

THE HUMANITARIAN.

VOL. I.

NEW YORK, DECEMBER, 1892.

No. 6.

OFFICE OF PUBLICATION, 20 VESEY STREET.

Published simultaneously in London.

EDITOR:

MRS. VICTORIA WOODHULL MARTIN.

ASSOCIATE EDITOR:

MRS. ZULA MAUD WOODHULL.

All communications should be addressed to
The Editor, HUMANITARIAN,
142 West 70th Street,
New York, U. S. A.
or, 17 Hyde Park Gate,
London, England.

[Entered as Second Class matter at the Post Office in New York.]

According to present arrangements Mrs. Woodhull Martin will lecture in the Carnegie Hall, New York, in January or February, her subject being Humanitarian Government.

MARRIAGE.

I—ETHICAL.

What is marriage? Dictionaries define marriage as the ceremony which pronounces man and woman husband and wife, but a scientific definition would be—Marriage is a union of two of the opposite sex, and a ceremony is a legal or social sanction of such union. It is very important to make this distinction, because many individuals speak of marriage as if the ceremony alone constituted it. The French use the concept marriage freely; first, a psychical signification is given to it—they say two colors do not marry, in other words do not harmonize; second, a physiological signification—they say two ingredients do not marry in a sauce; third, a legal signification—the expression has been used, if the servant does not *suit* we are not married to her. It is very difficult to give the exact human meaning to the concept marriage in a single definition. When a young man goes through a legal ceremony with a woman past seventy it is called a marriage, but is it really marriage?

All the lower animals marry without the formality of a ceremony, hence, a ceremony, no matter how crude, can be called human as something which distinguishes us from the lower animals. Among most savage tribes marriages are solemnized by some kind of ceremony. There is evidence, however, that these ceremonies did not originate from any moral

sense as applied to the relations of the sexes, but from a moral sense derived from the rights of property. Ceremonies were instituted among primitive groups to show that a man owned a particular woman or women—to show that they became his property.

The primitive idea that the ceremony gave the control of a woman to the man may be said to have persisted to this day. Many a man who goes through a legal ceremony with a woman thinks he owns her and that she has become his property, that she ought to have no other will other than his own. It is only too true that a man does not have this feeling if he marries a woman without going through the legal ceremony with her. It is popularly believed that primitive men protected the virtue of their women by physical force, from a moral sense. This is not so, primitive men protected their women, solely and simply, from an instinct of jealousy common to all animal males. Moreover, exogamy did not originate from any moral sense with regard to incest or the disadvantages of consanguinous marriages, but from the jealousy of the males within the tribe.

The attraction between two individuals becomes more and more psychical as humanity develops along the line of evolution, but although marriage among higher animals is determined by psychical attraction, the instinct which impels the sexes to marry is procreation—a tyrannical, biological need which is even stronger than self-preservation. The instinct of procreation is vital, fundamental, organic, animal; the power human beings have to control, modify, or check this instinct is human. Selective choice becomes more conscious as self-control or self-command is developed. Every influence, which strengthens and develops nerve-centres, controlling function, develops consciousness, and as human beings have the higher nerve-centres more developed than other animals, the great function of procreation is more governed by conscious choice in them. Everything which has strengthened the higher controlling centres, which check and modify the passions, has developed the soul. Self-control empowers individuals to consider consequences, hence there is a direct check upon particular actions. It is when self-control is developed that a man or woman

Copyrighted, by VICTORIA WOODHULL MARTIN.

will not yield to passion, when it will bring misery to others or to a beloved one. The soul is developed when a man or woman can subordinate his own desires to a higher good. The difference between slavery and freedom with regard to satisfying our desires and passions is that when passion masters and controls the higher nerve centres, then the being is slave; when the higher nerve-centres master and control passion then the being is free. Human beings are free when they can yield to or control their passions as best befits a man or woman. When they have attained this mastery a conscience is developed.

The judgment of our fellows, law, and religion have all aided in developing the saint. And remember, the devil is never so black as when he is depicted from the standpoint of the saint. What could be more inspiring than the ideal of a Holy Madonna embodying all that is purest and best in Motherhood? The coarser nature of man must needs become ennobled before such an ideal. To the utmost reach of human fancy can we look where purity and goodness are personified, where the instinct of procreation is transfigured in the Mother of a God; but we must not forget the steps by which humanity has climbed, and how few have attained a higher spiritual life. We would forget our animal origin. We do not like to have our attention drawn to the appetites and propensities which betray the gradual evolution, elevation, and refining of our animal passions. Many forget the forces by which controlling centres governing function have been developed, and imagine that all individuals are up to their own high standard, possessing self-command and a conscience.

Recognizing that all persons do not possess self-control with regard to their passions the question to be answered is, whether the legal ceremony and the stigma which has been put upon unions that have not received legal or social sanction, have strengthened self-command with regard to one of the most powerful of the passions. So strong is this passion that even the most unsocial or anti-social of animals will become social under its influence. The natural tendency of a human being is to satisfy his or her own individual desires, but when the higher controlling centres are well developed the desire is restrained by a monitor who says, if you satisfy this desire the consequences will be thus and so. Society decrees that the union of the sexes should be solemnized by some kind of ceremony, and all unions which are not sanctioned by or legalized by church or State are immoral. This stigma, this consequence deters; it regulates, modifies, checks the instinct of procreation by stigmatizing all unions not

sanctioned by law as improper. It may be said that legal marriage checks and restrains this passion in individuals who have not self-control developed to the altruistic standard, and it is therefore beneficial to the community, although too often destructive to the happiness of the individual.

A legal sanction to marriage is the ought expressed by the community. It says if you respect a woman and are honored by her willingness to become your wife, you ought to show your honor and respect for her by acknowledging her before the world, and so ought a woman to show her honor for the man. This moral obligation is not felt to be oppressive, when it is a marriage of the right man and the right woman. A ceremony does not alter the nature of the instinct which prompts the sexes to marry; its object is to regulate this instinct. We do not always do what we ought to do; the stronger our desires, passions, and appetites, the more difficult it is to subordinate them to the general weal. The moral sense in its application to the sexes distinguishes us from the brutes. Individuals who are in social relations with each other exact the observance of certain rules of conduct, or canons of morality from each other. What is immoral conduct? It is nothing more nor less than the failure of the individual to act in accordance with the accepted moral code of the community in which he or she lives, in other words, one course of conduct is moral and another immoral simply because the society in which we live has a particular standard of morality. If a man takes off his clothes and exposes himself in a public thoroughfare, he will be arrested for indecent or immoral conduct. He personally may think that is a proper way to go about in order to insure health or the most sensible way to insure hardiness to the race, but unless he can bring the rest of the community to his way of thinking, he will be accounted bad, and arrested, shunned, ostracized, not invited to his friend's house and the like. He would be an individual, it might be said, who failed to take into consideration the relation in which he stood to the rest of the community. In other parts of the world he may go without clothes unmolested. In one country a man is allowed numerous wives, in another country, a man who goes through the legal ceremony of marriage with two women is arrested for bigamy and sent to prison. He may think it more moral to go through a legal ceremony with two women, if he has a family by them, but the community in which he lives thinks otherwise, and stigmatizes such an act as a crime.

