

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

A MEDIUM

FOR THE FREE DISCUSSION OF GENERAL PRINCIPLES
AND PRACTICAL MEASURES,

PERTAINING TO

HUMAN PROGRESS AND GENERAL WELL-BEING.

The cause of truth is best promoted by free inquiry. Error alone fears investigation.

CONDUCTED BY JOHN PATTERSON.

CONTRIBUTORS.—A. Cridge, Anne Denton Cridge, Wm. Denton, T. P. Wright, J. H. Cook, J. W. Towner, W. A. Steere, Francis Barry, J. M. Stahl, J. B. Wolf, J. P. Davis, Joseph Treat, Mary A. Chilton, Jennie G. Adams, C. Sweet Towner, D. Colburn Bush, C. M. Overton, Lily White, P. I. Blacker, La Roy Sunderland, J. K. Moore, J. R. Monroe.

PUBLISHED BY THE RISING STAR ASSOCIATION.

FOR SALE BY M. BLY, 160 VINE STREET, CINCINNATI; BELA MARSH, 15 FRANKLIN ST., BOSTON; C. BLANCHARD, 76 NASSAU ST., AND S. T. MUNSON, No. 5 GT. JONES ST., NEW YORK.

Terms, \$1 a year in Advance, or five Copies for \$4; Specimen Nos. 10 cts.

Our Post Office Address:—Greenville, Darke Co., Ohio.



THE SOCIAL REVOLUTIONIST.

MY MARRIED LIFE.

LETTER IV.

“And dost thou think because I smile,
And joy, and wit, and friends surround me,
There is no torturing thought the while,
That with its secret power can wound me?
Ah! know, then, I have schooled my heart
To stifle every wayward feeling;
And, dearly have I bought the art,—
Not of conquering, but concealing.”

MY DEAR FRIEND:—Am I, indeed, to believe, that such a portion as my married life has been is all that the Benignant Father and Mother in Heaven designed in the institution of the Conjugal Relation? What! marriage, conjugality, without companionship! Married for life, and no conjugality! no spiritual or mental affinities! no equality! no union of soul with soul! Alas! what a mockery is such a marriage! And what a story for a man to tell, married twenty-eight years! Of real conjugal love, which gives an equal companion for your inmost soul, I have no experimental knowledge. A conjugal companion I never had; and such are the laws and the state of society around me, that I can have none. Like other matured human beings, I can but feel the want of companionship. I feel the want of sympathy when in trouble; the want of a counselor when in doubt; but no such congenial, competent companion has yet come to me—none such ever can come. The married life, which to others brings a division of joys and sorrows, which unites one soul in two bodies, and brings to both parties mutual sympathies, affinities, harmonies and heaven—this state has been to me a “hard road to travel,” and in it I have found more of the dreary, cheerless and repulsive; and much of my journey has been through scenes of **UTTER DESOLATION.**

In a few years after our marriage my health failed so as to incapacitate me for performing pastoral labors; and, as we were destitute, I was under the necessity of commencing business as a means of livelihood for myself and family. I moved to New York, where we lived for some seven years, and in a measure free from the shackles of bigotry. I had leisure for literary and philosophical pursuits more suited to the tenor of my mind. Gradually I had been outgrowing the theological notions in which I was educated, so that in 1842 I found myself wholly free from all the sectarian cords that had hitherto bound me; and she had, in the meantime, become infected with the Millerite mania, (from which, indeed, she has never since recovered) and her total abandonment of soul

and body to the fanatical vagaries of the so-called "Second Advent" delusions, severed the last cord that had seemed to bind us together. The breach has been widening for years, and now it has approached a crisis. Believing, or wishing to believe in the speedy destruction of this world, she beset me to yield up to her control one-half of my estate, which she claimed as her own property by right of marriage! She wished to spend it in furtherance of the Millerite doctrine, to which she had become a convert. And, as I declined to accede to this request, often made to me, I soon found that she never missed any chance for appropriating my funds, in any way that she thought would help on the epidemic to which she had fallen a victim. To give you some just conception of the estimate she put upon me, as also, the kind of companion and "help-meet" I had for a wife, (as good as she may have been in many respects) let me now compress a series of years into a few paragraphs, like the following :—

1. She never co-operated with me, labored for me, or assisted me in any study, business or work, at any time, first or last.

2. She opposed me persistently, and sometimes with bitterness, in the only remunerating business I ever undertook to do. One plan of mine, in New York, I had to abandon on account of her opposition, when it was immediately taken up by a medical gentleman, who, in less than one year, made over five thousand dollars by it.

3. As she did not assist me in my peculiar studies and labors, at all, so, from religious scruples she never joined me or our children in any forms of intellectual recreation, either private or public. My amusements have been sought and enjoyed alone.

4. For more than twenty years I have been more or less engaged in scientific investigations; and, besides editing papers, I have also found time for writing and publishing some twenty-five pamphlets and books on theology, physiology, psychology, pathology and health, and other important subjects connected with human welfare; but I do not remember an instance in which she ever once entered into conversation with me for solving any of the problems which so deeply and constantly interested my own mind, nor am I aware that she ever read one of the pamphlets or books entirely through which I ever published.

5. Having accumulated sufficient funds, she managed, by the assistance of a relative, to purchase a house and lot in the country, without my knowledge or consent, where she lived for more than one year before I found out the purchase she had made. She wished to become independent in her resources.

6. Thus she left me, and ceasing to be my wife, as she had, indeed, never been my conjugal companion, she has done nothing for me, rendered me no services, whatever; and yet she thrusts her hand into my pocket and takes my money from week to week, as she has declared she means to do while she lives; which was the last declaration which I ever heard from her own lips, made while avowing her unfeigned love for me!

LETTER V.

"What Love is, if thou would'st be taught,
Thy heart must teach alone,
Two souls with but a single thought,
Two hearts that beat as one.

And whence comes Love? Like morning's light
It comes without thy call,
And how dies Love? A spirit bright,
Love never dies at all."

MY DEAR FRIEND:—Such is my IDEAL of CONJUGAL LOVE. It is the highest and most

sacred. I suppose the Divine is really male and female, and the conjugation of the Divine Love and the Divine Wisdom makes all the Forms of Life we have in the Mineral, Vegetable, Animal and Spiritual Kingdoms. It is well known that these male and female (positive and negative) forces pervade all nature, attracting and repelling whatever is or is not in AFFINITY with each. Thus we see all nature teeming with Life, because these male and female forces conjugate for the evolution of Life; and, the higher we ascend in Nature, the more select, refining and spiritual do these unions become, until they are ultimated in one CONJUGAL of

"Two souls with but a single thought,
Two hearts that beat as one."

Such a marriage of Goodness and Truth,—such a conjugation of the Love and Wisdom Elements makes a real Conjugal Oneness, which is perfect and SATISFACTORY TO THE PARTIES. This Love must, in the nature of things, be the highest: because it is the ORIGIN of Life—the source whence comes all the other loves: the Parental, Filial, Fraternal and Universal. And this shows why it is that the most bitter woes which are ever endured by human beings, all come from the errors committed against this highest Love. My opinion is, that, as Conjugal Love is the highest, so conjugal delights are the purest which mortals ever enjoy; and, it follows, what that woe—that HELL must be, which results from the want of this Love. But this want of real Conjugal Love does not imply, necessarily, any want of goodness, justice, or integrity of character. Real Conjugal Love may exist where each of these elements are sadly deficient. But the case is made much worse where there is a deficiency in goodness, justice and integrity of character, and no Conjugal Love to supply the defect. In such cases, this want of Conjugal Love becomes the occasion of cupidity. One of the parties lives entirely at the cost of the other, rendering no love, no services, no kind acts in return. If both parties are equally responsible in contracting these unhappy marriages, then both should bear their share in the consequences. There should be mutual pity and forbearance, as without these fruits of goodness, burdens are often imposed by the wife upon the husband, that outrage all we know of justice and integrity, which makes equal sovereignties of all, and forbids that one should act and live at another's cost.

On finding that my wife had purchased the house in the country of which I have before spoken, after she had left me, of course I could not feel myself called upon to make any overtures for her return; and hence, for the past ten years, furnishing her with an independent support, I have allowed her to seek her society among her religious associates, where, I am persuaded, she is more happy than she could be anywhere else.

And now, my friend, what do you say to these details? IS THERE ANY REMEDY? My hope died out long ago.

"What is man's history? Born, living, dying;
Leaving the still shore for the troubled wave;
Struggling with storms, winds, over shipwrecks flying,
And, casting anchor in the silent grave."

"I hoped! Hope has fled!"

I am alone, live alone, work alone, suffer alone, and alone I expect to die. Yet I murmur not. Instruction comes from the past. And here, for the present, I close my account of

"Footprints, that, perhaps, another,
Sailing o'er Life's solemn main,
A forlorn and shipwrecked brother,
Seeing, shall take heart again."

Boston, March 4, 1857.

[The writer of the foregoing letters has now in preparation for the press, a work, entitled "CONJUGAL LOVE: The Mysteries, Miseries, Felicities of Courtship and Marriage; with remarks on Celibacy, Polygamy, Free Love, and Divorce." This work will contain some original views of the LIFE-RELATIONS, whence come all we know of GOODNESS, JUSTICE, and INTEGRITY of character. Some new and important thoughts are also elaborated in his "BOOK OF HUMAN NATURE," published by Bela Marsh, Boston. Sent by mail, free, for \$1.—L. S.]

INJUSTICE TO DEAF AND DUMB TEACHERS.

BY JOE, THE JERSEY MUTE.

