

HULL'S CRUCIBLE.

"And the fire shall try every man's work: of what sort it is."

Vol. VI.

18 Eliot Street, Boston, For the Week Ending May 5, 1877.

No. 18.

Original Poetry.

ROWING ALONE.

BY MRS. E. M. ODERKIRK.

The storm is on; Father of love,
Must I battle the waves alone,
The tempest beats against my frail bark
And my hands have so weary grown.

The tide runs high, the sea is rough,
The winds lash the waves into foam,
The bending heavens are dark to-night,
I'm weary of rowing alone.

So weary, and I long to know,
Does God's love really pierce this gloom,
Was ever a soul on life's ocean
So weary of rowing alone?

"Child, hark!—'tis borne o'er the waters
Like the voice of one I have known,
"Look! seest thou not one at the helm?
Fear not, thou art never alone.

"The minist'ring angels attend thee
When thou art faint and weary grown,
They may strengthen but touch not the oars
They've thought thee to use them alone.

"Take courage, nor float with the tide,
Be firm though the waves dash and moan,
Thou hast learned a great lesson in life
When thou rowest thy bark alone.

"Then trust the power that controls,
List the words that come through the gloom,
Thy freed soul will rejoice evermore
When thy bark anchors safe at home."

Polemics.

LOVE, MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE

THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE INDIVIDUAL

A DISCUSSION BY HENRY JAMES, HORACE GREELEY
AND STEPHEN PEARL ANDREWS: INCLUDING
THE FINAL REPLIES OF MR. ANDREWS,
REJECTED BY THE TRIBUNE.

INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER.

The columns of the New York *Tribune* have been abruptly, though not altogether unexpectedly, closed to me, in the midst of a Discussion upon Love, Marriage, and Divorce, and The Sovereignty of the Individual, which had been courted and invited by Mr. Horace Greeley, the responsible Editor of that influential journal. After detaining my replies to himself and to Mr. James from four to eight weeks, Mr. Greeley at length returns them to me, accompanied by a private note, approving my criticisms upon Mr. James, but assigning reasons for the declination of both of my communications.

The ostensible grounds for excluding my comments upon positions assumed, and arguments in support of those positions, are, 1st, That my replies "do not get the discussion one inch ahead." I obviously could not put the discussion ahead by stating and developing new positions, until I had answered those assumed by my opponents. Whether the real reason for "burking" my rejoinder was that I did not do the last well enough, or that I did it rather too effectively and conclusively for my continued popularity at the *Tribune* office, so many readers as I shall now be able to reach with some little industry on my part, will have the opportunity to decide. 2d., That expressions are employed by me which are offensive to the public sense of decency, and especially that the medical illustration of my lady correspondent is unfit for publication. I propose now to publish the rejected replies as written, that the world may judge whether anything I have said or embodied in them is of a nature which might reasonably be supposed likely "to dash the modesty" of Mr. Greeley, or the habitual readers of the *Tribune*.

The defenders of slavery, and the fastidious aristocratic classes everywhere, make a similar objection to that here urged, to displaying the unsightly accompaniments of the system they uphold. Much, however, as I dislike to have

my feelings or my tastes offended, I cannot help regarding the actual flogging of women, for example, in Austria, and the salt and pepper applications to the torn backs of negroes in the South, as not only in themselves worse than the pen and ink descriptions of the same transactions, but as fully justifying the latter, and actually demanding them, as a means of shaming the facts out of existence. So of the disgusting and intolerable features of any oppressive Social Institution. It is true the scenes of abhorrent and enforced debauchery, although covered by the respectable garb of legality, are not pleasing subjects for contemplation; but to my mind they are still less fitting to exist at all. If the denial of the latter fact cannot in conscience be made, I have little respect for that sickly suggestion of virtue, which by turning its face to the wall, refuses to see, and hopes for the best, without so much as a protest against the enormous degradation of our common humanity. The position is one not often assumed by Mr. Greeley, and does not seem to me either natural or becoming to him.

3d. The third objection is, that he, (Mr. Greeley,) can not permit his paper to be made the organ of repeatedly announcing and defending doctrines so destructive to the public well being, and especially that he cannot tolerate the reiterated assumption that Fornication, Adultery, etc., are no crimes. I can hardly conceive why the first statement of a dangerous or defensive set of opinions should be innocent enough for the columns of the *Tribune*, and a re statement of the same thing for the purpose of answering the objections or misrepresentations of an opponent should be too bad for the same columns. I can discover no reason, consistent with good faith, for prohibiting a writer who has been permitted so to commit himself to unpopular doctrines, from explaining his meaning until he is entirely comprehensible to all who desire to understand him. But if this objection were really such as weighs with the Editor of the *Tribune*, which I shall show presently is not, it could only be founded in misapprehension. I am as earnestly and thoroughly opposed to adultery, for example, as the Editor of the *Tribune* can be, except that we might differ in the definition. I charge adultery upon nine-tenths of the married couples in this city, committed not out of, but within, the limits of the marriage bonds.

Let me endeavor to make myself clear upon this point. If I were in a Catholic country, and derided or denounced the mass and the other ceremonies of the Church, I should clearly be held by the whole people to be an opposer of religion. Indeed, such a deportment might even be found described in the dictionary definition, in that country, of Irreligion or Atheism; and yet, it is quite conceivable by us, that such a course would be, or might be, dictated by a zeal for religion beyond anything prompting the defence of the stereotyped formalities of the place. The ambiguity exists in the diversity of understanding of the word Religion. The one believes the thing signified to consist in, or at least only to coexist with, certain rights and ceremonies with which it has always been associated in his mind; the other has a much higher, and as we think, a much purer conception of the idea to which the word corresponds. The former is, nevertheless, confirmed in his impression by the outward fact, that those whom he has hitherto seen least regardful of the external worship to which he is himself addicted, are the lawless and vagabond, who are fitted for every species of criminal act. He is not sufficiently developed in intellect and expansive in comprehension to discriminate and individualize, and by generalizing too early, outcouns me, the religious philosopher and enthusiast, with the vulgar herd of the godless and abandoned—the man who is above him with the man who is below him—because they both differ from him, and in one feature of that difference, to his cloudy understanding, they seem to agree. In the same manner there are those who are

below the restraints of the marriage institution, and those who are above their necessity; while the majority in civilized countries are as yet upon a level with the institution, and manufacture the public sentiment in conformity with that fact.

At the commencement of the Protestant Reformation three centuries ago, the world lay bound by three strong cords of superstition, the Ecclesiastical, the Government and the Matrimonial. The Church, the State, and the Family, each claimed to be of divine origin, and to exist by divine right.

