people in perpetual slavery—recalling the trick of the same banker trust when it defeated the Greenback policy of Thaddeus Stevens and Salmon P. Chase forty years ago, because the Greenbacks called for **no interest**, and gave no basis for government banks.

To illustrate how easily and needlessly the people were then and have always been fooled into selling themselves and their children into perpetual slavery to the banker trust, take this object lesson, this familiar pointer, clipped from the news columns of a recent issue of the Los Angeles Daily Times. The paragraph was headed, “Who Was the Loser?”

A Kansas paper offers this as “something to figure on”: A banker going home to dinner saw a \$10 bill on the curbstone. He picked it up, noted the number and went home to dinner. While at home his wife remarked that the

butcher had sent a bill amounting to \$10. The only money he had was the bill he had found, which he gave to her and she paid the butcher. The butcher paid it to a farmer for a calf, the farmer to the merchant, who in turn paid it to a washerwoman, and she, owing the banker a note of \$10, went to the bank and paid the note. The banker recognized the bill as the one he had found, and which to that time had paid \$50 worth of debt. On careful examination he discovered that the bill was counterfeit. Now what was lost in the transaction, and by whom?

Of course the fact that this bill was counterfeit cuts no figure in the case. The principle is simply that of **confidence**,—confidence that the note would be redeemed when presented for payment, by the person, the municipality, the corporation or the general government that first issued it.

This is the principle of the Greenback. The people had confidence in their government. They needed a circulating medium. All the redemption they wanted was that another Greenback should be issued to replace the first when worn out, lost, or destroyed by accident. Nobody wanted **interest** on these promissory notes—**nobody but the bankers!** nobody but the **Shylock** who wanted his notes (his ducats) to “breed like ewes and rams.”

By their trick of the “exemption clause” the banker trust succeeded in discrediting the Greenback to such extent that they easily induced the law-makers of the country to call in the legal tender non-interest-bearing notes and issue in their stead interest-bearing bonds, with the result that, after paying into the pockets of the bankers in the shape of interest the whole principal of the government war debt **several times over**, the debt is still unpaid, with no prospect that it ever will be paid—**not while the supply of fools**, the perennial supply of dupes and “easy-marks” continues as now, and as in all the past.

Following the example of the general government, every city, every town, county and corporation is issuing interest-bearing bonds for every conceivable purpose, for our children and children’s children to pay.

For a home illustration right here in Los Angeles, a monster demonstration was made yesterday on the streets—many thousands of people in line; many enthusiastic speeches made and newspaper editorials without number written, to induce “patriotic” men of money to buy the school bonds already issued to build more school houses to accommodate the rapidly increasing number of children in the city. The school bonds are “four per cents,” and the bankers refuse to buy them at that rate of increase. These four per cent “rams and ewes” would not breed fast enough to suit these modern Shylocks, who, like their prototype, are not in the banking business “for their health,” nor for “patriotism.” The children may go without schooling unless the city dads will give them a bigger “rake-off.”

But why should **any** rate of interest be paid?

The citizens need more circulating medium to meet the growing wants of trade. Why not issue, instead of interest-bearing bonds

to be sold to bankers for cash,—**less the discount**—why not issue “city scrip” (as the bankers themselves issued “clearing house” scrip two years ago at the time of the panic to supply a lack of circulating medium)—to be used now to build the school houses, which scrip could be called in at regular intervals and paid off with a new issue whenever more municipal improvements should be needed?

There is but one answer to this question, namely, that the issue of scrip by the city would interfere with the bankers' monopoly, so that they could not lend money at five per cent and upwards!

Money laws are made by bankers, or at their dictation, not by the people, nor for the benefit of the people.

Judging the future by the past, the tax-paying, the bond-paying but not bond-owning producers and consumers will learn nothing from their hard experiences. They prefer to bear their own heavy burdens and to carry besides a far greater load of parasites, greedy bloodsuckers, millionaire leeches and vampires. A few only seem to see what the trouble is, and these few do not appear to know where the remedy is to be found.

Dr. Holland's Pointer.

Some years ago in time of national calamity Dr. J. G. Holland, “Timothy Titcomb,” wrote these stirring lines:

God give us men; a time like this demands
Great hearts, strong minds, true faith and willing hands;
Men whom the lust of office cannot kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who honor; men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a Demagogue
And damn his treach'rous flatteries without winking;
Tall men, sunburnt, who live above the fog,
In public duty and in private thinking.

For while the rabble with its thumb-worn creeds,
Its large professions and its little deeds,
Mingle in selfish strife, lo Freedom weeps,
Wrong rules the land and waiting Justice sleeps.

Dr. Holland saw clearly enough that what the troubled “time” demanded most was **men!** Saw clearly that the “rabble” of politicians—such as we have today in our chief magistrate and his tariff-tinkering congress—their “large professions and their little deeds mingling in selfish strife,” each trying to get the better of the other—could never bring peace and prosperity to the suffering masses, and that “freedom” would continue to “weep” and “waiting justice” continue to “sleep” and wrong continue “to rule the land,” until we could get a better class of men to take hold of public affairs.

Like the rabble he condemned, however, Dr. Holland himself was fettered by his own “thumb-worn creeds,” one of which is that “God” gives us men—the time-honored creed that “in the beginning the gods created the heavens and the earth and all that in them is,” and

last of all made "man in their own image, etc.," and therefore—as some of us see it—the first thing Dr. Holland should have done would have been to reform his own creed and get it into line with the advanced thought of the present age.

Col. Ingersoll's Pointer.

Cotemporary with Dr. Holland lived Robert G. Ingersoll who, while still holding on to some of his own inherited and thumb-worn creeds—such as a national "protective tariff," a "gold-standard currency," etc., had outgrown the creed of his youth that the old mythical gods have something to do with making men, something to do with the institutions, the laws and customs of the people. He did not believe that "the powers that be are ordained of God," or that "the voice of the people is the voice of God."

In his last lecture, entitled "What is Religion," Robert Ingersoll gave voice to one of the best pointers ever yet given to the world of thinkers. Very clearly and forcibly he showed the causes of the failure of reformers to reform the world, then he told his hearers what he believed to be the true remedy—which in brief is contained in these words:

You cannot reform people with tracts and talk—with preach and creed. Religion is helpless. Law can punish but it can neither reform criminals nor prevent crime. . . . There is but one hope. To accomplish this there is but one way. Science must make woman the owner, the mistress of herself. . . . must put it in the power of woman to decide for herself whether she will or will not become a mother. This is the solution of the whole question. This frees woman. The babes that are then born will be welcome. They will be clasped by glad hands to happy breasts. They will fill homes with light and joy. . . . When that time comes the prison walls will fall, the dungeons will be flooded with light, and the shadow of the scaffold will cease to curse the earth. . . . The whole world will be intelligent, virtuous and free.

This in brief is the Ingersollian pointer. He did not live to elaborate his remedy. He did not tell just how or why the freedom of motherhood would accomplish such wonderful results, or how freedom of motherhood is to be obtained. Others have supplied what the great Agnostic orator lacked.

Henry B. Blackwell and Lucy Stone.

Prominent among Ingersoll's co-workers—in the field of reform long before Ingersoll, in fact, was a man who began to give pointers in the direction of freedom and justice to woman as early as 1853, when he made his first speech in favor of woman suffrage, and who for forty years was editor-in-chief of perhaps the best known of all the journals devoted to woman's political and economic enfranchisement, namely, the "Woman's Journal" of Boston, and who laid down his pen only with his life. I mean, of course, the honored and revered Henry B. Blackwell, who died at his home in Boston on the seventh of this present month, September, in the eighty-fifth year of his age.

But the most important service to the world by the veteran Henry

B. Blackwell was not his editorials and speeches in favor of woman's political and industrial emancipation, but what he said and did for the freeing of womanhood and motherhood from slavery to man-made marriage laws. Here is the protest, formulated and published to the world by Henry B. Blackwell and Lucy Stone, at the time of their very unconventional wedding in May, 1855:

We protest especially against the laws which give the husband:

1. The custody of the wife's person.
2. The exclusive control and guardianship of their children.
3. The sole ownership of her personal and use of her real estate, unless previously settled upon her or placed in the hands of trustees, as in the case of minors, idiots and lunatics.
4. The absolute right to the product of her industry.
5. Also against laws which give to the widower so much larger and more permanent an interest in the property of his deceased wife than they give to the widow in that of her deceased husband.
6. Finally, against the whole system by which "the legal existence of the wife is suspended during marriage," so that, in most States, she neither has a legal part in the choice of her residence, nor can she make a will, nor sue or be sued in her own name, nor inherit property.

Our readers will see that with the abolition of these characteristic features, against which this protest was directed, there would be little left of church-state marriage. Through the efforts of these two brave and tireless workers much has been done to modify and make more just and humane the marriage laws of most states of the American Union—though very much remains yet to be done. The example of Lucy Stone in retaining through life her maiden name, was a tremendous pointer in the direction of woman's primal right to self-ownership. Sad to say, very few married women, even among those who now oppose institutional marriage, have risen to the plane of revolt against the rule of priest, judge and Grundy, the plane implied by the retention of the name they bore before joining in a "love-and-labor union" with a comrade of the opposite sex.

Emile Zola's Private Life.

This article is already much too long, but I feel that it will be decidedly incomplete without one more pointer, one more **Ursa Major** pointer in the direction of the absolute and unconditional freedom of womanhood and motherhood and, through such liberation, the complete and final emancipation of the whole human race from all kinds of bondage that enslave, dwarf and degenerate. It is found in the example of the great novelist, philanthropist and lover of honesty, truth and justice, Emile Zola, and of his brave and true wife. On the world's intellectual and moral horizon few if any stars have risen and shone in modern times whose influence for good has been greater than has been that of this renowned Frenchman, and when the history of the woman he called wife, and of the other woman who gave birth to the children that now bear his name, shall come to be written, the whole will constitute one of the greatest pointers

towards the possibility of a heaven upon earth ever yet given to this old sinning and repenting, this weeping and sighing, this warring and suffering world.

The only history of the private life of Zola and of the two women just referred to, that I have seen is that found in the following brief paragraphs republished, with appropriate comments, by Lillian Harman, when editing *Lucifer the Light Bearer* in Chicago three years ago, while I was "doing time," as captive of the Modern Inquisition, at the federal work-house in Leavenworth, Kansas:

The story of Zola's children, born outside marriage, which was given to the world soon after his death, is again brought to the notice of the public by Madame Zola, who, herself childless, wishes her husband's children to bear his name. Under date of December 6 the following cablegram from Paris appeared in the *Chicago Tribune*:

"Mme. Emile Zola today formally applied to the courts for permission to confer her late husband's name on the three children born as a result of M. Zola's intimacy with Mme. Rosereau, which was revealed only at the death of the famous novelist. The children are being reared by Mme. Zola, who expresses special gratification at the fact that the boy has decided to adopt a technical profession instead of trying to emulate his father in the field of letters.

"The strange romance in the life of Zola, which only his death revealed, has had few counterparts in modern times. It was a romance in which all defied the law and the conventionalities of society. And yet it had the sanction of Zola's wife.

"When Zola died a mysterious veiled woman, accompanied by two children—a boy aged 13 and a girl aged 5—appeared at his home and wept beside his coffin.

"On the day of the funeral, when the procession wended its way through the streets, followed by a great concourse of mourners, the thousands who stood with uncovered heads along the route looked with wonder at a woman in black, heavily veiled, who walked by the hearse, leading two children by the hand, all the way to the cemetery. When the mourners had departed the veiled woman and the children went to the grave and prayer.

"When Zola's will was opened and read the mystery of the veiled woman and the two children was solved, for Zola had acknowledged the children as his own and made ample provision for them as well as for their mother.

"Zola was devotedly attached to his wife. They were inseparable companions. It was to her that he looked for all his inspiration. It was to her that he turned for solace when exiled from France by the powerful enemies of Dreyfus.

"At the same time Zola loved Mme. Rosereau. She became the mother of his children. She had loved Zola for years before she knew his real name.

"Mme. Zola knew of the intimacy between her husband and Mme. Rosereau and sanctioned it. When the first child was born to Zola by Mme. Rosereau, Mme. Zola insisted that the mother and the child be invited to her home.

"Then began the strange friendship between the two women. Mme. Rosereau and her children, of whom Zola was the father, were frequent visitors to Zola's home."

Briefly stated, a few of the results of the general adoption of this ethical code would be:

1. An end to sexual jealousy and hate, the twin devils that create more unhappiness to adults and more degeneracy to the unborn; more murders and suicides; more wars of households, clans and nations, than any other single cause, if not more than all other causes put together.

2. An end to enforced celibacy—enforced childlessness, on the part of the million surplus women of England, and of the half million that statistics show to exist in the eastern part of the United States.