Know all men by these presents, that I, Joe, the Jersey Mute, of the city of Philadelphia, and state of Pennsylvania, am employed as a teacher in the Deaf and Dumb Institution, with a salary of seven hundred dollars a year. Of my hearing associates, the married get eleven hundred dollars per year, and the unmarried one thousand dollars. As to the unmarried mute teachers, their wages do not exceed six hundred dollars a year. I blush to say it, but the truth must be said. The wages which the mute teachers receive for labor are disproportioned to those of their hearing colleagues, notwithstanding the service rendered is of the same nature, and is as well performed by the former as by the latter. The managers of the institution attempt to account for and justify this distinction, by saying that the classical education which the hearing teachers received must be taken into consideration in regulating the compensation allotted them. Oh, no wonder! Never mind the low rate of the mute teachers' wages! Put down any attempt of these human animals to strike for higher wages! Cut them short if they complain of the difficulty of defraying the current household expenses in consequence of the inadequacy of their salaries! Threaten to reduce their wages to the very lowest point compatible with existence, and they will not raise up their hands against you! Teach them to bend the knee before the powers that be! No matter how scanty the pittance afforded, they must accept it, because they are deprived of speech and hearing! They must, of necessity, learn to look for comfort and consolation from on high, taking into consideration their bereft condition! The mute begs for a rise in the rate of his wages! Oh, ye gods! he is ungrateful! the wretch! who has been schooled in all kinds of useful knowledge at the expense of hearing people! Freedom of speech is not intended for those who, by nature, are shut out from verbal communication with the world, but solely for those who convey their ideas by word of mouth. It is not for the deaf and dumb, however gifted with uncommon reasoning powers, to discuss things pro and con! They must preserve a stolid silence, in character with their infirmity! The mute is like a half-sphere, body, mind, and everything else considered. His want of speech incapacitates him from emerging his individuality into that of a citizen, so as to make a complete individuality! A petition for an increase of salary, therefore, is about equal to showing the demon of ingratitude up! He has taken a "better half"! It is folly in one of his limited income to rush madly into the trials, perplexities and expenses of marriage! But the thing is done, and he must suffer the consequences of his imprudence! He sends in his petition praying for an increase of salary, and backs it up by the reason of the enhancement in the cost of all the articles of consumption! What business has he to marry and then ask for an increased salary? He ought to know that it is no use to attend to the matter! Better negative his request at once!

Such are some of the ideas of the managers of most of the Deaf and Dumb institutions in the United States. As I have before said, the mute teachers get seven hundred dollars a year, while the hearing ones get one thousand. You see, herein, the enormous difference between the wages of the mute and the hearing teachers. This is justice inverted. In truth, it must be admitted that the mute teachers, as a general thing, have received but scanty justice as to rights of compensation. The evil must be remedied at once,—immediately,—without delay. The Legislature must see to it that the mute and speaking teachers are equally remunerated. In my opinion, I am not exceeding the bounds of truth when I say that the mute teachers in some of the institutions feel most of the evils resulting from inadequate remuneration that fall on clerks with small salaries. The employment of a teacher, be he deaf or hearing, rises to the dignity of a profession; but the majority of mechanics in the humble walks of life, are better off than the mute teachers. In spite of the universal rise in the wages of all classes of mechanics, clerks, and other employees, the mute instructors are kept on a scanty allowance. I should not be surprised if they were impoverished by the exorbitant prices that reign in the markets. In view of the famine prices at which the commonest necessaries of life range, and the strike of different trades with favorable results, no reason can be assigned why the governors of the institutions should not give the deaf teachers a lift.

Mr. Job Turner, himself a well-educated mute and assistant teacher in the Virginia Institution for the Deaf and Dumb, has a salary of nine hundred dollars a year,—a large amount, indeed, when it is remembered that the expenses of life in that neighborhood are not so great as I have shown them to be in great cities. The salary of a deaf teacher in the Ohio Institution, it is understood, averages eight hundred and fifty dollars per annum.

Touching the literary acquirements of mute teachers, I have only to quote the opinions of the principals, expressed in the annual reports they transmitted to the Legislatures of the respective States in which the institutions of which they have the charge are situated :

The principal of the Michigan Institution says of one of the mutes employed in that establishment as teachers: "Mr. William L. M. Breg, a deaf mute, who was educated at the New York Institution, and was under instruction ten years, was appointed to fill the vacancy occasioned by the resignation of Mr. N——, and entered upon his duties the first of May last. His literary attainments and general character were commended to us in unqualified terms by the President of the New York Institution and his son, (the latter had been his instructor for the last three years), but the result of our acquaintance with him thus far has more than equaled our expectations. In his superior education he is a rare specimen of what can be accomplished for the unfortunate deaf mute. Added to this, his amiable disposition and correct deportment, his energy, industry and perseverance, his love of order and discipline, eminently qualify him for the station he occupies." The President of the New York Institution, in speaking of the appointment of two "distinguished" graduates of the high class (recently organized in that institution for the prosecution of the higher branches of a thorough English education), to fill the vacancies in the corps of instructors, says: "Teachers of the deaf and dumb who are themselves well-educated deaf mutes, are, in most cases, better fitted than teachers who hear and speak, for the instruction of the younger classes." It may not be out of place here to remark that the mute teachers in the New York Institution are greatly underpaid, notwithstanding their extraordinary attainments in those higher branches of an English education, as algebra, astronomy, natural history, &c.

Now, for the reason why this abused class of persons are poorly remunerated. It is,

that they cannot speak! It is not because they can converse fluently on the topics of the day,—it is not because they are well-grounded in the principles of grammar; it is only their want of speech that, in the opinion of the sage managers of the institutions, entitle them to earn three times less the sum. If they could speak they would be allowed the same rights and privileges as teachers who hear and speak, but since they are debarred the faculty of speech they must be content to work for a scanty pittance!

It is impossible to live decently on seven hundred dollars a year when provisions range at prices somewhat like one hundred per cent. over what they were about fifty years ago. Yet I know some mute teachers who are restricted on such a slender salary, while the enhanced cost of the necessaries of life is speedily followed by a general movement among all classes of mechanics for a rise in the rate of wages. Seven hundred dollars a year would pay in a country town, but in a large city all the expenses of living come out of this, leaving nothing, in the end, to turn to good account.

[Injustice to deaf and dumb teachers is a part of the cannibalism of existing society. Institutions defraud such teachers just because they can. The strong crush the weak in whatever the weakness may consist. Woman can not get so much for the same kind of labor as man can. She has a tenderer heart, a longer dress, and less energy—she is not as well qualified for selfish competition, and so she suffers. It all belongs to the same system of “Christian civilization”—“the big fish eating the little ones.” The remedy is education and co-operation;—justice and fraternity must mold the life itself.]

EXTREMISTS.

BY LA ROY SUNDERLAND.

It is an old proverb that “one extreme leads to another.” And we have been told, also, that “the worst sinners make the best saints.” It will be readily conceded, I think, that when those persons who have occupied prominent positions in society are seen to run into excesses in credulity or in traditional theology, they necessarily become legitimate subjects of public criticism. Any sober and truthful remarks may be made of such characters without doing them any real injury, however much, indeed, the subjects themselves or their friends may object to the notice which is thus taken of them. Having voluntarily made themselves, as it were, public property, they can have no just grounds for complaint when different and even conflicting views are expressed of their character and conduct. The public have an undoubted right to scrutinize and pass solemn and candid judgment upon its own servants, or those who have professed to be such.

That two reformers have recently turned Papists and “kissed the Pope’s toe,” is not, to me, any matter of surprise, at all. I am, indeed, more surprised that the friends who have known them for a series of years should marvel at what they have done. Having, myself, been well acquainted with Mrs. Gove (that was), for more than twenty years, I was fully prepared for a summerset like this: and, long ago, spoke of it to mutual friends as highly probable. She has a benevolence of character somewhat attractive; but the elements of her nature are unevenly developed, as the whole history of her life will abundantly prove; with a decidedly nervous, sympathetic temperament. Her mind is so constituted as to give her an unusual SUSCEPTIBILITY, especially to those influences which flow from the spheres of men. She was so some twenty-five years ago, when I

first saw her. She is exceedingly excitable and impulsive; and in this respect she may justly be called an EXTREMIST. "One extreme leads to another"—and her life has been made up of extremes. She showed them in her "Lectures to Ladies," twenty years ago; and her "Mary Lyndon" is a bundle of extremes. No intelligent friend of Human Progression who knows her, will differ, I think, from the opinion here expressed. Many have RELIED upon the writer of "Mary Lyndon" for instruction and guidance; many, indeed, have looked up to her as an able, womanly, safe leader, who never knew, very well, how to estimate her true character. How long a woman constituted as Mrs. Nichols is, remains in any one given position, will depend very much on her surroundings. It is in the female to lean on the male for guidance and support—the female heart is more "accustomed to cling" than the male. I always supposed that Mrs. N. would be very likely to become a Papist, or anything else which the occasion or surrounding circumstances might suggest, or which should hold out the biggest promise of hope to her willing ear. We do all long for the greatest good; but we differ in our faculties of hope, by which to anticipate its fruition. These female CHARACTERISTICS of yielding and receptivity, are often manifest in the male. Such men and such women (some of whom I know to be of the excellent of the earth), constitute that class, out of whom the spiritual media and pathematic subjects are made, always. Orestes A. Bronson is one of this class. From the extremes of Protestantism he went over into Popery. He said to me once, that he had shifted about so much, that he could compare himself to nothing, more fitly, than a man leaping for life from one cake of ice to another. So, he had jumped from one position to another, until he finally got stuck fast in the ice of Popery. I know that he is one of this class of highly susceptible persons. As he was about to attend one of my public lectures on Pathetism, he requested that I should not exercise any of that influence over him that it was well known I did exert over my audiences. And, what American Protesant has ever shown himself a more obsequious, devoted Papist, completely dependent on the "Mother Church"—so much so, that he can not stand alone, or even THINK for himself?