The claim of the Church was shaken by Luther, and from his day to ours, Religion and Ecclesiastical Organization have been separating themselves, as ideas, wider and wider in men's minds. Washington and the American Revolution mark a similar era in Political Affairs, and modern Socialism foreshadows a corresponding change in the sphere of Domestic Relations. Men now distinguish pretty clearly that elevation of aims and that devotion to the good and true, which they now mean by Religion, from the Church Establishment or an Organization of any sort. They distinguish, in like manner the propriety, the well-being, and civic order of the community, from Crowns, and Cabinets, and Parliaments, and Standing Armies of Politicians and Soldiers. In like manner, they begin to distinguish Purity in the sexual union of loving souls from the sordid considerations of a marriage settlement, and even from the humane, prudential, and economical arrangements for the care of offspring.

The fallacy—expounded by the development of mind—consists in the assumption, that "The Church" is essential to the existence of elevated sentiments toward God and one's fellow-being—that the love of spiritual truths and of the social virtues is not naturally in men, growing with their growth, but, that it has to be put into them, and kept in them by the constant instrumentality of Popes, Cardinals, Bishops and Priests, Councils, Inquisitions, Constitutions and Synods—that men do not, by nature, love order, and justice, and harmony in their civic relations, and love it the more in proportion to their refinement, education, and development, and only need to know how they are to be attained, and to be relieved from hindrances and overmastering temptations adversely, to give themselves gladly to the pursuit of those virtues; but that, on the contrary, these elements likewise have to be provided and administered by Magistrates and Bailiffs, and all the tedious machinery of government; and, finally, that men do not, naturally, love their own offspring, and the mothers of their children, and difference for their sex, and Sexual Purity, and all the beautiful and refining influences of that the purest and holiest of all our intercourse on earth, and gravitate powerfully toward the realization, of those loves, in proportion as they become, through all elevating influences, more perfect men—but that those virtues again have to be made, injected, and preserved in human beings by Legislation, which, strangely enough, is merely the collective action of the same being who, taken individually are assumed to be destitute of those same qualities. So opposite is the truth, that it is the love of these very virtues which cheats and constrains men to endure the organizations and systems under which they groan, because they have been taught that those systems are the only condition of retaining the virtues. It is the discovery of this sham, which, I have said, marks the development of mind. The cheat, thus exposed, is to be taken in connection with another. It is assumed, that just those forms of action which these artificial organizations or patent manufactories of Virtue prescribe are the sole true forms of action, that their product is the genuine article, and that every other product is Vice. Hence attention of mankind is turned wholly away from the study of Nature, and the human

mind gradually trained to the acceptance of authority and tradition without question or dissent.

In this manner, Piety is made to signify Zeal for the Church or a Sect, Patriotism, Loyalty to the Sovereign and Purity, Fidelity to the Marriage Bond. In the same manner, Irreligion is identified with Heresy, Treason with the Rights of the people, and Debauchery with the Freedom of the Affections. It suits the Bigot, the Despot, and the Male or Female Prude to foster this confusion of things dissimilar, and to denounce the champions of Freedom as licentious and wicked men—the enemies of mankind.

In the case supposed, the Catholic denounces the Protestant as guilty of Impiety, and so in this case, Mr. Greeley denounces me, as favoring Impurity and Adultery. It is clear, as I have said, that whether I do so or not, depends upon the definitions of the terms. If by Adultery is meant a breach of a legal bond, binding a man and woman, between whom there are repugnance and disgust instead of attraction and love, to live together in the marital embrace, then there may be some grounds for the charge; but if, as I choose to define it, Adultery means a sexual union, induced by any other motive, however aimable or justifiable in itself, than that mutual Love which by Nature prompts the amative conjunction of the sexes, materially and spiritually, then do I oppose and inveigh against, and then does Mr. Greeley defend and uphold Adultery. As to Purity, I have no idea whatever that Mr. Greeley knows, owing to the perverting influence of authority or legislation, what Purity is. Nor does he know what Impurity is, for, since all things must be known by contrasts, no man, whose conceptions upon this subject do not transcend the limits of legality, can know it, nor loathe it, as those do, who, having conceived of or experienced a genuine freedom, come to distinguish a prurient fancy from a genuine affection, and learn to make the highest and most perfect affinities of their nature the Law of their being.

But however pernicious my views may be held to be, the fact of their being so is no reason, according to Mr. Greeley, why they should not be given to the world. At least, although he now urges it as a reason, it is only a few weeks since he stoutly defended the opposite position; and if there be any settled principle or policy to which he has professed and attempted to adhere, it has been more than any other, that all sorts of opinions, good, bad, and "detestable" even, should have a chance to be uttered, and so confirmed or refuted. It has been his favorite doctrine, apparently, that "Error need not be feared while Truth is left free to combat it." Very recently, in stating the policy of the *Tribune*, he gave the noblest estimate ever promulgated of the true function of the Newspaper, namely, "To let every body know what every body else is thinking." To a writer, calling himself "Young America," who objected to the *Tribune* reporting the arguments of Catholics, Mr. Greeley replied in substance, that he should just as readily report the doings, and arguments, and opinions of a Convention of Atheists, as he should do the same service for his own co-religionists. In this very discussion he says, "We are inflexibly opposed, therefore, to any extension of the privileges of divorce, now accorded by our laws, but we are not opposed to the discussion of the subject; on the contrary, we deem such discussion as already too long neglected." Of Mr. James he says, "We totally differ from him on some quite fundamental questions, but that is no reason for suppressing what he has to say." In his reply to me, published herein, he repudiates the right to suppress what I have to say, while he avers that he would aid to suppress me if I attempted to act on my own opinions. Finally, in various ways and upon various occasions, the columns of the *Tribune* were formally thrown open for the full discussion of this subject of Marriage and Divorce, as well for those views of the subject which the Editor deems pernicious, as for the other side. The Editor of the *Observer* reproaches him for so doing, and he defended the course as the only truth-seeking and honorable procedure. He wished especially to drag to the light, in their full extension and strength, those "eminently detestable" doctrines, of one phase of which he seems to regard me as a representative, in order that they might forever after have got their quietus from a blow of the sledge-hammer of his logic.

If, now, the valiant Editor proves shaky in his adherence to this truly sublime position, of justice and a fair hearing to all parties, shall we, in kindness to him, find the solution in the supposition that he was dishonest in assuming it, or give him the benefit of the milder hypothesis, that he found himself rather farther at sea than he is accustomed to navigate, and betook himself again in alarm to the coast voyage?

I shall leave it to the public to decide, finally, what was the real cause of my getting myself turned out of Court before I had fairly stated, much less argued, my defence. I shall not, in the meantime, however, hesitate to say what I think of the matter myself. I have not the slightest idea

that any one of the reasons assigned influenced the decision a straw's weight. The sole cause of my extrusion was, that Mr. Greeley found himself completely "headed" and hemmed in the argument, with the astuteness clearly to perceive that fact, while he had neither the dialectical skill to obscure the issues and disguise it, nor magnanimity frankly to acknowledge a defeat. Hence, there was no alternative but to apply "the gag" and "suppress" me, by the exercise of that power which the present organization of the press, and his position in connection with it, lodges in his hands. Had fortune made him the Emperor of Austria, and me a subject, he would have done the same thing in a slightly different manner, in strict accordance with his character and the principles he had avowed in this discussion. Such men mistake themselves when they suppose that they have any genuine affection for freedom. They laud it only so far as prejudice or education incline them to favor this or that instance of its operation. They refer their defense of it to no principle. No security has yet been achieved for the continuance of the enjoyment of such freedom and such rights as we now enjoy; no safeguard even against a final return to despotism, and thence to barbarism, until the Principle upon which the right to freedom rests, and the scope of that principle, are discovered, nor until a public sentiment exists, based upon the knowledge. Americans, no more than barbarians, have as yet attained to the fullness of that wisdom, and as little as any does Mr. Greeley know of any such guide through the maze of problems which environ him, and, perhaps less than most, is he capable of following it.