3. An end—in time—of the enormous multiplication of the **unfit**—the born **degenerate**, by the substitution of the **fit**, the **superior**, the **best**, through natural selection of the best fatherhood by sexually free mothers.

4. An end (in time) to that dread scourge of the human race, **venereal disease**, because an end to professional body-prostitution which is the natural consequence, the inevitable outgrowth and counterpart of exclusive, indissoluble, law-enforced, monogamic marriage.

Time and space forbid elaboration of what the example of Zola and his two women friends mean to the world, and of what it does **not** mean. This will require another article—will need many articles, in fact, of average magazine length. So great is the power of age-old prejudice that any infraction of the canons of the church-state marriage code will be regarded by most people as a blow aimed against virtue, against purity of life, against sex morality, against “law and order,”—a backward movement towards barbarism, savagery and social chaos.

But while this will doubtless be the popular verdict in regard to the influence of the private life of Zola, the intellectual and moral horizon is dotted, here and there, with many pointers that indicate a general upheaval, a widespread uprising against the church-state moral code and in favor of—not promiscuous and unbridled sex-indulgence, not in favor of polygamy, polyandry, or of irresponsible parenthood, but the opposite of all these—a movement in favor of intelligent, philanthropic, sympathetic and humane reorganization of the code and mode of life that bring into existence new human beings.

The republication of the private life of Zola is rendered timely by the rapid strides that the principles of Socialism are making, especially in France, where a Socialist has lately been appointed prime minister under President Fallieres. That the leading Socialist writers on the continent and in England, such as August Bebel and August Forel in Germany, and Bernard Shaw in England, are in open revolt against the conventional and popular marriage code, is well known. How much Zola's writings and example have contributed to this revolt cannot, of course, be known with certainty, but that their influence has been very great towards fixing the conviction in all progressively intelligent minds that our marriage code needs reconstruction quite as much as do our economic and our theologic systems, cannot be doubted by those who read and who do their own thinking.

Lest We Forget.

But let it never be forgotten that Liberty is the solvent of all moral or ethical problems. Under the reign of liberty in love not all women and men would choose to live the complex life of Zola and

his two women friends. Many would choose the exclusive monogamic relation. Many men, and most women doubtless are now monogamists at heart, however they may appear to others, and when the human race shall have reached as near to perfection of type as have storks, geese, doves and some other birds, it is probable very few men and still fewer women will choose to live on any other sexual plane than the monogamic. But it must always be remembered that the monogamic birds and beasts have reached the nearly perfect type through **voluntary selection**—sexual selection on the part of the **female**, not through **marriage**, which is a masculine institution and means the denial and defeat of natural selection.

With R. W. Emerson we may all say,

“The very hopes of man, the thoughts of his heart, the religion of nations, the manners and morals of mankind, are all at the mercy of a new generalization.”

M. H.

Addendum.

Lest any reader of the foregoing long article should infer that its writer indulges at times in vindictive or pharisaic feelings, I wish to say, once for all, that I claim to be no better than the people whose conduct I criticise. I do not forget that if born and bred as William H. Taft was born and bred, I too would have been like him, an aristocrat of the aristocrats. And when I speak of the masses of the people as “fools,” as easily humbugged, hypnotized and made to vote against their own interests, I **include myself**. As a loyal Republican and disciple of Horace Greely I voted for “protective tariffs,” government bonds and for the retirement of the greenbacks; voted for national, state and county aid to railroad corporations, not foreseeing the terrible consequences of such voting.

Now, while I still think the non-interest-bearing greenback incomparably better than the present currency system, I think there is still a “more excellent way,” which way I hope to live long enough to see practicalized, but which I can not now explain. Our readers will have no difficulty in seeing that my object in introducing the money question in this article is simply to show the **need of men!**—men who can “stand before a demagogue and damn his treacherous flatteries without winking”—men that will neither rob and enslave others, nor be themselves robbed and enslaved—all this to point the way, the only way in which such men can be obtained.

M. H.

SUSTAINING FUND.

Godfrey Gustafson, Nebraska, 75c; Paul Winch, Mass., 25c; Joan Flora Tilton, Mass., \$1; Dr. F. A. M. Cook, Kansas, 32c; Nelson Wickens, Wis., 60c; Geo. B. Wheeler, Chicago, \$1; Robert E. Taylor, N. Y., 40c; Frank J. Stiles, Mass, \$1; C. C. Hitchcock, Mass., \$1; Jacob Stein, Maine, \$1.15; Laura A. Miller, Utah, 50c; F. G. de Stone, Calif., \$2; Abby Hedge Coryell, Maine, \$1; C. C. Reinbold, Tenn, 50c; Q. P.

Loomis, Va., \$1; Mrs. Nettie Howell, Calif, \$1; Mrs. L. E. Griffin, Kansas, \$1; J. Scarceriaux, N. J., \$1.25; Dr. M. Rowe, Illinois, \$5; Mrs. B. M., N. Y., \$5; Chas. F. Govan, Wash., 25c; Ed Arnaud, N. Y., \$9; O. A. Rice, Ill., 12c; W. W. Miller, Conn., \$4; A Friend, Canada, \$7.50; B. F. Richards, Calif, \$1.50.

GETTING DOWN TO BUSINESS.

A good friend and subscriber in Washington—state, not city—writes as follows:

Editor **Eugenics**, Los Angeles, Cal.

Dear Sir: I have read your May-June **Eugenics** and I want to write and tell you I particularly appreciate Mrs. W. S. P. article in that number.

If eugenics means the better birthing of babies, and if the editor of **Eugenics** knows how to teach us how to have better babies, why don't he settle right down to business and tell us, instead of "beating around the bush" and telling us we need "variety in love," polygamy, "promiscuity," "Unitary homes," etc.

Really, now, Mr. Editor, do you really believe or do you even think that there is any other way to have well born babies than as Mrs. W. S. P. says, which is that a prospective father and mother who love each other dearly, agreeing and abiding by the decision that no unwanted baby, nor an accident, nor the fruit of desire only, shall ever enter their home?

A man and a woman who ever loved each other and lived such a life could not cease loving each other, and all talk to them about "variety in love," "promiscuity," "polygamy," "Unitary home," etc., would be disgusting and revolting. Then why not teach our fathers and mothers this instead of teaching them that the summum bonum of existence is sexual gratification which is the teaching of most of the contributions to **Eugenics**.

Some of your contributions imply that you think the civilized world has gone mad on sex gratification and you want to show them how to make this madness endurable by making them more mad by more indulgence and gratification.

Why don't the editor of **Eugenics** teach them that the sex passion must be controlled as all passions should.

No question is ever settled until it is settled right, and this question of sex will never be settled by teaching us to expect to find our soul mate in half a dozen persons, more or less.

Then again: Some of your communications teach mothers that they should be willing for the father of their children to be away from them, embracing other women, because of their desire and need for variety in love, and you seem to think that under such environment mothers would produce ideal children. Bah!

Such proceedings on the part of human beings would not produce even well-born animals. It would produce satyrs which we do not consider even good animals. Ask any mother if she could produce a well-born child under such environment.

The only way to have ideal children is for both father and mother to want them, and if the father does his duty to his children he will have a plenty to do and his desire to be the father of several women's children will vanish as the mist before the sun.

To be the father of an ideal child, requires something more than to be the father of an animal, and we must teach this to the fathers.

Our mothers know it. They all learn it in that bitter and expensive school—the school of experience.

Not many years ago everybody thought it was right and proper to indulge in intoxicants to the point of drunkenness. Today all this is changed and the person who does not control his passion for drink is considered an imbecile.

May we not hope that the day is near when the man or woman who does not control his or her sex passion will be considered the same as the person who does

not control his passion for drink, and branded as the inebriate.

In conclusion, I hope you will begin to teach true eugenics and I will then be glad to contribute my mite to the good work. Very respectfully,
MRS. M. J. BAKER.

Pretty evidently Mrs. M. J. B. did not read the editorials in the May-June number, or she would not write as she does. Evidently she has not been a reader of the magazine now called **Eugenics** for the past few years or she would not write as she has written.

Yes, eugenics means "the borning of better babies." It means, also, includes necessarily, a discussion of the conditions under which babies can be better born than is possible under present environments, present laws, traditions, customs, education, or lack of education.

If our friendly critic had been a reader of the magazine now known as **Eugenics** for the past quarter century or more she would not say that its editor "beats around the bush," or that he tells his readers they "need variety in love, polygamy, promiscuity," etc.

She would know that this editor does not assume to know all about how people should live together in order to secure happiness for themselves and how to transmit to their children the best possible inheritance of mind and body.

She would know that it is because he is conscious of his own lack of knowledge in regard to these tremendously important questions that he has invited his readers to assist him in the effort to find out the better way. She would know that he has asked for honest opinions, plainly and candidly expressed, no matter how much these opinions might differ from his own.

In these discussions of what would or could be "improved conditions in the relations of the sexes"—see the dictionary definition of "eugenics," the editor has been all the while doing his best to "get right down to business"; has tried to give all a fair hearing, without fear or favor. He has asked for truth no matter to what strange or unwelcome landings the search for truth might lead him.

The very best evidence—it would seem—that this old editor has been honestly trying to get down to business in his search for eugenic truth, and in his defence of what he believes is the right of the unborn to be born well, is the fact that he has been willing to face slander, misrepresentation and abuse; willing to face the loss of friends, the loss of opportunities to gain popularity and wealth; willing to face the loss even of personal liberty rather than retreat from the stand he had taken for free speech and free press, as necessary means to secure such right for himself and for the voiceless unborn.

* * *

At the risk of being once more misunderstood; at the risk of being again accused of personal vanity or of an itching for notoriety, the editor aforesaid now proposes to give a very brief resume of some of the evidences that he has been honestly trying for years to get

down to business in his search for bed-rock truth in regard to eugenics.

In June, 1886, twenty-three years ago, the editor of **Eugenics**,—then called *Lucifer, the Light Bearer*,—published a letter by W. G. Markland, of Tennessee, written to show how impossible it is that children can be born well so long as marriage laws give husbands the right to abuse their wives worse than brute beasts abuse their females. For publishing this letter—the truth of whose statements of fact was never disputed, the editor was sentenced to five years in State prison and to pay a fine of \$300. He did not pay the fine, but served, in all, fourteen months in prison for such publication.

While trial for this alleged offence was pending, Dr. R. V. O'Neil, a member in good standing of the New York Medical Association, wrote and sent a defense of the editor's act in publishing the Markland letter. The O'Neil letter was an earnestly worded plea for plainness of speech in exposing the evils of ignorance of sex, showing how such ignorance leads to abuses of the reproductive powers and functions, such as must inevitably defeat the right birthing of children. For printing this letter the editor was sentenced to one year in prison, of which time he served eight months.

Some years later, Sarah Crist Campbell, of Illinois, mother of a large and much respected family, a grandmother as well, wrote a letter urging men to restrain their sex passion in the interest of the unborn, as well as to prevent needless pain, sorrow and danger to mothers, to say nothing of the great advantage such restraint would bring to the prospective fathers themselves.

About the same time, a subscriber in Canada, whose name is not now recalled, wrote a letter for publication, in which he protested against what he called the custom of requiring women in wedlock to perform the functions of a prostitute while bringing a child into the world. That is, against the custom,—almost universal, of requiring expectant mothers to satisfy the sex needs of their husbands, "to keep them virtuous,"—or words to that effect. Evidently our Canadian friend would have the example of Mary, mother of Jesus, followed during the nine months before the birth of each child,—namely, that all expectant mothers should live celibate lives.

For publishing the last named two letters the editor was sentenced to a year in the Illinois state prison, where he probably would have died if friends had not secured his transfer to the federal prison at Leavenworth, Kansas, from which place he was released—pretty thoroughly broken in health, but by no means broken in spirit, December 26, 1906.

One more letter, among the many held to be unmailable by the postal censors, should be mentioned here, namely, that of Celia B. Whitehead, the noted writer on dress reform. This letter was written in reply to one by Elmina D. Slenker, and was a strongly worded protest against the use of "preventives of conception." In other

words, it was an earnest plea for self-control, for abstinence, in fact, on the part of the husband, for preventing waste of sex forces, confining intimate sex relations to the single purpose of generating new human beings. This letter, known as the "Whitehead letter," was one of those upon which the sentence of five years and the fine of \$300 was secured in the Kansas federal court, against the editor who is now urged to "settle down to business" in the work of showing mothers "how to have better babies."

All the letters, without exception, for the publication of which the said editor was sent to prison, were written in favor of continence, of temperance, of self-control, and not one in favor of unbridled licentiousness or of gross animal indulgence.

* * *

This brief resume of the editor's experiences with the postal censors, is inserted here in part because of the many calls for his autobiography, chapters of which have often been promised for these columns, but as often postponed for lack of room, lack of time or lack of nervous energy.

