

THE
S O C I A L
R E V O L U T I O N I S T ;

A M E D I U M

FOR THE FREE DISCUSSION OF GENERAL PRINCIPLES
AND PRACTICAL MEASURES,

P E R T A I N I N G T O

H U M A N P R O G R E S S

A N D G E N E R A L W E L L - B E I N G .

THE CAUSE OF TRUTH IS BEST PROMOTED BY FREE INQUIRY. ERROR
ALONE FEARS INVESTIGATION.

JOHN PATTERSON, RESIDENT EDITOR; WILLIAM DENTON, CORRESPOND-
ING EDITOR.

CONTRIBUTORS.—Amos Gilbert, Alfred Cridge, Mrs. Anne D. Cridge, Wm. McDiarmid, T. P. Wright,
L. A. Hine, J. H. Cook, J. W. Towner, J. P. Lasley, E. C. Cochran, Francis Barry, H. Tuttle, J. M.
Stahl, L. H. Bigarel, R. H. Howard, J. B. Wolff, J. P. Davis, W. S. Courtney, E. L. Crane, J. Treat.

C O N T E N T S .

Bible Prophecies, - - - - -	99—102
Jottings, - - - - -	102—104
Love;—Material Union, - - - - -	105—110
To Free Lovers, - - - - -	110—116
Review of L. A. Hine, - - - - -	116—118
To L. A. Hine, - - - - -	118—119
As Broad as it is Long, - - - - -	119—121
My Soul's Thralldom;—Chap. 6, - - - - -	121—126
Letter from Wm. Denton, - - - - -	126—127

PUBLISHED BY THE RISING STAR ASSOCIATION.

L. H. BIGAREL, PRINTER.

FOR SALE BY F. BLY, VINE STREET, CINCINNATI; BELA MARSH, 15 FRANKLIN
STREET, BOSTON; C. BLANCHARD, 76 NASSAU ST., NEW YORK.

TERMS, ONE DOLLAR A YEAR; FIVE COPIES, FOUR DOLLARS.

Our Post Office Address:—GREENVILLE, DARKE Co., OHIO.

CONVENTION OF SOCIALISTS.

TO ALL WHO WISH TO ESTABLISH AN ASSOCIATION.

We invite you to meet us in convention, at Berlin Heights Erie Co., O., on Monday, the 27th day of October next, to take immediate measures for selecting and procuring a Site, with the view of organizing an Association next Spring. We wish to know how many we are; what assurances of means and cooperation can be relied on; what are our preferences as to locality; and then proceed directly to the arrangements of all needed plans for the consummation of our undertaking. Let all who can, come themselves, and bring reports from all interested ones in their neighborhoods; and let such as can not contribute to the enterprise in either of those ways, write to us, (early, to avoid failure from non-reception—and addressing to Francis Barry, Berlin Heights,) taking care to give all necessary particulars—especially as to PECUNIARY aid which can be rendered. A Basket-Meeting, of the friends of Freedom and General Reform, will be held on Sunday, the day before the convention. Friends are requested to call at the house of C. and F. Barry, one mile and a half from Berlin Station, Cleveland and Toledo Railroad

Now is the time to strike—let each one attracted, take hold!

Joseph Treat, Cordelia Barry, Francis Barry, Mrs. C. H. Bowen, Mrs. R. A. Brogden, James H. Cook, Clarissa W. Cook, Gratia A. Howard, Thos. P. Wright, Joseph Allen, Chauncey Paul, Mrs. E. A. Adams.

The names of several practical Socialists which were solicited for the above call, could not be given, because it proposes immediate action to be matured in convention. They think it would be difficult for persons with property to get ready at such short notice; and that a convention is not the place to mature a work of life like this. It requires more deliberation than can possibly be had under the excitement of a few days in convention, where the most eloquent and influential are not always the most practical. It is thought, too, by some, that co-operators should understand each other better, before going into action; but the Convention will be useful in giving Socialists an opportunity to compare views and become acquainted. It is hoped by all parties that there will be a general turn out at Berlin. For this group I can say that most of us expect to be there. Some from the West will probably call here on their way to Berlin. We invite as many as can to do so. They will get off the cars at Greenville.

An article of considerable length from the pen of Joseph Treat was sent along with the above call, to be printed with it, and prepare the way for the Convention, but the matter was already made out for this number, and the article could not go in. It will appear in Nov. No.

Nov. No. will be a little late on account of having to get out a reprint of the Jan. No.

REGISTRATION.—We must agitate this matter in next No., and show its advantages to all concerned. We appeal to subscribers, agents, lecturers and all who are friendly to Free Inquiry, to assist in finding out who our brethren are. See Proposition in Extra, appended to No. 4, vol. 1.

FREE LOVE.—The reasoning in the last two paragraphs of friend HINE's strictures, (in this No.,) on my views of Free Love, is based on the assumption that the Race advances with an EVEN FRONT, and, therefore, what suits one individual, suits all. This assumption is false, as friend HINE very well knows. Portions of the human Race will enjoy fraternity and free love, ages before the great masses will. It is friend HINE that fails in his fealty to integral reform, when he attempts to impede the advance of a wing of it, by his forays against freedom for the affections. He may yet learn that his Woman's Rights, Land Reform and Harmonic Education in society based upon the family, will not amount to much more than grafting the peach on a thistle, or the rose on a toad-stool. We agitate free love as a means of social regeneration; and it will effect this work with a power that will make Fogies' heads swim. The preparatory work must be and will be done—God speed the doers! but let them be "man enough" not to assail the PIONEERS of progressive thought.

I propose an article, or a series of articles on "The Entire Front of Reform," in which it may appear to some minds, what relation the reform of Affectional Freedom sustains to other reforms, and the bearing certain special reforms have on Human Advancement.

THE
SOCIAL REVOLUTIONIST.

OCTOBER, 1856.

BIBLE PROPHECIES.

BY W. D.

PROPHECIES RESPECTING NINEVEH.—Destruction is the fate of all cities; as “leaves have their time to fall,” and trees to wither, and cloud-capped mountains to dissolve, so all cities have a similar fate. They take root, flourish, and spread on every side, then stop, struggle awhile for existence and die, to be succeeded by others that shall share a like destiny.

It is just as easy to prophecy the fate of a city as the fate of a leaf or tree. Give me sufficient time for the fulfillment of my prophecy, and I will tell you the fate of every city on the face of the globe. To merely prophecy that a city will be destroyed; that it will be burned with fire, or if below the level of the river, that it will be flooded, or that it will be inhabited by wild beasts, is to say no more than what time has been teaching men for the past hundred thousand years, and will continue to teach them for ages to come. Such was the fate of early Egyptian cities, whose bones strew the valley of the Nile from one end to the other; such the fate of cities whose names we never heard that flourished in the valley of the Euphrates, long before Babylon and Nineveh were known; such the fate of the buried cities of Yucatan. Where the millions trod, the forest spreads his green arms, and in the tangled wilderness the monkey chatters over the palace of the crowned king!

The bible prophecies include the destruction of several cities, most of them are gone the way of cities, though not always at the time, nor in the manner indicated by the prophet. Foremost among these stands Nineveh, the capitol of the Assyrian empire,—once a city sixty miles in circumference, and which contained 600,000 inhabitants.—Against this city, which appears to have provoked the God of Israel by its wickedness, the prophet Jonah was sent; he cried through its streets: “Yet forty days and Nineveh shall be overthrown.” This prophecy was never fulfilled; the people repented, then God repented, and the city was spared. God of course knew that the people would repent, and that the city would not be destroyed, and, therefore, he sent Jonah to the Ninevites to tell them what he knew to be false. If all the prophecies were made on a similar principle, then their non-fulfillment may be readily accounted for—God having changed his mind!

Nahum, whose whole book relates to Nineveh, seems to give us an idea of the mental process by which he foretold the fate of that city. Apostrophizing the city, he says:—

"Art thou better than populous No, that was situate among the rivers, that had the waters round about it, whose rampart was the sea? Ethiopia and Egypt were her strength, and it was infinite. Yet was she carried away, she went into captivity; her young children also were dashed in pieces at the top of all the streets: and they cast lots for all her honorable men, and all her great men were bound in chains." After thus looking at No and many other cities, Nahum might very easily perceive that all cities must sooner or later come to the ground.

Nahum declares that God will make an utter end of the place: "Affliction shall not rise up the second time."—Nahum i: 9. If this means anything, it must mean that when the city should be destroyed it should not be rebuilt—it should never rise again. But what are the facts? The city was first taken by the Medes and Babylonians when Sardanapalus was king, and having risen to its former glory, it was again taken and destroyed 130 years afterward by Cyaxares and Nebuchadnezzar. In the 7th verse of the 2d chap., we read: "And Huzzab shall be led away captive; she shall be brought up, and her maids shall lead her." If this does not refer to the queen of Assyria, what does it refer to?—And yet Diadorus Siculus informs us that Sardanapalus finding that the city would fall into the hands of the enemy, set fire to his palace, and was destroyed with all his family.

If Nineveh was once as large as it has been represented to be, it occupied the ground on which now stands the city of Mosul, a place containing 50,000 inhabitants, and only a mile from where Layard has been at work exhuming the monuments of this city of the olden time. The prophecies respecting Nineveh are given in very general terms, and might be applied to the destruction of any ancient city, with but slight exception, as well as to Nineveh. Where the prophet descends to minute particulars, he fails, and thus proves that his prophecies are no prophecies at all.

PROPHECIES RESPECTING BABYLON.—On the destruction of Nineveh, Babylon increased rapidly in population and wealth, until she became the queen of the East, and one of the wonders of the world. It is said to have been built in the form of a square, each side fifteen miles in length, and was adorned with splendid palaces and wonderful gardens. To this place the Jews were brought captives and kept for several years, and the prophets consequently fulminated their anathemas against it.

Isaiah speaks in general terms of its overthrow, and then says in definite language: "I will also make it a possession for the bittern and pools of water."—Is. xiv: 23. But as Babylon was situated "in a low, watery plain," there was nothing wonderful in this; had it been prophesied of a city that was built upon a mountain; that it should become pools of water, then its fulfillment would have astonished us. The Babylonians had to dig large canals above the city to prevent its being flooded, and of course when the city was destroyed, the canals became choked, the river overflowed, pools were formed, and bitterns would naturally make a possession of them.

In Isaiah xiii: 19-22 we read: "And Babylon shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah. It shall never be inhabited, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation; neither shall the Arabian pitch tent there; neither shall the shepherds make their fold there. But wild beasts of the desert shall lie there; and their houses shall be full of doleful creatures; and owls shall dwell there, and satyrs shall dance there. And the wild beasts of the islands shall cry in their desolate houses, and dragons in their pleasant palaces, and her time is near to come, and her days shall not be prolonged."—At this present time, according to Layard and others, there is a town (Hillah) in the very center of ancient Babylon, which contains 9,000 inhabitants. So much for the prophecy which says it shall never be inhabited. Layard in his second vol. on Nineveh and Bab-

ylon, says: "Shortly after my arrival at Hillah, I visited the Birs Nimroud," (one of the largest mounds in Babylon,) "my companions did a little business on their own account on the way. Spying a party of ARABS retreating from the marshes with their TENTS and cattle, they fell upon them and 'under my shadow,' carried off a few cows and SHEEP."— Again he says: "From the summit of the Birs Nimroud I gazed over a vast marsh. * * The green morass was spotted with flocks of the black buffalo. The Arab settlements showed the activity of a hive of bees. Light boats were skimming to and fro over the shallow water, whilst men and women urged onward their FLOCKS and laden cattle."— And yet Isaiah says that the Arabian shall not pitch tent there, nor the shepherds make their folds. Are these passages ever to be quoted again as proof that the bible is God's word?

Satyrs could not dance there, for they are fabulous animals, half man and half goat, which never existed. Dragons could not cry in the palaces, for the same reason; there are no such creatures.