Circumstances—the fact he is a prominent Editor, that he has strenuously advocated certain reformatory measures, and that he has the reputation of great benevolence—have given to Mr. Greeley somewhat the position of leader of the Reform Movement in America. The lovers of Progress look to him in that capacity. The publicity and the immense importance of such a position will justify me, I think, in giving my estimate of the man and of his fitness for the work he is expected to perform, in the same manner as we investigate the character of a politician, or as Mr. Greeley himself would analyze for us the pretensions of Louis Napoleon or the Duke of Wellington. Similar considerations will authorize me in mingling with the portraiture of Mr. Greeley, a few shadowy outlines of Mr. James, contrasting them *a la Plutarch* in his "Lives of the Great Men."

In the first place, then, Horace Greeley is not a Philosopher—the farthest from it in the world. No great-misnomer could seriously be applied to him. He is a man of statistics and facts, but not of principles. He sees broadly over the surface, but never down into the center of things. As a Phrenologist would say, the perceptive preponderate over the reasoning faculties. He has no grasp of the whole of any thing as a system, but only of detached portions or fragments. Hence, instead of principles, he has whims, and acts from them as if they were principles. He does not see clearly the relation of cause and effect. He has no logical, or, what is the same thing, no mathematical mind. He is one of the class of men who will admit candidly that A is equal to B, and that B is equal to C, and then cavil over or deny point blank that A is equal to C. Hence, he earns the reputation of inconsistency, and a large portion of the public believe him dishonest. This last is, I think, a mistake. Mr. Greeley is a bigot, and bigotry is generally honest. His tergiversation is organic, not intentional. His incapacity for system is shown in the fact, that although he has been regarded as the grand embodiment of Fourierism in this country, he never accepted and never gave any intimation that he even understood the fundamental principle of Fourier's whole social theory.

Fourier (who was really about the most remarkable genius who has yet lived) claims, as his grand discovery, that Attraction, which Newton discovered to be the Law and the Regulator of the motions of material bodies, is equally the Law and the God-intended Regulator of the whole affectional and social sphere in human affairs; in other words, that Newton's discovery was partial, while his is integral, and lays the basis of a science of Analogy between the material and the spiritual world, so that reasoning may be carried on with safety from one to the other.

This principle, announced by Fourier as the starting point of all science, has been accepted by Mr. Greeley in a single one of its applications, namely, the organization of labor, and wholly rejected by him in its universality, as applicable to the human passions, and elsewhere. The farthest he seems ever to have seen into the magnificent speculations of Fourier, is to the economy to be gained by labor done upon the scale, and the possibility of the retention of profits by the laborers themselves by means of association. It is as if a man should gain the reputation of a leader in the promulgation of the Copernico-Newtonian System of Astronomy, by publishing his conviction that the moon is retained in her orbit by gravitation toward the earth, while denying wholly that the earth is round, or that the sun is the centre of the system, or that attraction can be supposed to operate at such an immense distance as that

body and the planets. In the same manner, Mr. Greeley can understand the Sovereignty of the Individual in one aspect, as the assertion of one's own rights, but not at all in the other, namely, as the concession of the rights of all others, and through its limitation, "to be exercised at one's own cost"—the exact demarcator between what one may and what he may not do. He is a man of great power, and strikes hard blows, when he fairly gets a chance to strike at all, but with his prevailing inconsistency he reminds one of a blind giant hitting out at random in a fray.

Mr. Greeley has never been able to see any thing in the "Cost principle" except the fact that it abolishes interest on money, and hence he begins at once by opposing it. He has worked hard for his money, and it seems to him a very natural, convenient, and proper thing, that that money, so earned, should go on earning more for him while he sleeps. This one consideration settles, with him, the whole question. He does not comprehend in this sublime and simple principle a universal Law of Equity, which distributes wealth exactly according to Right; reduces all products to the *Minimum price*, thereby immensely augmenting consumption; removes all obstacles to the Adjustment of Supply and Demand; brings all human labor into steady demand; exchanges it for exact Equivalents; organizes Industry; places every human being in his or her appropriate work or function; substitutes universal Coöperation in the place of universal Antagonism; renders practicable the economies of the large scale, and the division of labor in every department; houses the whole people in palaces, surrounds them with luxury and refinement, and hundred-folds the wealth of the world. Such manifold and magnificent results from a simple change in the method of conducting ordinary trade, transcend the capacity of Mr. Greeley and the Philosophers of the *Tribune*; while there are now boys, and girls too, not twelve years of age, who can scientifically demonstrate these results as legitimate and certain, and can by the aid of this key solve with facility all the problems of Political Economy with a clearness, comprehensiveness, and precision never dreamed of by Say, Adam Smith, or Ricardo.

Mr. Greeley is, undoubtedly, a man of benevolence. He is profusely, perhaps even foolishly, lavish, as he begins, doubtless, himself to think, in his expenditures for the relief of suffering, and for random experiments, without system or coherent design, for the improvement of the condition of mankind. He is, however, too child-like in the lower and material range of human affairs. His thought rises no higher, apparently, than supplying men with food for the body, raiment, and shelter. At most, he aspires after so much education as will enable them "to cipher" and make profit. He has no experience of, no sympathy with, and no ability to conceive that immense hunger of the soul which craves, and will have, despite all the conventionalities of the Universe, the gratification of spiritual affinities, the congenial atmosphere of loving hearts. The explosive power of a grand passion is all Greek to him. So of all the delicate and more attenuated sentiment which forms the exquisite aroma of human society. He understands best, and appreciates most, the coarse, material realities of life. Purely mental exertion is repugnant to him.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

Do they Materialize?

—A—
DISSERTATION

ON THE BIBLICAL EVIDENCES

—OF—

SPIRIT-MATERIALIZATION,

By MOSES HULL.

AUTHOR OF "QUESTION SETTLED," "THE CONTRAST," "WHICH? SPIRITUALISM OR CHRISTIANITY," "LETTERS TO ELDER MILES GRANT," "BOTH SIDES," "THAT TERRIBLE QUESTION," "THE GENERAL JUDGMENT," "THE SUPREMACY OF REASON," "THE WOLF IN SHEEP'S CLOTHING," "MYSTERY SOLVED," ETC., ETC.,

"He showed them his hands and his feet." *Luke xxiv: 40.*

Moses Hull & Co., have just issued an important pamphlet on PHENOMENAL SPIRITUALISM, with the above title. It is an able and thorough argument in proof, that the phenomena known as *Spiritual Materializations* are not new. This pamphlet contains extracts from almost every book of the Bible, showing the evidences that, in those days as well as now, spirits occasionally represented themselves in a material form.