* * *

And now good friends, Mrs. M. J. B., Mrs. M. S. S., and other friendly critics, will you grant a patient and unprejudiced hearing to a few words more from the same oft misunderstood and oft harshly judged editor?

Changing from the third to the first person singular, as more direct and less formal, I will say that my investigations into the working of our popular ethical systems compel me to be a preacher of the gospel of discontent. I am forced to "cry aloud and spare not," else close my eyes and steel my heart against the wrongs and sufferings of my fellowmen and especially of my sister women and of their innocent, their disinherited unborn children.

In the May-June number Mrs. W. S. S. asks: "If a woman is married to a man who rules her more than is his right, what gain is there in teaching her to revolt, to despise him, to bring to her already troubled life a spirit which only increases her misery?" Further on she deprecates being told so much in **Eugenics** about "the curse of institutional marriage.....the troubles of forced monogamy, and so on."

The questions of Mrs. M. J. B., as printed above, tell the reason why I am "teaching women to revolt." It is because I **want their babies to be well born!** If the woman whose husband "rules her more than is his right," finds it the line of least resistance to **submit**,—to sacrifice her right to self-ownership at the command of law and custom it would seem her **personal right** so to do, but **what of the effect of such submission upon her unborn child?**

What becomes of the right of the voiceless unborn?

If the expectant mother desires that her son shall be a submissive slave to economic bosses; if she wishes him to be an obedient fol-

lower, an unquestioning dupe or henchman of autocratic leaders in state or church, then the advice of Mrs. W. S. S. is all right. But if she wants her son to be a **man among men!** If she wishes him to be a strong-willed, self-centered, self-reliant **man**; a man who will **die**—die fighting gloriously for his manhood rights and for the rights of his sisters and brothers, rather than tamely submit to tyrants who, with laws of their own making, rob him of his equal right to life, liberty and the enjoyment of the just proceeds of his labor—then such prospective mother will say to such husband:

"My body is my own! my soul is my own; my time and my labor are my own; the child I am building is my own; the fact of fatherhood gives you no just claim upon my child, now or hereafter. If you will not recognize my rights in these regards, then I demand an equitable division of the property mutually acquired since we came together, and also the property I brought to the partnership. I will go my way; you can go yours."

Children born of such high resolves could never be enslaved, as the great masses of people in all lands are now enslaved, and ever have been enslaved, since church and state enacted laws controlling motherhood.

Only babies born of such mothers can be well born.

Only children born of such mothers can be **legitimate**.

All others are illegitimates!"—**bastards** by decree of mother nature herself.

Hear what our own inspired prophetess, Ella Wheeler, says about legitimacy and illegitimacy:

Motherhood ought to be, but rarely is, a proof of the perfect mating of two souls.

I have heard more than one mother of several children make the awful confession that she had not the slightest understanding of love or passion as she heard those emotions described in books or by poets. She was fond of her husband, one wife said, but considered her maternal offices as a duty only, and that she believed such feelings were common to mothers.

I trust she was mistaken. Children conceived and born under such conditions are, to my thinking, the illegitimate offspring of earth. No law of man—no words pronounced by church or court—can make such children legitimate or well-born.

There must be, at least on the mother's part, a strong love and an abiding affection, and a complete abandon of her heart and mind upon the altar of love to render motherhood a sacred and successful office.

All the really great souls of earth were conceived and born from such a passion.

The reason there are so few great souls is because there are so few great passions.

And here is what J. William Lloyd thinks a strong and true woman would say to her husband:

The age is waiting not for the beaten woman, nor for the combative one, but for the great souled woman who looks at her husband with level eyes and says: "I do not in the least bind you. I do not ask nor expect you to be satisfied with me. Because I love you I want you to live and to know all the great and sweet experiences that life may hold for you. But I do want you to be true to yourself

and to me. I want you to be great. I want you to be large. I want you always for my hero, that my love may not fail. I not only set you free to love, but I give you my sympathy and my help. We must be comrades in all things—especially in our hearts. But I do ask you not to love beneath yourself. I do ask you not yield to loves that may sicken your body, corrupt your manhood, debase your ideals. Love greatly, beautifully, proudly, so that I may love those you love, and love and have you all the more for every new soul that enlarges the sphere of your life. I trust you and I liberate you—trust me and liberate me, for all that I yield you I claim for myself. I am proudly your equal. I too must live and love.”

That there are many other things to be considered besides the question of mateship or matchood in order that motherhood may be a complete success, and that babies may be well born, is very true, such as the questions of home and personal habits, food, drink, etc.; but **right matchood is the first and incomparably the most important question to be settled** by the woman who aspires to that greatest of all offices to which a human being can possibly aspire, namely, the office of **motherhood**.

Compared with the honors, the glories, the responsibilities—the **shame** (in case of failure), of this office the honors, the responsibilities of the office of king, emperor, president, pope, etc., sink into insignificance.

In the book called the “Crime of Undesigned and Undesired Maternity,” Henry C. Wright says something like this:

“The woman who gives to her child an inferior fatherhood commits a crime against that child, a crime that can have no forgiveness in this world or in any other.”

A terrible sentence, but one that I believe to be just and true.

SOCIALISM AND MARRIAGE.

[One of the most interesting of the many wars now being waged in the intellectual world is that between the radical and the conservative wings of the fast-increasing army of “Socialists.” In England, more than anywhere else, has this conflict reached the acute stage. The following long but exceedingly well-written article gives the fairest showing of arguments on either side yet given to the public, so far as I know. Dr. Coit, a Socialist clergyman, is candidate for a seat in Parliament, and in support of his claims appears to have published a pamphlet entitled “Socialism and Marriage,” which pamphlet sells for two pence, or four cents, and is freely quoted and commented on by the editor of the now discontinued radical journal known to many of our readers as “The Adult”—George Bedborough.
M. H.]

Dr. Coit is asking Wakefield to elect him to parliament. As its intellectual and eloquent vicar he would have graced its commonplace perpendicular parish church (now called a cathedral). Wakefield’s conservatives wrong themselves if they oppose Dr. Coit, who in spite of a genuine enthusiasm for the worker and an ardent desire for many desirable reforms is in many ways more conservative than Mr. Balfour, more religious than the Bishop of Wakefield, more moral than Mr. Stead, and more conformist than the Archbishop of Canterbury.

He has come to the rescue of an ancient institution even while appealing for socialist votes. His socialism is all right, but his views

on marriage are orthodox enough for St. Paul himself. In his new pamphlet Dr. Coit asks:

"What is socialism? It is the nationalization of the sources of life and hapiness, through the organized sovereignty of the State, for the benefit of the nation at large. If the nationalization of land in this manner is socialism, likewise of capital, likewise of labor, then surely the State ownership and control of the energy and ability to beget after one's own kind is equally socialism."—Page 9.

Individualists can answer for themselves. As a socialist I repudiate the doctrine that socialism involves any such conclusion. Dr. Coit has vainly protested for years against ethics being regarded as irreligious. He now attempts a similar defence of socialism. He ignores what socialists like Bebel have said about marriage. He dismisses Bernard Shaw as "a sincere but audacious writer," whose views on this question are "extremely rudimentary and retrogressive in their socialism." (page 15. After condemning H. G. Wells and J. A. Hobson he says:

"If any passage can be cited from the writings of any so-called socialist showing that he does not believe in the State control and ownership of the ability to bring human beings into the world, that passage is an absolute proof that in so far the writer of it is not a socialist." (page 10.)

Of course we know the "logician" who claims that unless a Socialist would socialize the moon, toothache, and all parlor games, or the total abstainer from eating, or the vegetarian cease from breathing germ-laden air, principle is violated. But when a practical politician opens his career with such exactitude, it shows us that in Dr. Coit we have a more careful type of mind than we usually find in a candidate.

Dr. Coit's complaint is that the enemies of Socialism have endeavored to fasten onto its advocates a belief in varying shades of immorality. The answer is perfectly simple to every Socialist except Dr. Coit. The Labor Party has met the accusation with an admirable retort based on history and fact:

"This Conference of the Labor Party (January, 1908) declares that the disintegration of the family is due to the creation of slums, the employment of children in factories, the dragging of mothers into workshops and factories, through economic pressure created by low wages of men, sweating and other operations of capitalism."

This is not enough for Dr. Coit because it says nothing about monogamy. But even he admits that "cases are numerous where a man is by no means faithful to his marriage vow (and therefore in his case monogamy is set at defiance), and yet the man supports the wife and children financially to their utmost need, enjoys the domesticity of his home, and is full of pride in the welfare and success of his offspring." (Page 7.)

Such cases fill Dr. Coit with loathing. These enemies of civiliza-

tion must be rooted out. Socialism must repudiate any idea of happiness based on such horrors. And his whole pamphlet (18 pages of small type) voices his demand.

"It will be necessary in future that a resolution shall be passed overtly declaring that the Labor Party stands for monogamic marriage. It will also be necessary to adopt as authoritative some statement setting forth reasoned proofs which will convince the public that monogamy is a socialistic institution." (Page 7.)

Where is this reasoned proof to come from? Certainly not from the pen of any known Socialist—American, German or British—with the single exception of our ethical leader who is constantly explaining the science, ethics and sociology of today in terms consistent with the fetiches, forms and fantasies of an effete religion.

Socialism has its own theories about the administration of things, wherein it differs from anarchism, toryism and liberalism. But all these systems and theories have problems in the **government of persons** which are common problems of civilization, and these will be decided by mankind according to its bias in favor of authority or individual liberty, a distinction which cuts transversely through religious, political and social theories, with which they have only an incidental if any connection. If the enemies of Socialism believe that a majority of Socialists repudiate monogamy, the answer must be based on statistics, not on prejudice. If Socialists are said to favor free love, murder, vegetarianism and the Baconian-Shakespeare theory it is no answer to attack these theories or to pretend that a Socialist cannot logically advocate either. But Dr. Coit is not contented to advocate and practice his monogamy, or even to attempt to convince recalcitrant anti-monogamic Socialists. After saying they don't exist, he wants the law to protect him; he asks for a State ban against the heretics. On what grounds? After admitting the possibility of "Many acts in life concerning only those who engage in them" (an anarchism for which he will some day repent in sackcloth), he proceeds to darken counsel by confusing **child-bearing** with marriage. This facetiousness vitiates all that such thinkers say about marriage laws or eugenics. Obviously the mildest as well as the most extreme stirpiculturist is out of court in suggesting interference with the marriages or sex relations of those who do not add to the population.

Alike as a Socialist and eugenist, I am prepared to welcome inducements offered to parents to produce a healthy and improved generation. Advice, warning, assistance, and even, under certain circumstances, restraint, are not unreasonable propositions for a Socialist democracy to consider in cases where offspring is adding to the responsibilities and perhaps burdens of a whole people. But Dr. Coit insists on State interference for its own sweet sake. "That rare thing, a marriage," is to become rarer, for Dr. Coit considers that the marriage of poetry, romance and reason is only a "courtesy marriage" (not a bad name, either), and that the real marriage is a compact

between the State and the man and woman." "The essence of marriage is the State's recognition of the union." Through monogamy the State says, "Thou shalt and thou shalt not." (Page 9.) A sense of humor suggests that Thou shalt is the one thing the State cannot say in this connection. It can and does too often write over the Garden of Love's door the inscription of "the chapel on the green" in Blake's poem, **Thou Shalt Not**; but the two parties to the agreement are the only parties who can say **We will**.

Dr. Coit's repudiation of the property idea in marriage is very halting for a Socialist. After glancing at the orthodox view that the woman belongs to the man (an idea which is the fundamental basis of Coit's conception if he only knew it), and after some admirable appreciation of a better gospel we reach the phrase: "If the idea of property is to enter in at all, it must be recognized that such ownership is wholly derived, and secondary, and so to speak, upon good behavior." (Page 10.)

This eventuality is a frank confession that property is to be socialistically abolished everywhere, except in its vilest form. And love is to claim property rights until convicted of criminality. Dr. Coit's symbolism only makes matters worse when he refers to "the responsible public ownership of the ability to produce human beings," which presumably, like land, etc., may be "let out for the special and exclusive use of individual persons." Most of us Socialists will repudiate such sentiments as these and may be pardoned if they mentally turn to Shelley, the atheist free-lover, for a change of air, after the moral maxims of the orthodox monogamists. Some shrines will remain even under Socialism, some poetry, some privacy, some place where one can still say, "The heart knoweth its own . . . and a stranger intermeddleth not therewith."