I have no knowledge of T. L. Nichols, except from his writings. I have admired the independence which he manifested in battling for what he thought to be the right; and, I remember he gave me a brief hearing, in defense of my theory of Nutrition, against what I considered some injustice done me by Dr. Trall, of the WATER-CURE JOURNAL. And yet, on the whole, I have always thought I could discover those imperfections in his mental constitution, the knowledge of which had prepared my mind, long ago, for his SUBMISSION TO POPYERY. We ought to know and be able, correctly to estimate those men who set themselves up for leaders in matters of the public weal. The writings of Mr. Nichols show him to have been an EXTREMIST of the rankest kind. He let himself to cater for a morbid sexual appetite. His book on "Marriage", his "Private Letter to Ladies," and his "Anthropology," although containing much physiological truth, and some good cautions, yet they originated from what I conceive to have been a morbid state of feeling in the author. They are so obviously addressed to a morbid sexual appetite that I do not see how any evenly-balanced mind can doubt or deny it. Indeed, their author, himself, now repudiates them, and confesses to his "Holy Father in God" the very judgment which is here passed upon them. There are no writers better paid than those who promise information and indulgence to the sexual instincts. It was but recently that I refused an offer of five hundred dollars from a publisher in this city, to prepare for him a small tract on the sexual system. But, in making these observations, I would not be understood as saying that Mr. and Mrs. Nichols have not acted out the impulses of their

own mental constitutions, as honestly as I may have done my own. I impose no responsibilities which do not grow out of human nature and the well-known relations of life. As I do not, myself, take for authority, in matters of belief or conduct, any so-called revelations from the dark, invisible world: so, I infer, that people who do this, are not fully developed into the doctrine of true manhood. When we hear people, therefore, talk of being "converted" by traditional dogmas, or by the "blessed teachings" of imaginary invisibles of another world, I must conclude that such persons are not yet fully matured. They cannot THINK for themselves. They have, perhaps, misjudged themselves, and thus attempting what they did not succeed in accomplishing, they are disappointed; and so, wanting something—they know not what—they GO BACKWARD, and lean on tradition, on the priest and the Pope. The ostrich feels secure while its head is thrust under the leaves. I have no unkind words, I am sure, for any who become Papists. Mr. and Mrs. Nichols, in going backward into the vagaries of Popery by advice coming from the invisible world, have done nothing more absurd than many other Spiritualists who have surrendered their self-hood and sovereignty to the inhabitants of another world, of whose grade and character they know precisely nothing at all. The Popish sect, it should be borne in mind, forbids and denounces all such spiritual communications, as of the Devil, and deserving God's bitter curse! And yet, that same Popish church receives into its bosom Mr. and Mrs. Nichols, "converted" to its faith by these very spiritual communications, which it has denounced with "bell, book and candle." Such are the monstrous inconsistencies of Popery,—that gigantic system of error to which Protestant Americans are being converted, "by the blessed teachings of St. Ignatius Loyola and St. Francis Xavier."

Those who comprehend Nature's alternating conditions are not surprised when mortals run from one extreme into another. Carry a pendulum to an extreme on one side, and when you loose the force that holds it there, you will see it swing as far the other way; and, if left to itself, will continue its vibrations until it hangs, perpendicularly. So it is, somewhat, with the human mind. We do not progress in straight lines.

My own opinion is, that if Mr. Nichols should not receive that patronage among the Papists which he wants, he will, of course, become dissatisfied; he will then make the discovery that God has some other "divinely-appointed means for the amelioration of humanity," besides the traditions and mummeries of Popery.

Boston, May 13, 1857.

TO LA ROY SUNDERLAND—RIGHTING THE PREMISES.

In the April No. of the S. R. (page 113), is an article from your pen, designed, as I understand it, to show the incompatibility of free love with certain relations which human beings (in civilized society) sustain to each other. The difficulties you present, were disposed of in vol. 2 of the S. R., according to my way of looking at the subject; and as I prefer to use MY space in this journal for fresh matter, I thought that your article did not require any reply from me; but as many of our present readers did not read vol. 2, they cannot know what was there said; and as this is a new subject, we shall have to revolve it over and over, and examine it on all sides, before there can be any just conception of the new views. You ask me (in a private note), not to attribute any opinions to you, as you are only a learner: I trust we are all learners, and if so, it is meet that we "reason together."

As I look at your objections to free love, they are such as a monarchist would make to republicanism, or a pro-slaveryist to emancipation. The monarchist says to the republican: "There are certain political relations which are incompatible with your theory;—there is the relation of ruler and subject which has existed from the foundation of the world, and is divine, and this relation, your scheme would subvert: it is perfectly ridiculous to attempt a system of government which makes the subjects rulers," &c., &c. In like manner, your objections are based on the presumption that the life-relations which obtain in "civilized society," are the only relations which are possible; and herein, as I conceive, is to be found the fallacy of the objections, you urge against social freedom. We have marriage and social despotism now; and the system is complete within itself, having its own proper relations, inclusive of "conjugalities." Marriage despotism necessitates certain social relations, just as political despotism necessitates certain political relations; but republicanism requires and establishes other relations, and so does affectional freedom, or the sovereignty of the individual.

You ask, "how can the sexual instincts be mutually indulged, when it would interfere with existing relations?" Your question would be answered by the tyrant Louis Napoleon, were he thus to appeal to his republican subjects: "How can your instincts of freedom be gratified, when it would interfere with existing relations?"

I admit that the life-relations you specify are absolute—all but one, and that one may or may not exist. If this one relation (conjugalities), obtain, then we have marriage, of course, and free love is a nullity; but I contend for freedom, and hence I ignore this relation. If any want to enter into it and bind themselves by the marriage contract, they should be free to do so—as free as they should be to join the Roman Catholic Church, or to sell themselves into any slavery; but the parties themselves must take the consequences, and if they find the chains galling and repent their folly;—why, I have nothing to do with their case;—I hold that the relation they entered into is a factitious one—a man-made relation not necessary at all; and when they passed the Rubicon of "single life" and swamped their individual sovereignty in a life-contract, binding up two wills in one, THEY PASSED BEYOND THE REACH OF MY PHILOSOPHY!

The very animus of social freedom fixes an eternal blight on the yoke-mated or conjugal relation. Affectional freedom can no more subsist with this relation than political freedom can subsist with Czarism. It is nevertheless true, that some are as free as they want to be under the rule of absolutism—they have no conception of a greater freedom as their right, and aspire to none; but it is not so with all. Some are as free as they want to be under the absolutism of marriage—they have no conception of a greater freedom as their right, and aspire to none; but all are not so contented. In despotic governments a class is growing in intelligence, developing into the activities of a higher life, and suffering, in consequence, more and more from the constraints of tyranny; so, the increase of intelligence and the demand of higher activities, are, at this moment, arming rebels against marriage.

To answer your question, "Can the conjugal relation be dual?" (I would say MULTIPLE or PLURAL instead of "dual"), would be like answering the question, Can the same subjects have more than one king? My philosophy does not recognize either relation as a finality. Affectional freedom, to my mind, implies the total abandonment of the yoke-mating process, and the practical recognition, in its stead, of individual sovereignty. The sovereign individual must be free at all times to live her best thought, and be true to her highest aspirations, without having to petition a yoke-mate for the privilege. And why one of these sovereign individuals may not be sexually attracted at the same time to

more than one of the other sex, I am not able to see. An individual particle of matter finds many affinities. Mr. Oxygen is not an exclusive monogamist.

There are a class of minds that are content with monotony in all the relations of life. They have been conceived in routine, bred up in routine, and they never aspire to any thing else. They are not progressive. Another class are not satisfied with monotony; they crave variety in the pursuits of life, and such are progressive. The attraction of positive and negative constitutes a, if not THE creative force of Nature; sexual love is the highest form of such attraction that we know any thing of; and some are satisfied with monotony in this creative sphere; others crave variety, and as to which class possesses the higher type of mind, I must be allowed from what I observe, to have my individual opinion. Recollect, I have no reference here to those who have no higher idea of sexual enjoyment than the gratification of lust, (the material embrace without love), but to such as crave variety in all that constitutes the fruition of integral love—the physical never without the spiritual.

The one exclusive love belongs to the plane whereon the animal, centripetal, or convergent forces of our nature are most active; this love concentrates upon one object, and seeks to own it. Unselfish love belongs to the plane—the higher plane, on which the spiritual, centrifugal, or divergent forces are most active, and it craves variety—asks for more than one love, but seeks to appropriate none. This is what I deem the plane of social freedom; but as few are yet prepared for it, variety in love (not lust), is still the exception, and duality, mating, or the two-one love, the rule.

While I claim that the conjugal relation is factitious, or the creation of a lower plane of human development, yet the parental relation is natural and absolute; and in this, one man and one woman must furnish the germ of the human individual. But we know that the father is not the only object external to the mother which affects the character of her child. An odor, a taste may excite longings in the mother, and stamp an ineradicable appetite upon the prospective man. An animal or a lunatic may start up before her, and affect her child with irremediable deformity or imbecility. Not the father of the babe, only, but her friends, male and female—all her surroundings have their influence on the human germ she nourishes. If persons of the other sex whom she deems worthy, influence her by the interchange of social amenities, I am not able to see why their influence would be bad, even if she should enjoy the caresses of sexual love with them, if so attracted. I am not saying, just now, that she would be so attracted, even in freedom; but this I do say: the fact that external objects other than the father do impress features and characteristics upon the offspring, is a fact which is fatal to the exclusive influence of one man, is proof of a variety of influences, and is presumptive evidence in favor of freedom for variety in love. If the prospective mother may receive masculine influence of a certain degree from persons of the other sex, by what principle shall we limit that degree? How shall we determine where the interchange of sexual feeling—masculine and feminine elements of character—shall stop. I know that some women do love more than one; and I believe that others would, if free from prejudice and conventional constraint, do so. It is just as true that the law is different for others. Give them freedom to love more than one, yet would they just as surely love only one. Selfish sexual love necessarily concentrates upon its solitary object, and as a pretext to appropriate that one, it asks to be appropriated itself. Such as are capable only of this kind of love, may attempt freedom, but will ever revert to dualism, mating—to marriage, with its peculiar oppressions and repressions. But failures of this kind would not disprove freedom, since we know there are those sufficiently unselfish to live affectional freedom in harmony.