Not only are the canons of morality at variance

in different nations, but they are often at variance in different classes of the same community. Moreover, there is a dense ignorance as to what really is morality. Public opinion decrees that a girl shall be left in ignorance of vital questions; she falls a victim to her ignorance; she is driven to infanticide from the terror of social ostracism; she is then hanged for murder—all justified on the ground of public morals. It is not immoral to leave her in ignorance, it is not immoral to drive the girl to suicide or murder. Morally we say she is bad, but who taught her morality?

Society has found it necessary to safeguard itself by regulating sexual unions, therefore the legal ceremony has become the standard of morality. A woman legally marries a diseased man for his money, knowing full well the nature and incurability of the disease; her husband dies leaving her with three sickly children, but in full possession of the money for which she married; she is received into society as a pattern of virtue, but the community is cursed by the fruits of her marriage. She does not violate the moral standard any more than hundreds and thousands of others who select partners for money considerations sanctified by law, and by the church. She, as well as they, is virtuous!

If the life of a rank weed began and ended with itself, it would not matter so much in a garden, but when it saps the vitality and nourishment from flowers which are being cultivated, when it multiplies and spreads, then its presence assumes vast importance to the cultivator. In like manner the marriage of individuals who are not physiologically mated, or who are manifestly inferior, does not assume vital importance until the results of such marriages threaten the very existence of the social organism itself. We know that children are the result of marriage, but we are only just beginning to know what *kind* of children are the result of *particular* marriages. With this knowledge, the fact is forced upon our attention that the legal ceremony alone cannot fix the moral standard of marriage. The legal ceremony as a standard of morality, or the moral ought with regard to the sexual relation, is a simple problem when viewed from the standpoint of individual benefit, but it becomes a most complex problem when viewed from the standpoint of the greatest benefit to the community. It does not concern the community so much if two individuals are legally married for money, for a home, for position, or sexual gratification, or the marriage of the drunkard with a diseased woman; their life may be a personal hell upon earth, if there is no result from the union. The legal ceremony is not in itself bad

when it binds two people together who are physiologically mated, but it becomes a curse when it binds two individuals together who are not mated, and the fruits of such unions are thrown upon society. But it is said, set up any other standard of morality in marriage, and it will lead to the breaking up of the family. It is said, the family as a unit persists to-day solely by reason of the legal tie, and the obligations which that tie imposes. Dissolve the legal tie, and the family falls to pieces. The legal tie is the safeguard for the children. It asserts who the father is, and who the mother is, and fixes responsibility where it belongs. This is true and perhaps necessary in the free state of the society of to-day having no high ideals, and having no other premium but the legal tie on virtue; but we would still further increase parental responsibility, by not only fixing who the father and mother is, but by fixing the responsibility of their marriages. Children are not alone safeguarded by having a legal claim on a drunken or otherwise diseased father; we must go still further and safeguard them with healthy, well-developed bodies. A higher conception of morality, however, will not lead to the breaking up of the family, but would lead to a happier and more perfected family life. To-day the family is being broken up. Reflect upon the enormous increase in illegitimate births and divorces. Look at the overcrowded foundling asylums where no responsibility of parentage is fixed. What is the most potent factor contributing to this modern growth of the dissolution of the family? It is the isolated family itself. It is because the more exclusive and independent the isolated family is, the more narrowed is selective choice. It restricts selective choice to the few friends or acquaintances of the family, and sometimes the family has no friends in the unbounded individualism of our great cities. The more isolated the family the less scope there is given to selective choice. It is a contradiction to say on the one hand that greater care must be taken in the selection of partners so as to improve the race; and on the other hand, by ignorant social customs, to limit more and more the circle from which to choose. What is to be said of a social custom which decrees that it is immodest for any girl to show any preference until she is sought out? How large is the circle in which the woman can be said to have given expression to her ideal in selective choice? How often does a woman go through a legal ceremony without knowing anything about a man's character, family, history, or habits? Are the marriageable acquaintances of a young man so numerous in a large city that it can be said he is giving expression

to his ideal when he marries? The outcome of this unnatural system is that there is a feeling growing for greater individual liberty, and it is contended that the individual, not the family, is the unit of society.

There are those, however, who maintain that the family and not the individual is the unit of society, and that the utmost limit of individual freedom is reached in the family as an independent unit of the complex social organism. But this unit is being disintegrated to-day and why? Because the isolation of the family as an independent unit is, that the sexes have less and less opportunity to meet their physiological mates and they marry those for whom they are not fitted. Especially in the higher evolution of marriage, as human beings are more highly developed, as the unions become more psychical, it is imperative that the opportunities of the sexes to become more fully acquainted with each other should be extended. We know full well what the environment does for individuals and how many have become interested and involved with beings who were unworthy, simply because they could not get out of this environment and come into contact with more worthy persons. Monogamic marriage is and will be more firmly established when individuals are psychically married. Mutual love strengthens the attachment to home and sanctifies it. But with greater freedom in selective choice we must have higher ideals than money and position to influence selection. In the future the moral ought will embrace duties which form no part of its code to-day. The comprehension of a higher morality will make it so that parents will be miserable when they have not a fine representative of themselves, and they will feel intense satisfaction when a son or daughter has excelled. When a premium is placed on superior qualities and high ideals are encouraged by the praise and approbation of scientifically organized society when we have a real aristocracy of blood, there will be a greater check to license, a more potent factor in developing the higher controlling centres, governing the functions of procreation, than the legal tie itself.

Individuals must be bred with the higher controlling centres well developed. In order to accomplish this they must not be overworked and devitalized for then they lose the power of self-control, and they breed individuals who, in their turn are deficient in self-control. The legal tie must carry with it a clearly defined, moral obligation. The legal tie must be based on a purer morality. We want a clearer conception with regard to marriage and its duties. This, and this only, will give that sacredness to marriage, without which it descends to mere animalism.

PHILOSOPHICAL NOTES AND COMMENTS.

"The difference between a wise man and a fool is that a fool's mistakes never teach him anything."

* * *

What is meant by Ethics?—It is a word from the Greek, and is applied to the science which treats of the nature and grounds of moral obligation.

* * *

"It is much easier to find a score of men wise enough to discover the truth than to find one intrepid enough, in the face of opposition, to stand up for it."

* * *

There is no loss but change, no death but sin,
No parting, save the slow corrupting pain
Of murdered faith that never lives again.

—Miss Muloch.

* * *

What is meant by Philosophy?—Any systematic inquiries into the nature of things, physical or mental. The term is from the Greek *phileo*, I love, and *sophia*, wisdom.

* * *

The good of human life cannot lie in the possession of things which for one man to possess is for the rest to lose, but rather in things which all can possess alike, and where one man's wealth promotes his neighbor's.—*Spinoza*.