Jeremiah fixes the time when the destruction of Babylon should take place. Jer. xxv: 9. "Behold I will send and take all the families of the North, saith the Lord, and Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, my servant, and will bring them against their land, and against the inhabitants thereof, and against all these nations round about, and will utterly destroy them, and make them an astonishment and an hissing, and perpetual desolations. Moreover, I will take from them the voice of mirth, and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom and the voice of the bride, the sound of the millstones and the light of the candle. And this whole land shall be a desolation, and an astonishment, and these nations shall serve the king of Babylon 70 years. And it shall come to pass when 70 years are accomplished, that I will punish the king of Babylon, and that nation, saith the Lord, for their iniquity, and the land of the Chaldeans, and will make it perpetual desolations." According to this, Nebuchadnezzar was to come against the land of Judah and the surrounding nations, and utterly destroy them, and the people should serve the king of Babylon for 70 years. So utter was this destruction to be, that the voice of mirth, the sound of millstones, and even the light of the candle were to be taken away, and at the end of 70 years, the king of Babylon was to be punished, and the land of the Chaldeans. Let us enquire as to the fulfillment of this definite prophecy. In the 11th year of the reign of Jehoiakim, (seven years after Jeremiah's prophecy,) Nebuchadnezzar came against Jerusalem and bound him in fetters and carried him and a few of the Jews, (less than 20,000,) among whom were Daniel and Ezekiel, to Babylon; but the mass of the people still remained in Judea for eleven years, and were under the government of Zedekiah.— (See 24th chapter, 2 Kings and 36th chapter, 2 Chron.) Therefore this prophecy of Jeremiah which declares that the land should be completely desolate, could not have been fulfilled at that time. In the 11th year of Zedekiah, the king of Babylon came up against Jerusalem again and carried the whole nation away to Babylon, except a few poor Jews, who were "left for vine-dressers and husbandmen." Allowing this to be the time and condition of things prophesied of, though the land was not wholly desolate, how long from this time was it to the destruction of Babylon and the release of the Jews from captivity? All chronologists agree that the Jews were carried to Babylon 588 B. C., and that Babylon was taken by the Medes and Persians 538 B. C. Subtracting this date from the former, we have 50 years instead of 70, as prophesied by Jeremiah.

From the prophecy of Jeremiah we might conclude that Babylon was to be entirely destroyed at the end of the 70 years, but this was by no means the case. When it was taken by the Persians, Herodotus informs us that many inhabitants of the city did not know of its capture until three days after, and Cyrus took the city with comparatively little bloodshed, for there was scarcely any resistance made. Two hundred years after-

ward when Alexander entered it after defeating Darius, it was a mighty city and "well provided with every thing," and it was many hundred years after this before it could be said in any sense to be desolate. Referring to Babylon, Jeremiah says: "And they shall not take of thee a stone for a corner, nor a stone for foundations; but thou shalt be desolate forever, saith the Lord." Yet Layard informs us that the neighboring towns are built almost entirely of the ruins of ancient Babylon. Babylon has been a quarry for centuries, he says, and, therefore, it was useless for him to dig there for monuments of the past, as they had long since been dug out and taken away for building purposes.

It is generally stated by the orthodox that Cyrus was prophesied of by Isaiah 200 years before he was born, and that it was likewise revealed that he should destroy Babylon, God declaring that he would go before him "and make the crooked places straight, break in pieces the gates of brass, and cut in sunder the bars of iron;" but this is not true. A Cyrus was prophesied of, but what Cyrus? Nothing is said of Babylon in reference to him, and if, as history informs us, the gates of Babylon were left open when it was taken by Cyrus, there was no need for any one to break them.

Those very prophecies which are brought forward to prove the divinity of the Scriptures, in the very plainest manner disprove it. Many of them were translated by men who had what they supposed to be the fulfillment of them in their minds, at the time.—This must of necessity have biased them; and yet which of them will bear calm, unprejudiced, rational investigation? Not one. Yet in looking over various orthodox works on prophecy, I am struck with the effrontery with which they appeal to history in proof of their fables, and the reiterated declarations that they make which are positive falsehoods. Who has not read of Babylon being completely desolate; that no shepherd dared to take his flock there on account of wild beasts; nor the Arabian to pitch his tent for "the scorpions, serpents and reptiles so numerous and deadly?" Not a word of which is true, the shepherd feeding his flock, the Arabian pitching his tent, and thousands of people living on the very spot where God is said to have declared, "it shall never be inhabited from generation to generation."

JOTTINGS.

BY L. A. HINE.

Free Love;—Bigotry in Ashland;—State Teachers' Association;—Lectures in Oberlin;—Curb-Stone Lectures.

MR. EDITOR:—

I see you give me credit for making a point against Free Love, and for having right views of the sexual relation, in an isolated state of society:—but you think the present social condition to be false throughout, and Free Love an indispensable element in the Communistic regeneration of the Race. If the abolition of marriage and the "freedom of the affections" are only, to generally obtain on condition of a total abandonment of the existing social order—DISORDER, you would call it—I think there is not much danger of the community being burdened with a VERY great addition to its orphan list, in consequence of a soon-to-be father's attraction to another woman!

Every state of society is perfectly natural. Communism is unnatural now, but may be the true state a long time hence when all the intermediate steps in Social Progress have been taken. Society like man is a growth. Man on earth, grows through one generation;—society's development covers an infinity of generations—that is, an indeterminate number.

Communism, therefore, is a falsehood now;—so also, as you must admit, is Free Love.

Reformers should attend to the first work to be done; but from your "stand point," you seem to overlook all that must go before, and gazing upon Pisga's summit, are attempting to sing the anthem of triumph centuries before the Millennial poet shall be born.

I have just returned from a two month's lecturing tour, and now jot you down some incidents, observations, etc.

My first stopping was at Ashland, where I found several good friends. The memorable incident connected with my course there, was the bigotry and intolerance of the principle clergyman and the superintendent of the Union School. They said I was an infidel—a shocking slander—and should not be heard in behalf of any cause, Popular Education not excepted. Soon as bills were posted, the curators of souls were thrown into consternation and diligently inquired for the audacious wretch who dared to invite me there. I was surprised to find the principal teacher opposing my efforts in behalf of education, for I do twice as much on that behalf for nothing as any one else on a good salary. They could not defeat me, however, for God's Temple is always open, rent free, and there the people will come. I understood that the genus irritable vatum, as Jefferson calls the priesthood, are seeking to establish a religious test in the board of School Examiners of that county, requiring the candidate for Teacher to affirm his belief in the Fall, the Fish story, the Devil, the Atonement, etc., in order to teach in the Public Schools.

From Ashland I went to Mansfield to attend the State Teachers' Association. The attendance was large, and the delegates were distinguished for the liberality and energy with which the Association was organized, the School Journal established, an agent paid a high salary out of their own pockets, the Normal School undertaken at great expense, etc., etc. They have and are still doing a great work for Ohio. Like all other bodies, it needs watching, for it seems the destiny of great bodies instituted for noble purposes, to degenerate. I perceive the increasing influence of the GENUS IRRITABLE VATUM of the Association. I believe every lecture was given by a priest, and that class of bigots are stepping into all its prominent positions. After liberal-minded Teachers had endured the heat and burden of the day and established a powerful organization, the clergy stepped in to sanction, sanctify—and ultimately be the death of it.

After lecturing in Mansfield and several other places, I went to Oberlin. All honor to the good work this college has effected! It struck out for Freedom when Anti-Slavery was most odious, and manfully struggled to a complete triumph. From poverty and contempt it has risen to wealth and respectability—commanding the largest number of students that attend upon any college of America. But Oberlin is now disposed to repose on her laurels. At first it was the champion of Freedom and Toleration. Her existence endangered by the mob, they preached Toleration—the right of all in a free country to speak their opinions; and when excluded from the popular churches, and even from the public school houses, they cried out persecution and, demanded toleration. But now that they have risen above all necessity for the aid of that virtue, they draw the reins upon Free Speech, as closely as any respectable fogies of the land. Last Winter I applied for a place to lecture on educational topics, but was shut out of town by the Faculty that commands every place of meeting in that town of three thousand inhabitants. Their reasons were that they had enough public speaking—had a Literary Association to provide lectures,—in short, they were all speakers and intended to monopolize the traffic. They did not give the real reason, to wit: my religious opinions. Accordingly, I took advantage of warm weather, and lectured four times in God's Temple to large audiences of students and citizens. The Faculty did not make more than twice in their investment against Toleration. My last lecture was on THINKING, and one of the Laws of Thought discussed, was FREEDOM of Thought and

Speech on all subjects, placing every one under a moral obligation to speak freely and fearlessly his opinions. I showed that all Faculties and priests who denounced Freedom of Speech, even on religious subjects and render it disgraceful for one to think aloud, if his doctrines be not popular, commit one of the greatest wrongs by encouraging hypocrisy, which is dishonesty, and by limiting the development of Thought by narrowing the scope of mental action. After describing the creed by which I would be governed in the administration of a college, one of the hearers cried out, "it is so here"—whereupon more than twenty contradicted him, and there was no one else to stand by the Faculty. I said nothing directly against Oberlin College, but of course it was not difficult to make the right application of many things that were said. One of the students had told me that an essay he had prepared for the commencement, had been quashed for obnoxious religious opinions, and he must write again.

The most rigid system of proselyting is here pursued. They make it a point to get all into the church who can be drawn in, dragged in, or kicked in—and if one is too obstinate and will not play the hypocrite, he or she is thenceforward slighted. They are impudent in the extreme in their religious conversations with the unconverted. They do all in their power to humiliate and crush the inexperienced and unsophisticated. Occasionally, however, even the President finds his match. He had taken great interest in the salvation of a lady student, and when he met her for religious conversation, would tenderly call her "my child." But she proved obstinate, and afterward when he met her, would say in his blunt method, "How are you, child of the devil?" whereupon she returned the salutation with "very well, I thank you: how are you, my dear papa?" President Finney is said to have also got his reward for impudence, recently, in Rochester, while there preaching up a revival. Walking out one day, he met by the mill pond, a drayman who was swearing at his horse. The reverend gentleman accosted him with "where are you going?" "O, up here, a couple of squares with this load, if I can get this d——d horse to mind me." "You are mistaken," rejoined Finney; "you are going to hell." Hereupon the drayman asked where HE was going. "To my lodging," was the reply. "No you are not," responded the knight of the dray; "you are going into this mill pond," and suiting the action to the word, he gave his reverence a regular Baptist immersion?

Two sermons on Sunday and one every Thursday afternoon, all the students are bound to attend. President Finney preached the Thursday I was there. While the choir were singing the last piece before preaching, Finney rose, opened the bible, adjusted his notes, and turning round, stared vacancy in the face—as much as to say, "I am talking with God and he is telling me how to speak to this dying congregation." The singing closed, he turns round, preaches an analytical discourse, makes an application of his subject, works up as much feeling as possible, and requesting brother Morgan to pray, he falls on his knees, takes off his spectacles, digs out his eyes with his handkerchief, and groans! Awful time! To make an impression! Affectation I verily believed. Brother Morgan prayed, but having sat there in the pulpit asleep, he could not rally much energy on so short notice after waking up. Great time! Finney taxing his utmost to terrify and save the unconverted who are exposed to eternal hell, and brother Morgan nodding over such infinitely solemn realities! Who could believe it possible? And that, too, from the professor, I believe, of Biblical Literature!

From Oberlin I went to many other places, but cannot prolong the narration, except that I had a very good time generally—the best though in Oberlin. Shall try and visit it as well as other colleges, every Summer, for some years.

I find out door speaking, especially on Land Reform, just THE method in warm weather. One is certain of an audience, and no anxiety is incurred in reference to a place, notice, slim audience, etc., etc.

Yours truly.

LOVE AND "MATERIAL UNION."

BY J. W. TOWNER.