Your objections assume the conjugal relation, the marriage contract, and the isolated household, all to be fixed and eternal conditions in the earth-sphere; and from this standpoint, you present the case. If I stood on your ground, I should reason as you do; but when I deny your premises and ask you to fortify them before I can proceed with you, then have I nothing to do with the consequences you develop. If the affections are not to be bound in eternal thrall upon this planet, then are we to hope for other social conditions than we now have. Affectional freedom demands facilities for industrial co-operation, and the fraternal or unitary home with a room and bed for each adult individual. It is not necessary that such co-operation shall sink the individual. Large hotels are, in a sense, unitary homes. Individuals sojourn or reside in them, and find their own employment; and yet are they as free as those who live in the isolated household. Unite many thus in one home, give each the control of his own business, free at all times to co-operate as seems to the parties concerned, best, then would the unitary home and industrial co-operation exalt, rather than depress the individual. Thus located in the fraternal home, or in many of them accessible to each other, and woman independent therein, then may affectional freedom obtain, and be wholly compatible with all the rights and all the relations of humanity. Love—free love, if you please, would take the place of arbitrary yoke-matching, and parents will not be robbed of rights in their children, nor children of rights in their parents. Parties who may have loved, but are not fitted to live as “husband and wife” in a life-union, may part quietly, and still enjoy their children, if there be any. Marriage makes a hell for such now, and it does so by its arbitrary bonds; freedom knows no such bonds.

It will not militate against this system to say that it is impracticable. Any form of society is an outgrowth of the minds of such as compose it; and if we think to erect a new form of society out of the materials fitted only for the old, we shall fail, of course; but it does not follow from this that none are prepared, or that none ever will be prepared for a higher order of society than the present. It must be recollected here that I am attempting to show that affectional freedom is not incompatible, under right conditions, with any essential love of the human heart, with any essential relation of life, and the case is clear enough to my mind. It would not be strange if you should see it differently. Thus, you derive all the life-relations from the CONJUGAL; I demolish this relation, and still the others exist—the paternal, filial, fraternal, universal—more exalted, as I must believe, than before. The conjugal relation and its especial appurtenance, the isolated household, are all I see that stand in the way of freedom for the plurality of sexual love, so that when we get rid of the conjugal relation, and establish the independence of woman, love may be free without infringing the right of any love or of any life-relation.

If this, my good friend, be not satisfactory, I shall be glad to learn from yourself, or any other candid investigator, wherein it is not so. One of the methods of arriving at truth on any subject, is by the kindly and candid interchange of views; and I shall always be ready to present to the readers of the S. R. my convictions of truth, whenever there seems to be a demand for them, however unpopular they may be.

Truth and Love are two—the most powerful things in the world; and when they both go together they cannot be easily withstood. The golden beams of truth and the silken cords of love, twisted together, will draw men on with a sweet violence, whether they will or no.—CUDWORTH.

CONJUGAL FACTS.

BY LILLY WHITE.

A young, trusting girl—very healthy and strong, became the wife of our “first chorister”—one of the best and most pious young men in the township; and every body seemed to think she had done well to get him for a husband. But ’twas not long till her rosy cheeks began to pale, her sparkling eyes to lose their lustre, and her pleasant countenance its happy expression. And ’twas not because she dressed tightly, or wore heavy skirts—she did neither—she was POSTED ON THESE subjects; and she was industrious—kept every thing clean and in place—worked in the garden, milked the cows and fed the chickens—like any good country housekeeper. But her husband had been born and brought up under the orthodox notions respecting marriage, and its infernal license for the unrestrained indulgence of lust.

When she had been married six years she had had four children and two miscarriages. I was with her when the last ocured. After the fright was over, and the immediate danger seemed removed, she began to cry and fret about the miseries and slaveries of MARRIED life, and complain of her husband being so amorous; said he was good enough in other respects, but in this he was so bad, she could have no peace! Said she to me, “You may thank your stars that YOU DIDN’T have him. I thought you foolish, THEN; but ’twas ME that was the fool, that time, and dearly have I paid for my folly.”

For more than a year after this she was not able to sew a patch on her children’s clothes, and yet, within the year, she had ANOTHER CHILD! I know not what has become of her since, but probably she is in her grave.

Is there no remedy for these evils? It seems to me there is. In the first place, let men cease to make the marriage-bed a hot-bed of licentiousness—avoid transmitting to the children a morbid excitability of the generative system; and, in the second place, let men consider the influence of low, sensual talk, on the character of boys, and refrain from it in THEIR PRESENCE, if not ALTOGETHER. MOTHERS CAN NOT shield their sons from this influence, as they do their daughters. But I know some women who will not allow their young sons to go out into the road or into a field where a parcel of men are at work, just because they “CAN’T BEAR to have their sons hear SUCH TALK !”—and this, in RESPECTABLE neighborhoods! I know SOME men who are disgusted with such stuff, and discountenance it, and I know some pretty nice, respectable men, who would be ashamed to see their OWN words in print.

Aye, boys not only have an excess of amativeness transmitted to them, but they are TAUGHT to be sensual, and to think it cunning, by the precepts and example of MEN—MARRIED men! And this brings me to marriage again, with a grave charge—that of making men licentious. It gives unlimited exercise to this passion, and we all know that exercise increases the activity of any passion or faculty; and I have observed that MARRIED men are more lustful than the UNMARRIED. Very many of the seductions and rapes which come to light (if not a majority of them), are the work of MARRIED men; (exclu-

sive of the rapes committed upon the persons of their wives), and a LARGE MAJORITY of the ATTEMPTS at seduction which have come to my knowledge, certainly have been made by married men.

Married women tell me their husbands become more amorous, and much more imperative in their demands after the first few years; and I see them becoming less refined in their feelings, and in their manner toward their wives, and, finally, toward all women—though other women are treated with more courtesy than the wife, as a rule. Married women say they grow more amorous, themselves, in marriage, till they get WORN OUT with excess. And then, when I advise temperance as necessary to the restoration of their health, they say, “Can’t follow that part of your advice—HUSBAND would not allow that—whatever he wants he WILL HAVE, even when I am sick, and tired half to death!” But, say I, REASON with him!—COAX him, or try to persuade him! In some cases, I say, Assert your right, and RESIST him. These are some of the answers I receive: “I might as well reason with a HORSE or JACKASS!” “I might as well try to persuade or coax a MULE!” “I might as well resist an AVALANCHE or a MAD BULL!” And last, though NOT LEAST, a married MAN says, he “might as well administer the decalogue to a famishing bear!” But I have the happiness of knowing that there are noble exceptions to this rule. I do not charge ALL the sensuality upon the MEN, either; both (men and women), are in the mire, and neither will ever get out without the united efforts of both. I know it is a general opinion that marriage (as well as brothels), is a safeguard to virtuous girls—that men who have WIVES are not so apt to annoy girls—try to seduce them; but MY observation, experience and knowledge, otherwise gained, have brought ME to the OPPOSITE CONCLUSION—it is the fruit of that IDEA of LICENSE; (they become familiar and BOLD in marriage), and we can never get out of that till we abolish MARRIAGE, with its rights and obligations, and become INDIVIDUALS, like UNMARRIED men and women—with no power OVER each other, or OBLIGATION to each other—seperate beds and purses, &c.

SECOND EPISTLE TO PETER.

This second epistle, beloved, I now write unto you; in both which I stir up your pure mind by way of remembrance:

That you may be mindful of the words which were spoken before.

Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last day scoffers, walking after their own lusts. (II. Peter; iii: 1, 2, 3).

And thee thought I was out of humor. See, then, if I don’t undeceive thee before I am done. I MAY have been deceived in myself, but methought I was in a fine vein of humor when I wrote, before. However, if my attempted pleasantry looked ill-natured to thee, I’ll try how “right-down, sober earnest” will look. I am surprised that thee should flinch and squirm so, merely at the overflowing of a “weaker vessel.” I would join thee in recommending “laughing and dancing in temperance.” Have often joined other Quakers in practical demonstration of my faith in those exercises. But all this has no bearing on the point at issue. Our lungs and limbs require DAILY exercise, which is furnished as perfectly and agreeably by the laugh and dance as by any other means. Our bodies require daily nutrition, which is mainly supplied by our daily meals; but I imagine thee would hardly bring material union alongside here. Nor am I able to see, after all that has been said through the S. R., that man’s life or health requires a monthly, or even yearly exercise of the sexual function.

I see not why thou shouldst ridicule the law of hereditary descent, even though it should militate strongly against thy doctrine. Surely, thou art not old-fogy enough to deny physiological or psychological science, art thou? Show me EXCEPTIONS to "the taint of hereditary influences," then sneer "upon reading my letter," if thee likes.

Thou places undue emphasis upon the assertion that "persons physically well-developed and happily situated in their affectional relations have more sexual desire than sickly persons, under any circumstances." I echo thy query, "What matters this fact?" Have I denied the like? Have I even ALLUDED to sickly individuals? Have I not admitted that most people (it matters not what are their affectional relations, or whether healthy or diseased), "have more sexual desire" than ever ought to be indulged? (Abundant proof of this fact I have witnessed in every neighborhood and village in which I ever resided). The healthy may have stronger impulses in ANY direction than the sickly, and they of course have the power for indulging to a greater extent whatever desire they do have, be it amative, alimentive, or any other. But might don't make right. Nay, I have neither denied nor "set aside" any of thy favorite facts; but simply questioned the propriety of receiving facts on so low a plane, as patterns from which to fashion our lives. Pray, don't talk to me of "favorite hobgoblins," so long as thee continues to present the ghost of some poor, melancholy fact, to every one who opposes thy creed.

Should'st thou make an assertion respecting the "law of gravitation," or aught else that I had reason to doubt, I might, perchance, answer thee Yankee fashion, as I did before, by asking if thou knowest what thou assertest, and if so, how thou knowest it. As to the timid little query that I placed in parentheses, rest assured, I had no idea 'twould "stultify" thee.

"TEMPERANCE of material union?" I don't understand how THAT'S to remedy "existing abuse." These TEMPERANCE folks, as they CALL themselves, don't stop at temperance. They adopt total abstinence, to eradicate the evil of drinking to excess. They allow no temperance of drinking—no occasional glass, from fear that "extremes develop each other."

Allow me to ask if it is THY prerogative to decide what is, and what is not "natural and attainable," any more than it is mine, or that of any other who differs from thee?

Begging thy pardon, I set no standard—have made no professions of chastity; would gladly, however, attain to that ONLY stand-point of purity which we can with justice and truth term chastity; have never hinted that I had already done so; should cherish no hope of being believed, if I had. I don't expect others to think me purer or better than themselves.