* * *

Who were the Gnostics?—They were the early Christian sects, who derived the name from the Greek word *gnosis*, knowledge, as applied to revealed religion. They considered that, from their superior philosophical perceptions, they had come to 'know' the nature of those truths which common Christians could only 'believe.' Hence they elevated Gnosis above Pistis (faith). The religious belief of the Gnostics was tinged with the mysticism of the East and the philosophy of the Greeks.

* * *

Indian mothers are wiser in one respect than we are. They are most careful to inculcate the habit of keeping their children's mouths shut from their infancy. When a baby is laid down to sleep the mother carefully presses its lips together. The habit thus early acquired seldom departs in after life. Many of us who dwell in London would suffer less from fogs were we to be careful in this particular. Many English mothers regard with little concern an early inclination to keep the mouth open on the part of their children. It is a great mistake to allow the defect to pass unnoticed, for, if only a matter of carelessness, it may tend to foster a weakness of throat or lungs, and if from some physical cause it should be seen to at once before it is too late to remedy the evil.—*The Hospital*.

SOME SUGGESTIONS FROM AN EX-HANGMAN.

It is an uncommon thing to find an executioner leave such a gruesome occupation and take to lecturing. Yet, such is the case with James Berry, who was recognized as the public executioner of England and who assisted at 500 executions and with his own hands sent 193 murderers into eternity. At a lecture delivered in Glasgow, Scotland, he ran over in detail many of the scenes in connection with recent executions in various parts of the United Kingdom, scenes in the condemned cells, chats with the felons, bringing out strongly the facts that a man who had once suffered the horrors of penal servitude never failed to express himself as being thankful he was sentenced to be hung rather than to be sent back to the hulks. Few criminals, he says, would prefer a second term of penal servitude if they had the choice of the gallows. This fact, coupled with the experience that capital punishment is no deterrent to crime—there being now more murders in this country (Britain) than ever—has mainly influenced him. He gives as a proof of this statement a published list of persons executed since the year 1806, and when the executions for what are now petty offences are eliminated it is seen that the ratio of capital offences has been largely on the increase. Mr. Berry, however, is not an abolitionist only, he has a substitute for what he would do away with, and if criminals were consulted it is just a question if they would agree with him. He said—"If a man kills his wife, probably in a drunken fit, I would not hang him—I would give him 12 years penal servitude, and every year on the anniversary of the crime, I would tie him up and give him a dozen lashes with the cat, just to keep the memory of his crime green. Nothing appeals to these people like a little bit of the beltinker. In this way the criminal has always something to look forward to."

After expressing his regrets at ever being associated with the gallows he goes on: "Believe me, I never got a good night's sleep all the time—unless, indeed, I had got some of your good Scotch whiskey in me. Nearly all our hangmen have taken to drink. I never could hang anybody myself unless I had about half a gill of brandy in me, and then, why I could have hanged the governor himself." He does not place any confidence in jurymen. Of them he says that "they act very stupidly on most occasions, convicting men and causing them to be put to death when no such thing should be done."

I wonder why we keep on sending our missionaries and our money abroad when a first-rate field lies open at our door for the conversion of jurymen."

The "conversion of jurymen" may be translated the elevation of the people. Humanity is in a deplorable condition. There are a class who are more at home in prison and if their pedigree were traced it would be found that they were born criminals. The murderer and the thief are bred and are allowed in their turn to produce like specimens. While alcoholism is an important factor in the production of crime it is not altogether to blame. In the *Psychologie Naturelle*, Despine gives an instance of the fertility of the criminal. A man, Jean Chrétien, had three sons, by name Jean Joseph, Thomas and Pierre. Jean Joseph had a family of seven and five were thieves, the other two did not come under the law, but one of them in her turn produced a murderer. Thomas had a family of two who were both murderers, and one of them produced a thief. Pierre had only one of a family, who was both a murderer and thief. And people such as those are allowed to perpetuate themselves! Many other examples could be given, and probably one of the most interesting is the poisoner Thomas Cream, alias Neil, who was executed in Newgate on the morning of the 15th November last. Here was a man using his scientific knowledge against the community, and even after suffering incarceration for ten years in Joliet penitentiary—being sentenced for life, but let go owing to his weak state and apparently beyond recuperation—he returns to his ghastly work.

It is time that something was done to stop this progress of the defective classes. Such people are extremely prolific. *This rapid multiplication of the unfit* requires to be checked, and this will never be done until we base our government on Humanitarian principles.

Let us repeat that old story from Sufi: "There was a man who, for seven years, did every act of charity, and at the end of seven years he mounted the steps to the gate of Heaven and knocked. A voice cried, 'Who is there?' 'Thy servant, O Lord,' and the gate was shut. Seven other years he did every other good work, and again mounted the three steps to Heaven and knocked. The voice cried, 'Who is there?' He answered, 'Thy slave, O God,' and the gates were shut. Seven other years he did every good deed and again mounted the steps to Heaven, and the voice said, 'Who is there?' He replied, 'Thyself, O God,' and the gates wide open flew."

SAPPHICS.

THE FRIEND OF HUMANITY AND THE KNIFE-GRINDER.

FRIEND OF HUMANITY.

"Needy Knife-grinder! whither are you going?
Rough is the road, your wheel is out of order—
Bleak blows the blast; your hat has got a hole in't,
So have your breeches!

"Weary Knife-grinder! little think the proud ones,
Who in their coaches roll along the turnpike-
road, what hard work'tis crying all day "Knives and
Scissars to grind O!

"Tell me, Knife-grinder, how you came to grind knives?
Did some rich man tyrannically use you?
Was it the squire? or parson of the parish?
Or the attorney?

"Was it the squire, for killing of his game? or
Covetous parson, for his tithes distraining?
Or roguish lawyer made you lose your little
All in a lawsuit?

"(Have you not read the Rights of Man, by Tom Paine?)
Drops of compassion tremble on my eyelids,
Ready to fall, as soon as you have told your
Pitiful story."

KNIFE-GRINDER.

"Story! God bless you! I have none to tell, sir,
Only last night a-drinking at the Chequers,
This poor old hat and breeches, as you see, were
torn in a scuffle.

"Constables came up for to take me into
Custody; they took me before the justice;
Justice Oldmixon put me in the parish-
Stocks for a vagrant.

"I should be glad to drink your Honor's health in
A pot of beer, if you will give me sixpence;
But for my part I never love to meddle
With politics, Sir."

FRIEND OF HUMANITY.

"I give thee sixpence! I will see thee damned first—
Wretch! whom no sense of wrongs can rouse to ven-
geance—
Sordid, unfeeling, reprobate, degraded,
Spiritless outcast!"

[Kicks the Knife-grinder, overturns his wheel, and exit in a trans-
port of Republican enthusiasm and universal philanthropy.]

It is scarcely necessary to say that the above poem
is one of the best known of its kind extant. It is
often quoted to show the folly of Humanitarianism.
That such people exist is not the result of Human-
itarianism, but the lack of it.

It has been long known that fishes return to about
the same place in the same rivers each year to
spawn, but it is a recent discovery that in going up
they take the left hand side of the stream, while in
coming down they take the opposite side. Fisher-
men may be benefitted by remembering this.

HINDOO SOCIAL SYSTEMS.