Dr. Coit is not so exact as he might be in saying that "the enemies of Socialism have noted that many Socialists are dissatisfied with the existing economic aspects of marriage," and that the changes advocated by Socialists and others "would not in the least affect the vital constitution of monogamy." (Page 11.) We shall see presently what is Dr. Coit's definition of this vital principle. But, speaking with some knowledge of Socialists and other advocates of marriage reform, I know that such reformers, *qua* Socialists, are keenly alive to the economic disabilities of women and are striving to remove them, but they have never made the mistake of ignoring the moral aspect of this marriage problem. On the moral side they see that, while men and women suffer in varying degrees through the operation on sex relations of existent economic laws, still more do men, women and children suffer through the pretense that modern marriage is monogamic and that marriage must last "till death do us part." As Bernard Shaw says, also, "Marriage places no restraint on debauchery so long as it is monogamic." Novels, essays, speeches, newspaper articles and correspondence, debates, plays and poems by So-

cialists and others have made the "Is marriage a failure?" controversy familiar in recent years, there is hardly a civilized country which has escaped the discussion. The economic side has occupied only a small share of the exposition of the sex problem, not because it is unimportant, but partly because sex economics is only a phase of the general economic question, and partly because in relation to sex the economic factor makes a more limited and therefore less effective appeal to those who suffer from unhappy sex conditions. In this respect sex slavery probably resembles the personal slavery of ante-bellum days. Doubtless there was an economic side there, but abolitionists had a more powerful appeal which went to the heart quicker than any economics ever did, because "We must be free or die." Personal liberty is the basis of all possible reform.

"The whole of monogamic marriage," says Dr. Coit, "consists in a love-duty contract."

A contract is a quite proper and practicable condition for common housekeeping between two persons, and may be useful as a mutual statement of what is understood on both sides. Under present conditions the weaker party risks much in dispensing with a contract, and one may intentionally or otherwise deceive the other. But the term "love duty" contract is meaningless. We do not contract to do our duty, and we cannot contract to love. An enforceable contract must have reference to material consideration, and is impertinent otherwise. If economic reforms can receive some equitable distribution of wealth, one phase of our problem vanishes, but Dr. Coit's contract is to endure even when the kingdom of heaven is established on earth.

"Policemen will be patrolling every street of the New Jerusalem." (Page 6.)

A contract to love is ridiculous. An attempt to enforce it by police is abominable. Dr. Coit would take from the marriage service the promise to obey—an undertaking of childish ease compared with the impossibility involved in the promise to love till death, which Dr. Coit would perpetuate.

Monogamy must be a flimsy institution indeed if Dr. Coit is right that "its purity can only be violated in one way—by infidelity in thought and act" (page 11), and Dr. Coit permits himself to speak of "the duty to the State" (page 12) as an admirable motive for the ideal marriage. He does not deny the existence of love as an instinct, but in his analysis love takes its proper place and becomes a well-behaved instinct worthy to inhabit an Englishman's home and fit to be mentioned in polite society.

"The sex instinct, in proportion as an animal or man is highly developed and lives in society, is not an erratic impulse, but becomes systematically co-ordinated and blended with all the other interests and deeper motives which regulate life and conduct. It itself becomes assuaged and tamed." (Page 13.)

Comment is superfluous in the light of Dr. Coit's own view that "It is a mark almost of insanity in a man that he should have . . . towards the woman he loves, no desire to be identified with her in the public mind." (Page 13.)

Dr. Coit is on safer ground when calling some of us insane than when he comes into the more definite region of history. Can we accept as universally true his statement of the "impossibility in the past that the type of man could survive or could be of great service to his community, in whom the various other affections and emotions did not keep the reproductive instinct in line with themselves." (Page 14.)

While I am not concerned to deny its underlying truth, it must be said that races, nations and individual transmitters of valuable physical qualities modify this broad generalization very materially. It is eminently desirable to see life steadily and see it whole, but a race may easily die out through an intellectuality unbalanced by sexuality, and we never hear the Stanton Coits of the world waxing indignant at priests, poets, painters and others in whom the reproductive instinct did not keep their other affections and emotions in line with itself.

Insanity is not a favorite epithet of mine. Dr. Coit would make intellectual criticism easier if he admitted that truth and reason are seldom all on one side. "It is conceivable that a man might prefer domesticity with one woman and love with another, and devotion to children neither of himself nor of any woman he loves; but does not the mere suggestion give us the sense that we are picturing a man whose emotional condition borders on insanity?" (Page 14.)

Insanity does not seem to me properly attributable to the person here described. There would be little hope for the race if such sentiments were considered insane. Devotion to children, independent of their birth certificates, is the kind of madness which elevates the race and makes progress possible—perhaps it is the first gleam in any of us of a love which is one day destined to right all the wrongs of humanity.

Dr. Coit sees that "new grounds are being exposed to view for the prolongation of the father's and mother's care of the child, far beyond the period during which public opinion at present expects and requires it." (Page 14.)

I see no evidence of this remarkable direction for the evolution of parentage. Signs on the contrary multiply daily for continuous contraction of parental care (often accurately described as the tyranny of the home). Rightly (as I think) or wrongly, the State and voluntary societies are beginning to pity the poor little souls left to the poverty or cruelty of unhappy "homes." The parent tends to become less and less the natural guardian of the child. And Dr. Coit, in the spirit of prophecy, cries, "Woe to the child that derives his nurture, mental and physical," from strangers. (Page 14.) Well, we have

ceased to rhapsodise about the **source** of the nurture. After hopeless attempts to force neglectful parents to love their children, or starving parents to feed the children they love, or ignorant parents to teach them, we have concluded that the children must anyway be fed and educated. A good foster parent is a million times more helpful than a bad parent, be his legitimacy established by law, Bible, or by the ethical marriage service on which the **New Age** has recently poured the vials of its wrath.

Dr. Coit is a Eugenist. He has written and spoken in favor of some of our ideals. We value his influence, but we want to see him advance a little nearer to our aims. He quotes with angry disapproval Shaw's common-sense suggestions that "Eugenic breeding would effectually protect the mothers and fathers of the race from any abuse of their relations," and that "what we need is freedom to breed the race, without being hampered by the mass of irrelevant conditions implied in the institution of marriage." Dr. Coit's highly-colored phrase that Bernard Shaw proposes the utilization of Don Juan, is merely his way of saying that Shaw (with every other thinker) wants to see the best animal energy and every other force of nature used for beneficent instead of malevolent purposes. He did not invent (nor mention) Don Juan, but when we find ourselves in the presence of a terrible and overwhelming natural force, the wise man will find out how to use rather than abolish such a force. There is no other philosophy worthy the name of Eugenics, humanity or economy. The evils of Don Juanism are the deception, the fraud, the stronger using the weaker for base ends even where the appetite itself is healthy, and on the other hand the over-feeding, the lust-producing drunkenness, the idleness, the power to do ill deeds which makes ill deeds done. All those evils are perpetuated and aggravated by the orthodox philosophy which ignores causes and confuses the essential, the natural and the irresistible good with the accidental, the artificial and the preventable evil.

The conclusions of this pamphlet consist of some specific proposals mostly deserving of consideration on their merits. As none of them involve either Socialism or monogamy, I am not concerned with them in this article, but there is not one of them which cannot be discussed in a journal like **Eugenics**. We should be glad to see Dr. Coit's defense of his most revolutionary proposals, even of the extraordinary one contained in this pamphlet that the age of consent should be raised to 21 for women and 23 for men. I am anxious not to misunderstand Dr. Coit, and perhaps there is some unexpressed qualification for what seems, as stated, an unthinkable proposition. If a man is, under a democratic law, to be able by his vote to participate at 21 in the government of a nation, but to be unable simultaneously to participate in the sex function until two years later, I begin to wonder whether I am dreaming.

Dr. Coit quotes Browning's glorious lines, beloved of Eugenists:
 "Make no more giants, God,
 But elevate the race."

Perhaps Dr. Coit's paraphrase is right. Perhaps Browning really meant the opposite of what Eugenists desire. But we have no other object in seeking for the super man than that the whole race may be improved, and perhaps Dr. Coit will find himself more in harmony with us when he understands what we are striving for. Freak-breeding never has been our aim. We shall never be contented until every woman is free, every man is strong, and every child is mentally, physically and morally **well-born**.

Men and women have plotted and rebelled against marriage laws which they believed to be of divine origin. They have fought against the priest while believing in the God he represented on earth. They have died protesting against State interference with happiness when the laws were made by an irresistible autocracy. Does anyone imagine that human decrees on marriage based on Sinai's laws without Sinai's thunder are going to make reasonable people turn away from reasonable reform? Are Socialists likely to recommend their cause by proving that certain practical steps for socializing national wealth involve a State interference (which all Socialists repudiate) with the most intimate of all personal things—the human affections. I imagine the universal answer will be with Burns:

"The kirk and state may join, and tell
 To do such things I mauna.
 The kirk and state may gae to hell—
 And I'll gae to my Anna."

GEORGE BEDBOROUGH,
 London.

A PLEA FOR VARIETY IN LOVE.

Healthfulness of Variety.

By R. B. Kerr.

(Concluded from May-June No.)

Another country which is often said to have "gone down" is Holland. Will anyone assert that the decline of Holland was caused by variety in love? Even Comstock would not accuse the Dutch of ruining themselves by "vice."

"But," cry the moralists with glee, "look at France. Is not France a dying nation? Is it not committing race suicide? Did not the death rate actually exceed the birth rate last year? And is not all this the result of variety in love?"

In the first place, I reply that France is only leading the rest of the world in cutting down the birth rate. All civilized nations are following in her footsteps. I fail to see what possible harm it can do them. Malthus and many other writers have pointed out the

evils of a dense population, but no person of any intelligence has attempted to show that a thin population is an evil. I admit that if France had a falling birth rate, and all surrounding countries went ahead as fast as ever increasing their population, it would inevitably lead to a foreign conquest of France. But if all nations cut down their birth rates, nothing but good can result. France may possibly have to suffer for being so far ahead of the rest of the world, but all pioneers are in danger of martyrdom.

However that may be, there is not a particle of evidence that the fall in the birth rate is caused by variety in love. French writers do not attribute it to that cause. They say that it is due to economic causes, such as the dowry system, and the land laws which cause land to be equally distributed between all the children of a family. In France a girl cannot get married unless she has a dowry; consequently, French parents who have a daughter try not to have another, as they think that to have a second would be to steal from the first. Moreover, the French are intensely thrifty, and they hate the idea of having their little farms divided up among a number of children; so they keep down the size of their families in order that each child may inherit as much as possible. Some writers also say that the French race was weakened by the killing off of all the most vigorous men in Napoleon's wars, and that consequently the French are now naturally less fertile than other nations. I do not know, however, of any able French writer who ascribes the low birth rate to variety in love. It is also worth remarking that at present the birth rate is falling faster in New Zealand and England than in France, and New Zealand and England are among the most monogamous countries in the world.

Puritanical nations are also in the habit of throwing stones at Italy and Spain, as countries which have been injured by variety. But this is merely ignorance. Havelock Ellis, one of the ablest observers in the world, has just written a book on Spain, which he has studied for many years; and he proves that the Spaniards are in point of fact one of the healthiest and most vigorous peoples in existence. He particularly remarks that the women do not show the slightest trace of degeneracy. As for Italy, I will simply quote the following passage from Jacob Burckhardt's book on "The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy":

"Notwithstanding their profligacy, the Italians continued to be, physically and mentally, one of the healthiest and best-born populations in Europe, and have retained this position, with improved morals, down to our own time." (I may say that, so far as variety is concerned, it would take a microscope to discover the "improved morals").

So much for the modern world. In the ancient world, Rome is always held up as the great pulpit example of a nation which "went down" because of variety in love. Historians, however, are totally

ignorant of this circumstance. Gibbon has written a work called "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," which is universally admitted to be the most exhaustive book on the subject; but, from the beginning to the end of it, Gibbon never suggests that the relations of the sexes had the remotest connection with the fall of Rome. Merivale, being a clergyman, cannot forbear from a passing allusion to "the inevitable effects of luxury and vice," but he mentions no particular "vice," and he explains at great length that the real causes of the fall of Rome were three: "Exhaustion caused by unceasing warfare on the frontiers, the mischievous fiscal system of the Romans, and the fatal effects of slavery." Momsen says that the low birth rate was one of the causes of the fall of Rome, but he does not say that it was due to variety in love, and he does tell us that those who were born could not make a living in Italy, and had to emigrate from the country. Under such conditions it would have been of little use to produce more children. In point of fact, variety in love had about as much to do with the fall of Rome as Jonah had to do with the fall of Nineveh.

I need say nothing of Greece, for nobody accuses the Greek women of variety. The Spartans boasted that there had never been a case of adultery in Sparta, and the wives and daughters of the Athenians were kept so closely under lock and key that they could hardly be anything but chaste; yet few nations ever "went down" more quickly than Sparta and Athens.

Now let me give the preachers a parting shot. By far the most enduring empire that ever existed was ancient Egypt. The general opinion of historians is that the period of the Pharaohs lasted more than four thousand years. During all that time the women of Egypt were notorious for practicing variety in love.