It will be sent to any address, post paid on receipt of 10 cts. Address 18 Eliot St., Boston.

Correspondence,

Open Letter to Rev. Dr. Buckingham—No. II.

BY F. R. LADD.

REV. DR. BUCKINGHAM:

My Dear Sir—In my last letter I told you that in my next I should try to show that in taxing churches we did not tax people's "generosity," but we taxed their avarice and selfishness. Having a little leisure time, I improve it in fulfilling the promise.

Before I proceed I will relate a little incident that occurred in the Post Office Rotunda not long since, which will show that the teachers who preside over our churches are not the persons to apply to for instruction and advice when anything in the scripture, that is not sufficiently explicit, needs further explanation. I was having a little controversy with a friend about the way a certain passage of scripture read, he maintaining that it read one way, I another, when a very popular priest, who has been quite active in organizing an association through which to bestow charity on the poor of this city, came in, and as my friend was acquainted with him, he said he would refer the matter to him. The passage in dispute was the one you referred me to, to prove that Jesus paid church tax. I was introduced, and he was asked how the passage read. His reply was that he did not remember, but the proof was very positive that Jesus paid the tax. I replied that there was no evidence, and the Bible did not contain any, that he paid it, or advised others to pay it, and if he or anybody else could point to any I would give them \$1000—I now make you the same offer. The priest gathered up his skirts, turned on his heels and left without saying as much as "good day."

Not ten days after, this same priest went before his large and intelligent audience and preached a long sermon from a text in the bible on the folly of having "controversies" with any one, and labored to show that they never did any good and should always be avoided, advised his hearers that they never on any occasion engage in them. I was told this by a member of the city council who pays \$100 for a family seat in this priest's church, and he thought it was all right, and that it was the best thing for anybody to do, and tried to persuade me to withdraw my opposition to the church and pay my church tax and not permit a stay to be made on my property by the officer whose duty it is to enforce the laws of the state. In the conversation he was honest enough to admit, before three witnesses, that he did not believe the doctrines taught there, but in giving it his support he consulted his "personal interest," and he believed the \$100 invested in that seat returned more per cent. on the investment than \$1000 would invested in any thing else. He said people who go to church are "respected" and they are thought more of and put forward into places that they would not be if they withheld their support from it. I admitted it all. Now if that seat was taxed, would it be taxing his "generosity" or his avarice and selfishness? While the discussion was going on, I asked him if it was customary to pass on questions that were presented in the council-room before discussing them? He replied, seldom. I asked him why they discussed them? He replied, in order to arrive at an understanding of them. I asked him if religious questions were not of less importance than the questions presented there, why they should not be discussed in order to arrive at an understanding of them? He saw the trap and kept out of it, by not answering—the same as theologians generally do when an answer would destroy the thing they were trying to prove, and this is not the worst thing about it, they advise their followers to do the same, and it keeps them in darkness and ignorance of the truth, as they hear only one side.

Some three years ago I was accosted in the street by an active, leading member of the church who was accompanied by his

priest, pulling a paper out of his pocket, he addressed me as follows:

"Mr. Ladd, we are getting subscriptions for our new church, and as you are the owner of a good deal real estate, we want a large subscription from you, for it will increase its value so that you can afford it." (My opposition to the church was not as well known then as it is now, if it had been I doubt whether he would have addressed me as he did.) I asked him how much he had on his subscription list and who were the heavy subscribers? He said he wanted \$25,000 in addition to what the old one bought, before they commenced operations. (I knew the old church brought a good price, for the lot it stood on was coveted by a rich man in order to extend and beautify his already vast possessions; so they allowed a good church to be pulled down that they might have a more stylish one built on a popular street, with the expectation that it would draw in the gay butterflies of fashion, who go to church to see and be seen, not to hear and learn the truth, and in so doing they break up all the associations connected with the old church, burdened the society with a heavy debt and taxed the people that the society might become popular. Now the society is bankrupt, I am told, and cannot pay the janitor; the mere pittance they agreed to pay him, and he suffers by it, but can raise \$3,000 to pay a popular preacher's salary.) He then read over a list of names and what they had subscribed:—Mr. A \$1,000; Mr. B \$1,000; \$2,000, on condition it be located to suit. Mr. E. would give the lot to build it on if located to suit him; Mr. F \$1,000, place specified; Mr. G \$500, and so on, nearly all the heavy subscribers were interested more or less in the location. So I asked him where they expected to locate it. He said it would depend on the subscription list—the probability was that it would be on the course of—and—streets. I said, a church there would not help my real estate much, would it? He said a church anywhere in the city would increase the value of my real estate. I then said here is Mr. A. and Mr. B. who head the list, I know them both well. One is a carpenter, the other is a brick mason, are they able to give so much? He said, "they will probably have the contract to build it." "How much is the church going to cost without the lot?" "Somewhere about \$40,000." I then said, "I guess they subscribe in order to make money, for the profit on so large a job will be considerable. Do they subscribe on that condition?" He gave an evasive answer to this question. "And you say if I subscribe, I shall get my money back by increasing the value of my real estate?" He thought so. I replied that under our present civilization it might be true, but as I believe the church has been the curse of the world in the past and kept the people in darkness and ignorance of the true way of salvation, by chaining the human mind to a book that it teaches is the infallible word of God to man, I would not subscribe if I knew it would double the value of my real estate.

This closed the conversation, and I am sure that nine churches out of ten are built in the same way. Interested parties who have building lots for sale, or selfish contractors who want the job of building them, will make large subscriptions conditionally, and after it is so started, it invites rivalry among the people, and one man does not like to be outdone by another, so they often subscribe to the injury of themselves and their creditors. The proof is positive that in taxing the churches we do not tax people's "generosity," but we tax their avarice and selfishness. This is one way of building churches. Another is (and the same selfish motive prompts the movement) wealthy members of church societies, who live in extravagance and splendor at home, become dissatisfied with the old church, it is not in keeping with what they are accustomed to, and they want new ones built that are more in harmony with their extravagant notions; and wishing the praise of the world and anxious to have their acts of benevo-

lence (?) sounded abroad and their names go down to posterity as benefactors, they will offer ten, twenty, thirty, and even more thousands of dollars, on condition the society raise an equal amount towards a new one. The effort is made and succeeds. Thus by exempting church property from taxation, everybody is taxed to support their extravagance and gratify their avarice and selfishness. But these are not my reasons for taxing churches. If the reasons you gave for exemption were true, I would favor it as strong as you do, but they are not. You "regard all churches a public benefit—they make good citizens, and save the city the cost of ignorance, poverty and crime." This so far from being true, is directly the opposite of the truth; they do not make good citizens as God designs they shall be. It makes them self-conceited, narrow-minded, bigoted, unchristian, uncharitable, intolerant, superstitious, &c., in their views, none of which are calculated to make man the unselfish and self-reliant being that makes "good citizens. They do not save the city the "cost of ignorance, poverty and crime," but keep people in ignorance by teaching salvation out of a book that is 1800 years behind the times. They keep people in poverty when those who teach them take all the salary they can get, and let the poor laborer work for a mere pittance when they can get work of any kind to do. And the laws that are now on our statute books, which the church has the power to repeal but does not, makes criminals by the wholesale, and churches, generally, instead of making "good citizens," are neither more nor less than assignation houses, and more young people, to say nothing of the older ones, attend them for that purpose than do to get good, twice told. Worse than this, Jesus (Matt., x—21, 37) says these things shall take place on his account, and they have, through the church, which he had nothing to do about organizing, and which he always denounced.