In the last number of the *Social Revolutionist*, I find an article on the "Law of Love," by George Pyburn, which contains strictures upon some of the positions in my letter to Mrs. Nichols, upon the "Law of Progression in Harmony." The subject matter of these strictures appears to deserve farther notice. First, however, a few words with reference to the spirit with which reformers should treat each other. It seems to be presumed by some, that because reformers are likely to differ from each other, and to criticise each other's arguments and positions, they are going to quarrel with each other and to part company, dissolving all sympathetic relations and withholding all fraternal cooperation.—Friendly criticism and comparison of opinions and views may be indulged in without quarreling in the least. I am quite sure my letter to Mrs. Nichols was not conceived or executed in a quarrelsome spirit. She had written to those who could not receive the "Law," very plainly, yet kindly. Her letter seemed to require an answer. That answer was given without impatience, anger, or other quarrelsome feelings. My protest is here recorded against the application of such terms to represent honest differences, or the discussions growing out of them. As to reformers parting company, they must do so when radical differences come to exist among them. I said I was one of those whom Mrs. N. described as parting company with them. Not that I intended to separate myself entirely from them and their work, or to withdraw from the *Progressive Union*. The parting was in respect to the "Law of Progression in Harmony." They made the reception of this a condition of cooperation in the interior work in which they were engaged. Not being able to receive it, of course I must part from them in that respect. So we shall frequently find occasion to part from each other. New fields of labor and of thought will be opened to us in which all cannot work. But notwithstanding this tendency to difference and divergence, we can, and it is to be hoped we shall still, in many ways, hold up each other's hands, and extend to each other tokens of sympathy and encouragement.

I cannot have that "charity which" literally "thinketh no evil," as long as there is evil to deal with, (define it as we may). This same charity would have us "believe all things, and endure all things." This would destroy us as reformers at once. If we go to Paul for instruction on this point, it might be well to remember that he was in the habit of criticising the views and conduct of those who differed from him in no measured terms.—Plainness of speech in honest and candid criticism is not inconsistent with the sincerest regard for, and sympathy with each other in our appropriate fields of labor.

The subject of sexual laws and relations is one which must be discussed, and discussed fully. None is more important; none has a more potential bearing upon man's welfare. A proper understanding of the law within us respecting the uses and ends, the sphere and limits of sexual intercourse, is of vital moment to every human being. Believing that the result will be good, I say let us have the discussion. Give us light, "more light still." This will save us and the race.

In writing on this subject, I feel as though I had no case to make out one way or the other. I would approach it as a student, or as an impartial judge rather than as an advocate, or as a partisan. I will thank any one to reveal the truth to me, and will try to avoid interpreting revelations of truth by the light of foregone conclusions. Let it be shown that the doctrine—"no material union of the sexes except for offspring"—is a law within us, and it will be received without doubt. We should all be as willing to obey the truth in reform of life as in another, provided the truth points us thereto. To aid in illustrating

truth, let mind come in contact with mind. The solution of the question was referred, in my letter to Mrs Nichols, to physiology as a source more legitimate than Revelation. The "Law of Progression in Harmony" is a revelation from spirits. If such be the law, we ought to have and can have a scientific demonstration of its existence, or, at least, an approximation thereto. I agree that it is also a question of pathology, and as far as our present relations to each other and to society are concerned, of expediency. No one can object to what friend Pyburn says of the question in its pathological bearings. Much more might be said with equal truth. No doubt there are many who are not able or fit to enter into "material union," either for pleasure or for offspring. It must be incumbent upon every one to look well to himself or herself, in this respect, and not drain the already too poorly supplied fountain of vitality. At the same time it should be remembered that there are some diseased states of the sexual functions and of the general system, which are bettered by intercourse with the opposite sex.

As to what is expedient, be the truth where it may, each individual must be the judge in his own case. For one, I would resort to expediency only in consideration of personal consequences. No one would be so unwise as to provoke, knowingly, "more opposition than he can withstand." But it is thought by some that we should be very careful how we use our liberty, lest we retard the progress of the cause. The cause is abundantly able to take care of itself, and will do so. Let us live as fully in the light of our principles as we can, and not trouble ourselves about the opposition which we shall excite against those principles. That measure of personal opposition and persecution which we can brave, let us face. That which we cannot endure, let us refrain from exciting.

As to using expediency so as to be "above suspicion," it appears well nigh impossible. In the eyes of the world, we must appear "licentious," if we use our liberty at all. We must either suppress or compromise our principles, or we shall be suspected; "the lions will open their mouths." I believe that so far as the "Free Lovers" where I live, are concerned, there never has been any departure from the rules of sexual morality sanctioned by the world. And yet rumor has it, that we are sexual communists; that the married exchange partners; and the unmarried do that which is as bad, or worse. In the name of truth, yea, of expediency, how are we to be "above suspicion?"

In reference to the modicum of sexual intercourse mentioned by friend Pyburn in his last paragraph, on the physiological aspects of the matter, which will be demanded in freedom, compared with the amount which is demanded in the repression of civilization, I heartily agree. The greater the freedom of the affections, the wider the range of their activities, the more various the objects to whom they are directed, and upon whom they are lavished, the less the demand, or perhaps it should be said, the less the temptation to indulge in material union, until a certain limit is reached, where it is demanded. "Society as it is" shuts up one man and one woman together; from constant contact, the points of attraction between them are soon absorbed; being then no longer able to gratify each other's higher wants, monotony and poverty of spirit succeed. With a hungering and thirsting after that mysterious something which brought them together; as a consequence, they rush into the physical embrace to allay the excitement of this interior craving, and the marriage bed becomes a bed of lecherous pollution. Freedom will remove the causes which lead to this excess, and thus remove excess itself. Still, as hinted above, I think there is and will be a sphere for the legitimate exercise of the sexual functions in material union, for other uses and ends than the production of offspring. This brings me to the consideration of the main point in the question under examination.

The conclusion of friend Pyburn is, "that the desire for material union unaccompanied by desire for offspring is an incomplete, inharmonious, or unnatural desire." Each of

the premises from which this conclusion is drawn, it appears to me, requires considerable qualification. In our interpretation of the teachings of nature's analogies, we should be careful and not do as theologians often do with parables, endeavor to make it "go on all fours," for by so doing, we are apt to involve ourselves in inconsistency and confusion.

First, it is not strictly true, that "in the harmony of nature, supply and demand are in equilibrio." Sometimes there is great disproportion, the supply being now profuse and superabundant, and then meager and deficient. This is especially the case with respect to generation and reproduction. In the vegetable kingdom, there are multitudes of blossoms or germs demanding impregnation which never receive it. And also multitudes of seminal particles which never perform the office of fecundation. In the human kingdom, we know that several ova are generally formed at a time, while but seldom is more than one impregnated; and thousands, perhaps millions of spermatozoa are wasted to one which fulfills the office of impregnation. Is it logical to infer in view of such facts, that it is wrong to interfere with the relations of supply and demand? Because a thing is capacitated to perform a certain function, it does not necessarily follow, that to arrest it in its way to such performance, is always a reprehensible interference with the "harmony of nature."

Secondly, when we say that impregnation and offspring are the natural sequence of material union, we should bear in mind, that as a general rule, (and it may be believed, that the healthier the person, the more certain is the rule in its application,) such sequence follows only during the period of the maturation and expulsion of the ova, a period extending from three to fourteen days of every month. During the remainder of the time, impregnation is not the natural sequence of such union, but an exceptional result.

Thirdly, it seems to me perfectly legitimate for man in the exercise of his intellectual and spiritual faculties to interfere with the lower harmonies of nature, to take upon himself the regulation of the flow of supply to demand, to divert forces from their natural channels and thereby improve upon nature, thus creating higher harmonies and bringing to pass results more in accordance with the higher plane of being upon which he moves. Those things and actions which would be inharmonious and unnatural, when viewed from one plane of being, become perfectly harmonious and natural when viewed from another. In the ordinary course of nature, plants and trees assume certain forms and manifest certain phenomena which are natural to them, but man by transplanting, propagating, pruning and the multifarious processes of horticulture and pomology, works a complete change in their natures and uses, bringing about marked improvements. Now looking from the plane of the simple being of the plant or tree, this is all unnatural and inharmonious. But looking from the higher plane of intellectual being, it is natural in the highest degree.—Cultivated man interferes with the lower harmonies of nature, in felling trees, quarrying stone and coal, emboweling the earth and appropriating its ores, converting all these into means and appliances of human comfort and welfare, and thus instituting higher harmonies. All that intellect does, is of this character. Herein is the essence of improvement and progress; to take the natural elements and use them to higher and still higher ends, under the guidance of mind, enriched constantly by the facts of experience to divert natural forces, and give a bent to natural tendencies, such as shall work for the higher good of intellectual and spiritual beings. Taking this view of nature and man's relations to, and powers over it, it appears that other reasons than those given by friend Pyburn are necessary, to show that interference to prevent the material union resulting in offspring, is necessarily inharmonious or unnatural, or contrary to a just "sense of fitness, propriety, or purity."

But if his form of argument is sound, it does more than to establish the negative proposition, "no material union except for offspring." If it be true, that in the ordinary course of nature, the spermatie fluids or particles do not come in contact with the female germs, or ova, without impregnation, thereby establishing the fact that the matter is a sequence of the former; it is also true, that, as a general rule, whenever the germ or ovum exists and is prepared for impregnation, or, in other words, whenever the condition for impregnation exists, that result takes place. Plants and trees bear their seeds and fruits every season, reproducing their various kinds as often as nature enables them to do so. So with animals, the female is constantly bearing or rearing her young; as soon as her offspring has outgrown the necessity of deriving its food directly from or through her, she is prepared for and receives impregnation, and so the process continues. This is nature's harmony.—The condition or capacity for impregnation constitutes a demand for the same.

Now, first, "in the harmony of nature, supply and demand are in equilibrium." Therefore the demand for impregnation ought to have its corresponding supply, viz., impregnation.

Second. "By inference, then," the existence of the demand for impregnation without its corresponding supply, is evidence of an inharmonious or unnatural condition.

In the human kingdom, the female is subject to laws similar to those which govern the lower animals. To her as to them, nature says, commence bearing as soon as the power to do so is developed in you, and continue the same as often and as long as that power manifests itself in the production of ova fitted for impregnation. But I cannot say that it is wise for us to draw our analogies quite so closely, for by so doing, we establish also the affirmative proposition, material union for the sake of offspring whenever nature institutes the condition for impregnation, which is to my mind absurd and revolting to the last degree. The harmony of nature would thus require woman to be constantly bearing or nursing children, a burden which in any state or under any conditions, would be too onerous to be borne consistently with our needs and aspirations for intellectual and spiritual progress and development.

Again, I am impressed that the contact of the sexual symbols in material union indulged in, in temperance, has other uses. (Parenthetically, I would observe, that by temperate or occasional indulgence, is meant once a month or thereabouts.) As to healthy persons thus "wasting" vital power, there need be no apprehension, if Hahnemann's assertion respecting "semi-functions" be true. Not only would such indulgence be no waste in reality; it tends, as experience shows, to mutual compensation, where there is harmonious adaptation and mutual attraction. Love certainly has a tendency to ultimate itself in the physical sexual embrace.

This in turn reacts upon and intensifies the sentiment of love. The experience of the gentle and holy influences of mutual love, leading step by step, from the simplest forms of personal contact to the ultimate and complete blending of body and soul in the union of the sexual symbols, testifies to this fact in the plainest terms. How the souls of the twain melt as it were into one, transfusing and blending their elements, man becoming thereby more fully able to enter into a loving appreciation of woman, into sweeter harmony with her gentle lovingness, and woman into the manliness of man! Why not? The simplest contact between a mutually loving pair is satisfying, ennobling and strengthening. The warm pressure of hand, the tender kiss, the loving clasp and caress, how they thrill the whole being, infusing new life through every department of consciousness! How much more the complete material union! "Ah! but," says one, "this is sensual pleasure, and you advocate sensuality."

Sensuality! Indeed! Then is all the pleasure which comes from the contact of the sexes, in kisses, caresses and the like, sensual! This pleasure comes mainly from the union of sexual elements. Then is the pleasure which comes from the gratification of healthy

appetites, or the exercise of healthy muscles, sensual. But these have higher uses than mere physical pleasure. So has material union. Sexual pleasures appear to be among the highest which we are capable of experiencing, and the acts which cause them, highly conducive to our welfare. I would include everything here which pertains to, and flows from the relations of men and women as such. The sexual characteristics are among the highest which pertain to human beings. The distinction of sex is much more marked in the higher than in the lower departments of existence; much greater in the higher than in the lower forms of the same species, the degree of sexuality seeming to be proportionate to the elevation of the individual or class, in the scale of being. In the vegetable kingdom, as a general thing, the sexual characteristics are combined in the same individual, though in some of the higher forms, they are uncombined and exist in different individuals. In the animal kingdom, the higher the grade of being, the more distinct in form and appearance, the male and female. So of man; the lower the type of human existence, the greater the similarity between man and woman; and, on the other hand, the higher the type, the greater the difference; the more marked the distinction and characteristics of sex. Sexuality, then, is no mean, low, or merely animal thing; it is noble and eminently consistent with the intellectuality and spirituality of being. And whatever action of this element contributes to the happiness of such beings, taking into consideration remote as well as immediate results, cannot be inconsistent with propriety or purity. As to what will thus contribute, observation and experience alone can enable us to decide.