Another argument often brought against Varietism is that it would spread venereal disease. Dr. Eder says that it is estimated that in New York four men in every five have had gonorrhoea. If that is the present situation, it is hard to see how Varietism could make it worse. In point of fact, Varietism would tend to weed out venereal disease, because it would sweep away prostitution, which is the chief disseminator of venereal disease. It is a well known fact that among American Varietists venereal disease is extremely rare, and has always been so. When the Oneida Community was under public discussion, the "Times" of Vineland, New Jersey, was able to announce that "secret diseases of all sorts, either male or female, are unknown in this Community." Let me add, however, that venereal disease can never be abolished until it can be treated and discussed as publicly and openly as any other kind of disease. Such publicity could easily be obtained under Varietism, but it is quite impossible under monogamy.

While there is not a particle of proof that variety is unhealthy, it would hardly be possible to use too strong language in describing

the unhealthiness of monogamy. Under monogamy, the problem of the young is insoluble, and there is no escape from exhausting secret excesses in youth, with the alternative, to some extent, of prostitution and venereal disease. Under monogamy it is inevitable that many should remain single, and then we have old maids and all the evils of enforced celibacy. Under monogamy it must very often happen that a man and woman are yoked together who are unequal in their desires, or who have desires at different times, and then one of them must constantly submit to martyrdom to please the other. Under monogamy it is impossible for a woman to be unmolested even during pregnancy. Even Dr. Forel, one of the strongest supporters of the rights of women, condemns the proposal that married people should be continent during the pregnancy of the wife, because he says that such continence would destroy the husband's love for his wife. In short, monogamy involves the most enormous injuries to health, from which there is no escape.

It has always been held that the looks are an almost infallible sign of health, or of an unhealthy condition. When we say that a person is "looking well," we take it for granted that he is well; and vice versa. Apply this test to variety in love. Look at that jaded wife, so tired with domestic work that she can hardly drag one foot after another. Let her go to a dance, where she can dance and flirt with other men than her husband, and her whole being will be immediately transfigured. Her eyes will sparkle, and her cheeks will glow, and she will dance for six hours without the slightest feeling of fatigue. It is the same with more intimate love affairs. Every man and woman in the world looks more radiant and joyous and full of vigor when engaged in a new love affair than at any other time. If any doctor could discover an elixir which would make men and women look as well as variety in love makes them look, we should reverence him as a magician.

R. B. KERR.

Dear Mr. Harman: In the May-June number you say: "In his next utterance on Varietism, I will thank Mr. Kerr to explain whether by the term 'love' he means simply the physical manifestation of the sex appetite, or does he include what is known as psychic or soul love."

In reply I would say, first, that all love is psychic. Every emotion is a state of mind or consciousness. Moreover, there is reason to believe that every emotion is accompanied by a certain state of the nerves, and in that sense every emotion is also physical. Thus the supposed distinction between mental and physical feelings is totally imaginary. Every feeling, emotion, or desire is both mental and physical.

Secondly, what is called soul love always depends to a great extent on the agreeableness of the body. It would be very hard to fall into soul love with a person who had an unpleasant smell, or whose face

was being eaten away by some disgusting disease, however beautiful the soul of such a person might be. People do not fall very deep into soul love with persons they have merely corresponded with, unless they form in their minds a pleasant imaginary picture of their correspondents. Even then, one is never content until one actually sees what one's correspondent is like.

Thirdly, desire is hardly ever inspired by the body only; in fact, I do not think it ever is. In England, where old maids are very numerous, one often meets a woman with perfect features and good figure, who has never attracted anybody. On the other hand, one constantly meets women who have no face or figure worth speaking of, and who nevertheless are always surrounded by men.

I make these remarks to show the extreme difficulty of drawing a line between body love and soul love. My answer to your question is simply this, that by "love" I mean every kind of attraction between the sexes, and that such attractions are usually very complex. All kinds of love are subject to the law of variety.

Cordially yours,
R. B. KERR.

AN AUTUMNAL GREETING.

Autumn! Crown of the year, is with us once more.

September!—seventh month, since the Latin **septem** means seven, indicating that the old calendars reckoned the year to begin with March, as first month—a very natural arrangement, as it would seem, for people living north of the tropic of Cancer.

March—when snow leaves the fields and woods, and ice melts in the lakes and rivers; when trees put forth their green leaves and many colored blossoms; March, when hybernating beasts, reptiles and insects come forth from their winter quarters; March, when all nature, inanimate as well as animate, seems to wake from its long, deathlike sleep—March would seem the real beginning of the year, not January, the mid-winter month, as our calendars now reckon.

Autumn! mellow, nut-brown autumn; season of ripened and ripening fruits, nuts and grains,—best and most natural food (as many of us think) for adult humans. Food that can be gathered and stored without depriving any sentient being of the joys of life, of liberty or pursuit of happiness. If there is joy in living on earth at all, much of that joy come to us or should come at the time of gathering and storing the fruits, nuts and grains, from fields, forests, orchards and vineyards, for future use, and hence the time-honored festival called the "Harvest Home," which festival with our European ancestors came in September or October.

Compare the peaceful joys, the quiet, humane and humanizing pleasures of the Harvest Home with the savage joys, the brutal and brutalizing pleasures of the "chase," the pursuit and slaughter of innocent beasts and birds of the forests, plains or jungles, or with those of the

butcher and packer in our modern packing-houses, as described by Upton Sinclair and others!

Then the question naturally recurs: If the gathering and storing of fruits, nuts and grains bring peaceful joys and humanizing influences **why not have our homes where such influences prevail all the year round**, instead of in the noisy and crowded cities?

Here in Southern California, fruits, nuts or grains may be gathered every month of the year, the only trouble being a lack of water during summer and fall, but since the discovery of the method now known as "dry farming,"—spoken of elsewhere in this issue, the need of water is largely overcome. **Fall and winter flowing** does the work.

As compared to the peaceful, humane and humanizing life on the farm, life in the city is much like that of the hunter and trapper—it is **war!** It is **murder!** It is worse even than the life of the primitive hunter who hunted and killed wild beasts from necessity. City life is **cannibalism!**—It is kill and eat your neighbor, else be killed and eaten by him.

Is this an exaggerated statement?

Let any one study the ethics of our industrial systems; the strategy, the deception, the fraud, the cruelty—every man for himself and the devil for the hindmost!

"War to the knife and the knife to the hilt!" Brother against brother, friend against friend, in order to get ahead in the competitive struggle. Read the story of McKees Rocks, near Pittsburg, and many more like it.

Read the published accounts of suicides because of lack of work, and still more because of fear of what the future has in store.

All this industrial war and its fearful consequences would disappear if people would get back to the land and live the simple natural life of the farm, the orchard, the garden, the vineyard, the forests, the meadows, the plains and the mountains.

These are some of the thoughts inspired by the calm, mild skies, the gentle winds, the ripe and ripening nuts and fruits of these early autumnal days.

M. H.

DRY FARMING AND POULTRY RAISING IN CALIFORNIA.

The following letter from one who has traveled much and tried home-making in several states of the American Union, will interest many of the readers of **Eugenics**—many who have found it hard to secure the right conditions under which to develop the best that is in themselves and best under which to transmit the best in themselves to their offspring:

Mr. Moses Harman, Dear Sir and Friend:

Your letter received; there is no use of making any excuses. Better late than never, but better never late. Mrs. Smith and self are quite well—as a rule we have been well since we came here six years ago this coming November, and as you well know, we came with the pitiful sum of \$20.00—no more; and we

borrowed a tent to live in, ran in debt for nine acres of the finest land the sun shines on, and in one of the choicest spots between the Gulf of Mexico and the Arctic Circle. In this our present location we can raise something every month in the year; with the use of water, and with the regular season's rains, have raised sixty bushels of corn to the acre, and this year expect to do better than that, as we have never had so fine a showing as we have now, while our main efforts are in the poultry line.

On account of our loss by fire last year, we were obliged, last fall, to dispose of about 1600 ducks and chickens, and this spring commence anew. Our loss by fire was \$1250—no insurance. Now we have some 1200 ducks, chickens and turkeys, and will keep incubators running during the summer, and expect to build up the enterprise to four or five thousand laying fowls. You know of our home and surroundings which we have paid for, and recently bought some more adjoining us.

While there are many different opinions about each and every enterprise, the solution is: Determination and sticktoitiveness, and plenty of hard work and long days, always finding something to do and ready and willing and determined to do it; then eat, live, sleep and be happy, the art of which lies in having "a little farm well tilled, a little wife well willed, and a little house well filled." This is all of heaven! Every truly yours,

E. B. and MARY E. SMITH.

Hermosa Beach, Calif., Box 42.

N. B.—That invitation to visit us is always open. Find check inclosed for \$5.00. E. B. and M. E. S.

I visited the writer of this letter about six years ago when he and his brave companion were just beginning their experiment of home-making on what seemed a sandy and almost barren ridge overlooking the Pacific Ocean, about 20 miles from Los Angeles. They were then living in a tent,—living as near to nature as it was possible to get and still conform to the cramping requirements of our so-called civilized society. They were both considerably beyond what is called the prime of life, their children all gone from them, and living their own lives in distant parts of the country. They borrowed money at a high rate of interest to buy their nine acres at two hundred dollars per acre. Knowing what he now knows Brother Smith tells me he would not pay any such price to the "land-sharks," but would go out to what is called "desert" land and take a homestead. He says experience has shown him that almost any of this treeless and apparently worthless land can be made very productive, and with little or no irrigation, if rightly handled. He says the great secret lies in **deep and thorough plowing in fall and during the winter months.** He says this treatment causes the ground to absorb and to hold all the rain that falls in winter and early spring; then by early planting and good cultivation—to keep down the weeds, 60 to 80 bushels of corn can be raised without irrigation and without fertilizers, and nearly all other crops in the same way, except when desired to raise several crops from the same land—such as the third, fourth, fifth or sixth crop of alfalfa, in which case irrigation is needed.

The rapidity with which the eucalyptus and other timber trees grow on such land when properly planted, without irrigation or cultivation, is simply marvelous, and would be incredible to those who

have not been there to see it for themselves. The same is largely true of fruit and nut-bearing trees.

From many answers to inquiries asked by me of mine host and hostess at Hermosa Beach, and of many others whose experience has been similar to theirs, I am constrained to believe that it is fear of the hard work incident to farm life, and especially the fear of isolation from what is called society, that makes people crowd to the cities and fight each other to the death for a chance to sell themselves and their labor to a boss who offers to give them an easy job indoors.

When I told Brother Smith of the plans to get people away from the overcrowded cities, he said:

“Better spend your time trying to get them into the cities. Your efforts would then meet with success instead of failure—as now.”

But when the homeless, landless toilers in the sweat-shops, the mills and factories of the cities, and in the mines and smelters of the mining districts, and when all the scrub-women and other hand-to-mouth” workers learn that to live in the country does not mean **isolation** and life-long toil before a home and competence can be achieved, but that by going to the land in companies of a dozen or more families, buying land in a body and living together in groups, all the real advantages of the cities can be enjoyed without the drawbacks of the old-time segregated home life of the country,—surely then there will begin the long-talked-of “turn of the tide,”—away from the city and “back to the land;” back to nature; back to the “simple life;” the unconventional life; the life of health, peace and happiness.

M. H.

LOVE IS VARIETY—LOVE IS UNLIMITED.

Editor **Eugenics**, Dear Sir:

The March-April number of **Eugenics** has interested me much; perhaps you will not take it unkindly if I briefly review some of the statements and tell you how they strike me.

First let me say that the arguments adduced by many of the writers are principally pure sophistry and serve but the one purpose of showing how extremely thin a veneer is sufficient to blind an individual to his own real state of mind and the funny part of it is (if it were not so pathetic), that he is like the proverbial ostrich, he imagines that the other fellow will not see his real state of mind.

Take, for instance, Friend Kerr’s diatribe; he is writing largely to find out what he does really think and while I have no doubt he is in earnest and means well, the covering is so very thin that the veriest novice could not fail to see he suffers from canker at heart. Really the man’s heart is bare—he has never known what love really is and has here written a long dissertation on lust. If he had even the faintest conception of what love really is, he would not have wasted his time writing such an article, nor have asked you to devote space to such a play on words; not that it lacks anything in read-

ableness so far as diction and adherence to the line of thought he starts out with, for as a charming dissertation on lust it is all that could be wished. His mistake consists in the caption; it should have been, "A Plea for Variety in Lust." Lust deals with one little pitiful sentient phase of being—a possible adjunct to love but not in any sense vital to it.

Variety in love? Why bless you! LOVE IS VARIETY; it covers every faculty of intelligence and is all-inclusive of both the physical and mental, hence when one begins to talk of the sexual act as being the summum bonum of love and needing to be resorted to in many bodies for fear of breaking the charm through satiety, it makes the writer appear as ridiculous as it would to say that breathing air would become monotonous if one did not stop breathing occasionally.