I did not expect to tell thee any thing thee did not know before, in my former letter; but merely to stir up thy mind by way of remembrance, as thee seemed to have forgotten the unnatural, enervating lives that nuns and Shakers lead, ASIDE from their sexual natures.

Thou hast given a vastly different measure from that I meted thee. I assayed to reason, and gave thee my best efforts. I am more than ever convinced that 'tis vain for women to remain at home and ask the men.

From the reasoning proclivities which I fancied thou had'st displayed in responding to others, I had hoped for something bearing the impress of reason, in reply to MY interrogatories; but I regret to say thee manifests far less of patience and philosophy than does my young clerical correspondent, when I propound my most heretical and saucy questions concerning his Calvinistic faith.

Yea, astonishing as it seems, Peter, surnamed Socialist, whom I had supposed a social reformer—a defender of woman's rights, and redresser of her wrongs—this same Peter, has met a woman's appeal to his better judgment, only with derision! Aye, ridicule—that contemptible weapon, worthy only the hand of the vanquished coward. My inquiries and arguments—the pearls of my reason—I find, were "cast before" an unappreciating mind. Truly, as saith the text: (not included in the "sermon on the mount"), "Blessed are they who expect nothing, for they shall not be disappointed!"

Farewell.

RUTH.

REPLY TO "J. P."

BY J. K. MOORE.

FRIEND PATTERSON:—Do I "turn about and make a God of Atheism?" If twelve inches make one foot, or words have definitions, and we have standards, then I have not made a God of Atheism. Webster says an Atheist is "One who disbelieves in the existence of a God or Supreme intelligent Being; and, Theist, "One who believes in a Supreme Being—Creator, and Sovereign of the Universe." Now, friend P., you make a new definition for a word when you say, "The collective energies of the Universe is God." Why not say collective energies, and let God step out? But if you still persist, I shall have to call on each of the great men to tell me what the word God means. When we discard God, what have we left, but just the Universe and its powers, or simply Nature, and find all the greatness and power very near ourselves? Wonder how you can be a "Free Lover" and not be a devotee of sect, if being without a God makes a sectarian? May be the influence of sect remains with you a little, or you would not ask the question that fogies ask so frequently as to Atheism in France. I grant all the good or bad inherent in human nature, and speak of creeds or systems as influencing that nature. If the French were more animal than we, they would be quite sure to rebound, and get to an extreme of cruelty we would not, after having been repressed by priests; for no system of hygiene heals all diseases in a day, so loathsome as superstition.

Do I claim all good springs from Atheism, or only that it is the letting-alone system—freedom, or harmony, which comes from freedom? Your God-system made the Universe—keeps constantly busy with it, to govern it—makes horrible blunders, at that. I HAVE defined Atheism to be the system of harmony, spontaneity, or a Universe without a God, and can't be so accomodating as to make another, till I learn there is another; and certainly could not define it to be "the preponderating influences of the moral sentiments," for that would not be harmony: for some get so moral they despise all the animal sentiments, and call them sensual—DEVILISH; and that's a long way from harmony.

Friend P., do you spat folks right in the face, when they don't say things just according to your notion? You speak of the "just sense" of the word Theism. I know of no more "just sense" than definition according to standard dictionaries; but if you claim the right to call the belief in the "collective energies of the Universe," Theism, why, I will give up your right; but if allowed to go by the dictionaries, shall still insist that the God idea was the father of arbitrary power. The very word implies POWER; (not good, as some claim), and the more ignorant, the worse use would be made of the poison—for creeds do poison, don't they, John? Man first learns from Nature, (the appreciation of it is all in him), and imitates that which is greatest and most powerful. The idea of government had to exist first, and that had to be derived from something supposed to rule;

yet I allow the "hen had to exist before the egg," or the "oak before the acorn." Yes; I grant that it is ignorance makes people unhappy, and as they let creeds hurt them; but being "ignorant" don't hinder Gods and creeds hurting them. But may be you think it policy only to tell your side of the story; but that, no doubt, (if it is so), is the effect of Godism? Things bearing their true relations to us make them good, and vice versa; and if we have no creeds or Gods to govern us, but let "it do itself," we are in the best possible condition to find true adaptations.

And, brother John, if I have failed to tell all the truth, and come short, if you will splice it out for me, and I can live it, it will be just as dear to me as if I had found it without your help. Give us your hand—Good-bye!

BERLIN HEIGHTS, June 26.

[Discussions respecting the abstract phases of the "God-question," I cannot but regard as rather unprofitable, considering the large questions of a more practical character we have on hands for the small space in the Social Revolutionist. Perhaps friend Moore and I can make a final disposition of this question? and with this hope, I proceed to the examination of some of his positions:

He says that "if twelve inches make one foot, or words have definitions, and we have standards, then he has not made a god of Atheism." He then gives Webster's definition of Theism and Atheism, but passes over Webster's definition of God: the very word we want most, in this connection, to know the meaning of. I signified that friend Moore made a god of Atheism, and I used the word "god" in a sense in which it is very commonly used—that given in Webster under figure 4: "Any person or THING EXALTED TOO MUCH IN ESTIMATION, or deified or honored as the chief good; as, 'their GOD is their belly.'"

Friend Moore thinks I make a new definition for the word, when I say, "God is the collective Energies of the Universe." The same word has, very frequently, many definitions; and I have the same right according to the extent of my reading and hearing, that Webster had, to say what the definition of a word is. What is it that establishes the meaning of a word? Simply usage. Then, when I observe radical thinkers of taste and literature, who no more believe in a God-entity with feet and hands, and "hinder parts" [bible], than our friend, himself;—when I observe many such using the term "God," to designate the collective Forces of the Universe, then does such usage establish this as one of the meanings of the word. Terms get new significations, legitimately. This is a necessity growing out of human change and progress. The word "platform," for example, is used every Presidential campaign in a sense not to be found in Webster's definition of the term. But our friend will not have the hardihood to question the legitimacy of those "new definitions," based, as they are, in the constitution of the human mind and the progress of thought. But even if HIS philosophy set aside the legitimacy of the "new definitions," still the stubborn FACT would remain as part and parcel of the history of every cultivated language. And the progressive idea attached to the word "God," but exemplifies what is true of a great many other words.

If the preponderating influence of the moral sentiments be not a condition of harmony, then reason, benevolence, and justice should not overrule destructiveness—there should be no regulating force of the human mind manifesting itself through the upper and frontal region of the brain; all the faculties should be peers—none lower and none higher—destructiveness should not be under the control of reason and the moral sentiments, but should mangle and destroy for its own gratification. The influence of the sun preponderates in the solar system; but this is a condition of physical harmony; and I am not able

to see why the predonderating influence of the moral sentiments over the animal propensities may not also be an absolute condition of mental harmony.

I think you misapprehend the dictionary, and get things mixed, when you say that the God-idea was the father of arbitrary power. Was not the "God-idea" and the idea of "arbitrary power" one and the same thing?

If our friend can not be patient with criticism, he should not write for a "free paper." I suggest, that if he can not have his positions examined without treating his critic to unmannerly talk about "spatting folks right in the face," he should give due notice of the fact, so that we can all keep at a respectful distance, with our hats off, and regard his utterances with deferential silence?]

REPLY TO A. HUNTER.

The first part of our friend's article emphasizes the principle that the higher kind of love—that which "is satisfied with reciprocal intellectual or moral enjoyment," is necessarily beyond control, and consequently free. He says that "peculiar organizations may limit it, but conventionalities can not enslave it." And, further on, in reference to these higher affinities, he says, "this is Free Love, and I enjoy it. Why? Not because I have a right to it, but because I CAN NOT HELP IT."

If this be true, then a married woman is free to enjoy all this kind of love that her nature craves; yet this same married woman is cooped up in an isolated house, under the surveillance of a master who usually guards her well;—but the point our friend makes is this: that any one—a married woman, for example, can enjoy all her loves of the "higher order," without the objects of them residing with her in the same house.

But, further on, his gutta percha logic has a different part to play, and he writes: "Or did it escape the clear vision of 'self' that if 'wife' had children by other lovers, that he would be enjoying the society of other men's juveniles, whilst their FATHERS can not enjoy them? Can not the modest matron perceive that the individual sovereign who lives with her for the sake of her children, may have other children with whom he can not live, and therefore can not enjoy, and that the voice of Nature is as strong in the one case as in the other?" Now, if the parents can not enjoy such "juveniles" when all do not reside in the same house, how are they, living thus separated from their other spiritual affinities, to enjoy the exalted love our inimitable logician prates so rapturously about? If our friend can not manage to have parents enjoy the "higher love" for their children unless all are under the same roof, how does he manage so adroitly to have them enjoy the "higher love" for other sexual affinities, under the self-same conditions of isolation? But, in another part of his article, he does manage to have parents (mothers), enjoy their parental love, in spite of all possible barriers. In illustrating the higher love, he says, "the natural instinct of a mother makes it peculiarly strong for her offspring. How could you enslave this sentiment in the mother?—how prevent its free action? Try to circumscribe it, and it becomes more intense." She enjoys this love, not because it is her right, but because she CAN NOT HELP IT. This is his doctrine. We are here given to understand that the love of the parent must have full scope for action—that it is impossible to prevent it; while he asserts, further on, that certain parents could not enjoy their own juveniles! But I will drop this part of the subject; I don't like to carry my readers so far into the regions of the sublime?

Our friend plays upon the words "sigh" and "suffer," in a way that may be smart, for any thing I know. He plays, also, upon the word "mistake," but in such a way as to prove his entire misapprehension of the sense in which it was used in the quotation he gives. The word was used in that connection with sole reference to the idea that the dual love would make the parties happy for life. The "mistake" consists, not in loving each other, but in EXPECTING THAT IT SHOULD MAKE THEM ENTIRELY SATISFIED AND HAPPY. Let our friend's remarks in this connection be read with this sense of the term in the mind—the sense in which it was used in the quotation—and it will be seen how totally irrelevant and unjust his reflections are. He misconstrues the meaning of a writer, and then fires hollow words at Free Love!