The reference to "Onan" for the purpose of making "checks," appear repulsive and perhaps sinful, has not, as I see, any pertinency. What if "the ESSENTIAL of Onanism is procuring the pleasure of the propagative act without the consequences?" (impregnation and offspring.) If, after all, it shall appear that there are other consequences—consequences promotive of human happiness and welfare, where is the justness of stamping that act with the infamy of a vice which all are ready to admit is disgusting and baneful in the extreme?

It is further said, that my argument founded on the law of exercise "if it proves anything, proves too much." From what friend Pyburn has adduced, I cannot see wherein it does so. It certainly proves something. It will hardly be denied that the sexual organs do need exercise, (though not "constant, continual or daily exercise," as Dr. Nichols supposed me to claim). If the "semi-functional activities," of which friend Pyburn speaks, are sufficient to preserve their tone and power for the best performance of their functions, then nothing further is needed in the shape of exercise, but taking into consideration all the facts which pertain to the work of reproduction, considering how much preparation in the way of the harmonization of the whole being of those who combine for that purpose, is necessary, it may well be believed that something MORE is necessary, especially if, as appears to me, such exercise is attended with harmonizing and love-intensifying results.

These thoughts are submitted for consideration. If true, their truth will become more apparent; if false, their falsity will soon be exposed, a result which will be no more satisfactory to others than to myself.

A STIRRING STUMP SPEECH!—The shouts of some of our people, are loud and long, for Free Speech, Free Soil, and Fremont! They say nothing about Free Thought, and Free Love; and some of these fellows who are crying free speech the loudest, would be the last to tolerate free thought. They only want free speech as long as there is little or no free thought; and yet what does the one amount to without the other? And why not vote for free love? Love is the paramount element in human happiness, and why not redeem that from Slavery? Hurrah for Free Thought, Free Speech, Free Soil, Free Labor, and Free Love!—As to the Buchanan boys, all we have to say is, that some of us prefer Social Democracy to your style of political democracy. Hurrah for the Sovereignty of the Individual—the ultimatum of all democracy!

TO FREE LOVERS A LA TREAT AND PYBURN.

THE RIGHTS OF SEXUAL LOVE AND THE CONDITIONS OF FREEDOM.

There is much common to man and the lower animals, for he comprehends all that is below him; and in a general way, he is all that the lower types of sentient being are; but he is also MORE; and in that he is more, we must study man himself for the laws of his being, for then there is no analogy to guide us. Many of the natural laws which pertain to man, are found amongst the inferior orders of creation, but not all.

In man we find a sense of shame or of modesty connected with some of the physiological functions of his nature, of which we can detect little or no trace in the inferior animals. Even the inferior tribes of men show little of the painful consciousness of the material grossness with which the human is allied in its earth sphere. They go naked, and hardly seek privacy for the offensive necessities of nature, or for the act of coition, any more than do the brutes themselves. They show little more of the human than the lower animals, and so they feel only a little more the antagonism which exists between the spiritual and animal. But when we get higher in the scale of humanity, we find spiritual refinement associated with a painful consciousness of the animalism with which it is allied. There is a constant striving of the spiritual to get way from its animal appendages; but failing in this, it covers them up with graceful clothing, and rests content with the hope of a more æsthetic companionship hereafter. This repugnance to our earth nature is no unwarranted caprice of civilized man; it has a sure philosophical basis in the essential qualities and mutual relationships of exalted spirit and the grosser forms of matter.

Those animal functions by which the individual and the race are continued in existence, must be strong enough in the higher types of human kind, to overcome this spiritual antagonism. They must be as much stronger than they are in brutes or the lower types of men, as this spiritual antagonism is stronger; they must be sufficiently strong to ensure the propagation of the species. The doctrine that we should subdue the amative desire, and then beget children from a sense of duty, may be very sentimental and refined, but not very philosophical; and the developing analogies of Nature have been directed by a higher wisdom than this.

The Law: the stimuli of every animal function upon the exercise of which depends the life of the individual and of the race, must be sufficiently powerful to overcome all antagonism, and make the exercise of the function a necessity. This is mathematical as well as physiological. It is the law now for every living race, and always will be, however much an exclusive and short-sighted sentimentalism may rebel against it. It is true, that some by an act of the will, have refused gratification to the appetite for food until they perished; still more have refused gratification to the sexual desire, and permitted their line to become extinct; but these are the exceptions, and caused always by some defect in the constitution of mind, or by some outrage which a more symmetrical organization has suffered. But when there is ordinary symmetry of constitution and a corresponding fitness in the surroundings, reproduction is an absolute mathematico-physiological NECESSITY.

Since man, by virtue of the antagonistic elements of modesty and refinement, must have more amative power than the brutes to ensure the propagation of his kind; and since, when by the general law government of the Universe, he has this much, he has also more, (as there are hundreds of drones to ensure the impregnation of the mother bee, by one of them); then, one of two things is true: either the amative demand beyond the one act essential to reproduction, has some use, or if not, there is excess which it behooves us

to dispose of as wisely as possible. If there be uses in the physical union; one of these may be to intensify the love of the parents and melt their souls more livingly into one, before the propagative act; and after it, to perfect the human of the fœtus in the early stages of its growth. But even if we admit these uses, there may still be this superabundance, especially in the male sex; and if there be, it is surely no cause for wonder. The play of the Universe is not unexceptionable harmony by any means. The chemistry of Nature is absolutely indispensable to her operations, and so are the mechanical forces; but when they sink a city, or overwhelm it with melted lava, there seems to be rather an unfortunate excess of chemistry and mechanics. In consequence of the general law regulations of Nature, there is hardly a functional sphere with which we are acquainted, in which discord does not obtain to a greater or less extent; and man in his rudimental state is certainly no exception. And right here is your great error. With more of the æsthetic than the scientific, consulting too exclusively the requirements of your spiritual nature, you confidently aspire to perfect harmony in the rudimental sphere of our existence, without being able to see that, owing to the contrariety of the animal and spiritual, it is utterly impossible to achieve it. You take no account of this amative excess, as a necessary condition of man's continued existence on this planet; and hence your philosophy of life is grossly defective, and fraught with ruin.

And whilst I enter my protest against this [want of] philosophy, you will permit me to reveal what, as it seems to me, would be the result of this sentimentalism carried into actual life. A dear, sweet girl of this beautiful faith, with a fine, plump person and bewitching eye, tells her friends: "O, I am entirely too young to enter into sexual relations; I believe no woman ought to have more than from two to four children, and then she should be in the prime of life: I am six years too young yet, at least." When she said it, she looked the very picture of love and happiness, and still there was a want; a smile without, but a seriousness within, and a deep sigh was struggling for expression.—She and her lover—you may call him husband, if you choose—have long indulged freely in all the dear caresses of their Platonic love, and still do, but would not for the world, infringe the spiritual law, that "physical union should be had only when the highest wisdom of the harmony demands a child." But their mutual love has been matured; the habitual indulgence of amative caresses has roused up their sexual nature; their love has descended into the body, and they find it becoming less and less exclusively spiritual, and more and more sensuous. Something in their nature has become clamorous for the "physical union," and it **MUST BE** their "highest wisdom" demanding a child! The rights of their sexual love have been too long denied, and though a tithe of the appointed six years has not expired, their damned up and inflamed amativeness finds relief in the procreative act, and the child gets an overcharge of animality.

This is the first false step. Had the law of sexual love, and the physiological condition of the parental function, been observed in a temperate indulgence, before this crisis, the natural vigor of the procreative faculty, without irritability, would have obtained, fitting it for its functional activity at the proper time, according to the real, and not the mock "highest wisdom of the harmony."

But here ends not the mischief of this delusion. The sexual demand in a healthy woman is as great in the early stages of pregnancy as at any other time. To this natural demand, your spiritual faith inexorably refuses any supply. The constant efforts of the prospective mother cannot suppress her longings, and they impress themselves upon the child, as such longings are known to do, and it is born the animalized victim of parental folly, with a strong besetting sin to curse it all through life!

"Extremes develop each other." The severity of Roman virtue in the early days of

the republic, relaxed into luxury and dissipation in the days of the empire; the reign of puritanism in the time of Cromwell, was succeeded by a general laxity of morals in the reign of the "Merry Monarch;" and the mother's attempts at suppression result in the excessive and depraved animality* of her offspring. This is not all theory. The observation of actual results first set the writer to thinking as to what might be the philosophy of their cause; and this occurred previous to the commencement of the current agitation of the subject.

Ladies of the city who breathe no pure air, and waste their vital energies in fashionable and literary dissipation, may become so paralyzed or perverted in their sexual nature, that the material union may be repugnant at any time; but such are not fit to become mothers at all, and we cannot look to them for the rule; but for symmetrical and healthy women in the country, I am well assured that the law of sexual desire is what I have presumed it to be, in accounting for the degenerating tendency of carrying this faith into actual life. If it were possible for the mother to subdue her sexual longings before and after conception to the minimum of the use which this sentimentalism requires—which, however, is not possible in the healthy subject—the child would probably be born without a proper development in the distinctive characteristics of sex. You might not be able to identify the male and the female head by their outward conformation.

Owing to the sexual exhaustion now so general in married life, and to the constant disgust in which so many are conceived, and the mystery of conscious impurity which is thrown around our sexual nature, and infused into the young by parental influence, there is a very general antipathy to the open mention of this subject. When I see extraordinary fastidiousness in relation to this matter, I cannot but think of the parental disgust from which it is directly or indirectly derived. And I cannot but fear that this same sentimentality, and event contemptuous repulsion toward all sexual union but that which discharges a moral obligation in parenting a child, has its origin in the same parental exhaustion and its consequent disgust. The excess of sexual ultimation in the parents, results in a fastidious antipathy of faith in the offspring to all sexual ultimation, but what is barely sufficient to continue the race in existence. And if in turn, this fastidiousness of faith should carry its excess of abstinence into actual life, it would result in excess of animality in the offspring, as already shown; and it is thus that the pendulum of unphilosophy would forever oscillate from one extreme of wrong to another. "Extremes develop each other."

But we are told that the union unaccompanied by a desire for offspring is incomplete, inharmonious and unnatural. This presumes the essential oneness of the amative impulse and the desire for offspring; but this assumption cannot be maintained for a moment. The sexual impulse and the love for the young are very different functions of the human mind. The power of the one is no indication of the power of the other; the one may be active without any activity of the other. A woman with large philoprogenitiveness and small amativeness will greatly wish for a child, but have very little desire for the physical union necessary to this result, and may even be so organized otherwise as to feel a repugnance to it; while in a man with large amativeness and small philoprogenitiveness, the reverse would be true. Children take food without thinking of nutrition; brutes cohabit without intending offspring; but man being a rational creature, he is enabled by observation to connect "material union" with its usual consequences, and this is the source of the association in his mind. They are very far from being parts of the same faculty, and the activity of one does not necessarily imply the activity of the other, any more than the activity of the producing energies implies the activity of the hoarding propensity; though the two may

* I use this term in its Phrenological sense. A heavy base to the brain may obtain along with small bones and flimsy muscles.

be active at the same time; and one may be an incentive to the other.