The fact of the matter is that love is indefinable because it is infinite—it is absolutely unknowable in entirety because it is unlimited—it is what Emerson would call a **whole**. As one author has said, "it is as utterly impossible to define to another what particular quality causes the charm of the one beloved, as it is to tell where space ends."

"One may tire," as Friend Kerr says, "of repetitions made on any sense organ or organs." Because it is a **sense organ**, hence, one statement is sufficient to show the lameness of his argument. **Love is an ideal**, and like all other ideals its variety is never exhausted—it is feelings, **plus**.

Louise Harding strikes the right note in her illustration of the violin, but the one instrument that plays on indefinitely, in never ending variety, is the **heart** that echoes the beats of your own, in the opposite sex.

Friend Kerr tries to have us believe that the human heart is not so prolific of variety as is an instrument made by the hand of man. Wherein is there any logic in this?

The argument, however, is not a valid one from either his or her viewpoint, because it deals entirely with material sensation, for while sense is the stepping stone by which intelligence is reached, it is not properly a psychical factor—has no more claim to that phase of intellect which lifts to the ideals of love, than has the wood and iron used in the construction of a flying machine the right to claim being the machine itself.

As a means to an end sex-passion—desire, is all that Friend Kerr claims for it and I quite agree with him that the race should be privileged to enjoy this phase of sense-life as a means by which the real life mate may be found.

Mabel Urner discovers the "Nigger in the woodpile," the juggernaut of public opinion forces women to legally prostitute themselves instead of letting their real nature flow freely forth, but my dear sister, you do not have to do so, if you will rise up and demand your birth-right. It is yours—as Lois Waisbroker says, in one of her books, "A

woman is not ruined because she allows nature to speak, unless she herself believes she has sinned."

The tragedy in the little story Mabel tells, shows the farce of legal union without love.

In my opinion there is not a great difference in the sexes as regards love. Either man or woman who really loves wants to be told of that love continuously.

Then under "Unitary Home—Symposium." The author says the reason love cannot be kept burning continuously is because nature herself interposes and brings about a reaction. The nut is here found in the shell that covers all the arguments here reviewed, namely, the failure to understand that real love is not a feeling purely physical—purely of sense, but it is psychical and a subtle something that is beyond sense although it is reached through sense channels.

No reasoner has yet claimed that the psychical phase of being can be accounted for wholly through feelings or emotions. Spencer comes the nearest to doing so, yet frankly admits his inability to cover the ground.

To my mind the point to be reached that will give us more nearly our ideals in life is that of not merely talking what we believe but really and openly living each day our faith; in no other way can we hope to gain freedom. If all religions were eschewed and all attempts at following someone else were given over and if we would take these three little words as our guide, I am sure we would soon have an ideal world: **Live Your Convictions!**

Wishing you all the good fortune you deserve,

F. G. DeSTONE, M. D.

[This article was crowded out of the May-June issue, but as a contribution to the Symposium on the Love and Parentage question it has lost none of its value by age. The admonition given in the last paragraph of Dr. DeStone's article is worthy of universal acceptance, as I think, "**Live Your Convictions!**" In our segregated home life to practicalize this admonition is not easy, and yet most of us could do better than we are now doing, if we would only try.—M. H.]

AN EARNEST WORD TO SUBSCRIBERS AND READERS

Good Friends, one and all:

Can you give me a very little of what we all know is your most valuable possession—your time?

If you have read the "Explanatory and Personal" found on the first page of this issue, you will have seen why there has been no EUGENICS since the May-June number. As therein stated, the summer has been a hard one on "yours truly," and now, to make up for lost time, with the cooler weather and with the opening of the fall season,—the best of all seasons of the year for active work,—I

have decided to take the field for a two or three months' tour, and for the following among other reasons:

First.—From long experience I have found travel to be the best restorer of waning health and jaded energies.

Second.—I want very much to meet face to face, the friends and supporters of EUGENICS in the many towns, cities and country places along the west coast of the United States—most of which friends I have never seen.

Third.—I want to visit the great Pacific-Yukon-Alaska Fair at that center of cosmopolitan travel, intelligence and enterprise, Seattle, with the hope that much may be done during that visit to inaugurate a grand forward movement in behalf of what some of us think the true and only really practical solution of the many perplexing ethical, sociologic and biologic problems that confront us on every hand.

But most of all, I want to do something to increase the influence, the circulation, of the JOURNAL OF EUGENICS. Our subscription list is very small compared to what it should be, for a journal that claims to be cosmopolitan—world-wide—in its field of effort. I want to personally secure not less than **one thousand** new subscribers, as one of the results of my proposed two or three months' trip.

In order that I may devote myself for awhile wholly to the work outlined in the article "Explanatory and Personal," the matter for the November number has mainly been put in type and proofs corrected, ready, or nearly so, for the press. The chief articles now set for that number are the following:

"Harvest of Crimes," by Dr. Mary Walker, of Oswego, N. Y.

"The Curse of Christian Morality," by Lois Waisbrooker, Antioch, Cal.

"Is There Help for Josephine?" by Edgar Lucien Larkin, Astronomer at Mt. Lowe Observatory, Echo Mountain, Cal.

Each of these three is an elaborated and exceptionally fine article, written for EUGENICS, by a recognized master, dealing with bed-rock principles in sociologic and biologic science.

An extended editorial on the "Outlook for Freedom and Justice," set for this issue, including notes and comments on the "Appeal to Reason" prosecutions, the Freeman Knowles case, and other late assaults on Liberty of Speech and of Press, will appear in the November number.

Mr. Kerr will answer the critics who have taken him roundly to task for his advocacy of what they regard as very demoralizing doctrines in regard to sex, the home, and family life.

Many other shorter but scarcely less important articles are set for the November issue.

* * *

Right here, good friends, old and new, is the crucial, the pivotal point in this family talk. Presuming on your co-operation I have

been promising at least **six issues** of EUGENICS within the current year. To do this we must get to press two more issues before January, 1910—one for November and one for December. Without your prompt and efficient aid I am powerless to do this. Is it expecting too much if I ask each reader of these lines to send a little help for this purpose?

No donations, as such, are asked for, or expected, unless in the way indicated by Brother Arnaud, of New York, who sends nine dollars to pay subscription for those who are not able to pay for themselves. Several more of our old-time helpers have sent smaller sums for a like purpose.—See the list of contributors to the "Sustaining Fund," in this and earlier numbers of EUGENICS.

Another very efficient and very practical way of keeping the magazine up to the promised frequency of issue is to send for some of the "Eugenist Library" books—see advertised list—for home use or for Holiday gifts for friends. Some of these books and pamphlets have been contributed to the Sustaining Fund by their authors or publishers.

But the most important of all the methods of helping EUGENICS is to send the names of those **who pay their own money** as subscribers for a year or less time. A few of our old-time workers have shown what can be done in this way by a little earnest effort. One, in Cleveland, Ohio, has sent us the names and cash for 26 new subscribers within the past six months. To all who will help in this way, a commission of forty per cent will be paid. Subscription blanks and certificates of agency will be sent to those who desire to use them.

M. H.

"THERE IS NO WEALTH BUT LIFE."

The best-known writer and lecturer on eugenics in the English language, perhaps, is Dr. Caleb Williams Saleeby, of Edinburgh, Scotland. His latest work is entitled "Parenthood and Race Culture," a large book of 389 pages. The American publishers, Moffat, Yard & Company, New York, say of this work:

This book constitutes the first attempt to define, as a whole, the general principles of race-culture or eugenics. The author assumes that there is no wealth but life, that the culture of the racial life is the vital industry of any people, that conditions of parenthood, and especially as regards its quality rather than its quantity, are the dominant factors that determine the destiny of nations.

Defining the limits of education, and recognizing the importance of heredity, he seeks to show how eugenics may be practiced even in the present state of social sentiment, and how marriage may serve, with enhanced value, to this end. The principles of what the author calls negative eugenics—the discouragement of parenthood on the part of the insane, chronic inebriates and feeble-minded—are carefully discussed.

In view of the great importance of this volume to the work of our magazine it is now thought best to offer a clubbing rate, namely, to all new yearly subscribers and to all prompt renewals to the

JOURNAL OF EUGENICS, a finely bound copy of "Parenthood and Race Culture" will be sent, postpaid, for \$2.00; that is, for \$2.00 in addition to the yearly price of the magazine. Price of book alone, \$2.50, net; postage 20 cents.

The November number of EUGENICS will probably contain an elaborate review of this truly remarkable book. M. H.

A FREE PRESS ANTHOLOGY.

Another book, just from the press of the "Truth Seeker" Co., New York, is of even greater importance than that of Dr. Saleeby, because without freedom of speech and of press the subject of eugenics cannot be discussed in public and scarcely in private. "A Free Press Anthology is the only work of the kind ever issued. Compiled by Theodore Schroeder, of New York, from the writings of many brave and true men and women, in defence of the bed-rock citizen right, the denial of which right "slays the life of the people and entombs the hope of the race." Considerable space is given to a history of the case of D. M. Bennett, editor and founder of the "Truthseeker," imprisoned for selling "Cupid's Yokes," and also to the case of the editor of this magazine, four times imprisoned for teaching eugenics, and for protesting against the abuse of motherhood, under protection of conventional marriage laws.

A large octavo volume, price \$2. With the Journal of Eugenics one year this splendid and most useful work will be sent post-paid for \$2.50. A small edition only has been issued and the type sent to the melting pot. First come, first served.

MR. BENJ. R. TUCKER

Is beginning the publication of "The Tucker Series" in London, directing the work from his home in France. I am the American agent for this Series, and for Mr. Tucker's other works. The first issue of the Series is Leonid Andrieff's "The Seven That Were Hanged." Price, 15 cents. I am prepared for individual and trade orders.

Dr. Saleeby's "Parenthood and Race Culture," so favorably received in England, will appear in its American edition early in September. Order at once if you want a copy of the first American edition. Price, \$2.50 net; postage 20 cents.

Theodore Schroeder's great compilation, "Free Press Anthology," is now in the hands of the binder. By the time this meets your eye, it will be ready for delivery. This marvelous work is unique; there is nothing like it in our language, nor in any other, it is safe to say. Only a thousand copies printed and the types' to the melting-pot. So do not procrastinate. It is an octavo of 280 pages and the price is only \$2.

EDWIN C. WALKER.

244 West 143rd Street, Manhattan, New York City.

August 21, 1909.

Various Voices.

Dear Friend Moses: Don't conclude that I have lost interest in the cause of progress as represented by you, but I really have so many ways for the needful to go that my wishes go much ahead of my bank account. I enclose now \$5. You may place my subscription ahead accordingly.

HENRY BOOL.

New York.

Dear Moses Harman:

I don't know when my subscription ran out but I enclose \$5, which will probably cover it; if not, let me know.

Sincerely yours,

M. B.

New York.

Glad you are alive and well.

Dear Sir:

Enclosed please find ten dollars (\$10) in money order for eight years for the renewal of EUGENICS. Would have answered your letter sooner, but was unable to do so. I'm gladly sending you the above. Yours truly,

PAUL KUTCHAN.

Virginia.

My dear Moses Harman:

Enclosed is one dollar to help pay expenses to the Seattle fair and I want you to understand that this particular dollar is for that explicit purpose and for no other, and if you fail to use it for that distinct purpose it is to be returned to me. I want so much that you should go to that fair that I am willing to help all I can for that purpose, not being able to go myself, as I had previously planned to do.

W. W. MILLER.

Connecticut.

Brother Harman:

Arrived last Sunday from my seventh visit to Palestine, Jerusalem, Egypt, Constantinople and Greece, and therefore have just received yours of June 4th. Am extremely busy and can find time now only to assure you that my interest in you and your great work remain fully as great as ever.

PHILIP G. PEABODY.

Boston.

R. B. Kerr's article, "A Plea for Variety in Love," page 8 (March-April No.), is a magnificent essay—profound, logical, convincing; he and E. C. Walker are wonderful pair.

Why Not Lend a Hand?

Dear Brother Harman:

I have just been reading the article of Mrs. W. S. S., in the May-June number, entitled "Why Teach Women to Revolt?" The dear sister! Why doesn't she lend a hand? Why don't she do something to aid the dear brother who has "wrought so long and so well," instead of asking that EUGENICS should cease coming to her address? If the magazine is not all that could be wished, why does she not bring to its columns the beautiful ideals on Matehood, on Motherhood and Fatherhood that she says have been evolved in her own married life? If she herself has had no reason "to revolt," she surely should sympathize with those who have—and do what she can to help those who need help to throw off the chains of sex-slavery. So I hope Mrs. W. S. S. will send not only her subscription but her noble contribution to help lift the magazine to the plane she so much desires. To my thinking EUGENICS grows better and better all the time.

SARAH STONE ROCKHILL.