Whilst I believe it is a "mistake" to expect too much of any love, yet I can not conceive that any love is itself a mistake. Whether the love last for a year or a life-time, I can not see that it is in any sense an evil; I think it a good so far as it goes—an angelisation, and any thing but a mistake.

Talking of mistakes, reminds me that our friend has made a few in his valiant onset against Free Love. One of these I shall refer to as a preliminary—the other as a cardinal mistake. The first consists in the presumption that the "higher love" between the sexes is not circumscribed by conventionalities. A woman who has promised to "honor and obey" one man, thus submitting her will to that of another, who guards her day and night;—is not such a woman's opportunities for the enjoyment of this higher love circumscribed by the conventionalities of marriage? She has not even a room sacred to herself which her husband may not break into any hour—she is not securely free to exchange any of the endearments of a higher love which her husband may not witness. There are no sanctities of love for the woman but such as her legal master shares. He may be very stupid, but he has an instinct in his heart far truer than our friend's quasi-philosophy. He knows very well that it is not best to let the intimacies of the higher love between his wife and other men, go to far; for he has the consciousness within himself that this tender and exalting sentiment which obtains between the sexes may descend into the body and demand the physical embrace as its right and only satisfying condition. But this would be too much freedom for him—and he is a virtuous man; he has the right of property in a woman's person—it serves him a purpose, and he takes care to prevent every sweet endearment of the higher love that puts his exclusive right and use of said woman's person in jeopardy. And yet we are told that "pure loves" can not be circumscribed by conventionality! Nonsense! They are so circumscribed and proscribed in every nook and corner of civilization!

This brings us to our friend's cardinal mistake—a mistake which vitiates all his article, and neutralizes all its caustic properties. It consists in treating of love between the sexes and sexual communion as if there was no relation between them—as if they were distinct and separate things.

Integral sexual love, as I understand it to obtain in healthy persons, embraces two elements: the spiritual and physical—the spiritual always preceding the physical, and fitting the subjects for that intensity which the latter gives. In an integral love-manifestation the physical is always a part, and always subordinate to the spiritual. Where there is not physiological affinity between the parties, their love can not be regarded as an integral sexual love, since they may be attracted to each other as friends, but not as lovers, to the sexual union. But in speaking of "sexual love," I have reference to a love when matured, that demands the physical ultimatum by virtue of the eternal laws of love, itself. To deny such ultimate expression, I must regard as injustice to love and treason

against purity. The denial is a flagrant breach of natural law; and it meets with its just reward in a disquieted soul and a diseased body. Such suppression of the rights of love have reacted into the opposite extreme, and swelled the ranks of prostitution. It has unhinged the minds of sensitive and loving ones; it has unbalanced the health of others, and hurried them to premature graves. "Virtue"—the cant of imbecility and hypocrisy, has done this damning work!—virtue: which means the puritanical outlawry of the highest principles implanted in the human constitution! Such "virtue" does not spare the rod, lest it spoil the child; it makes Sunday a day of gloom, and the home a prison-house for youth, lest they romp and sing, and be joyous, as it is their wont to be; it snaps the strings of the harp and stops the dance with a scowl; it seeks every occasion to staunch the warm gushings of the heart and throw a pall over the jubilees of universal life! Conventionality drives a man and woman into wedlock which results in discord and hate; but it grants no release from the conditions of habitual prostitution, and this is "virtue!" If our friend loves this unclean prude, with a face as long as a priest's, and a heart full of hypocrisy—let him; but give me the nymph of Nature—sweet, and clean, and chaste, and beautiful, with a heart that must be true to itself.

"Would it be an unpardonable crime to insinuate that neither wife nor self were governed by any higher principle than that of mere lust?" This question, together with the context, proves that its author has no higher conception of the physical manifestations of love than of the unloving coition of the bawdy-house. Though he refers, often, to the physical embrace, yet not in any one instance in all his article of four pages, does he speak of it as the legitimate right of a matured love, subordinated thereto—the physical sanctified by the spiritual; but he divests the act of all love—is at pains to do so, and alludes to it solely as a low, gross, bestial act, till we feel that he has no conception of it in any other light. I hope he does not speak on this matter from his own experience.

Such zest has this writer for the lascivious, that he takes an extract from the S. R. and substitutes "sexual intercourse," "sexual pleasure," and "cohabit," for "love," and "free love," and then it reads to his mind; for he says, "I submit, this is the true representation of the idea meant to be conveyed." I, John Patterson, the writer of that extract, know that this filthy travesty is not the true representation of the idea meant to be conveyed; but that the original might have conveyed such an idea to an imagination polluted with diseased amativeness, I do not question.

Our friend speaks of affinities of a higher order which "are calculated to revolutionize society by drawing the VIRTUOUS together; by associating those who can look upon other men's 'mates' through other optics than the eye of sexual passion, and give them a love UNADULTERATED by the lower propensities of our nature." Here we have "virtue" all in a nut-shell. Virtue does not require that a man who has a "mate" shall monopolize all her spiritual love. His mate may give of that to other men—she is allowed control of the spiritual elements of her being, but her body—so much more precious than her soul in the eye of this supernal "virtue," belongs exclusively to her husband, who is so much better qualified than herself, we presume, to keep it "pure." She may give a pinch of "intellectual or moral love" to others; but the physical—why, her husband owns all that just as conclusively and exclusively as he owns his horse; and all who believe in this sort of thing are "virtuous!" Plenty such—and it is a wonder they have not redeemed society, long ago! The cause of the failure is to be found in this, perhaps: that such "virtue" grew, originally, out of the base of the brain; whilst it is unchastened animality that sustains it now, and diseased amativeness that breeds all this mawkish sentimentality about "love unadulterated with the lower propensities," and "affinities so spir-

itual and holy that the animal instincts sink into utter insignificance," and (in the same strain it might have been added), "are everlastingly nasty."

This valiant defender of the faith erst delivered to the "virtuous," forgets that the physical ultimatum of love—the sexual act subordinated to love and informed by it, may seem really pure and good—natural and exalting, even, to such as have not had their affectional nature diseased by lives sexually unnatural—that such act is pure to pure minds, and impure only to impure minds. We commend these reflections to our good friend, hoping they will not be entirely lost upon him.

Dr. Hunter asserts that a certain writer for the S. R. is "an advocate of unrestricted sexual connection." This I deny; and so the burthen of proof falls upon the doctor; and this he must furnish or retract the charge, else stand convicted of wilful misrepresentation. If he undertake to sustain the assertion, let him not resort to unfair garbling and travesty, nor mistake the blur of his own optics for the sense of the writer. I know that not a word has ever been traced by the writer in question, with reference to the normal functions of love, which does not presume the ENTIRE AND COMPLETE SUBORDINATION OF THE PHYSICAL UNION TO SPIRITUAL LOVE, and no case incompatible with this can be made out against him.

But our chivalrous knight, not content with this charge, proceeds upon the heels of the travestied paragraph, I have already noticed, to announce "that what Reformers require and plead for IS NOT A GREATER ELEVATION OF THE AFFECTIONAL MAN, but a more extended liberty in the gratification of the sexual propensity," &c. This charge, without any exaggeration, might be deemed a sweeper—it takes down the whole army of "Reformers" at one fell swoop—and the champion that does such mighty works in the cause of Fogyism, ought to be well fortified with facts, logically armed, and protected by a ponderous shield of—"virtue." But he has made the assault; and as the Social Revolutionist is an open field, we shall see how well he acquits himself.

THE GRADES OF FREEDOM.

We are talking a great deal about social freedom, without talking very definitely to the point; and the result is that in not understanding ourselves very clearly, we fail to understand each other. I begin with the proposition that all mankind are just as free as they want to be. This is stated, of course, as the rule; there are exceptions, as for example: political "insurgents," religious "dissenters," and social "revolutionists;" but these classes altogether are not numerous when compared with the entire population of the earth. There is most discontent amongst the most advanced peoples, because with them the activities of progress are greatest, and discontent is a necessity of progress. But the point is this: the great mass of mankind—all the millions of Europe and Asia are quite satisfied with their condition—they have all the freedom they want—all the freedom they could enjoy. The same is essentially true of the chattel slaves of the South and the wages slaves of the North—they do not know of any higher freedom for themselves, and they plod along, stolid and satisfied with what they have. The same is essentially true of the great mass of marriage slaves. What do the millions of wedded women in civilization want with more affectional freedom than they have? They would take the very offer of more as an insult.

Freedom is a thing of grades. The individual more highly organized, wants a wider range than one of lower organization. What is adequate freedom to a German boor, would be slavery to a restless Yankee. The peasant who was conceived and reared in the midst of routine and insipidity, is content with the routine of every day occurrences, and sups his beer and smokes his pipe, dreaming of no enjoyment more exalted than this; but a Humboldt or a Herschel must have scope to revel in the midst of other activities. The conditions of life for the two classes are very different. The boor can not enjoy the freedom of a Humboldt, because he has not the capacity to use its conditions; a Humboldt would be cramped to death in the contracted sphere of the boor. What is true in this case, is true, as I conceive, in every other. Every grade of mankind has social conditions adapted to the freedom demanded by that grade. Thus, monogamic marriage has its conditions, and those conditions, and the scope of freedom which they permit, are just what the great mass of civilizees want. Monogamists enjoy all the freedom they want—they have all the freedom they have capacity to appreciate; and hence they erst established, and perpetually maintain the conditions of monogamy.

But some are dissatisfied with any form of marriage; they want more freedom than is consistent with its necessary conditions. Now, I claim that as monogamy has its peculiar conditions, so has a higher freedom its peculiar conditions. Every grade of society—every grade of social freedom, has its own special conditions. Some assert the claim of social freedom, and yet assume that they have a right in freedom to establish for themselves the conditions of exclusive dualism, as mating off, and occupying the same room and bed, continuously. They certainly have this right; they have the right to employ a priest to mumble the ceremony, if they wish; but this much I feel to assure them: that if they establish the conditions of a lower freedom for themselves, they will have to “put up” with that lower freedom; and that if they want a higher grade of freedom, they will have to conform to the conditions of such higher grade. How the more exalted freedom is to be actualized under the conditions which are adapted only to a lower grade of freedom, I am not able to see.