In all social systems the most important matters of
legislation are marriage, filiation, paternal author-
ity tutelage, adoption, property, the laws of con-
tract, deposit, loan, sale, partnerships, donations,
and testaments.

We shall see, on examination, that these divisions
have passed, almost unaltered, from Hindoo law into
Roman law and French law, and that the greater
part of their particular dispositions are to-day still
in vigor.

There can be no comment or possible discussion;
where there is a text there is no room for dissent.

The Hindoo laws were codified by Manou, more
than three thousand years before the Christian era,
copied by entire antiquity, and notably by Rome,
which alone has left us a written law—the code of
Justinian, which has been adopted as the base of all
modern legislations.

Let us see and compare:

BETROTHAL—MARRIAGE.

Marriage, by the Hindoo law, is accomplished by
the giving of the woman by the father, and her
acceptance by the husband, with the ceremony of
water and fire.

The same form at Rome—Leg. 66, §i. Digest of
Justinian. *Virgini in hortos deductæ. . . .*
Die nuptiarum priusquam ad eum transiret, et
priusquam aqua et igne acciperetur, id est nuptiæ
celebrarentur. . . . obtulit decem aureos dono.

The union of hands as well as the *confarreatio*
(or eating the bride-cake), of the Roman rite, are
but copies of ordinances of Manou.

In Hindoo marriage two different epochs are to be
considered—the betrothal and the celebration; the
betrothal always takes place some years before the
final ceremony.

The same usages, the same distinct periods, re-
legated to Rome.

The word betrothal (*sponsalia*) Leg. 2, tit. i. l.
xxiii. of the Digest, comes from the word to prom-
ise (*a spondendo*), for it was a custom of the
ancients to stipulate for the promise of a future wife.

"Often" says law 17, under the same head, "suf-
ficient cause may prolong the period of betrothal
not only for one or two, but even for three, four, or
more years."

The consent by contract required by Hindoo law
was also required at Rome—Law 2, clause ii, *spon-*
salia sicut nuptiæ consensu contrahentium fiunt.

With the Hindoos the young wife remains with
her family until the age of puberty; the father then
sends a message to the husband to intimate that his

rights have commenced, and that he may claim his wife.

The same at Rome: *In potestate manente filia, pater sponso nuntium remittere potest.*—(Leg. 10, *de Sponsalibus*.)

Conducting the wife to the house of her husband, was in India, as in Rome, the final ceremony of marriage—and was celebrated with music and feasting.

Marriages, by the law of Manou, are prohibited of every degree in the direct line and, in the collateral, to the seventh degree on the paternal, and fifth degree of the maternal line. Lastly, the father, who in India marries his daughter to any one, after having betrothed her to another, is held infamous.

Listen to the Roman law (Leg. 13. § 1, lib. iii.): *Item si alteri sponsa, alteri nupta sit ex sententia edicti puniatur.*

This is not all. The Hindoo spirit is found to govern Roman law, even in those liaisons which modern legislation, except that of Brazil, has declined to recognize. Concubinage, tolerated and regulated at Rome, is another Indian institution which the Romans adopted in deference to tradition: the strict and pure manners of primitive times would never have inspired the sanction of licentious love.

We do but touch here upon all these points of interest. What important critical studies might not a deeper exploration afford us of those admirable laws of the ancient cradle of humanity?

One word more and we have done with marriage.

Divorce, legally instituted in India, was the same in Rome. Let us hear from the Hindoo legislator the causes for which a woman may separate from her husband:

"The husband may be abandoned by his wife if he is criminal, impotent, degraded, afflicted with leprosy, or because of a prolonged absence in foreign countries."

The Roman law states no other causes: degradation, civil death, impotence, contagious disease, and absence.

In India, as in Rome, the adulterous wife loses her dowry. The husband is not obliged to restore it.

Thus, in this very important part of law, which is the base of societies and of nations, we see India giving lessons by which all people have profited. Let us pursue these comparisons, which, although summary, are neither less sure nor less authentic.

FILIATION, PATERNAL AUTHORITY, TUTELAGE, AND ADOPTION.

The rule, *Pater is est quem justæ nuptiæ demonstrant*, admitted as an axiom in Roman law, and

adopted by our code, thus expressed in Article 312, "The child conceived during marriage has the husband as father," is thus expressed by Manou.

"The child born in a house belongs to the husband of the woman."

The Hindoo law distinguishes children as legitimate and natural, incestuous and adulterous. Natural children have a right, though a small one, in the succession of their parents. The children of incest or adultery can claim nothing but aliment.

It then establishes the procedure for repudiation, in these terms: "If from circumstances it is proven with certainty that the real father is some other than the husband, the child is adulterous, and deprived of all rights in the family." Lastly, a very remarkable disposition is, that it admits the legitimization of a natural child by subsequent marriage of the parents.

We may say, without fear of error, that all the above principles, adopted by the Roman law, still form the substance of the laws of France and of the majority of European nations. What admiration must fill the thinker, the philosopher, the juriconsult, at the sight of legislation so wise, so simple, so practical, that after five thousand years we have adopted it, finding nothing superior to supplant it!

As with filiation, paternal authority presents the same coincidence; what it was in India, such was it in Rome.

The head of the family says Gibelin, held his wife, his children, his slaves in his hand by the right of master, and with the same power; even to-day the son can acquire nothing, possess nothing, that is not his father's.

Whatever his age, says the Hindoo commentator Catyayana, while his father is in life the son is never independent.

As to tutelage, the principles are always the same as admitted and now recognized in the Roman law. It would seem, in truth, that instead of studying India we are in reality upon modern soil.

Hindoo law admits the legal tutelage, first of progenitors, next of paternal and maternal relations, and lastly *dative* guardianship, as well as the intervention of a family council and of public authority for protection of the person and property of a minor.

It may be noted as a special coincidence, that the Hindoo legislator prefers male to female tutelage, as long as male relatives exist. A still more striking accordance is that the mother forfeits the tutelage of her children, if being a widow, she marries again without consent of a family council.

We may conclude our glance at Indian law on

this point with a word on adoption. The Hindoo code permits adoption whether to introduce a child into a childless family, or from motives of good-will towards the adopted himself. As in Roman law, the adoption should be solemnized in the presence of the family, of patriarchs, Brahmins, and heads of caste.

French law, in adopting the usage, has sought to give extraordinary solemnity and authenticity to the act in requiring that its adoption shall only be permitted after consent of a tribunal of first instance and of a superior court.

Once adopted, the child becomes one of the family, with the same rights as children who might afterwards be born. The same dispositions in Roman and French law.

Vrid'd'ha-Gautama, annotated by Nanda-Pandita, says:

"If there exists an adopted son of good disposition, and a legitimate son born afterwards, let them equally share the succession of their father."

At Athens the formula of adoption was:

"I adopt that I may have a son to accomplish on my tomb the sacred ceremonies, to perpetuate my race, and in transmitting my name through an unbroken chain of descendants, confer upon it some degree of immortality."

Is not this Greek formula of adoption, a reproduction of the Hindoo text of Manou?