Ohio.

Women Fear Women.

Brother Harman: I know this is the "dry season" of the year, the hard season for radical journals, so I send my check (\$10.00). Credit me a year's subscription and use the rest as you see fit. In one of your letters you say I have done this (sent \$10.00 each year) for ten or more years. Well, hardly. I don't think I am on your list ten years; not quite. Hope I may have the pleasure of doing this, not for ten more years but for many more than ten years. I always give my copies away, and when I find one interested I try to get a subscriber. Am willing to help those who cannot afford to pay, but don't think it does any good to pay for those who are able to pay for themselves.

You doubtless carry many who cannot afford to pay, so let my mite help you to bear the strain. It isn't much that can be done for freedom of motherhood. Your fight is for women but your best help is from men. Many, many times when talking with women (especially young women) I am told such ideas are all right, and that they wish every man thought as I did. I tell them most men do, but that its the women that don't, and they will finally admit it's the women they are afraid of. They don't want other women to know that they think as they do. The mothers are all afraid their daughters will know too much. Still, with all that we can all help, even though it be slow work.

ED. ARNAUD.

New York.

Food As a Moral Force.

Most of the shortcomings of monogamic marriage, I venture to assert, are caused either by ignorance of sexual life, by ignorance pertaining to food and drink, or by evil social conditions—improper occupation for mind and body.

One point, and the most important: Don't you think that the diet question has a great deal to do with the sex question and with marriage? We know that an unnatural, stimulating diet and strong drink create unnatural and abnormal sexual desires. And we know the consequences of such desires. I believe firmly that our physical as well as mental nutrition is the basis of all our actions in society and in marriage. Is it a wonder that systems of government are failures, that marriage is a failure, that anything is a failure when we consider the quantity and quality of the food consumed by the people?

Ignorance of the ways of life is the cause of all evil, of all mistakes in life. Laws and institutions are responsible for existing wrongs only to the extent that they prohibit enlightenment, in the measure they interfere with and punish those who spread enlightenment.

Would it not be worth while to devote a part of *Eugenics* to the diet question and its relation to health and to the sex question? I am convinced that it would, and that it would strengthen the

magazine, making it more extensively read.

So long as men eat and drink as they do, they will act as they do in spite of teachings, laws and institutions.

Our physical and mental nutrition is the basis of all our actions.

INQUIRER.

[Yes, most certainly, the diet question has much to do with the sex question, and soon as possible there will be a department of Dietetics in the *Journal of Eugenics*. But the first and most important thing to determine is the right relation of the sexes, as indicated by the definition of eugenics. We already have a few dozen magazines devoted mainly to the diet question, but only one, in this country, devoted chiefly to sex and marriage reform.—M. H.]

No Longer on the Defensive.

My Dear Friend Harman: The May-June number of *Eugenics* reached me a few days ago, and to tell the simple truth, I was surprised at its contents—surprised at the tone and manner of the articles rather than by what they contained. The old forces of conservatism have begun in good earnest to apologize for their remaining on the stage in any form, and are beginning to look for a place of safety to which they may retreat, when the light becomes too strong here for their weak eyes. *Eugenics* is no longer on the defensive, it has come at the invitation of true Progress, at the demand of Truth and Righteousness; of Honor and Justice, and it has come to stay.

Who would have supposed, the last time you were sent to prison, that the seed you had planted with such labor and care would bear such a crop as this in so short a time?

H. W. HUNT.

Maryland.

Dear Moses Harman: I have just read the May-June number of *Eugenics*—every word of it. It's a splendid magazine. I have not yet seen a publication so broad-minded, so free from sectarianism, as *Eugenics*. There is no reason why it should not be supported by thinking people everywhere.

THEO. JOHNSON.

"A LITTLE LAND AND A LIVING."

Many persons wish to see "A Little Land and a Living"—which is really a more advanced book than "Three Acres and Liberty"—who do not wish to invest in it.

You see, not then being known as an accurate observer nor as a practical agriculturist, when the Macmillans offered to publish the first book, I did not venture to state the whole truth about the profitable possible productivity of land,—it would have been scoffed at.

For instance, the average crop of strawberries in New Jersey (which with North Carolina is now the great strawberry state), is about three thousand quarts per acre. When I said that eight thousand quarts might be easily raised, people opened their eyes as far as was polite, because they knew that many growers have made money and think they have done well with five hundred quarts.

In "A Little Land," however, I felt safe in citing a verified instance of over twenty-four thousand quarts per acre produced commercially on Long Island. The grower claims that he has raised forty-two thousand quarts per acre and that it paid better than the smaller yield.

Now I want people to read that book. So if anyone will enquire for it at all the public libraries within his reach, if there are any, does not find it, and will send me the names of the libraries that have not got it, I will lend him (or her) the book, sending it by mail, and trust to his (or her) native honesty and to his (or her) interest in others reading it, to return it to me by mail when he (or she) has finished with it, or within two months.

BOLTON HALL.

56 Pine Street, New York.

Books Received.

"The Venereal Peril," a Popular Treatise on the three venereal diseases, their nature, cause, course, symptoms and prevention—by Wm. L. Holt, M. D., edited with notes and additions by Wm. J. Robinson, M. D., editor of the "American Journal of Urology and Venereal Diseases," and the "Critic and Guide, and Therapeutic Medicine." Paper bound, 25 cents; cloth bound, 50 cents. Published by The Altrurians, 12 Mt. Morris Park, N. Y.

"The Social Evil, Its Causes and Cure," by Wm. L. Holt, M. D. 10 cents. Address as above.

These prices include postage to any part of the world.

From Henry Meulen, "with the author's compliments," comes "Banking and the Social Problem," Price, three and a half pence;

19 Boscombe Road, Shepherd's Bush, London W. A keen analysis of the money question, and of the banker's privileges.

"Landlords and Lobsters, Creators of Imperial Wealth and Religion," by Lucien Stebbins. Price, 10 cents. The New Dawn Publishing Company, 335 North 50th Court, Chicago, Ill.; and "Socialism or Religion, Which?" Price 10 cents, by the same author and company; both compiled and edited by Hulda L. Potter-Loomis.

"The Soul of the World," by Estella Bachman, Equitist Publishing House, Station A, Pasadena, Calif., 1909.

An interesting story whose central thought seems to be Equal Freedom based upon, or growing out of, a "balanced land tenure," the land question being considered the pivotal or underlying problem in all reform. The book is well printed and bound in red cloth—428 pages. Address as above.

"The New Ethics," by J. Howard Moore, Instructor in Zoology, Crans Manual Training High School, 1909; 216 pages, well printed and bound. Price, \$1 net. Address Samuel A. Bloch, the Bookman, Chicago.

"The Unseen Dangers Behind Humanity," or the Real Causes Why the Jew Is Hated the World Over; by Joseph S. Shatzke. The New Humanity Publishing Society, Aurora, near Denver, Colo.; 381 pages; price not given, presumably \$1.

VERY SPECIAL OFFER!

The FRA Magazine	-	-	-	-	-	\$3.00
Roycroft Book	-	-	-	-	-	\$2.00
If you subscribe at once—both for \$2.00						\$5.00

The FRA Magazine is a Journal of Affirmation—a Booster. It speaks of persons, places and principles in a frank, free and open-hearted way. It tells the truth about things. The Editor's pen is never gagged, chained or chloroformed. It is a Magazine or Merit. Elbert Hubbard edits this Magazine and contributes each month a philosophical stimulant—The Open Road. People who knew, proclaim The Fra the finest Magazine in America, in both text and typography. Folks on the Upward March read—The Fra! The Roycroft Book—Beautifully bound in Limp Leather, silk-lined with marker. Many are printed in bold-faced type, on Holland Hand-Made, Watermarked Paper, and a few are hand illuminated. All are works of Art. Check the Book you want and forward this ad. with Two Dollars—At Once.

Health and Wealth..... Elbert Hubbard
 Woman's Work..... Alice Hubbard
 Battle of Waterloo..... Victor Hugo
 White Hyacinths..... Elbert Hubbard

The Rubalyat..... Omar Khayyam
 William Morris Book..... Hubbard Thomson
 Crimes Against Criminals..... R. G. Ingersoll
 Ballad of Reading Gaol..... Oscar Wilde

The Roycrofters, East Aurora, New York

THE EUGENISTS LIBRARY

When sending for books our friends are requested to name second or third choice, inasmuch as the stock of some of these is near exhausted and we find it difficult, often impossible, to get more.

Dr. E. B. Foote's *Cyclopedia of Medical, Social and Sexual Science*; twelve hundred pages; finely illustrated; the most complete work of the kind ever written; price, two dollars, prepaid. With the *Journal of Eugenics* one year, \$2.50.

Race Culture and Parenthood, by Dr. C. W. Saleeby, of Edinburg, Scotland. The first attempt to define, as a whole, the general principles of race-culture or eugenics; 389 large pages; well bound; price, \$2.50 net; postage, 20c. With the *Journal of Eugenics* one year, \$3.00, postpaid.

Ancient Sex Worship. Price, postpaid, \$1.00.

Bible Myths and Their Parallels in Other Religions, by T. W. Doane; invaluable to all students of religious literature; price, \$2.50, prepaid. With the *Journal of Eugenics* one year, \$3.00.

"*Eugenics—or Race Culture Lessons*," by Lois Waisbrooker. Price 50c.

"*Conventional Marriage—Why I Oppose It*," by M. Harman. Price 5c.

"*Love's Coming of Age*," by Edward Carpenter. Price \$1.

"*Never Told Tales*," by Dr. Wm. J. Robinson. Price \$1.

"*Woman's Source of Power*," by Lois Waisbrooker. Price 25c.

"*Bible Truth, Bursting Its Shell*," by Lois Waisbrooker. Price 25c.

"*Boy Love*," by Dr. Alice B. Stockham. Topics: Boy Lover, Girl Lover, Recreation, Courtesy, The Awakening. Price 25c.

"*Tokology, a Book for Every Woman*," by Dr. Alice B. Stockham. This large volume is in itself a library of most important knowledge for every mother or for every woman or girl who expects ever to become a mother. Price, in very substantial and beautiful cloth binding, \$2.25; postage, 15c.

"*A Cityless and Countryless World*," a treatise on "Co-operative Individualism." Price \$1; postage 13c. Paper cover, 50c; postage 12c.

"*Hilda's Home*," a Story of Woman's Trials and Triumphs. Price in cloth \$1; postage paid.

"*Cursed Before Birth*," Dr. H. J. Tilden; \$1, postpaid. A thrilling story.

"*Borning Better Babies*," by Dr. E. B. Foote, Jr. Price 25c.

"*Marriage in Free Society*," by Edward Carpenter. Price 25c.

"*Right to Be Born Well*," by M. Harman. Price 25c; cloth, 50c.

"*Administrative Process of the Postal Department*." A letter to President Roosevelt, by Thaddeus Burr Wakeman. Price 10c.

"*Institutional Marriage*." A lecture before the Society of Anthropology, Chicago, by M. Harman. Price 10c.

"*Marred in the Making*," by Lydia Kingsmill Commander. Price 25c.

"*What the Young Need to Know*," by Edwin C. Walker. Price 15c.

"*Evolution of Modesty*," by Jonathan Mayo Crane. Price 5c.

Dr. Alice B. Stockham's "*Karezza*." Price \$1.

George N. Miller's "*Strike of Sex*." Price 25c.

"*Religion and Sensualism, as Connected by Clergymen*," by Theodore Schroeder. Price 10c.

"*Diana*," by Henry M. Parkhurst. Price 25c.

"*Marriage and Divorce*," by Josephine K. Henry. Price 25c.

"*The Bright Side of Kissing, and the Dark Side*," by E. B. Foote, Jr., M. D. Price 20c.

"*A Freeman's Creed*," by M. Harman. Price 5c.

"*Vice, Its Friends and Its Foes*," by Edwin C. Walker. Price 15c.

"*Our Worship of Primitive Social Guesses*," by Edwin C. Walker. Price 15c.

"*Do You Want Free Speech?*" by James F. Morton. Price 10c.

"*The Rights of Periodicals*," by James F. Morton. Price 10c.

"*Import and Ultimate of Our Sex Natures*," by Edward Cowles. Price 5c.

"*Prodiga! Daughter,*" by Rachel Campbell, including "*Pioneer Chips*" from the correspondence of Rachel Campbell, by Florence Johnson; also "*Marriage, What It Was and Is—Will the Coming Woman Marry?*" by M. Harman; also other radical essays. Price 25 cents.

"*Motherhood in Freedom,*" by M. Harman, together with "*Sexual Love Analyzed,*" by Ernest Winne; "*Priestly Celibacy,*" by A. L. Rawson; "*Incoherence of Transition,*" by E. C. Walker, and other essays. Price 25 cents.

"*Social Freedom,*" by Hulda L. Potter Loomis. Price 20 cents.