The principal point in the argument here turns upon the question of superabundance beyond the simplest necessities of reproduction; for if we admit this, your proposition that the desire for physical union is incomplete and unnatural unless accompanied by the desire for offspring, must fall to the ground. But even if this superabundance obtain, still it does not follow that the amative power may not have other very important uses; but I am now discussing the question of excess or superabundance over and above the simplest needs of reproduction, and it is in this sense that I use the term. There are four conditions, which, as I conceive, most conclusively settle this question of superabundance in the affirmative: 1. In the animal races including man, the controlling influence of amativeness seems to be commensurate with the power of those faculties which give æsthetic refinement and spiritual aspiration; weaker in the lower tribes; stronger in the higher. 2. Desire as controlling in the early stages of pregnancy as in any other condition. 3. A plurality of sexual loves at the same time. 4. Desire in sexual conditions when conception cannot take place.

Besides the reasons already given why the sexual power is and even may be commensurate with the spiritual power of any race, I may add that in sexual attraction is the central force of all creative energy. The attraction of opposites generates, whether in the mineral, vegetable, animal or spiritual kingdoms. Hence, in the lower forms of individualized being, we find the male and female characteristics combined in the same individual, as in most plants and some animals; while in the more exalted species—higher in the scale of intelligence and spirituality, the more distinctly individualized are these sexual opposites, and the stronger their mutual attraction. This is the rule; there are of course, exceptions.

With respect to that consideration which presumes the existence of desire during pregnancy in the human kind, I shall add nothing here; I leave the rule with entire confidence to the experience of the symmetrical and healthy subject.

With all existing prejudices, men and women very often do have more than one sexual love at a time; though as they consider this an evidence of depravity, they seldom acknowledge it even to themselves. And if the plurality of loves obtain with all our prejudice to the contrary, how much more readily must it obtain under the conditions of freedom? Our faith moulds our lives to a very great extent; and often we do not do a thing because we think we cannot. I have known a woman to say in all sincerity: "I can have only one integral sexual love at a time;" and yet when she made the discovery that this one loveism makes affectional despotism a necessity; that there could be no satisfying freedom in duality, but only in plurality, she found herself in a few brief months loving more than one, with a cordiality and power she had never known before; and he who had previously been the favored one, now found himself the recipient in her affectional sphere, of a more vitalizing and satisfying love, than when he monopolized it all. Upon the plane of selfish, exclusive love, how little does the human heart realize the extent of its natural capacities!

This plurality of integral sexual loves bears upon the point at issue in this, that all these loves cannot result in fruitfulness, and, consequently, there must be superabundance.

But suppose that to get rid of this conclusion, we deny the plurality of sexual loves; so then you might as well become the attorneys of despotism. If offspring be the proper result of the natural ultimatum of every matured sexual love, then will the dark and gloomy, glowering Dragon of duality forever hold his court in the realms of love, and earth will be forever cursed with aching hearts! And thus, in trying to get clear of this excess beyond the absolute needs of reproduction, you get rid of freedom itself. As soon as you admit the plurality of loves which makes freedom possible, you admit the superabundant amative desire which requires the superabundance of coition. Thus, you

must contend for the exclusive duality of the sexual love which ultimates in a child, and which is incompatible with freedom; or else you must renounce your faith in the "congress only which parents a child." Choose which horn ye will.

If on account of its animal elements, sexual love must be restricted in the consummation of its integral character; if it be essentially selfish and necessarily dual and exclusive in its physical ultimation; then is there irrevocable discord in the realm of love, and you and I, my friends, may as well lay aside the trumpet of freedom, and throw down the weapons of our warfare. It will boot us nothing to war on destiny, and strive against the relentless Fates; and devils will laugh at us.

The brute mother has no desire—no longings but the minimum necessary to the propagation of the species; the human mother has, both before and after pregnancy. Previous thereto, these uneasy and depressing, even painful longings obtain in a condition of the physiological system when there are no ova present to become vitalized. There may not be actual physical desire; but whether there be or not, there are yearnings even at times when pregnancy cannot take place; and while this proves an excess of amative-ness beyond the absolute needs of reproduction, it also indicates the proper time for the ultimation of this excess. We thus find in physiological conditions, a natural relief in union for the superabundance which will not result in offspring. Its ultimation at this time gives pleasure and satisfies; it is the food which the craving demands; and hence, I conclude that its temperate use in love under these physiological conditions, is natural and right. These considerations are significant to my mind, and I see no way to escape the conclusion derived therefrom, but to deny the facts; and this I expect no one to do who is acquainted with womanhood in the wealth of its developed resources.

There is a physiology of love which you have overlooked entirely in what seems to me, your want of philosophy. A matured sexual love is not all sentiment with no rights but such as are exclusively spiritual; it has descended into the body, upon which it has certain well known effects, and in connection with which it has certain inconvertible and incontrovertible rights. The lover grows serious and thoughtful; the nervous and circulatory systems are variously affected; the heart becomes heavy, and finds but a partial relief in sighing; there is a general relaxation of the physical energies; and the intellect cannot readily be concentrated except on what may be in some way connected with the object loved. All this may become intensified into actual sadness, depression and suffering, for which there is but one natural and satisfying relief, and that is the consummation of the love in material union. If this be denied, outraged nature either sinks under the wrong, or avenges itself by indignantly casting from herself the unnatural love, and seeking another by the instincts of her integral needs. This love matured, may result in disappointment and pain as the other did; but grant the ultimation in temperance at the proper time, and the blood again flows freely, the heart grows light, the countenance becomes radiant and cheerful; and man becomes more a man, and woman more a woman, and this is the reward of obedience to the laws of an integral sexual love.

In variety there might be partial relief in diffusion, and these physiological effects less intense in consequence; but still the physical ultimation is the right of every matured sexual love; the love and the right are inseparably connected; and for either to obtain without the other is violation and wrong.

If a woman have more loves than one at a time, as I very well know she may have, a child cannot be the right of each; her instincts do not require such a result for every love; and what is true of her, is true of man. Sexual love, its endearments and physical rights constituting an integral love, is one thing; the desire for children is quite another thing; and the two may or may not be connected. In healthy, symmetrical pa-

rents, the child is never demanded without the love which prepares them for the fruitful embrace; and owing to this superabundance, which I claim to be demonstrated in the experience of every healthy woman, the love may exist and demand its rights without any wish whatever for offspring.

Your faith will not bear the test of logic, and still less will it bear the test of practice. In the freedom you accord, a woman may have a plurality of sexual loves. Your freedom may work finely, and your loving brotherhood endure so long as you adhere strictly to Shaker practice, but the moment you veer from that, beware! So long as all the lovers are denied the rights of love, all are equal in their compulsory unnaturalness, and there may be no revulsion of jealousy and envy. But herein is the element of irremediable rupture in your system, that if the beloved one grant the rights of love to one, she must still deny them to all the rest. Now these, with all their Platonism, will be outraged, and your system of free-lovism and your brotherhood of love will thus develop the elements of discord and ultimate in dissolution.

Your freedom will commit suicide so soon as you give it a chance to ultimate its inherent tendencies. Shaker celibacy is a consistent despotism throughout, and so it is practicable; monogomy and polygamy are consistent despotisms, and they are practicable; but you unite freedom for love with exclusiveness in the fruition of its rights and the consummation of its integral character, and hence any attempt at actualization, must result in inevitable explosion.

The doctrine of the "congress only which parents a child" is not new; it has been observed to some extent, in actual life, under the conditions of exclusive duality, in the isolated household; and these are the only relations in which it can be practiced without still greater revulsion and discord which will end at last in isolation, exclusiveness and despotism. On one hand, we have the plurality of loves and FREEDOM; on the other, exclusively dual love and DESPOTISM; such is the inevitable coupling.

But whatever our faith, let us live it so far as our outward conditions permit. If it be true, our life will have a power which our words cannot have. If you believe that the congress is sacred to conception, so then beware that you desecrate not this "holy of holies." But friend Pyburn, I discover, has adroitly woven a loop-hole into the web of his faith; though I am not willing to think that he has any design at present of slipping out himself. Perhaps he thought it would be useful for others. But when brother Pyburn tells us, it would be better for some with a "large and active amative organization" to step beyond the limitations of the rule in question, he concedes the whole ground. I simply claim that, in the human kind, amateness is too "large and active," to be confined within the limits of your rule, and so there must be additional expression. We may differ as to what the reason of this excess is; but admitting its existence, we two stand upon precisely the same ground. And though many may "accept the law" and live true to it in an untrue life; yet, there will ever be enough to avail themselves of your exception to make it unequivocally the rule. Paul with all the sanctions of revelation, has not been able to induce any considerable class of mankind to mortify the body through the extortionary exactions of the spirit; neither can ye. The whole man will assert its rights in the actualities of life, in spite of the monopolizing tendency of any part. It is folly to impose a rule which only the few can observe.

We shall not cure the evil of excess by running into the evil of suppression. The children of the monotony, staleness and exhaustion of marriage are unfortunate enough; but the children of a starved love such as you contend for, I am apprehensive, would be still worse off. The dual exclusiveness of the present system with its social monotony and sexual starvation and exhaustion, I would supplant by the attractiveness of variety under the conditions of freedom for the plurality of loves. Then would our loveliness be a con-

stant requisite for the enjoyment of love; and these conditions of attractiveness we could not maintain without the observance of strict temperance in all the manifestations of sex. We want freedom for the subversion of wrong and the upbuilding of right. We want freedom that there may be a motive in love itself for the use, and not the abuse of its privileges. It is not exclusiveness and suppression we need, but freedom for variety in temperance, that the heart may be filled.

Many dualists and familists profess free love; but this is absurd and must be profitless. Few, perhaps, of all that profess affectional freedom, understand the essential nature of sexual love, the sphere of its manifestations and the structure of its outer conditions. This is a comprehensive field, and it must be fully explored. I shall be willing to do my part. I have written this letter to counteract what seems to me a wrong tendency—one which is gaining ground and already working mischief; and in doing so, I think I have discharged a duty. This, my dear friends, is my only apology for writing; and with unfeigned love for you and for all that are earnestly seeking the better way,

I subscribe myself your friend and brother,

PETER SOCIALIST.

REVIEW OF L. A. HINE.

BY J. D. GAGE.

The author asserts as the rights of parents: 1. That "the father has the right to his child, and if he claim not this right, his free love is evidently free lust." This proposition that the father has the right to his child is not sufficiently axiomatic for the foundation of an argument. He SHOULD have this right and does have it, when it does not interfere with the mother's stronger right, or the happiness of the child. There are some instances when the father slows that he is moved by anything rather than the spirit of love in asserting this as his right. It may be to display his power, or to persecute the mother, and a neglect to assert it may be from a regard for the mother, or the happiness of the child. 2. "The mother has the right to her child, and if she claim it not above all things else, she is exorcised from motherhood, womanhood, and the holiest relations of life." The right of the mother is superior to that of the father, but not to the happiness of the child. There may be rare exceptional cases, growing out of our present false system, where the happiness of the child would be best secured by separating it from the mother, and here the mother's right should yield. The feeling of pity towards the mother who cannot assert this right above all things else, is more appropriate than that of harshness. The author says that Free Love will meet the wants of those mothers who begin to despise their offspring before they are born, and this I joyfully admit to be true. Free Love will be negative as well as positive. It will give every woman the right to refuse the embrace of every man except when she wishes him to be the father of her child.—Thus she will never need to fear the production of a being, to whose birth she will not look forward with all the fond yearnings of a mother's heart. She will never begin to despise her offspring before they are born, for they will be the products of harmony and love, not discord and hate. She will never be driven to abandon them, or to murder them either before or after birth, as is so often the case under our present cursed system. 3. "The child has a right to both parents, and one of the greatest wrongs is committed if it be robbed of this right." Better say that the child has the right to the love of both parents, for where an unloved child lives with unloving parents, its lot is no better than that of a foundling. The child is robbed of this right when it is supported by discordant parents,