"I, who am without male descendants, hasten with solicitude to adopt a son for the continuation of my funeral offerings and sacred rites, and for the perpetuation of my name."

Let us remark, in conclusion, that Hindoo law was the first to consider marriage as an indissoluble bond. Even death did not dissolve it, for in the castes that permitted re-marriage of widows, it was only in cases where the defunct having left no children, it became imperative to provide for him a son, who should accomplish on his tomb the ceremonies necessary for his salvation. For, in Hindoo theology, the father can only attain the abodes of the blest through the expiatory ceremonies of his son. The second husband, therefore, was only permitted as a means, the child begotten by him was not his, but belonged to and inherited the property of the defunct.

Besides, what antiquity wholly overlooked, but what we cannot too much admire in India, is its respect for women, almost amounting to a worship.

This extract from Manou (lib. iii. sloca 55, &c., &c.) will not be read without surprise:

"Women should be nurtured with every tenderness and attention by their fathers, their brothers, their

husbands, and their brothers-in-law, if they desire great prosperity.

"Where women live in affliction, the family soon becomes extinct; but when they are loved and respected, and cherished with tenderness, the family grows and prospers under all circumstances.

"When women are honored the divinities are content; but when we honor them not, all acts of piety are sterile.

"The households cursed by the women to whom they have not rendered due homage, find ruin weigh them down and destroy them as if smitten by some secret power.

"In the family where the husband is content with his wife, and the wife with her husband, happiness is assured forever."

This veneration of woman produced in India an epoch of adventurous chivalry, during which we find the heroes of Hindoo poems accomplishing high deeds, which reduce all the exploits of Amadis, Knights of the Round Table, and the Paladins of the Middle Age, to mere child's play.

Grand and peaceful epoch! which India, has, to-day, somewhat forgotten. But whose the fault, if not those brutal and stupid invasions, which for ages dispute her fine and fertile soil?

—*The Bible in India.*

India, according to Vedas, entertained a respect for woman amounting almost to worship.

MAXIMS FROM THE SACRED BOOKS OF INDIA.

"He who despises woman despises his mother."

"Who is cursed by a woman is cursed by God."

"The tears of a woman call down the fire of Heaven on those who make them flow."

"Evil to him who laughs at woman's sufferings: God shall laugh at his prayers."

"It was at the prayer of a woman that the Creator pardoned Man: Cursed be he who forgets it."

"Who shall forget the sufferings of his mother at his birth shall be reborn in the body of an owl during three successive transmigrations."

"There is no crime more odious than to persecute woman."

"When women are honored the Divinities are content; but when they are not honored all undertakings fail."

"The households cursed by women to whom they have not rendered the homage due them find themselves weighed down with ruin, and destroyed as if they had been struck by some secret power."

"The infinite and the boundless can alone comprehend the boundless and the infinite, God only can comprehend God."

"As the body is strengthened by muscles, the soul is fortified by virtue."

"The wrongs we inflict upon others follow us like our shadow."

"It is time to appreciate all things at their true value."

A LETTER ON ARISTOCRACY.

To the Editor of The Humanitarian :

In your July number, you advocate an aristocracy of blood which would have the effect of simply placing more power in the hands of the few. We know very well what this "aristocracy" is and what it has done for European countries. It is all very well for a man to sit in his drawing-room, with no cares other than where he can obtain the choicest wines and expensive pleasures, while the servile workman must take what is thrown him like a dog. It is easy for a man to have a princely air and to strut about straight and erect as if he owned the earth, when he has nothing else to do or think upon. Your "high-stepper" may be what you call aristocratic and may be highly bred, but that is no criterion of the man, and the vulgar workman, whom he tramples upon, is of more use to the community than such a nonentity. How easy is it for those with enormous fortunes to be further removed from ignorance than those who have to earn their existence by the sweat of their brow, but does that denote manhood or personal worth? Do noble deeds or coats of arms best befit a man? Does the course of conduct bespeak a man, or the lawful heritage of a hundred earls? Is man's nature not their blood, and who is to trace this current of blood? And this is aristocracy—to support by our industry a red-nosed, big-stomached mass of iniquity who looks upon the working-man as dirt. Your aristocracy who talks about wage-earners as human garbage—refuse when poverty overtakes them. What would your aristocracy do without the tradesmen? Your titles, what good are they? Would I be a man or a lord? Which think you, do I feel more honored to be called? Take from your lord his wealth and you have nothing left but a useless being, having neither brains nor muscles. Titles, indeed! What good would they be to the workingman who has no money or position. It is these things that give the *eclat* to it. No, there is nothing greater than the low workman, and to be willing and have the strength to work is a blessing far and away in advance of your lazy, champagne-drinking, titled aristocracy.

PHILIP GOWER.

Our correspondent speaks very plain, but he has overlooked the whole tenor of the article *Aristocracy of Blood*. The class he so forcibly denounces has no bearing in fact on the subject. The word aristocracy has been given a meaning, under press tuition, associating it with all that savors of bondage and high-handed autocracy. Aristocracy really means the best government. Does any one want anything better than that? We might have used the word nobility, and indeed what can be higher than a noble-man? The aristocracy we want would raise

man as man, and this can only be done by a high ideal of manhood. "Is men's nature not their blood?" No, certainly not, but men's blood is their nature. We find Theophrastus (born 372 B. C.), in his treatise on Ethics, discussing whether a man's character can be changed by disease, and whether virtue depends upon bodily health, and to-day we know it is so, but we do not act upon our knowledge. It is the malnutrition of the various tissues of the body that cause deterioration of the individual, acquired and hereditary. The nature is controlled by the blood, not the blood by the nature. Superior breeding and good environment must raise the tone of the people, for ancestry bespeaks the man. The aristocracy you mention is not aristocracy at all. It is plutocracy. Men shout and rant and roar about a "bloated aristocracy"—which is nonsense, for aristocracy cannot be bloated; the moment a blemish is put upon it, it ceases to be aristocracy. We know that aristocracy has been based upon a fallacy, for in England men were originally ennobled for their valor in or value to the community, and upon the assumption that their valor and value would descend upon the first children, as in the law of succession, so was the title handed down. Now we are certain, and statistics prove, that the first-born do not reach to such a high degree in humanity as the later-born, for very often the mother is not sufficiently matured; besides the maternal organs are not so well developed with the first-born. In China if a man attains prominence his parents are praised. Now if by selection the race is placed upon a higher level what else would it be but an aristocracy of blood. "Who is to trace this current of blood?" you say. In our October issue we give an outline of a pedigree register for that purpose. Many have said to us that the keeping of the genealogy would not be of benefit. If it were kept with scientific precision it would be a great boon to humanity. Nature teaches us there can be no equality, for "no two individuals are quite alike: If we sow a number of seeds from the same capsule, under as nearly as possible the same conditions, they germinate at different rates and grow more or less vigorously. They resist cold and other unfavorable conditions differently. They would in all probability, as in animals of the same species, be somewhat differently acted on by the same poison, or by the same disease. They have different powers of transmitting their characters to their offspring."