I repeat, that every grade of freedom has its own peculiar conditions. The conditions of marriage do not give a noble woman the freedom she craves. She wants a freedom, the conditions of which, at no time, rob her of individual sovereignty. So, she must be sovereign through the day and through the night; she must have her own room and her own bed at her own sovereign disposal. If she become, either by her love or by any other condition, DEPENDENT upon any one man, then is her individual sovereignty at an end; she becomes the mere appendage of a man—the THING that she is now held to be by law and gospel. I say, if a woman is thus dependent upon any one man in any condition growing out of love, as that of pregnancy, for example: then is the social freedom we are hoping for an ignis fatuus. If, in this condition, her love must become the monopoly of one man, no one would be willing to love her, but under circumstances which would not be likely to exalt another to the chief place, and drive the first from her love with a wrong heart; and hence, the old process of mating off would be the result; and there is nothing freer for humanity than marriage—and there is a hell in the Universe.

Many who now seem to wish for the higher freedom will only re-establish the conditions of the old freedom, such as it is in marriage. Place the boor in Humboldt's library, or in Faraday's laboratory, and he would want, as much as ever, to swig his beer and smoke his pipe. It is only on those with a preponderating activity of those faculties whose scope of action is divergent and comprehensive, that we can rely, to establish the conditions of the higher freedom, and give an example of the same to the world.

TOLERATION---WHAT IS IT?

It is easy to talk about toleration, and easy to claim it, but not so easy to know just what it is. Toleration is a thing of actual life; and those who agree very fully in theory may differ when it comes to the minutæ of practice. In a practical light, hardly two minds will conceive precisely the same thing of toleration; and hence the error of those who claim that mutual toleration may unite such as entertain conflicting views of life, and make them a harmonious brotherhood. I can not see that "toleration" has any such magic power; since two minds for the union of which, we might presume toleration a necessity, would, for that very reason, conceive differently of toleration itself, and would, consequently, be as far apart as ever. The idea of toleration, itself, will be diversely tinged in passing through two minds who take different views of life; and, therefore, toleration can not be a bond of union between them.

We may get at the meaning of toleration most readily, perhaps, by inquiring what intolerance would be. When Rome had the inquisition, the rack, and stake, she was intolerant. We all agree as to that. If a Protestant sect assume that all who do not belong to it will be damned, and refuse fellowship with those of different faith from its own, it is intolerant. We shall not disagree as to that. But if the people of one denomination accord to others the credit of sincerity, and give them cordial fellowship in their religious exercises, are they not tolerant? Some denominations in the rural districts, where "civilization" has not yet done its work, are thus brotherly; and I claim that they are tolerant to each other on the subject of religion.

But we want to know what toleration is in the social sphere. Those who claim to be of noble blood, or of the "best families," surround themselves with conventional barriers, which better persons than themselves of a "lower caste" are not permitted to break through. Such society, in discarding the companionship of others, upon arbitrary grounds, is, to my mind, intolerant. I am an avowed free lover—I am such from principle; but whatever might be my capabilities for giving and receiving enjoyment in society of standard respectability, yet would that society contemptuously reject my companionship. Such society would be intolerant. But I have a neighbor who thinks me wrong in my social faith, and absolutely in my life; and he says so to others; and tells me so whenever proper opportunities present themselves for doing so; yet he does not think me insincere because of my faith and practice; nor does he discard my companionship upon arbitrary grounds; but recognizes me as his brother, to the extent which we are mutually capable of responding socially to each other. If I understand the matter rightly, this neighbor is tolerant. He may seek the companionship of those who see like him, far more than he seeks mine; and this would be right: since, all things else equal, one who took the same views of life with himself, could give him a fuller response, and, consequently, more social happiness than I could.

Social tolerance seems to me to consist in withholding fellowship from others from considerations which are purely arbitrary or conventional; social toleration: in accepting the companionship of others so far as they have social affinities for us—so far as they can give us social response.

But I am convinced that some who are making the claim of toleration, demand a good deal more than this. Toleration, as they seem to understand it, means APPROVAL; or, if not approval, then, no expression of opinions adverse to the course which they pursue. That is: they want toleration for their acts, at the expense of free speech in others. Thus,

I believe, that living under the symbols of marriage, as in mating off and rooming together, whether legally united or not, is incompatible with the social freedom of all; and so, those who profess freedom, yet adopt these outward expressions of dualism in their lives, charge me with intolerance, for the free expression of my opinions respecting their course. Honestly believing, as I do, that their habits in this regard, must eventuate in social despotism; or, in other words, in permanent dualism, isolation and the family, I must suppress the utterance of that thought, or else, I am held to be intolerant. Now, if I allow them to live their own lives, without charging them with insincerity because of their faith or practice, and without discarding their companionship in any respect in which they are capable of responding to me, I am every whit tolerant, as I suppose, though I give utterance, in my own way, to candid opinions adverse to their course of life. Let those who claim toleration for their acts, remember, that in return, they must tolerate thought and speech.

But I have intimated that toleration will not hold those together, who do not legitimately belong to each other. Here is one party who adopts a course of life which another party thinks unwise: and it so gives expression to its opinions. The first party feels reflected upon, gets uneasy, suspects censure, and becomes nettled. They fail to come to an understanding; the breach widens, and the parties separate. I do not see how toleration can unite those upon different social planes, in the same harmonic brotherhood. The world of mankind always has divided upon this principle, into clans, cliques, groups, communities, &c.; and I think it always will. Those will unite who can respond most fully to each other; and the sameness of faith and life is an element of social affinity and a condition of the fullness of response. "Birds of a feather flock together," is the homely statement of a principle which I believe is true—not for the past, only, but for the future—not for the earth, only, but for the heavens.

LAYING DOWN THE LAW.

BY CORDELIA BARRY.

We good people talk very largely about what is "natural," and "law," and "right," in regard to the various manifestations and expressions of love; in regard to the free play of the affinities, attractions, repulsions, &c. We who claim to have reached the plane of freedom; who have ranked ourselves as acceptors of more than one, only love, are, like all the rest of the world, forever laying down THE LAW—we BELIEVE so and so; Nature's law is this or that. To me there is little of the absolute which we have yet attained to; of few things can we say, this is axiomatic; for what is the law of right and harmony for us to-day, may be outgrown to-morrow; what is natural and legitimate in our present unfolding, will seem unnatural and wrong in the futures that come to us.

We all know the idea of freedom is absolute—we all feel that freedom is an ever need, and that whatever else is NOT, THIS MUST BE; yet what we count as freedom, can not be seen so by another; and what is legitimate and conclusive to us, may be wildest vagaries to them. We see from different stand-points, and, of course, a different view is presented to each. We should remember this, when the naturalness and beauty of certain manifestations pertaining to the affectional sphere are written, or talked of. We grow: are not forever standing on the one round of the ladder; and every step upward brings a different landscape to our eyes—a different shape and shading to all objects. So in the

whole wide realm of thought—change is the life of the universe; and this precludes the idea of marking out the “straight and narrow way.”

Men and women give out their thought and experience—both coming from the discordances and fetters of marriage, mostly; yet it is given us as LAW, NATURE, PURITY, as verified in their own lives: presuming, or imagining that what has seemed the law to them is, perforce, as much a law to others; and that which has seemed natural and inevitable in marriage, must also hold good in freedom. Here is our grand mistake. Women who have thrown out those “nuts to crack,” have given us “law” as MARRIAGE has unfolded it to them—have given their experience in one condition, as our rule in far other conditions; and we, out of that phase, yet in the more transitional state, and knowing scarcely nothing of the freedom we are growing to—we, as much, seem inclined to think we have found “the law,” in our brief experience to an approaching freedom; and, most magnanimously, give it to the world. It is all good; I like all experiences, in all phases: all philosophies, for all conditions; only let us not assume to ourselves we have found the positiveness—the everlasting-unchangeable; for as conditions change, so do our relations to things; and this is law—THE RELATIONS OF THINGS. So, one thing may be law to us now, while the “to come” will bring other conditions, other developments, other “relations to things.”

Then what have we to do, as apostles of the new dispensation—or, rather, as individual human souls—self-reliant, self-poised, yet ever-developing spirits: but simply to LIVE OUR OWN LIFE daily and hourly, as it comes to us; being true to our own natures; flowing out in the spontaneous, free, upwelling life of love, and joy, and beauty; asking not of our souls—“Dost act as thy faith teaches?” but LIVING as our whole being prompts, and rendering reverent homage to the law of now. Presuming on the future from the desires and aspirations of the past or present, is like imagining that a coat that fits and pleases us to-day, must ever thus fit and please—even in those “coming golden years,” when conditions shall be so changed, our own natures necessarily developed to a higher plane, and the radiance of a more glorious day shall shed its shine upon our spirits.

We shall be charged with “inconsistency” if we live not to-morrow what we talked and acted upon to-day: but what boots it? Are we not to grow? Is not change inevitable? Must we feel there is anything stereotyped, when the very pith of life is progress? Melancthon could be THUS inconsistent; for when accused, his answer was: “I should be ashamed to have lived these years and not have LEARNED anything.” We need advocate no faith; we need have no creed; we can truthfully present nothing with a “Thus saith the Lord,” for the myriad voices of Nature speak to each soul differently, and the life and aspiration of each, is as their development. So, on whatever plane we are, we must live out our own natures—be true to our own interior convictions, as the only path to a true and beautiful unfolding. We need not quarrel with ourselves, that we see not like others; it is well, and beautiful as well; it is a part of the great plan of the universe that our very differences should most unfold us. There is an eternal fitness of things; and because our brother sees and acts differently from us, we need neither count him lower, nor ourselves higher; for each is acting just as he must—just as his organization and surroundings make him; and we have but to realize, in the clearness of our philosophy, that only as each is true to his present growth, does he lead a pure and fitting life; and that each is pure and beautiful, in proportion to his trueness and naturalness.