(Concluded next week.)

Opposition of Physicians to Medical Reform.

But to whom shall we look for reform? Shall it be to the professors and practitioners of Medicine as a class of men? This is most unreasonable. When was it ever known that a whole clique, ring, syndicate, corruption, company, or community of men, set themselves earnestly to work to denounce the principles and destroy the means by which they obtained their wealth, and their high consideration in society? Is it not for the interest of the professors and practitioners of medicine that the people should be sick, sick often, much, and long? Are they not paid in proportion to the number of students and patients they have, the visits they make, and the doses they administer? It is true that we find now and then among the profession, one sufficiently benevolent to be willing, for the sake of relieving human suffering, to speak, write, and labor for reform in the practice, though he knows that it may reduce and even destroy the sources of his personal wealth, ease, and honor. But we do not believe that, in opposition to the testimony of all human history, there ever will be effected a radical, an extensive and a permanent reform in medicine, till we revolutionize our practice of employing and paying the medical profession. As it is now, we employ doctors only when we are sick, and we pay them for the number of their visits to us and for the prescriptions that they give us. This makes it their interest to visit us as often and as long as possible, and to give us as many and as costly prescriptions as they can devise. Is it not evident that, unless they are different from the great mass of men, they will take advantage of our folly, and do what they can to keep us ignorant of what we all ought to know of the prevention and cure of disease, and of the character and tendency of the remedies they give us to cure it? Will they not desire that we should be sick often? and will they not give us remedies (?) calculated to prolong the disease rather than to ar-

rest its progress? Will they not often give enough of "articles in their nature inimical to the human constitution" to endanger life, especially as their bills are to be paid in full out of the first proceeds of the executor's collections from the assets of the estate? Let us see.

Doctors discourage the study of medicine in the schools, especially by females. They declare that disease is so diversified or complicated in its character and symptoms, that none can understand it who do not devote many years to its study, and at an expense of much money. They tell us "it is an unnatural condition and must be treated with unnatural remedies." (Prof. J. P. Harrison.) They pretend that its nature and requirements are as numerous as its symptoms; and they describe these in arbitrary abbreviations of dead languages, and declare that no person is properly qualified to treat any case of disease till he has learned, in their colleges and hospitals, the peculiar signs of all its ordinary forms, and is competent "to distinguish the diversified shades of morbid action, and apply to each its appropriate remedy." (Professor Chapman, Crit. No. 22.) Thus they prevent all our efforts to doctor ourselves.

Not only are we cheated out of health and life, by being persuaded to take poisons covered by abbreviations of unknown tongues, but falsely told that they are the best of all medicines, and that, to enable any person to prepare and use them properly, he must study three years with an experienced physician, attend two or three courses of medical lectures from six to twenty professors, and clinics in their hospitals, spending an enormous sum of money before he can have from those professors a certificate of their opinion that he can be safely trusted to give a cup of catnip tea and a vapor bath, which will cure a case of influenza, rheumatism, or diarrhoea much quicker and better than they ever do it with all their college learning and diplomas. But, finding that all this humbuggy fails to secure all our patronage, the doctors have persuaded legislatures to pass laws to prevent the people from paying for medical services any persons who have not those certificates, which they call diplomas, or authorities to practice, though the colleges have no more constitutional right to prevent any man from giving medicine to the sick than food to the hungry, nor from collecting pay for the medicines and services, than for food and cooking it.

The doctors also require apothecaries, men educated to the business, to prepare chemical compounds, extracts, etc., of various substances, many of them foreign, to prevent us, the people, from using the vastly superior native remedies that God made for us, and as he made them.

Look at the wicked Bill which they introduced into the last Legislature, "to regulate the Practice of Medicine in Ohio,"—a disgrace to the intelligence and humanity of the man who introduced it, and to that of the whole Legislature (if they passed it), for its whole object was to prevent the people from learning how to prevent and cure disease, and to compel all to go to the legalized faculty, and pay them enormous price for professional visits and doses of poisonous drugs, the numerous and powerful agents by which those visits and doses are multiplied (See Crit., p. 46.)

The only preventive of all these evils is to avoid every thing that produces them. Instead of requiring every man who would heal the sick to graduate at one of their colleges, encourage and employ those who prove themselves to be the most successful, and pay them for the useful instructions they give, instead of the number of visits or doses. We should employ physicians as we do preachers and teachers, pay them a regular salary, and require them to perform gratuitously all the personal labor that is needed.

Lastly, all laws that justify the use of poisons for medicines should be repealed, and doctors punished for injuring their fellow men, as all other men are for the commission of the same crimes.

Hull's Crucible.

MOSES HULL,
MATTIE SAWYER, } Conductors.
D. W. HULL.

Boston, Saturday, May 5, 1877.

Hull's Crucible is Independent and Progressive, devoted to the interests of no sect or party. Its editors solicit short, pithy articles on any subject germane to the interests of humanity. Lengthy articles will only be inserted when of great interest, or when not crowding too much on other matter. No well-written article will be rejected on account of its sentiments. The CRUCIBLE has no room for offensive personalities. Anonymous articles will not be published unless, as a guarantee of good faith, the author's real name is made known to the editors. Rejected articles will be returned only at the request and expense of those who write them.

ANOTHER MURDER OR SOMETHING ELSE.

It was hoped that, the Chicago hell, known as the *Religio Philosophical Journal* office would somewhat reform after the death of its chief devil, Jones, but the leopard cannot change his spots nor the Ethiopian his skin. Jones and one of his paramours, Mrs. Robinson, have sown so many of the seeds of all kinds of iniquity that the fruit must be plucked for many years to come. Week before last, the third murder or suicide has come to light in the *Religio* establishment, within three months. All this aside from the unknown deaths of innocents, called abortions. The report from the Coroner's inquest makes Mrs. Robinson, and her son full equals in iniquity with Jones. From the report we extract the following:

"The only witnesses in the case were Mrs. A. H. Robinson, proprietress of the house Mr. and Mrs. Doak, the lodgers who heard the shot and first discovered the body, and the officers who were called in, and no facts were elicited contradiction of the report of the affair made in *The Inter Ocean* of yesterday. Young Robinson was not put upon the stand, for sundry reasons, one of which was that he was "a hard young man, and would only say what he chose, any way," as was explained by the Coroner to a reporter after the inquest. By the way, young Robinson stated definitely Sunday night that the deceased girl had first sought his mother for 'treatment' when 'in trouble;' but yesterday Mrs. Robinson gave a different version, saying that the girl had come to her house one day and asked to be allowed to see a newspaper, that she might see if she could not obtain a situation through an advertisement. After some conversation she was received into the family, but afterward left, and earned her living by becoming a servant in the Sands House, Desplaines House, and similar places, subsequently returning to the haunt on the avenue, suffering from a terrible disease.