for when the couple hate each other, they will be apt to hold much the same feeling toward their offspring. It is to be hoped that L. A. Hine will not again charge his fellow contributors with upholding such a civilized curse as the abandonment of the child by either parent, till he can quote some passage to that effect. 4. "The mother has a right to the aid of the father, in the support and education of the child. And yet Free Love sends her adrift at the whim, caprice, or beastful propensity of the father." This is one of those rights which our present system entirely fails to protect. Many industrious, intelligent mothers are bound to drunken, profligate husbands, who spend the mother's hard earnings for their own destruction. This right cannot be secured by outward, arbitrary law, but where the child is the offspring of ardent, earnest love; where its birth is anxiously longed for, there need be no fear but it will be lovingly provided for. The aid which a whimsical, capricious man with beastful propensity would render a loving mother, could not be very efficient, and any woman with a mother's feelings to her child, would prefer to be set adrift, rather than have herself and child subject to such a man. 5. "The father has a right to the cooperation of the mother in the nurture and education of his child; and yet Free Love tears her from him and his, if she shall be a flirt, or pretty enough to secure the admiration and flattery of other lovers." This right of the father, like that of the mother, is one which the enactments of all the legislatures aided by the proclamations of all the governors, and supported by the decisions of all the courts, would be utterly unable to defend. All the laws in the world could not make a soft, simple lady of fashion, an efficient aid in the nurture and education of the child. The author assures us that the discord between parents is, in nine cases out of ten, a humbug, and that "it arises from the ignorance and inconstancy with which too many are afflicted." Here is the direct point at issue, whether two persons have the power to love each other all their lives, by the mere exercise of their wills or not, and whether when two persons are uncomfortable in each other's society, they shall have the right to separate, or be compelled to remain bound together, till they can convince everybody of the necessity of separation. Whatever may be the cause of this discord, those who are pained by it will not be humbugged into the belief that it is harmony. "If attraction is to be the watchword, why not let the thief steal and teach him that theft is his duty? or to lie, or fight, or kill?" It is one of the evils of the present system that pairs are often bedded together who are utterly repulsive to each other, that it is impossible for them to produce anything but beings as discordant with themselves as they are with each other; yet this is no reason why these unfortunates shall not be prevented, as far as possible, from injuring others. It can hardly be supposed that friend Hine asked this question for information. It seems to be properly connected with a fling at the converts of Free Love doctrines, a few lines above. The fling referred to will become worthy of notice whenever we are shown how the advocates of any reform can prevent evil disposed persons from professing their doctrines. "When one is right and the other wrong, it is simply a misfortune for which existing public sentiment and law abundantly provide." I know of no such provision, except that divorce may be obtained in case of certain acts on the part of one or the other parties, who are considered as disgraced by their commission. This is an admission of the right of separation at the option of third parties, while we hold it to be a question with which, in a true social system, third parties would have no right to interfere. In the lines which follow, the author commits the evident error of mistaking the freedom of the affections for an integral social system, whereas it is only an important and fundamental principle which helps to compose such a system. His demand that we should complete our system in all its details before announcing the premises, on pain of being considered obnoxious by all consistent philosophers, appears somewhat unreasonable. We consider the present social system as false, and declare perfect freedom of love to be one of the

primary conditions of a true system, and our consistent philosopher tells us to complete our system if it can be completed, or we will be justly held obnoxious. Our friend seems to think that if two persons are living together, one of whom loves, and the other hates, the loving party is happy and the other is miserable. How can any one conceive of a person so constituted as to be made happy by loving their hater, bound to them? Surely if one loved and the other hated, the loving party being desirous of seeing the other happy, would desire a separation above all things, so that this instead of being a question of WHICH shall suffer, is whether both shall suffer or not. "Another advantage of the present system over the one which you propose, is that the children are protected, while under Free Love half the offspring of discordant parents would be worse than orphans." One of the chief beauties of the system which we propose is that there would be no offspring of discordant parents. Such are the legitimate results of making a woman share her bed with a man she does not love. Half such children are worse than orphans now. The protection which they receive is "such as vultures give to lambs." Under the system which we propose, the children would all be born in love and nurtured in love. As the isolate household belongs to the present system and not to ours, the pain which results from occasionally bursting its bonds, must not be charged to ours.

TO L. A. HINE.

BY JOSEPH TREAT.

I expected to read the objections you urge against the Free Love doctrine, (and many more, yet stronger,) but not from your pen. I answered beforehand, all you say; both in my original statement, and also in my "Tempest in a Tea-Pot"—long waiting its turn for insertion in the *Revolutionist*, before your article was ever written.

All your objections are against Freedom—human liberty. Free Love is only a part of Freedom—the greater includes the less.

A principle is to be judged—by its truth—in the light of all other true principles—and by its results when all men embrace it. Will Freedom suffer from these tests? Will it need to be held an outlaw in the Good Time Coming? And haven't we a right to preach it now, then?

You yourself admit Association to be the true constitution of society; but in that constitution, what becomes of all your objections?

You urge: That "the father has the right to his child, and if he claim not this right, his Free Love is evidently Free Lust:" [yes,] that "the mother has the right to her child," etc: [yes,] that "the child has the right to both parents," etc: [yes,] that "the mother has a right to the aid of the father in the support and education of the child:" [yes, and to that of every other man,] and, that "the father has a right to the cooperation of the mother in the nurture and education of his child:" [yes, and to that of every other woman.] Now grant Association, and you have all these—not only those you assert, but also those I interpolate for you; which last, you can never by any possibility have in Marriage. No, and you DON'T have even the others; but in millions of instances this same boasted Marriage strikes them down, as if they had never even been heard of.

You again and again assume, that Free Love will open the flood-gates of vice; and pave the way to all wretchedness from the disruption of families; and be fraught with innumerable other ills to which Marriage is an immaculate stranger. I distinctly deny your assumption, and as often as you make it. With an emphasis, I protest that it is Mar-

riage that shall be made the scape-goat—the Slavery of love—and not the beautiful Freedom which comes to us from harmony, and our own true natures! I protest that there would not be so much Lust to-morrow, if Marriage were destroyed forever from to-day!

What if there shall be, a great breaking up of foundations under the operation of Free Love, and its pathway shall sometimes be strewn with wrecks? Is not that a very fate of the Universe? Didn't the earth pass through convulsions to get here?

You say, that the “discord between parents, is in nine cases out of ten, a humbug;” [It is not, but on the contrary, it is a reality so notorious as to have passed into a proverb.] “and arises from the ignorance and inconstancy with which too many are afflicted.”—THAT don't look very much like its being a ‘humbug.’

“When one is right and the other wrong, it is simply a misfortune for which existing public sentiment and law abundantly provide.” This is cruel, and the untold agonies of myriads will brand it false! Myriads as good and noble as Joseph Treat, or L. A. Hine.

“Parties, one of whom hates and the other loves, are living together. Under Free Love, they would separate, and still one—the loving party—would be miserable;” [No, it would be right the other way; for then he, or she, would find a requiting love.] “while as it is now, the hating party is wretched.” [And the loving party is NOT, I suppose.] “Ten to one, the hating party deserves to be miserable, and is unworthy of any love,” [and the sentiment is unworthy of you]. A more cold, heartless, inhuman utterance, never fell from human lips. A bad cause brought you to that, brother!

Under Free Love, BOTH the parties might become happy: in Marriage, neither ever can be—some difference. Besides, neither party may be a “hating” one. Good people can't live together happily. The fault is in the relation, not the folks.

“Under Free Love, half the offspring of discordant parents would be worse than orphans;” and in Marriage, half the offspring of all the parents, would be blest if they WERE orphans, and always had been—never had been born!

“If ‘attraction’ is to be the watchword, why not let the thief steal, etc.? Complete your system, gentlemen of the Free Love school, if it can be completed, or you will justly be held obnoxious by all consistent philosophers.” If FREEDOM (that's ‘attraction,’) is to be the watchword, why not let the thief steal, etc.? Complete your system, if it can be completed, gentlemen of the school that denies the “divine rights of kings,” and preachers up Republicanism, and the right of the people to govern themselves, or you will justly be held obnoxious by consistent philosophers.

You close with, “Thus far I am for Freedom of the Affections.” Equivalent to, “Beyond this, I'm for Enslavement of the Affections.” What a record to go down to the future, and forever signed, “L. A. HINE!”

AS BROAD AS IT IS LONG: OR THE TABLES TURNED.

BY JOSEPH TREAT.

L. A. Hine's argument against Free Love, assumes—and is based on the assumption—that one class of human rights, sometimes need to be sacrificed to another class, to keep the peace. His point is, that rights belonging to Parents and Children, must in any event stand; while those belonging to Lovers, must, for that very reason, go down. Let ME base an argument on the same assumption; and see if, presto! these different parties don't change places—see if the logic don't come out Free Love, all over!

1st. Every human being has a right—natural, and inalienable right—to love whom he

or she is amind to: whom he or she can: whom he or she is attracted to love. ERGO, rights of parents and children inconsistent with this, swept away.

2dly. Every human being has a right to be loved, by any body who is amind to love him or her: any body who can, or is attracted to love him or her. ERGO, rights of parents and children swept away.

3dly. Every individual has a right, (over and above all that is strictly called LOVE,) to flow to the general attractions, and sympathies, of society; and to receive, and enjoy, all beatitudes conferred by congenial friendships. ERGO, rights of parents and children gone: for of course, parents and children can't be housed up in the nursery, and yet every body be mingling in the most attractive groups, circles, and societies.

By this time, Lovers are evidently ahead; and the poor Parents and Children have to put up with what they can get. But let us try the argument, simply, on the rights of those Parents and Children themselves. L. A. Hine has set down some of their rights—by no means all, nor the most important.

1. Every Father has this right to love whom he is amind to, and be loved by whom he can, just as much as every body else; and so has every Mother. Any body say, No? But that's Free Love—equal to the freest!

2. Every Father has a right not only to love whom he pleases, but also to seek whom he pleases, to be the mother of his child; and to get her, if he can: and every Mother has the same right, to decide if she will have a child; and then to seek whom she pleases to be its father; and to get him if she can attract him. Apodictic, isn't it? But that's not only Free Love, but Free Parentage! But CAN you help yourself?

3. Every Father or Mother has a right to such a state of society, as will surround his or her child with harmonious and happy conditions: but such a state can never by any possibility co-exist with the isolate household, nor with the million discords and antagonisms, that isolate household must forever beget and perpetuate. In other words: Every father or mother has a right to the eternal abrogation of Marriage, and to the resulting installation of Affectional Freedom, as the only possible means by which the child can be unfolded into the harmony and happiness constituting its true destiny. Or yet again: Every father or mother has a right to ASSOCIATION, for the sake of the child. But Association and Free Love go together of course—Association is Free Love.

The rights of Parents, then, are all, and every way rights of Freedom:—how about of those children?

1. Every child has a right to be born of parents, who love each other, and who choose each other to be the parents of that child. Both Free Love and Free Parentage again!

2. Every child, after birth, has a right to nestle in the love of parents, who mutually do love and flow to each other in a great and beautiful harmony. No constraint of an indissoluble tie, but only the freedom of an ever new attraction! How many children find such love now?

3. Every child has a right to all the good Society can do him, over and above all his parents can do: but in an instant Marriage steps in, mad as a setting hen, "Hands off! mind your own business! don't want any of your interference! take care of my own domestic concerns!" This leads to

4. Every child has a right to that same state of society, to secure its own development into harmony and happiness, which the parents had a right to, in order to secure that same development for their child—Association. In other words, the child, equally with the parents, has a right to—No Marriage and Universal Freedom—or the conditions of its attaining its true destiny. For remember, that is the meaning of Association.

Lovers' rights, Parents' rights, and Children's rights, then, all agree in this—all to Freedom, and the calumniated Free Love—yes, to Freedom, Free Love, and Free

Parentage! If anybody says No, I refer him to an ancient and much honored document, called, "Declaration of Independence."

For the assumption is false, that any of these rights need to be sacrificed. On the contrary: What will save any of them, will save all of them; and on the other hand: What will not save all, will save none. My system—Free Love, with Association—saves all: L. A. Hine's system—Marriage, with or without whatever else—neither. Who has the argument?

And then it is his own reasoning which overthrows his own system—the very conclusion the very reasoning sought to establish. His Proposition is, THE RIGHTS OF PARENTS AND CHILDREN; but it is that identical Proposition which annihilates compulsory Marriage, and forever inaugurates Freedom of the Affections in its stead. He has stricken off his own head with his own sword.

Your pardon, my brother; but strike me as hard as I strike you; and as much harder as you are able.

MY SOUL'S THRALLDOM AND ITS DELIVERANCE.
AN AUTOBIOGRAPHY.