"*Persecution and Appreciation*" of M. Harman, by many speakers at the reception given the prisoner on his return home from the Federal Penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kansas, to his home in Chicago. Price cents.

"*Age of Reason,*" by Thomas Paine. Paper cover; good paper and type. Price 15 cents.

"*The Old God and the New Humanity,*" by Winwood Reade. Price 10 cents.

"*Vital Force,*" by Albert Chavaunes. Price 25 cents.

"*Temperance Folly,*" by Lois Walsbrooker. Price 10 cents.

"*Evolution of the Family,*" by Jonathan Mayo Crane. Price 10 cents.

"*Our Despotical Postal Censorship,*" by Louis F. Post. Price 3 cents.

"*Social Question,*" a Discussion of the Conjugal and Marital Relations, by Dr. Juliet H. Severance and David Jones, editor of the "*Olive Branch.*" Price 15 cents.

"*Studies in Sociology,*" by Albert Chavaunes. Price 25 cents.

"*Modern Paradise,*" by Henry Olerich. Price 50 cents.

"*Communism and Conscience,*" by Edwin C. Walker. Price 25 cents.

"*The New Hedonism,*" by Grant Allen. Price 10 cents.

"*Varieties of Official Modesty,*" by Theodore Schroeder. Price 10 cents.

"*Who Is the Enemy, Comstock or You?*" by Edwin C. Walker. Price 20c.

Love Ventures of Tom, Dick and Harry. "They were naked but not ashamed." An Amusing Satire upon Conventional Morality and Popular Forms of Government. Price 25c.

"*Government Analyzed,*" by Col. John R. Kelso, A. M., the famous "*Union Scout.*" 519 pages. Well bound in cloth. Price \$1.00. A very timely book, now that the foundations of human governments are challenged on every hand.

"*Free Land—A Social Anticipation,*" by Dr. Theodor Hertzka, the noted Austrian social philosopher. Translated by Arthur Ransom. Equatorial Africa is the scene of Dr. Hertzka's very interesting experiment. Price \$1.00. Well bound in cloth. Paper cover, 50c. 443 pages.

"*Jaennette, the Reclaimed Delilah, a Thrilling Story of Abandoned Life,*" by "A Man of the World." Price 15 cents.

"*Government as it Was, Is and Should Be,*" by M. Harman, together with *Eugenist Essays* by Lizzie M. Holmes, Moses Hull, M. Florence Johnson, Lucy N. Colman, Albert Chavaunes and others. Price 25 cents.

"*Judgment,*" by Wm. Platt. Price 10 cents.

"*Freedom of the Press and Obscene Literature,*" by Theodore Schroeder. Price 25 cents.

GREATEST DETECTIVE STORY EVER WRITTEN.

"*The Pinkerton Labor Spy,*" by Morris Friedman. The greatest expose of the Pinkerton Detective Agency ever written, showing up all the secrets of this great detective agency. Tells exactly how they do it. 75,000 copies sold first six months. This concerns you! Perhaps there is one of the agents of this mighty monster dogging your footsteps today. Get a copy at once. It will surprise you. The author was for years the confidential man in the Pinkerton Agency and has exposed in this book their innermost secrets. The greatest detective story ever written. Send 25 cents for a copy.

WILSHIRE BOOK COMPANY,
Room 204, 18 Frankfort Street, New York.

DO YOU RIDE

In the ox-cart of our grandfathers, or are you traveling,
IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY LIMITED?

Are you glued to antiquated theories, born of ignorance and in darkness, or is your mind open to the sunlight of reason?

Purchase a ticket over a well-ballasted, rational route, via **A Stuffed Club**, a magazine that teaches you how to **LIVE**, through common sense.

Sample copies, 10 cents. One dollar per year.
 Address, **A STUFFED CLUB**,
 Box 375, Denver, Colo.

From the Malthusian, London, Eng.
 Moses Harman.

Dear Sir: We hope you are well, and that you will have strength and support to carry on your splendid work uninterruptedly. Our cause (A Crusade Against Poverty, Through Limitation of Families) is beginning to attract the attention of all classes of thinkers, as well as of those who merely make use of the knowledge in their family life; and it is for the theory—for the comprehension of the principles of Malthusianism—that this League works. When the whole matter is understood and absorbed as a religion, then only can we feel that true progress has been gained.

With kind regards,
 Yours sincerely,
MRS. BESSIE DRYSDALE.

**MARRIAGE
 AND
 DIVORCE.**

Up-to-date pamphlet on the most vital question before the American people, written from a woman's standpoint.

In circulation in every State in the Union.
 All orders promptly filled.

**SINGLE COPY, 25 CENTS.
 FIVE COPIES FOR \$1.00.**

Sold only by the author,
JOSEPHINE K. HENRY,
VERSAILLES, - - KENTUCKY.

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



Contains a full, plain, and easy reading treatise on "Health and Disease, with Recipes," all the average reader can profitably learn of personal hygiene and common diseases (including special, separate chapters for men and women); all right up-to-date, and fully illustrated with hundreds of photo-engravings and chromo-lithographs. Contains also the already popular "Plain Home Talk" about the relations of the sexes and social customs in all ages and all countries, with "original and startling" suggestions for social reforms; newly revised, enlarged, and well illustrated. All its "heart to heart" plain home talk from a clear thinking, plain speaking, liberal minded medical author of over forty years' experience. Nearly 1,000,000 of his former books sold. A curious book for curious people, and a sensible book for everyone. Answers 1001 delicate questions one would like to ask his regular physician and yet doesn't want to.

1248 pages, 400 illustrations (60 in colors), 250 recipes. Price, clothbound, \$2, mailed.
 240 SAMPLE PAGES, including two full chapters, in handsome "Flashlight" cover, mailed for 6 cents postage.

Tocology for Mothers
 330 pages, illustrated, cloth bound; by mail \$1.
 American reprint of "The Wife and Mother Medical Guide," an up-to-date English work, with added illustrations in the text, and twelve artistic and appropriate full page half-tone engravings. The latest and best book for popular instruction on child-bearing and child-caring. Edited for this country by Dr. E. B. Foote, Jr.
MURRAY HILL PUB. CO., 120 E. 23th St., New York.

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 meet- 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.

FOR SALE, OR ROYALTY:

The following six patents:

- Rack Cutting Machine (automatic), No. 717167.
- Screw Shaving Machine (hand), No. 717166.
- Traveler's Shaving Brush (collapsible), No. 723365.
- "Head End" Lathe, No. 777181.
- Turret Lathe, No. 656318.
- Forming Lathe, No. 595238.

W. L. CHENEY, MERIDEN, CONN.

The Evolution of Man

By Wilhelm Boelsche, translated by Ernest Untermann. A clear, strong, simple explanation of the Evolution theory on which International Socialism is based. It not only states the theory—it proves it. The "missing links" have been found and their pictures are in this book. Contains facts that are new to university men told in a style that is easy reading for children. First published last summer and now in its sixth thousand.

Cloth, illustrated, 50 cents postpaid.

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.

Our Course of Six Lessons in FUNDAMENTAL THINKING,

Commencing with "The Origin of Thought," and ending with "The Limitation of Thought," "How to Know Truth," and "The Power of Generalization," will cause every real Educator and Psychologist in the world to sit up and take notice.

The Fake Psychologists will not dare go through this course or mention it to others, because it will put them out of business.

Every One Needs It—

There Are No Exceptions.

THE COURSE IS WORTH \$1,000.
IT COSTS \$5.00.

To-Morrow School of Clear Thinking,
2238 Calumet Av., Chicago, Ill.

REFERENCE—Any Professor of Mental Science in the World.

J. RUSSELL PRICE, M. D.,

1637 Indiana Avenue, Chicago.

Phone: Calumet 734.

Free from the Insidious Control of "Advertising Interests."

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY MAGAZINE

A REVIEW OF CONSTRUCTIVE DEMOCRACY, SOCIAL PROGRESS AND INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT.

Edited by B. O. FLOWER, the founder of The Arena.

Friends of free institutions and just government are everywhere coming to realize the absolute necessity of the people having at the present time one great, free, untrammelled and absolutely fearless monthly review of opinion, outspoken in its advocacy of a government "of the people, for the people and by the people." It is the intention of Mr. Flower and the publishers to make The Twentieth Century Magazine a review equal to The Arena in its best days, when under Mr. Flower's management. The special contributors already secured for its pages constitute, we believe, the most brilliant coterie of authoritative and popular thinkers among the friends of fundamental democracy and social advance that has ever been brought together in one magazine. The following are but a few of the strong and brilliant writers who will contribute to the pages of The Twentieth Century Magazine during the coming year:

- | | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Edwin Markham | Prof. Charles Zueblin | Brand Whitlock |
| J. Lincoln Steffens | Helen Campbell | Will Allen Dromgoole |
| Hamlin Garland | Ex-Gov. L. F. C. Garvin | Lillian Whiting |
| | Prof. Thos. E. Will | |

Each Issue will be Illustrated and will contain at least One Full Page Cartoon by Ryan Walker.

The following "Table of Contents" of leading features of the opening issue will give an idea of the general character of the magazine:

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS OF THE OCTOBER NUMBER.

- Frontispiece, Hamlin Garland. From Mr. Garland's latest and best photograph.
- A Representative Western Artist: A Pen-Picture of Professor W. L. Judson, Illustrated.
- Direct-Legislation in Switzerland. Theodore Curti. An extremely important paper.
- Ernest Howard Crosby and His Message. Hamlin Garland. A luminous paper.
- Political Parties of the Future. Hon. John D. Works.
- The Master Demand of Twentieth Century Civilization. Edwin Markham.
- The Bondage of the Press. By a Prominent American Journalist.
- British Rule and the Fundamental Demands of the Indian Nationalist. Taraknath Das.
- An Automatic System of Relief for the Unemployed. Clinton P. McAllister.
- Socialism Defined. William Restelle Shier. A brief and illuminating contribution.
- The Income Tax and the Proposed Constitutional Amendment. W. R. Eastman.
- Faith and Works of Christian Science: A Book Study. By the Editor.
- New Zealand's Past and Present: Facts Versus Fiction. By the Editor.
- Glasgow's Latest Message to the American Municipalities. Editor.
- The Climax: A Powerful Drama Dealing with Mental Suggestion. Editor.

THE SUBSCRIPTION PRICE OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY MAGAZINE WILL BE \$2.50 A YEAR

But in order to start our magazine with a subscription list of not less than 25,000 subscribers, and because we are confident that all who become well acquainted with our magazine will find it indispensable, we make the following special and limited offer:

OUR UNPARALLELED OFFER. (1 To all who send us \$1.00 before November 1st, we will send The Twentieth Century Magazine for one year on trial; or (2) those who prefer to send 25c will receive the first three issues of the magazine, provided their subscriptions are received before November 1st. These are the most liberal offers ever made by a \$2.50 magazine, and they are absolutely limited to the dates given. Fill out the coupon and return it today. Call the attention of your friends to this exceptional offer. They will thank you for it, and in this way you will be materially aiding the preservation of a free press and of pure and just government.

Twentieth Century Company

5 Park Square, Boston, Mass.

Herewith find enclosed } \$1 { for which
my subscription for } 25c { please enter
} 1 year { to The
} 3 months { Twentieth
Century Magazine.

Name
Address
Town
State

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS

Formerly known as Lucifer the Light Bearer

The Pioneer Journal—in Modern Times—of an old and almost forgotten science, the most important of all sciences, a science successfully and openly taught and practiced by the ancient Greeks and Egyptians, but ignored, defeated, scorned, out-lawed by all modern nations, viz., the Science of Right-Borning, the Science of

GOOD GENERATION

The Century Dictionary thus defines Eugenics:

The doctrine of Progress, or Evolution, especially in the human race, through improved conditions in the relations of the sexes.

Its central thought is Natural Selection through Freedom of Motherhood, the Self-ownership of Woman in the Realm of Sex and Reproduction—Intelligent and Responsible Parenthood; Woman First, Man Second.

This much neglected, this tabooed, disgraced, and almost unknown Science was named "Eugenics" by Francis Galton, cousin of, and co-worker with, the great Charles Darwin; and now, both in England and in Continental Europe, is beginning to receive the attention its importance demands.

The American Journal of Eugenics is in its thirtieth year of publication; sustained by a long list of able and well-known contributors, women and men of national and international reputation, it is now published bi-monthly—standard magazine size—price, \$1.00 a year postpaid; single copy, 15 cents.

Trial subscribers will receive three back numbers—less than a year old, also a copy of the booklet, "Institutional Marriage," a lecture by the editor—all for 25 cents in stamps or coin. For sale by news-dealers, or sent postpaid by the editor and publisher, Moses Harman, with lists and prices of standard English and American Eugenic publications. Address, 1319 Kellam Avenue, Los Angeles, California.