* * * Some hints were prompted in the last issue of *The Inter Ocean*, touching the girl with the son of Mrs. Robinson, the medium, who obtained considerable prominence at the time of the Jones murder. Yesterday an INTER OCEAN representative had a conversation with one who has been intimately associated with the people occupying the building, and whose name is at present withheld from prudential reasons. This party gave some facts that reflect very severely upon both Mrs. Robinson and her son. He stated that the deceased, Mary Butler, had lived in the house for some years. She had been brought up in an orphan asylum, and was obtained by Mrs. Robinson as a mistress for her son, who is an individual of the lowest moral principles. The girl's life was passed between household drudgery for mother and son and in ministering to the viciousness of the latter. But this was not the only bitter part of the poor girl's life. She was brutally used by the young ruffian, who would beat her upon the slightest provocation, and his conduct was not only unchecked, but applauded by the mother. About a year ago she received a pistol shot in the head at the hands of young

Robinson. The affair was investigated at the time, but he declared that the shot was purely accidental, and the matter was passed over. The mark of the wound, it is said, she now bears. One can imagine the life this young girl led. Blows, hard names, and abuse, moral and physical, was her portion, and what could she do? That was her only home. She was an orphan and friendless, and according to her own confession had been subjected to the buffets of the uncharitable all her life. She stated to the party with whom the reporter conversed that her life was a burden to her, and she longed for death. If she had had a friend or a home to go to outside of the Fourth avenue sink of iniquity she would have gladly gone; but not being fortunate enough to possess this, she was compelled to remain where her lot was cast, and live in wretchedness. She had naturally a good, kindly disposition, and the rough treatment she received preyed upon her to such an extent that six weeks ago she tried to end her misery, but was prevented in time. On Sunday last, however, she made the second attempt, which successfully terminated her young life, which had been so crushed and broken."

Nearly fourteen years have elapsed since we first felt it our duty to thoroughly expose to public view, the life of S. S. Jones, and Co., but now that Jones has gone to his own place, we will "let the dead bury their dead;" yet it will be the duty of some one to expose the conduct of the *R. P. Journal*, and those who manage it. Have not its managers made enough out of a credulous public? Have they ever been known to make one honest move? Their sales of dog oil at five dollars a gill, as hair restorative may be laughed at as a good joke—one by which they take the money from fools; but their spiritual and religious frauds are impositions too deep to be long or lightly passed over.

It now seems that Heaven's hand has commenced the work of judgment, for the sake of the people, let us hope the work may go on. The one thing that surprises us more than all others is that either the ignorance or cowardice of the spiritual press has led them rather to flatter the late knave S. S. Jones, and his confreere than to expose the unholy work carried on under his administration during the last quarter of a century. M. H.

HOME PENCILLINGS.

We are just home from Mansfield and have no "evil report" to bring. The weather was inclement during the entire day on Sunday, our audiences may have been a little *ensmalled* in consequence, but we had a good hearing and a glorious time. Seed has been sown there which has already taken root and I trust will grow an abundant harvest. Lovell's Hall has been offered to the Spiritualists at low figures and arrangements are being made for regular meetings.

Moses discoursed on the "Infidelity of the Churches" in the afternoon; the subject of the evening lecture was "The True Believer and his Work." Of course it is anything but pleasant for professed Christians and Bible-believers to see their theories thrown overboard by a Spiritualist, and that, too, by logical arguments drawn from the book they have used as their only defense. All we ask of our Christian friends is to "prove themselves" to us. "These signs shall follow those that believe." Where are the signs? I declare that the Spiritualists are the only people in the world who prove their faith by works.

While in Mansfield we shared the home of Alexander Davis and his estimable com-

panion, our sojourn with them will be among our pleasant remembrances.

Next Sunday, we intend to be in Rochester, N. H. How many pleasant and endearing associations come to mind at the mention of that town. My readers will remember that our Missionary Tent was pitched there two years ago the coming Summer, also Moses was met by one of the most solid arguments against truth—a brick-bat. In that quiet town the first blood of the present revolution was spilled and Moses was the martyr. Since that time we have received all kinds of persecutions, but they have been helps instead of hindrances. Radicals on one hand and conservatives on the other, have condemned and traduced, but in our souls there is not one drop of bitterness for them. Probably not one among them sees our short comings and weaknesses more than ourselves. We have been engaged in a long and a fierce battle—a battle in which we have most earnestly felt the good of the human race was involved. How much we may have been aided from "the Beyond" we know not, but some power has put strength in our souls and firmness in our feet, and amid the smoke and fire from the enemy's ranks we have marched on. I pray that we may be true to ourselves in word, thought and deed, however it may conflict with the opinions of others.

Since our last issue, intelligence comes to us of another horrible tragedy, enacted in the office of the *Religio Philosophical Journal*. When I heard of the fate of S. S. Jones, I said, let him go to meet the consequences of his own. I thought it unwise to reiterate what had been said of him and what was known of him as a base, designing man; but when I read the account in the *Inter Ocean* of the fate of a friendless girl and how much she had suffered in that little hell in Chicago, I felt that angels might weep, that any man or woman should placard the doors of their home with the sacred name of Spiritualism and behind the screen of that door give countenance to actions that might bring a blush upon the face of the lowest fiend in hell. Oh, Spiritualists are you asleep? Ye who are penning from week to week communications and items for the interest and welfare of the Spiritualist throughout the country, do you think to build up your cause by misrepresentations? Five years ago it was prophesied that the iniquity and hypocrisy of the Spiritualists editor who advertised his virtue and wilfully slandered his fellow workers would be exposed; the prophecy has met a fulfilment. Again is that ill fated building in which Jones breathed his last, stained with blood. A young girl is killed! whether her own hand severed the cord binding the crushed soul to the abused body or whether she was slain, has not been proved. But speaking in the way of the world, the girl is dead, another murder or suicide, perpetrated under the roof, where a "pure respectable unadulterated Spiritualism" has reigned supremely in a spot where the angels from time to time have breathed their sweetest benedictions (?) Let us be willing to meet the truth at whatever cost. MATTIE.

Sympathetic Epidemics.

Walter Bagshot, in his book entitled *Physics and Politics*, pp. 94, 95, has shown that beliefs are more or less epidemic. It has been shown by Buckle, in his "History of Civilization," that in certain years there

were more crimes of one character than of another, when in another year the character of crimes would change.