It is conclusive that our knowledge of the hereditary principles, scientifically considered, must be brought to bear upon the government, and if our law-makers were men so educated, there would be a better class, for they would legislate accordingly. There would not be 'the undesirable' and the 'not wanted' that you speak about. To ennoble ourselves we must have a very high ideal, and it is only to be attained by attention to the laws of hereditary. If the principles were properly carried out every man would be a noble-man if not a prince.

A POET ON POVERTY.

In a letter of date January 17th, 1791, Robert Burns says:

"Take these two guineas and place them over that — account of yours, which has gagged my mouth these five or six months! I can as little write good things as apologize to the man I owe money to. Oh, the supreme curse of making three guineas do the business of five! Not all the labors of Hercules—not all the Hebrew three centuries of Egyptian bondage—were such an insuperable business such an — task! Poverty, thou half-sister of death, thou cousin-germain of hell! where shall I find force of execration equal to the amplitude of thy demerits? Oppressed by thee, the venerable ancient, grown hoary in the practice of every virtue, laden with years and wretchedness, implores a little—a little aid to support his existence from a stony-hearted son of Mammon, whose sun of prosperity never knew a cloud, and is by him betrayed and insulted. Oppressed by thee the man of sentiment, whose heart glows with independence, and melts with sensibility, only pines under the neglect, or writhes in bitterness of soul under the contumely of arrogant, unfeeling wealth. Oppressed by thee the son of genius, whose ill-starred ambition plants him at the tables of the fashionable and polite, must see in suffering silence his remarks neglected, and his person despised, while shallow greatness, in his odious attempts at wit shall meet with countenance and applause. Nor is it only the family of worth that have reason to complain of thee; the children of folly and vice, though in common with thee the offspring of evil, smart equally under thy rod. Owing to thee the man of unfortunate disposition and neglected education is condemned as a fool for his dissipation, despised and shunned as a needy wretch when his follies, as usual, bring him to want, and when his unprincipled necessities drive him to dishonest practices, he is abhorred as a miscreant, and perishes by the justice of his country. But how far otherwise is the lot of the man of family and fortune. *His* early follies and extravagance are spirit and fire; his consequent wants are the embarrassments of an honest fellow; and when to remedy the matter he has gained a legal commission to plunder distant provinces, or massacre peaceful nations, he returns, perhaps laden with the spoils of rapine and murder; lives wicked and respected and dies a— and a lord.

Nay, worst of all, alas, the helpless woman! the needy prostitute who has shivered at the corner of the street, waiting to earn the wages of carnal pros-

titution, is left neglected and insulted, ridden down by the chariot wheels of the coroneted rip, hurrying on to the guilty assignation. She, too, without the same necessities to plead, riots nightly in the same guilty trade.

"Well! divines may say of it what they please, but execration is to the mind what phlebotomy is to the body; the vital sluices of both are wonderfully relieved by their respective evacuations."

WHY MALAYS RUN "AMOK."

Dr. Ellis, Medical Superintendent of the Lunatic Asylum at Singapore, discusses, in his last report, the peculiar form of madness known as "amok." He says that fright, grief, brooding over real or imaginary wrongs, the sight of human blood (especially the person's own), and a peculiar condition of nervous depression, have all been noted as exciting causes. The question is how far a man should be held responsible for the crimes committed when running amok. As in persons suffering from epilepsy strong emotion will bring on a fit, due, according to the most recent theories, to transient nervous discharges emanating from explosions in the motor portions in the cerebral cortex, which cause the intense muscular spasms, so Dr. Ellis believes that in some Malays strong emotions bring on explosions in the sensory portions of their cerebral cortex, the result of which is an unconscious paroxysm of homicidal mania. During this paroxysm the unfortunate individual will rush through the most crowded street or village, stabbing right and left at man, woman, or child, relation, friend, or stranger. After such an outbreak, the duration of which may be from a few hours only to a few days, nothing is remembered that took place during it, the usual explanation on the part of the individual being that the head was giddy, and that everything appeared red or black, or like blood to the eyes. All men examined by Dr Ellis after running amok at periods varying from a day to a few weeks after the incident, had a wild, furtive stare, showing much sclerotic, and when questioned as to the amok their respirations became hurried, and their pulse quickened, as they gave the above explanation, or answered, "I don't know;" "I can't remember." He could discover nothing else abnormal, except in one man who was undoubtedly very insane. Those who run amok from a sudden impulse are, in his opinion, quite unable to refrain from obeying that impulse, and, moreover, are unconscious of what they do whilst obedient to their impulse, and

divided the American people. The chief source of hostility was the belief that a strong central government endangered both the rights of the States and the liberties of the individual citizen. Freedom, it was declared, would perish, freedom rescued from George III., would perish at the hands of her own children. Consolidation (for the word centralization had not yet been invented) would extinguish the State governments and the local institutions they protected. The feeling was very bitter, and in some States, notably in Massachusetts and New York, the majorities were dangerously narrow. Had the decision been left to what is now called "the voice of the people," that is, to the mass of the citizens all over the country, voting at the polls, the voice of the people would probably have pronounced against the Constitution, and this would have been still more likely if the question had been voted on everywhere upon the same day, seeing that several doubtful States were influenced by the approval which other States had already given.*

It is significant that the State of Rhode Island, smallest in size, was the last to give its adherence to the Union from fear that its natural advantages would be lost were it merged in the larger mass and so exposed to the dangers of a centralised government such as that from which it had only just broken free. But, behind the territory of the new republic lay the power of France and Spain, while England was still supreme north of the St. Lawrence. It is true that in early times the colonies had made shadowy pretensions to all the unknown land that lay back of their settlements, a doctrine of "hinterland" that has been laid down more recently in Africa; and this "hinterland" doctrine availed them so far as regards the territory east of the Mississippi, which was subsequently allotted to Tennessee, Ohio, Indiana, Mississippi, Illinois, Alabama, Michigan, and Wisconsin.

The great French territory of Louisiana was not confined to the sub-tropical, alluvial tract of land that still retains the name, but included the whole of the valleys of the Arkansas, Platte and Missouri Rivers, with their affluents, and extended northwards to the present boundaries of the British Dominion of Canada, and westwards over the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific. And behind the French Louisiana lay the region under Spanish influence, so that the emancipated colonists had still to reckon with two great European powers in their rear, while the English still held their own in their Canadian colony. Any one of them might at any time threaten the revolted colonies until their power was

consolidated, any combination of their neighbors must inevitably be most formidable. The maxim that "United we stand, divided we fall" was easily laid to heart, and it may be said that the adhesion of the revolted colonies to a common constitution was ultimately secured less through unanimity among themselves, than through jealous apprehension of their neighbors. The United States at their birth had a foreign policy; it was only as they consolidated their power, and extended it over the land that foreign affairs gradually became practically indifferent to them. The French cession of 1803, put them in possession of an area larger than their own, from which were destined to be created the States and Territories of Louisiana, Missouri, Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Oregon, Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, Dakota, Montana, Washington, Wyoming and Idaho. Florida, after being bandied to and fro as a makeweight in treaties between France and Spain, was purchased in 1819; and lastly, by acquisition or conquest, the Spanish dominions rounded off the Federal domain, and furnished the States and Territories of Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, California, Arizona and Texas.