BY ANNE DENTON CRIDGE.

CHAPTER VI.

Daybreak;—Land ho!—The Past and the Present;—Quakers;—Barker vs. Barkerites.

"What is right and what is true?" became the questions of the day. "Conversation meetings" for the purpose of hearing and comparing the opinions of all on a doubtful passage of scripture, on what was considered a fundamental doctrine of religion, were held once and sometimes twice a week. Occasionally we had very warm discussions at those meetings, but never any hard feelings or abusive language, because of differences of opinion.

Barker's tracts were occasionally read, examined and compared with reason and scripture. His tracts on "Eternal Torments," or the eternity of hell, caused considerable discussion. Strange it seems to me now, that it should have been so hard to throw away such an absurd and abominable doctrine. A lake of fire and brimstone anywhere in God's Universe! Strange that any body should receive such a horrible belief.

"The soul that sinneth it shall die," saith the scriptures. Die, orthodox divines tell us, means to live forever; die, the dictionary tells us, means to cease to exist. Again, the bible tells us "the wicked shall be destroyed;" "their lamp shall be put out;" "they shall not remain, neither root nor branch," etc., etc.

What could all this mean, but that the wicked should cease to exist? We became believers in annihilation; one absurdity for another, it is true; but it was better far than the old doctrine; it was a step from error toward right. We could not conceive it consistent with a God of love to consign nine-tenths of his creatures to eternal misery; besides, our sphere was very circumscribed; we believed in the inspiration of the scriptures; we took the best of its teachings—the best and most consistent with our reason. Reason we believed in using about all things; reason came from God; we looked upon it as one of God's best gifts to man; thought and investigation taught us better than to call it "blind

reason;" we looked upon it as a test by which to try all things; yet we believed in revelation, and this limited our vision.

We soon learned not to take anything upon trust—not to take John Wesley, or Adam Clarke's opinion in preference to our own; the thought in our own soul was as worthy of being listened to as theirs; they used their reason; why take it in preference to our own? Had we not the right to think and examine for ourselves? Certainly.

How vividly the past comes before me! I see the little band of enquirers collected in friend B.'s parlor; each has his bible open: all look studious; one after another give their opinions on some passage; light dawns upon their glad eyes; they get a glimpse in the right direction. The scene changes: the present position of those dear friends rise beautifully to my view, and I exclaim:—thank God for liberty! Thank God for freedom!—Eternal thanks for the possession of truth; for they are all basking in its sunshine.

John B. is a Dr. and farmer in Wisconsin. He lectures on various reformatory movements, and is as zealous in pulling down the old false dogmas of the past as he was once in building them up.

Thomas D., our class-leader, is residing in Pennsylvania and is a thorough reformer.

Mary B. and her husband—John Parker—at that time no farther progressed than us—are also in Pa. They have a sweet family of children, and are training them up in what our opponents are pleased to call infidelity. John has written a volume of poetry.

George Sunter, a devoted Methodist and another of that group, is an engineer in W. Canada. George has published several pamphlets on reformatory subjects. His first, in the early part of the movement, was "Sunday no Sabbath;" and another, "The Bible not Inspired." These have been succeeded by various others as he has progressed.

John W. removed to this country several years ago, and died shortly afterwards, not in the faith of his fathers, but a decided heretic. His widow resides there now, and is a beautiful, progressive spirit.

It is unnecessary to name them all. There were females not a few, now ranked among the most progressive spirits of the age.

Of all that little group that collected in that small Northern English town, only one is orthodox; nearly all the others are on this side of the Atlantic, and forever free from priestcraft as well as kingcraft.

Jane Robson alone belongs to "the good old way." She had, previously to the reform movement, been a member of the Primitive Methodists and Wesleyan Methodists; was quite talented and often preached for both sects. Jane was considered a wandering sheep because she had changed pastures.

Her husband had emigrated to W. Canada, and at the time was an itinerant preacher among the Episcopal Methodists.

She left the sects; thought it wrong to be divided into sects and parties; rejected the idea of hell, original sin and trinity, and would have been not only the saviour of herself but others, (for she was truly talented,) when her husband arrived and took her into the very heart of orthodoxy.

Last Summer when I was on a lecturing tour through Canada, I heard that a Mrs. Robson was going to preach about four miles in the country. Thinking it might be my old friend Jane, we drove to the meeting-house. It was her, indeed. Her subject was the great atonement. Beautifully (looking on the orthodox side of the picture,) she spoke. How pained I felt as I listened to her remarks of original sin, hell and the "Godhead!"—Alas! alas!! I mentally exclaimed; how much power, and power of usefulness is blasted!

Her countenance told plainly there had been great suffering experienced in crushing the Godhead in herself.

We talked long and affectionately of the past, of our present views, and of Joseph Bar-

ever he is, he is good and sincere."

Having removed to Canada at an early stage of the movement, where such ideas, at that time, were not in vogue and her husband being decidedly of the old school, accounts for her retrogression.

I remarked, however, that she did not give out the hymn or pray, and I understood her husband always performs that part. She probably yet retains that early germ of reform implanted long, long ago. Like Lot's wife, she has looked back and has become crystallized.

Days of the past, ye are blessed. I look back with exquisite pleasure. There freedom had its birth; there the scales began to fall from our eyes; there we began to realize the dignity and divinity of manhood.

Gradually we came to believe that Christians should not be divided into sects and parties, but that they should be in one fold, under one shepherd—Christ; that difference of opinion should not divide people, but wrong doing; that Sunday was no more than any other day, and that every day was just as good and holy as Sunday. We observed that nature knows no Sabbath. The brooks go singing aloud, and the birds tune their voices to the melody. The sun shines into every little cot; the flowers unfold their petals to its loving embrace; the world and ten thousand other worlds, continue their onward march, though it is the holy Sabbath. Nature knows no Sabbath.

We examined the so called "word of God." There the seventh day is talked of as being made holy, or hallowed, because God rested on that day; the seventh day, however, was not kept, but the first; by whose authority was it changed? Should not every day be a Sabbath to a Christian? Whatever business we engage in, or whatever we do, ought it not to be for the good of the race? Then it would be wrong to make swords, keep distilleries, sell liquors, tobacco, etc., on any day. "Is it not well to have a day of rest?" asked one; "would it not be better to have two?" enquired another; "would it not be better still," said a third, "if we worked eight hours, studied eight hours, and rested eight hours every day?"

We ceased to recognize a Sabbath; so far we were, in many respects, like the Quakers. This induced us to examine their notions for using plain language, rejecting the names of the month and days of the week.

"You" was no longer used to the rich, and "thou" and "thee" to the poor; therefore, to adopt their plain language would be formality. Months and days were named, it is true, by the idolators in honor of their gods; this we did not consider a sufficient reason for the ideas associated with them had passed away; we were not recognized as idolators, as in days of yore, because we used them. They were merely forms without the spirit. I now regard Quakerism in the same light. They retain the forms without the spirit.

Wm. Penn and George Fox uttered their loud protest against forms and ceremonies; but now the Quakers have resolved into a mass of formality. "Thee" and "thou," "first month," etc., "first day," etc., broad brimmed hats, scoop bonnets, and collarless coats, are the great fundamental principles of the Society.

We loved the spirit of Quakerism which rejected forms and ceremonies; we adopted plain clothing, bonnets without any trimming, etc; but had no distinguishing marks—no badges.

At one of our meetings, the question was introduced: Is it right to have in our churches, pews for the rich, and benches without backs for the poor? No, was the universal answer before we left. Often have I seen a lady in silks and jewelry, handed into a pew, while a poor tottering old woman or man was pointed to a bench. Wealth has been might, but right shall be might, and man shall yet be measured by his soul.

Joseph Barker came to lecture on reform; he was poor; made no charge for his labors,

but trusted in Providence to supply all his needs. Threadbare coat out at the elbow and empty cupboards whispered that his master did not take the best care of him.

Joseph preached against laying up treasure upon earth; against providing for old age, urging God's promises to take care of his own; reminding us that the very hairs of our heads are all numbered. It went down very well with many, but the poor-house stood out conspicuously with many a good servant of God within its walls. Their food the poorest, their clothing the coarsest, emblematical of charity, and what kind of charity? We looked at this with many a query in our minds; but we remembered "God's ways are not as our ways." If people were poor, doubtless it was for the best; wealth might make them forget God. If rich, the Lord prospered them. True, many of the wicked are wealthy; but "the wicked flourish as a green bay tree," was the reply. We could not give up the idea of particular providence. The time had not yet come; but it did come, though it was much later.

Barker was faithful to his belief in Providence, though he suffered much from it; but he never stood still; he had got an impetus, and onward he went. Thousands whom he had roused, went much faster than he did. How little they imagined where truth would lead them!

Joseph has learned to trust more in himself and his own efforts, than Providence; and that mental labor deserves remuneration as well as physical; why take the wear and tare of a man's brains for nothing, any more than of sinew or muscle?

In the early part of the reform movement, Barker could obtain churches to lecture in; but he had not gone far, before the doors of all meeting-houses were closed against him. God's great Temple, however, was always open. A table or a chair answered the purpose of a pulpit, and often, very often, Joseph has lectured for five or six hours to hundreds and thousands, all so attentive and quiet that a pin might have almost been heard to drop. Churches were shaken to their foundations; preachers, and some formed entirely of orthodox materials, considered Joseph a wolf, devouring the flock. In some places, as in our own, nearly the whole flock were affected; even John B. was among the number. Mother often remarked about this time: "John will now learn not to shout so loud. Adam curses the world no more and the 'devil is dead,' he has very little left to shout about." It was even so. John is now as heterodox and as quiet and rational as could be desired. I often think I would like to see him "clothed and in his right mind." Had he remained much longer in "the ways of the Lord," he would long before this have been hushed in the grave; for he had several attacks of hæmorrhage at the lungs, through "crying aloud." An incident occurs to my mind this moment which John often told, to show that congregations would sing anything the preacher gave out. John and Mr. Kipling went into Wensedale, or, as we used to call it, the hilly country, to preach. Nearly every one in the neighborhood, owned a small lot of land and a house. I believe it is the only spot in England where the people are the owners of the soil. Mr. Kipling gave out,

"No foot of land do I possess,
Nor cottage in the wilderness;
A poor wayfaring man."

The whole congregation sang it doubtless "with the spirit and the understanding also!"

The next question that naturally introduced itself for discussion, was: Ought we not to come out from the churches and be free from all creeds and isms? I remember asking John B.'s opinion on this subject. He answered: "Anne, you can only judge for yourself; if you think so, act."

Time passed on; one after another left and formed a little band. Opinions were no test of membership; the requisite qualifications were a Christian life and an earnest purpose to

the right. They acknowledged no name but Christ; professed not to be a sect; but they were to all intents and purposes. People called them Barkerites. A similar society was formed in Barker's neighborhood, Gateshead, New Castle. It worked well for a time, but eventually Joseph discovered, that like Penn, Wesley and other reformers, he was only building up a sect; so he withdrew from them, for that was not his intention. But it took considerable time for Barker to learn this.

After much thought and earnest prayer to be directed aright, I told my class-leader, John B., that I had decided to leave the church, and desired him to erase my name from the class book. He expressed a hope that I was satisfied I was doing right; to my reply that I was quite satisfied, he moved his head but said nothing. I then united with the Free Thinkers, or Barkerites.

One rule of the Society (understood) was to provide for poor members. After every meeting, the question was asked, "Are any in need of assistance?" One middle aged man nearly always required help. He had a large family of children, for his wife had little ones as fast as she could, and he being but a day laborer, could not earn enough to support them.

We substituted in place of class-meetings where all are required to speak, a sort of fellowship meeting where each was free to speak or not, as disposed.

This man used to speak eloquently (considered religiously,) both in these meetings and in prayer meetings when he "spoke with God(?)" tears fell profusely over his face as he told of his great enjoyments and soul-refreshing seasons. This man I now consider to have been insane; he used to go through the street, prophesying(?) and reading passages from the bible, with eyes red and swollen from religious excitement. I remember him one time passing our house when my infidel uncle Jacques was on a visit. He was repeating in a slow, solemn, but loud voice, "Go to, now, ye rich! weep and howl for the miseries that are come upon you," etc. Uncle turned to me and asked: "Does thee not think that man a fit subject for a Lunatic Asylum?" I did not answer, for I felt rather ashamed of such a votary.