Social eccentricities are not only epidemic, but endemic, as we all know. Some neighborhoods are productive of certain mental phenomena, while others are entirely barren of any such peculiarities, and in a very few years the contagion moving in the direction of the hitherto barren neighborhood, will spring up in a bountiful crop all along the line of its travel until the majority of the minds of the once barren neighborhood will succumb to the powerful influences of the epidemic, while the neighborhood where it first appeared will be enjoying a comparative rest, the disease, or whatever it may be termed, having exhausted itself in that locality before it reached the last. But there are neighborhoods where this endemic influence is more pronounced, as for instance, in rural districts and those tracts of country lying off from the great lines of travel. The people in these regions having but little access to the outward world, cannot have their minds pre-occupied with that versatility of subjects calculated to exclude the germinating of mental contagions.

When an epidemic has exhausted itself in a neighborhood or country, it is usually some years before it can appear again. But the disease may reappear in a slightly modified form in a very short period. The Hermits were succeeded by the Crusaders, and they in turn were succeeded by the Flagellants; but closely connected with every religious epidemic there is a determination to crime and bloodshed. If it does not appear in the individuals identified with the religious epidemic, it appears in the immediate neighborhood of it, and often with those who are strongly in sympathy with the epidemic.

The present religious revival has been preceded by a period of commercial prosperity followed immediately by a suspension of commercial intercourse and a contraction of business, until people have been driven to destitution and want, numbers having starved to death. Immediately succeeding the panic of 1873 came the Temperance Crusade. This Crusade was, to all intents and purposes, an endemic-epidemic. It did not appeal to reason or the law of justice. It touched the sexual passions, blending them with the religious emotions, and men gave up their saloons merely because they were swept under by the current turned against them. The revival began last winter was the legitimate outgrowth of the Temperance crusade, and shows its paternity by hitching to temperance instead of hitching to religion, as the crusaders do.

Rev. Joseph Cook has lately, in a lecture, called attention to the succession of religious revivals by wars. A war, he says, generally succeeds a revival, and sometimes very close upon the heels of it; and among several instances, he cites the revival of 1857, followed so shortly after by our civil war. He was merely calling attention to the idea as an illustration of the providence and foresight of God in getting people converted before a calamity, that they might afterwards be saved; somewhat upon the same principle that a Western farmer will fatten his swine for several weeks before he slaughters them. But in our mind there is more of a natural than a providential connection between the two, and we think that this connection might be easily traced out if we could have access to all the data bearing on the case.

(Concluded next week.)

THE "MONDAY LECTURE-SHIPS."

JOSEPH COOK'S Monday lectures are always sophistical and his gestures correspond. They (his jestures we mean) are *so-fist-ical* that when he gyrates his "Scholarly" mandibles "small philosophers," are thrown into consternation, because they have no means of making the altitude of his thought from his geometric angles. There is too much haste from one altitude to another and while his body seems to be in epileptic convulsions, or as if he had taken an emetic and was in the act of disgoring his stomach, goblins damned, Trinities, long-eared skeptics, devil, small philosophers and saints, his hands are cutting the ether into a perfect hash. You have watched all these antics amid ravings so inarticulate that you could hardly keep trace of the subject and a godly voice pitched on a key amounting to almost a shriek, and while you are trying to divine how his godly hands now open and then clutched can be in so many places at the same time, the Reverend howler brings his pious fists together and a concussion ensues like the striking of a clapboard on the water.

The excellence of the "Monday lectureship," over every other lectureship consists of awkwardness that is the merit of "scientific scholarship" which "philosophers never can either imitate or admire," intense noise, in application to the subject in hand and abuse of every body who cannot accept what the lectureship does, as truth. His voice traverses all shades of sound from a whisper to a scream in an incredible fraction of time while it is just as impossible to tell the next position of his hands from the position they seem to be taking as it is to tell where a boomerang will fetch up when hurled from the hand of a novice. And just at the most inappropriate part of his remarks, as if the audience had a proper conception of the take-off comes the applause. Indeed the awkwardness of the gestures, the tortures of of the face and body, the intense-ness of his voice and the applause of the audience would give one the impression that the whole thing was a caricature of religion, if we did not see so much said in the papers about his eloquence and learning.

D. W. H.

Spiritual Experiences.

BY S. Y. WOODHULL.

V.

Speaking in the unknown tongue, one of many incidents. In New Boston, Mercer Co., Illinois, during the month of September, 1860, a liberal convention was held. One day, during recess, I was sitting in my room, when two ladies entered and at once introduced the subject of healing. I said if they wished a diagnosis, I had better take the hand of one of them, as by so doing I could get en rapport sooner than otherwise, advising them not to tell me anything until I was through, and then to say whether it was true or false, if not correct no fee would be accepted. One lady then said, it was neither of them, but a friend who was sick, fifty miles away, where they also lived; they had heard of my great power to heal the sick. I said I would try but first requested the age and sex of their friend, nothing more.

This being complied with, I at once submitted to spirit control and was soon en rapport with the sick friend. I told all the particulars, events, what kind of medicine had been prescribed, how she had to lay to get any rest. The second lady proved to be the second doctor and in charge of the case at that time, and said as they were

about leaving that she could not have described in detail as correctly as I had. After paying the usual fee, they went to the house of Joseph Graham told him what I had done and gave me all the credit that was due me.

I started for the hall, but stopped at brother Graham's, where I found quite a number of friends and was invited to join the circle then formed. I at once began to talk to me, an unknown tongue. When through, Mrs. Graham said that was the only thing she disliked in the circle, that gibberish which did no one any good. A stranger in the circle, said then, that I had spoken in German, which he translated into English.

One year ago last fall my wife and self were at Big River, on the coast thirty miles distant. We had a load of grapes to sell. Where we camped at night some Indians came to buy grapes. My wife said you are giving over weight. I replied that I did not care as I felt great sympathy for them, that nearly every one thought it all right to cheat and misuse them, I would give them good measure, full and running over, and let them know there was one man on earth who would not take the advantage of their ignorance. I told her I felt like talking to them. "Why not do so," said my wife. I answered that I felt, as I always did, that people think I do it of myself, so I resist, but if the feeling comes over me again, I will yield; it will do no harm.

The next morning at day-break a dozen of them came. I was soon controlled to speak. At first they appeared to be startled, then answered, and we seemed to converse as though understanding each other, we talked and laughed, and they seemed to enjoy it very much. Some of them could talk English, my wife asked them if they understood what I was saying, they said they did, and that I talked good Indian. I did not know a word I was saying, but felt a genuine pleasure, as I do when I converse in my native tongue and of myself. I say to you, reader, I do not know a single sentence of any language except my own, much less the meaning, but yet I have the assurance of many, that I have, in the last twenty years, spoken twelve different languages at different times and places, and will perhaps give you some cases, names, places, and dates so that some who were knowing to the facts, may see the statement and verify it.

Ukiah, Cal, April, 1877.

From R. W. Hume.