But the forces that have tended to weld the United States into one homogeneous whole, have, in their very nature, had a precisely opposite result in the case of its citizens. The rate of development of the country would have been seriously retarded had not the gates been thrown widely open to the swarms of immigrants for whom altered conditions made the land of their birth too narrow, and to whom steam transit made emigration possible. The great Irish potato famine of 1846, disclosed the fact that nearly three-eighths of the people were resting in false security on a source of food-supply on whose permanence no trust could be placed; the great Irish exodus of the following year opened the way for a great host of emigrants of both the Teutonic and Latin races. Scandinavians and Germans, Spaniards, French and Italians, whether under the pressure of over-population, of over-taxation, or of desire to avoid military conscription, hastened to avail themselves of the advantages of a land which was free for all, and where, in the well-worn phrase, a career was open to talent.

Nor was it from Europe alone that the flood of emigration descended on the land. During the whole course of history the surplus population of Asia has passed forth westwards over Europe; in the present century steam has stemmed and reversed the tide. China now directs the stream of her emigration across the Pacific, towards the rising sun. It is unnecessary to trace the steps by which the

*The American Commonwealth, by J. Bryce, Vol. I., p. 23.

citizens of the United States have gradually arrived at the conclusion that they may, after all, have been too liberal in opening their ports to all comers; it is enough that they have decided and that the line of policy which may be dictated by this ever-strengthening conviction, may give rise to very far-reaching social and economic developments.

The results of the policy that has been pursued in the past are in themselves sufficiently startling. Of the total of nearly seventeen millions of adult males in the United States, not quite four million three hundred and fifty thousand, or over one-quarter, are of foreign birth. This proportion is naturally not uniform throughout the country, but varies from over fifty per cent. in California, to five per cent. in the Southern Atlantic States. Needless to say, this rapid increase in the proportion of alien-born citizens has engaged considerable attention on the part of those who are watching the development of the country: it has been suggested that the allegiance of these to the country of their adoption can be but partial and half-hearted; that blood is thicker than water, and that in the event of war between the United States and any European power, conflicting claims may not inconceivably arise, to the serious embarrassment and disadvantage of the country. The same argument has been urged in seeking to guide the stream of British emigration towards Canada rather than towards the United States; it has been pointed out that, should strife arise between the two countries, some three millions of British born subjects will find themselves in the position of having renounced allegiance to the land of their birth, and of being under compulsion to bear arms against their own brethren. That this is a danger not altogether imaginary cannot be denied; the lynching at New Orleans of a number of Italian prisoners, deplorable in itself as showing that, on the one hand, the baleful influence of the Sicilian Mafia had taken deep root in the old French city, and that on the other the administration of the law did not in any way command the confidence of its citizens, had this further result that a wave of feeling inimical to the obnoxious immigrant swept through the whole country, which, by a happy accident rather than through any restraining influence, spent its force without ending in serious bloodshed.

But the peculiar conditions of the United States lend to discussions as to her action as a belligerent the unreality of speculation as to the outcome of a contest between the whale and the elephant: the danger to which her internal affairs and economic condition may be modified by the presence of this leavening of alien-born citizens is a matter of more

real importance, and one more worthy of serious consideration.

It is possible that the proportion of alien-born citizens in the country may be approaching, or may even already have reached, the maximum. The rate of increase of the whole population during the past decade has not come up to the expectations of those who measure thereby the progress of the country; it is no secret that the census returns of 1890 were disappointing. Some ten years ago it was estimated on good authority to be by no means unlikely that the United States would show, in 1900, a population of one hundred millions; it is now clear that this anticipation cannot be fulfilled. Nature herself has opposed no obstacle to an increase such as this; it has been calculated that, given a slightly longer lapse of time, the State of Texas alone may prove herself capable of sustaining a population exceeding of a hundred and twenty millions of souls. The full occupation of the land may more probably be delayed by impediments more or less consciously placed in the path by those already in possession of the soil. To the motto "Welcome All" there has gradually succeeded the watch-word "America for the Americans;" the exclusion of the infirm and pauper immigrant has been followed by the inhibition of the capable and skilled workman, under the provisions of the Contract Labor law, from trespassing on the domain of native American industry. It would be entering on too thorny a path to attempt to discuss whether, and if so how far, the system of a protective tariff may operate in the same direction; it is sufficient to note that the holders of extreme views have openly announced the satisfaction with which they would regard the extinction of foreign commerce, the inclusion of the whole republic in a ring-fence, sufficient in all things unto itself, and independent of the foreigner. This aspiration may not prove easy of attainment, but in the meantime the forces above referred to that are working in the same direction have their effect in retarding the tide of immigration. And all the while the native-born population is increasing, and the alien already within the gates is being absorbed into the native population, and becoming identified with it in language, customs and sympathies. The rapidity with which this process of assimilation takes place in the United States has long been a matter of observation; in another generation the twenty-five per cent. of her adult male population who are now recorded as of alien birth will have been succeeded by children claiming to be citizens by birth; and if the number of immigrants does not keep pace with the growth of the home-

born citizens; if by artificial restraint it remains at its present level, still more if it diminishes in volume, the proportion of aliens to the whole mass of inhabitants will gradually decline.

But the citizens thus gained to the State will owe their allegiance rather to a Federal Union than to a Confederation of States. England, France, Spain, and more recently Italy and Germany, have, in the course of their history, gone through the same phase of development; the kingdoms of the Heptarchy, Burgundy and Guienne, Castile and Aragon, Tuscany and Venice and Naples, are merged in a wider nationality. It would be easy to show that in the case of the United States there are points of dissimilarity with any of the above parallels, but the general tendency seems likely to be the same, and the immigrant from the British or the German Empire, or from the French Republic, will not easily learn to attach supreme importance to questions of State rights that appear momentous to the descendants of Jefferson, Madison, or Alexander Hamilton. He will become a citizen of the United States, rather than the State of New York or of Illinois.

Should this anticipation be realized, the citizens of the Republic will tend towards regaining the homogeneous character that was theirs at the time of the foundation of the Union, but which they have at present to a considerable extent lost. But in the meantime the personal and social characteristics that have marked the several States will have been softened or in some measure effaced, in proportion as the full occupation of the land shall have taken place by citizens owing no preferential allegiance to one State rather than to another, while rapid transit has day by day facilitated emigration from State to State and created common interests.

It is not to be supposed that the tendency to Federalism which seems likely to be the outcome of the forces now in operation, will by any means over-ride or abrogate the doctrine of State rights. The State as a distinct entity is of the very essence of the Constitution as drafted a century ago; the Union is a federation of States, which have so far forfeited their independence that, as has been proved by the arbitrament of the sword, they cannot retire from it, and which have delegated central authority, certain clearly defined functions. Apart from these limitations, the so-called sovereignty of the State is no less clearly defined, and jealously watched; it is not to be supposed that privileges anti-dating the Constitution of 1789 will be lightly surrendered or carelessly thrown away. But, from the beginning it has been recognized that the Constitution is capable of amendment, and it

has been modified by amendments accordingly. The want of uniformity in the laws affecting trade, bankruptcy, marriage and divorce, and in the regulations respecting the collection of vital statistics, is felt to be a blot.