"Is the Old Testament the word of God?" was the agitating question. My father soon said "No!" With what indignation savored with a plentiful supply of wit, he used to talk about God fighting battles, the licentious Solomon, and the murderous and licentious David, "the man after God's own heart." Mother, though she had never been converted and never was such a firm believer as father, was shocked at the readiness and perfect calmness with which father threw his old notions overboard. Many, many years afterwards and shortly before mother's death, we were mutually recalling the past and remarking how unusual it was for persons of his age, to change their views, for father embraced opinions so much at variance from those he had endorsed most of his life,—when mother told us a little incident we had not heard before. For years after their marriage, father was very anxious for her conversion, and often used to ask her when they retired for the night, if she was not afraid she would die before morning and open her eyes in the bottomless pit. Mother disliked noisy meetings; always went home when "revivals" were the "order of the day." My father's sister got converted at one of these meetings. Aunt was then about seventeen years of age. When they came home, they were both full of "heavenly love." Father told aunt to kneel down and pray for the conversion of her unconverted sister. They both knelt down; mother was so disgusted that she exclaimed: "Get up, you two SIMPLETONS; I want none of your prayers." While telling us this she seemed to feel all the indignation she then felt, although we were laughing merrily at the story.

This aunt afterwards married Jacques—my infidel uncle. She became a believer in his religion—rationalism—and was basking in the sunshine of freedom when we were buried in orthodoxy.

LETTER FROM WM. DENTON.

GROVE NEAR WINCHESTER, O.

BROTHER JOHN:—Here I am, singularly enough, in a Methodist camp-meeting! The place looks like a little village, a large open space in the center occupied with benches, the floor covered with straw; this is the preaching place in which are now congregated about one hundred persons. Yesterday, I am told, there were several thousands in attendance, but there are only a remnant this morning, like the scattered ashes after a conflagration.—A woman who looks like a debauchee that has been drinking for a week—her whole nervous system apparently unstrung, is walking up and down, and with most melancholy countenance and sepulchral voice crying out: "Glory be to God, I am so happy." A kind of love-feast seems to be going on. One of the preachers, of whom there are nine present, arises to give his experience. He is a jumping, shouting little fellow, and he tries to gather the scattered ashes together and blow them up into a flame. They glow for a moment, and then the thick smoke rolls up, and he sits down, spent with his fruitless labor. The second is cool and collected; he remembers when he was a sinner, far from God and on the high road to hell and damnation stared him in the face; but he gives glory to God that Jesus saved him from hell, and evidently considers the great excellency of religion to be that it saves men from the clutches of the devil.

Another jumps up; he hopes to shout till he dies; to die shouting and meet on the banks of deliverance with those who have gone before, and join with them in shouting glory to God and the Lamb forever. A woman is now giving her experience. "Before I came to the meeting, I asked God to make me as happy as ever I could be, and I had only just got on my knees, when I was filled with glory. I was so happy I did not know how to contain it, and I have been happy ever since. Glory, glory! Hallelujah!! I am 'going home,' and she walks out of the meeting, and I hear her voice in the distance, "I am going home! I am going home!" I cannot help thinking if religion has naturally such an influence upon people, the most sensible prayer would be to be delivered from it.

Another woman: "Six years ago I tried to give God my heart. Pray that I may be kept faithful. (Weeps.) I have many trials and temptations. Three months God laid his afflicting hand upon me. (Weeps and sobs aloud.) He took from me my lovely babe. But thanks be to God, after a few more struggles and trials, I hope I shall meet him in glory." Several others speak—the meeting breaks up, and my friend Grimes and I take a walk in the beautiful wood, and drink in the balmy influences of nature. Delightful contrast! A horn is blown, and my friend says it is the signal for another meeting. We return. A pleasant looking man dressed in the old Methodistical habit, stands up and reads an account of the last supper, for the sacrament is to be administered. Solemn time! After reading he addresses them. Warns them of false doctrine and bids them stand fast.—"There is here," says he, "among us an emissary of hell: (significant glances in my direction;) a devil incarnate, who seeks to deal out damnable heresies among you. God save the friends of the Church from such agents of damnation. God have mercy on him!—Amen. There is an infidel club in New York who send out through the land, agents to spread Abolitionism, Spiritualism and devilism. I have heard them many times. Yes, I heard the founder of Spiritualism denounce all the ministers of religion and all the members of the church of God, to outer darkness and eternal hell. Sisters and brothers, guard the fold; they look for the lambs to destroy them and send them to hell. Denounce modern Spiritualism and all inventions of hell. Let hell claim its own, but stand you steadfast unto the end." He concludes; they kneel around and eat a little bread, and

drink a little wine, talking in the meanwhile about blood and death, and so ends, I suppose, the morning service, for we leave before they are quite done. I think, as I walk away—a hundred years ago the Indian war-dance, the whoop of the savage, the torture of the helpless prisoner;—now, the Methodist camp-meeting, the cruel God, the howl of the penitent, the yell of the believer, the folly of all.—In the future, rational men and women, with minds expanded by knowledge, hearts warmed by true affection, rationally rejoicing in a land redeemed by knowledge.

Yesterday I lectured in the woods at Barnett's Station, six miles from here. There was a large audience, and we had a delightful meeting. Two preachers of the Christian church were present and took part in the meeting, which added much to its interest.—One of them was one of the most noble men that I have met in discussion. He gave me his name and address for our list of Free Thinkers.

Thy friend and brother,

W. D.

LINES INSCRIBED TO — — .

BY EMMIE.

I would bid farewell to earth-land,
Fold my eyes and pass away,
To the vale of light and beauty,
Where the bright-winged angels stray;
I would seek a home in heaven,
Where comes no despairing wail,
Where hope-buds are never blighted,
Where is breathed no chilling tale.

Oft, when purple twilight lingers,
Till the shadows quiet lie,
And the evening clouds are floating,
Dreamily, across the sky,
I have pictured fairy cloud-ships.
Coasting on the airy sea,
Guided by the hands of angels,
Who were beckoning to me.

I have longed to part the shadows,
And fly swiftly to their side!
I would cross death's narrow river,
Where the silver wavelets glide,

Since I know true hearts are waiting
For me, on the other shore
Who will calm my soul's wild anguish,
When life's fitful dream is o'er.

Chide me not! the world is lovely,
But it hath no charms for me,
Since I saw each love-flower blighted
That was wreathing tenderly.—
When is stilled my young heart's beating,
I would rest where ivies creep;
Where nought save the wailing night-bird
Ever steals away to weep.

Shed no tears! 't would grieve my spirit
When I come again to earth,
Should I see you pale with sighing
O'er my early second birth.—
Brother dear, I'll love you fondly,
And my angel arms will twine
'Round you with as holy blessings
When I'm nearer the Divine.

A VOICE FROM THE PRISON; or Truth for the Multitude and Pearls for the Truthful. By
JAMES A. CLAY.

Received a copy of this work, but have had no time to read it yet, though some of our folks who have, say it is excellent, and that it deserves to be widely circulated. The author wrote it in prison—put there, we believe, for being decenter than people generally. But we hope for time to read it, and room to give it a notice such as may be worthy of a brave book. Price, \$1.00. Send to the author, Gardiner, Maine, or to Bela Marsh, 15 Franklin street, Boston.

LIST OF BOOKS.

THE FOLLOWING WORKS, AT THE OFFICE OF THE SOCIAL REVOLUTIONIST, MAY BE ORDERED BY WHOLESALE OR RETAIL.

CHARLES HOPEWELL; OR SOCIETY AS IT IS AND AS IT SHOULD BE.

By JOHN PATTERSON. An Exposition of the Evils of existing Society, and a careful Investigation of the Cardinal Principles and Practical Details by which the Societary Conditions of an advanced Humanity may be instituted. It discusses the Nature of the Individual Mind in reference to its Origin, its Education and its Future, and considers the quality and uses of the Property Instinct and the Theoretical and Practical Relations of Labor and Capital, together with the Law of Distributive Justice, by the observance of which, Fraternity, Harmony and a just individualism would be secured to all. Pp. 300. Price, 50 cts. per copy, paper cover; muslin, 75 cts.; postage pre-paid. A very large discount is allowed to those who purchase by the quantity.

"I have been a reader of all the Philosophical and liberal works that have come within my reach, for some time; but I will say that the six and seven chapters of Charles Hopewell contains the best philosophy in the least space of anything that I have ever seen. I do wish there was a copy of that work in every house, throughout the land."—G. T. Rockford, Ill.

"I am pleased with the plan and execution of the work. It evinces a thorough investigation of the Social Systems already promulgated, and an extensive knowledge of the difficulties to be obviated, and the reasons of those difficulties. The subject is one of such a peculiar character as to require more than ordinary boldness and ingenuity to present it in a popular dress. The work is admirably adapted to prepare minds for natural liberty. After all, this is the work of this age. We need preparation. A few minds are ready, and a part of these are restrained in duranee vile."—J. B. W., Moundsville, Va.

"Thinking persons who see that present claims on property lie at the base of our anti-social relations, should read and consider it for the simple, clear and important truths which are more distinctly brought into view than I have seen them elsewhere."—AMOS GILBERT.

"The principles developed in your admirable work meet the yearning of my truest, highest, noblest nature—a want which I have long felt, but which I then first found explained."—J. M., La Moille, Ill.

"Although I have been a student of Socialism for fifteen years, I have never met with any work which presented the communal doctrine in such a clear and lucid manner, and at the same time so attractive, with the objections so well considered and answered."—W. B. P., Toronto, C. W.

POEMS FOR REFORMERS. By WILLIAM DENTON. This is the title of a new Work just published; consisting principally of Poems of a Reformatory character, suited to the wants of the Progressive Minds of the Age. Price, 50 cts. per copy; postage 6 cts. Address DAYTON, Ohio.

COMMON SENSE THOUGHTS ON THE BIBLE. By WILLIAM DENTON. A synopsis of Facts and Arguments disproving the Divine Inspiration of the Bible. It is a pamphlet that Reformers should circulate to supply the place of such Theological rubbish as the American Tract Society is issuing. Price, 12 cts. per copy, post-paid. Address Dayton, Ohio.

SOCIAL REVOLUTIONIST; a Medium for the Free Discussion of General Principles and Practical Measures pertaining to Human Progress and General Well-Being. Edited by JOHN PATTERSON and WM. DENTON. It is the ambition of its Editors and Contributors to make it the BRAVEST and most RADICAL Journal in the world. Published at one dollar a year, single subscription; or five copies for four dollars. Address Rising Star, Greenville, Darke Co. Ohio.

* * * Most Reform books can be ordered through us at advertised prices. All letters should be directed to
RISING STAR, Greenville, Darke Co. Ohio.

SOCIAL DEMOCRACY;

A SOCIETY RECOGNIZING THE PRINCIPLES OF MUTUAL TOLERATION.

If such as accept the abnegation of Secedism will send their names and post office address, with a few postage stamps, at their option, to defray expenses, we propose to print a list of the same and send it to each one. Let it be distinctly understood that this project has no ulterior purpose which does not appear on its face. Its only object is to enable the most liberal minds to become acquainted with each other. The list of names will be given that each may make the most of it in his own way.

The list will appear when a sufficient number of names have been received. Address, JOHN PATTERSON, Greenville, Darke County, Ohio.

PSYCHOMETRY.

Mrs. ANNE DENTON CRIDGE will give Psychometric delineations of Character with a degree of accuracy far surpassing that of the most skillful Phrenologist, on receipt of a letter or portion of one, written by the person whose character is described. In order to ensure the right person's character being given, the letter should not have been lying with other letters, or long carried in any one's pocket. A letter recently written, is best for the purpose. Terms \$1. Address, Cincinnati, O.

LECTURING.

WILLIAM DENTON is prepared to lecture on Religious Reform, the Bible, Temperance, Slavery—Mental, Social and Chattel—Woman's Rights, Education, Phonotopy, Spiritualism, etc. Any one wishing to secure his services, can direct to him at Dayton, Ohio.