EDITORS OF THE CRUCIBLE:

Respected and Dear Friends—There are two statements in the New York Herald of this date (Sunday, April 8th) which I think merit to be purged by fire in your paper. The first is a remark by Wm. Coventry H. Waddell, as follows:

"One of the wisest saying which I ever heard, and which is attributed to a Chinese philosopher, was—'The wise man is the man who knows what he does not know.'"

That reads reads very much like a Chinese bull, and must have been made by a native of the Ireland of China, if it has one. The following statement is from Grecian history:

"When Socrates was informed that the oracle at Delphi had declared him to be 'the wisest of men,' the philosopher modestly replied—'If I merit that position, it must be because I know that I know nothing.'"

The sermon of the Rabbi Gotthail also deserves attention. In it, the Rabbi deplors the hatred that has been ever exhibited by Christians against Jews. When the pugnacious character of the Jewish Jehovah is considered, I think it not wonderful that such is the case. The Jews are commanded by their God to hate the Moabites and Ammonites forever, and it is only natural for the Moabites and Ammonites to return the

compliment. The Jewish rabbis, however, are in money matters ahead of their so called Christian (but really mammon worshipping) bretheren. To a man, I believe, they refuse to sanction interest for money, between brethren. Would to heaven that Catholic priests, whose church also approves that doctrine, were bold enough and wise enough to publicly assert the same. It would be the best card Pio Nono could play against the Emperor of Germany. Alas for the melancholy humbug of the age called "C'ristianty" which, in practice, is generally diametrically opposite to the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth. Alas for creeds, far harder upon the poor than the laws of Draco or Moses; for indeed it is my firm opinion that under the former, in England and Massachusetts, far more children are sacrificed in one year to mammon than ever were slain in Philistia in a century to Moloch.

Yours respectfully,

R. W. HUME.

LONG ISLAND CITY, N. Y., Apr. 8, '77.

Questionings.

Is it possible for the human race to be healthy as long as the majority of women are confined in houses the greater part of the time, derived of the pure air and sunshine? Is it possible for woman to be man's equal, intellectually, until the system of isolated housekeeping is abolished? Will woman ever cease to dress in the abominable fashions that ruin body and soul, until they can dress comfortably and healthfully, and feel that their husbands, brothers and friends gave them the same attentions and treat them with the same regard they do the butterflies of fashion? Will woman learn to be more independent and self reliant so long as men regard women who are willing to help themselves, as unwomanly, as not caring for the thoughtful attentions of those they love? As it is natural, is it the way God intended it should be that woman should at times, when they need the tenderest, most delicate consideration and love, not be able to invite that love without arousing in the object beloved, passions which she did not ask for? Is it normal for a prospective father not to be able to give the mother that beautiful platonic love which her soul so yearns for, and which made her life so sweet during courtship? Is it jealousy if she feels at such times the bitterest anguish if he seek other loves, and that she is not able to hold him by any power but the sensualistic? Will it best help the cause of reform for woman to accept and practice what man believes to be right in regard to sexual relations, or as to be guided by her own interior, intuitive perceptions of right? Is it best for a woman to try to retain the love of a husband at the expense and sacrifice of her own self respect? Do we become more spiritual by giving our time to trying to find out the future destiny of the human? Is it not wiser to let the future take care of itself and attend to the duties of to-day? Are the people who think so much of what is to be, the ones who help the most to make our own world blessed?

D. H. P.

Hold A Light! Man in the Mud.

BY J. H. P. GUILD.

The *Vindicator* in very orthodox effort to show that the New England Labor Reform League is in the mire, has itself fallen in the mire. Whilst deprecating the introduction of religious and social question into the labor movement, it takes hold of them when they are up and gives the flat-footed opinion that spiritualist fanatics, free lovers, communists and lunatics, have rendered the League a reproach to the cause of labor. 'Du tell! The advocates of orthodoxy and legalized prostitution and robbery, are indorsed by the *Vindicator*, which hangs out the sign "Independent in religion and politics," those who do not wish to lend their overpowering holy influence to the

"hoodlums fanatics and lunatics" are pleadingly warned to keep away. Mr. Smart, and Mr. Appleton are commended "as they went," but Mr. Heywood and his friends are represented as sailing under false colors. Now, Mr. Smart, Mr. Appleton, and the *Vindicator* defined their position; why may not those who differ from them? Is it not as much a scandal to declare for lawful marriage freedom, for men, without the love as it is to proclaim the freedom of love unfettered by the bondage of the law. Be it as it may with the *Vindicator* the League courts not popularity, but justice.

Rates of Postage.

Some of our correspondents have asked us to publish the legal rates of postage so that they might avoid mistakes in mailing manuscript and papers. We cheerfully comply. All mailable matter called "domestic," i. e. matter sent from one point to another within the United States, as distinguished from "foreign" mail matter, is divided into three classes, known as first, second, and third-class matter. These classes are subject to different rates of postage.

First class mail matter consists of letters, sealed packages, matter wholly or partly in writing, except book manuscript, local or drop letters, and postal cards. The rate on this class is three cents for each half ounce or fraction thereof.

Second class mail matter embraces all newspapers, magazines, and periodicals, exclusively in print, addressed to regular subscribers and mailed from the office of publication.

The rate for this class is two cents a pound on periodicals issued weekly or oftener; on those issued less frequently, three cents a pound.

Third-class matter embraces all pamphlets, occasional publications, transient newspapers, magazines, handbills, books, maps and many other articles not included in the first or second class. These are classified into two sorts and subject to different rates. The articles specified above, pamphlets, transient newspapers, etc., are subject to a postage of one cent for each ounce or fraction thereof.

Matter of the third class must be done up in wrappers left open at a side or end, so that the contents may be readily examined without destroying the wrapper.

The rates of postage on letters and newspapers to Canada are the same as within the United States. The postage on letters to Great Britain, France and Germany, is now five cents for each half-ounce or fraction thereof. Pre-payment is optional. Newspapers go to these countries at the rate of two cents for each paper, no single paper to weigh over four ounces.—*Am. Socialist*.

A WOMAN crossed Printing-House Square yesterday followed by a crowd of louts, who dogged her footsteps. When she stopped, so did they, and stared into whatever store or office she entered, remaining outside, flattening their noses against the window, and all because of the difference in garb. Her skirts did not trail over the filth of the pavement. She did not draw after her four inches of train, stiff with coagulated muck and unfit for human touch. She was not inclosed in a flexible iron cage half of whose use it is to impede locomotion. She was not weighed down by sundry pounds of useless cloth. She could with ease have jumped a ditch, climbed over a fence, or run from a burning building without stumbling in the useless folds of her dress and making the first fatal obstruction in hall or stairway. She wore a few inches less than the prescribed length of a female skirt, and this is all that is required to make her the head of a procession of hooting stupid wherever she goes, and possibly subject her to arrest.—*The Graphic*.

A religious body having resolved to build a new church, the pastor went about begging very zealously, accepting not only the widow's, but the child's mite. In the school one Sabbath, while instructing the children, he compared himself to a shepherd, and then inquired what the latter did with his flock. One bright-eyed little fellow promptly replied, "He shears 'em!"