The recent intervention of the Supreme Court in the regulation of the railway tariff in Texas may be noted as an instance in home affairs of the conflict that may arise between the state and the federal jurisdiction; another may be cited in which the same divided authority was prejudicial to the dignity of the Union in its foreign relations. It was felt to be a singular anomaly that in the New Orleans lynching case the remonstrances of the Italian Government were referred from Washington to the State authorities of Louisiana.

It seems reasonable to assume that on any modifications that may take place in the future, the needs of the time and the inclinations of the citizens will tend to shape a policy in which the Federalizing forces of centralization will prevail over the home-rule traditions of State rights.

ENNObLED CEREALS.

Many of our cereals have reached a high degree of perfection by cultivation and careful selection. As the work involved in raising inferior qualities is much the same in raising the superior, the farmer, if he looks to his interest will put aside the cheaper sorts and go in for the more carefully selected. It is beyond doubt with cereals that one head contains better grains than any other, and some heads are better than other heads from the same grain. The selection of the finest, healthiest and strongest ears for sowing gives a larger and more prolific crop, and besides such seeds tiller out more, and they are of better quality.

As a result of perseverance and intelligent handling, we may instance the productions of Mr. Mold of Ashford, Kent, England.

The want of space forbids us going more into detail on "Mold's ennobled," but we may mention that the "ennobled oats" had the "Red Ink" report at the Royal Agricultural trial, and since then Mr. Mold has outclassed all competitors. Mr. Mold remarks: "There is a danger of breeding in and in, which I guard against; for I boast I grow the best wheat only. My ennobled wheat is the result of a life, and now I have got a fixity of type. It requires to be sown earlier and thinner, or it will degenerate."

Mrs. Victoria Woodhull's Work.

NEW YORK TIMES, July, 1875. New York City.

"Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton says:—'Victoria Woodhull's acquaintance would be refining to any man. In her character and person there is never anything but refinement in word or movement. She has a beautiful face—the ideal of spirituality. Victoria Woodhull has done a work for Women that none of us could have done. She has faced and dared men to call her the names that make women shudder. She has risked and realized the sort of ignominy that would have paralyzed any of us who have longer been called strong-minded. Leaping into the brambles that were too high for us to see over them, she broke a path into their close and thorny interstices, with a steadfast faith that glorious principle would triumph at last over conspicuous ignominy, although her life might be sacrificed; and when, with a meteor's dash, she sank into a dismal swamp, we could not lift her out of the mire or buoy her through the deadly waters. She will be as famous as she has been infamous, made so by benighted cowardly men and women. In the annals of emancipation the name of Victoria Woodhull will have its own place as a deliverer.'"

COURIER, Dec. 4th, 1875. Syracuse (N. Y.)

"She called attention to a statement in one of Herbert Spencer's articles in a magazine, which she said was beyond anything she had ever said. It was this: 'It is a lamentable truth that the troubles which respectable hard-working married women undergo are more trying to the health and detrimental to the looks than any of the harlot's career.' What a commentary is this on the so-called sacred institution of marriage from the pen of the acknowledged leader of the scientific and philosophic world. 'But, yet, I am denounced,' she said, 'because I am doing everything in my power to bring about a better state of things for this class of women.'"

"But she is willing to wait for her justification. In deed, she said it had already begun to come. Where three years ago there was never a word upon these subjects printed in the papers, scarcely an important paper or magazine can now be found in which it is not discussed in some form. Moreover, some of the oldest and the most popular papers and magazines are now advocating substantially the same thing she advocates, the only difference being that they have not the moral courage yet to show how the desired results are to be obtained while this is a task from which she never shrinks."

UNION, September 30th, 1875. Kenosha, (Wis.)

"She would have society mend many of its ways, eliminate the ignorance existing with regard to things of vital concern, and cure itself of the squeamishness which is but a covering of many phases of sin. The justness of her standard of masculine purity is as exacting as any standard of feminine purity now existing, and was apparent to all. The rearing of children, she thought, should be undertaken with a better sense of the responsibility and duties to be incurred. The ignorance of physiological laws, which is the cause of the world's miseries in the

shape of idiotic and deformed progeny, the failure to discontinue procreation when organisms are unconditioned for bringing forth healthy children—these were the themes of the speaker's strongest condemnation."

EXPRESS, December 6th, 1875. Buffalo, (N. Y.)

"There is a thing that Mrs. Woodhull talks about that we wish every man, woman, and child could have talked to them—that is the criminal neglect to educate the young properly in the physiological facts that all must certainly learn some time, if not properly and purely, then improperly and vulgarly. Mrs. Woodhull's appeal to mothers to let the first light her boy or girl gets on this awful mystery of reproduction come from the sacred lamp of a mothers' experience, a natural, a pure, a sacred education, instead of being made unnecessarily and stupidly a shame, to be learned secretly in the streets from those who lead by impure suggestions of knowledge to impure use of it—if all mothers could read, ponder, and act on Mrs. Woodhull's talks it would be well."

PIONEER, February 13th, 1874. St. Paul (Minn.)

"The day must come when the study of the laws and the relations of the sexes will be made a pure and holy thing if we would have better men and women."

"If a woman respects herself others will respect her. If any man speaks disrespectfully of any woman it only shows the conditions of his home and surroundings. These questions cannot be dealt with without saying hard things. I complain that mothers do not explain to their children these matters. If they would have their children act right and be right, mothers should explain to them all about their bodies, and not allow them to be abused by secluded indulgence."

TIMES, October 17th, 1875. (Chicago Ill.)

"Promiscuity in sexuality is simply the anarchical stage of development wherein the passions rule supreme. When spirituality comes in and rescues the real man and woman from the domain of the purely material, promiscuity is simply impossible. As promiscuity is the analogue to anarchy, so is spirituality to scientific selection and adjustment. I am fully persuaded that the very highest unions are those that are monogamic, and that these are perfect in proportion as they are lasting. Sexual freedom means the abolition of prostitution, both in and out of marriage; means the emancipation of woman and her coming into ownership and control of her body; means the end of her pecuniary dependence upon man, so that she may never, even seemingly, have to procure whatever she may desire or need by sexual favor; means the abrogation of forced pregnancy, of ante-natal murder of undesired children; means the birth of loved and wished-for children, endowed by every inherited virtue that the highest exaltation can confer at conception, by every influence for good to be obtained during gestation, and by the wisest guidance and instruction on to manhood industrially and intellectually."

COMMONWEALTH, Feb. 2d, 1875. (Topeka Kan.)

"Her remedy for crime and her method of abolishing it may be comprehended in the word 'Stirpiculture,' the improvement of the human race by the application of the 'doctrine or natural selection' to the human family. She repudiated the notion that free-love, as she advocated it, meant promiscuity, and maintained that the inevitable result would be to prevent promiscuity, which was the curse of society now."