When we lay down no laws; when we assert nothing dogmatically; when we presume not to judge for another; when we have no sectarian faiths to uphold—then shall we know something of freedom, and something of the wants it may bring to us.

BERLIN HEIGHTS.

NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENT.

Reformers, as a class, are generally poor; and the high price of land in most of the proposed localities for social effort, has prevented, and will continue to prevent many from doing anything practical in the way of social reorganization. They very naturally want to own the land they occupy, from the start; and where a man has next to nothing to begin with, and land costs from \$25 to \$100 an acre, this is not so easily done. Now, if land can be got at a cheap rate, with nearly all the desired advantages, and an opportunity to develop the rest, this difficulty will be obviated.

In many parts of Missouri are quantities of land which can be had (by actual settlers) at from $12\frac{1}{2}$ cents to 75 cents or \$1 per acre. After June next, all the government land in southern Missouri can be had on these conditions, at not over 75 cents an acre. Missouri is fast settling by free state men, and slaveholders are leaving as fast; so that the objection to settling in a slave state is of no consequence. The anti-slavery feeling is rapidly gaining a preponderance, and those who are disposed to attend to their own affairs, and not meddle with those of other people, can live without molestation in any part of the state. I have recently seen a man (Mr. Sumpter), who has traveled considerably in the state, and bought land in the south-western district. He observed, closely, the condition of things; and from him, and other reliable sources, I gathered the following information: The soil is generally good—some variety, but mostly a reddish clay-sand, inclining, sometimes, to muck; deep and loose; well adapted to growing fruit: which, together with Irish and sweet potatoes, melons, and, in fact, everything that thrives well in a loose, warm soil, grows luxuriantly. Fine large grapes grow wild. There is every variety of scenery, from rich lowlands to mountains and valleys. Prairies abound to some extent, though not so much as in some other states of the West. Briskly running streams of good water abound in many localities; also, springs of water, more or less pure. Plenty of fish and game—for those who want them. The Summer season is about a month longer at each end, than in the latitude of central Ohio; and melons, Indian corn and many other things come to a perfection not attainable in more northern latitudes. The Winters are mild and short; and stock requires but little care. Mr. S. said that cattle were good beef when he left, (about June 15), though the Spring was about a month later than usual. (By the way, cattle-growing would be a profitable business for those who are disposed to go into it). Fruit is a pretty sure crop. Last Winter was unusually severe; the ground froze, under the leaves—and the inhabitants were afraid their timber would all be killed! The cold season being shorter and less severe, many expenses would be greatly diminished: as clothing, fuel, &c. People would not need to make slaves of themselves to maintain a bare existence; but could afford a little time for rest, and to cultivate their higher natures. For this reason, as well as being better for fruit and other crops, a situation well to the South would be desirable.

All the land offices have been lately closed, to keep out speculators, it is supposed; but pre-emptions (which hold the land for a year), can be made at any time. One may preempt for others; Mr. S. did so for several friends—the expense is \$1. The amount one may buy, with the benefit of the graduation law, is 320 acres—enough for any reasonable man, I think.

I have not learned as much about the $12\frac{1}{2}$ cent land, as the other, but understand it lies mostly in the south-east part of the State (St. Louis district). One man I talked

with said it included as good land as any in the state; but was generally too uneven to suit him. (He didn't like Kansas, for the same reason). That is just the reason why I would prefer it, unless it is too broken. It would be preferable to a level country, for several reasons: better for fruit, better scenery, better water, and more healthy; and, besides, it would give good southern exposures for grapes and other fruits.

Land at $12\frac{1}{2}$ cents is certainly preferable (other things being equal), to that at 75 cts. But I would not sacrifice anything worth while for such a consideration. With a rapid influx of immigration, making a ready market for all that could be raised, a man ought to make enough off of his land in a single season to pay for a good home, at 75 cents. Some, who have the means to do so, might prefer to buy improved farms; these, I understand, could be got far cheaper than farms similarly situated, further north or east. Mr. S. stated, that farms with first-rate improvements could be got for from \$5 to \$25 per acre. The fact is, slaveholding is getting to be a precarious business, and slaveholders are anxious to leave and go where their property will be more safe. Slavery will probably continue to exist in Arkansas, south, and Indian Territory, south-west; and it would be advisable to locate far enough from either to be out of its atmosphere—30 to 50 miles I would consider a safe distance. It would also be desirable to locate on a stream, large enough to furnish plenty of power for machinery, and, also, water for irrigation, &c.

Now, what I am coming at is this: There are several reformers in this neighborhood, myself included, who talk of going to Missouri and starting a reform neighborhood. I am acquainted with several, in other parts, who will also be likely to go. We want to get as many WHOLE- SOULED, PRACTICAL REFORMERS as we can, who like the idea, to go with us. We want, if possible, to go in sufficient numbers to control public sentiment, establish a union store, library association, and such other measures of economy and progress as may be thought best. Would not propose any special rules for future action, but leave circumstances to develop such measures as may be needed. Some may form associations, and others co-operate in certain directions, as a matter of economy. It would be desirable to have none along but those who are PRACTICAL in their reform, and who dispense with tobacco, pork, drugs, and spirituous liquors.

We do not expect to escape all the privations incident to the settlement of a new country; but these will be much less than in Iowa or Kansas, for the reason that Missouri has been partially settled for a good many years, and the necessaries and conveniences of life are far more plenty than in newer states. I think the advantages to be gained will far overbalance the privations; and those who can not endure a little temporary inconvenience for the sake of the benefits to be gained, are not worth having along.

Whatever is done, should be done without unnecessary delay. I would propose that some one or more competent persons, who can do so, start on an exploring expedition as soon as possible, find a suitable location, (where there is considerable vacant land, in a body), make a start for themselves, and pre-empt for others, who could follow up, as fast as they get ready.

Let us have as much concert of action as circumstances will allow. Any person, possessing further important information respecting southern Missouri, would confer a favor by publishing it. We expect to report progress through the Social Revolutionist, or Vanguard—probably both. Those wishing to join the movement may address (enclosing a stamp, if an answer is desired),

M. BOYD,

Union County Water-Cure, Cottage Grove, Ind.

Spiritual and reform papers please copy.

CRITICISMS.

BY J. H. MENDENHALL.

To T. McWHORTER:—

I object to the following—not to its being thy honest conviction; but to its philosophy:

“It is our sincere conviction, that had the human mind been freed from its blind adherence to mythological traditions, and its unfettered powers been directed to the natural relation which man sustains to external nature and his fellow-man—to all the wants and desires of human nature—to all the causes of human misery—to all the springs of happiness—had the same amount of talent, thought and investigation been directed to the study of the natural laws of our being, as developed in the constitutional nature of man, as, for the last thousand years, has been wasted over the mystic pages of the bible, the earth would have been blessed with the millennial reign of peace, harmony, love and freedom.”—[S. R., vol. 3, page 141].

Now, brother, permit me to say, that no talent, time nor means have been wasted over the mystic pages of the bible; nor could the “millennial reign” usher in any sooner than what it will. Neither could the unfettered powers of the mind have been directed to the above mentioned studies, only at such periods of the world’s history as were adapted to their birth or promulgation; for all things are governed by the unerring law of progression: hence, all come up at an appropriate time, and had they come sooner they would not have been received. Had they not yet come, the world would only be that much behind what it now is, in point of progress. He who can look into Nature can see that all is as it had to be—not from any will or design of some supposed deity: but from the innate tendency of the law of progression, which pervades all things known to man. Time may be measured into ages, periods and revolutions—each measure brings forth its own legitimate fruit, good, or bad in quality, according to the development made. With this view, brother, we see that “whatever is, is right.” Each individual is true to its own organization, and acts in harmony with the general surroundings of its own sphere.

To P. I. BLACKER:—

“Each person is both male and female—both positive and negative.”—[S. R., vol. 3, page 114].

Now, as it is generally acknowledged, among reformers, that there is nothing too sacred to talk about, I trust the Revolutionist will not censure me if I use plain language in reviewing this question. If the above quotation is true, in reference to the dual principle, then might the propagation of the human species go on without the aid of what is commonly known as the female sex. Each male, when desirous of offspring, would exercise his dual organism, and lo! a child would be born—perhaps a Christ—or a sodomite: for these are the only cases of the kind that I can now recall to mind?

Again: if the brother has made such new discoveries as he asserts, in his dual theory, would it not be an improvement to let the world know it: that we might be blest with a strong and robust generation, derived from the giant males of the earth? as, also, charitable, in relieving many a poor female from the untold suffering of child-bearing, at which his Freelovism revolts?

And again: Nature don’t often make demands without supplies; and vice versa. Where there are supplies there always are demands. Now, if brother Blacker’s theory is correct, then there would be no such demands and supplies between man and woman as the sexual relations call for: but each would produce their own kind, regardless of the other.

TO MARY.

BY JOSEPH.

My own Mary, to whom my heart has long been so kind, and to whom I feel I to-day render the deep and worshipful homage of an appreciation of which few are capable—yet you are fallen to me! There's a terrible SPELL in your words, that stifles my very breath as I read, and turns my heart to an icy cold; and I shrink from its withering, as from the touch of fire! I shudder at your Article, and I shudder at you.

It is to me a great "depravity," that can bring a WOMAN so to write herself down a procurer and a set-on. The great world of to-day will praise you, and exclaim, "A Daniel come to judgment!" but they that shall make up the verdict in the good world that shall be after, shall hang their heads, and sigh over your record of Jesuitism and evasion, and seek to blot it out, but that the Universe embalms all its annals imperishable forever! Myself would not be the author of that record THEN, for more than this round world of gold!

The SPIRIT of your Article must yet breathe to my receiving nature, that it is the "hit bird that flutters!"

Mary, dear, I still love. One day, may you yet be saved! Then you will be GLORIOUS.

EDITORIAL MISCELLANY.

A PRACTICAL MOVEMENT.—There is a movement originating amongst New England Spiritualists, which is exciting some attention at present; and about which there are conflicting opinions. The writer of this has tried, somewhat, to study it; but so far, has not made satisfactory progress. Some of the principal agitators are J. M. Spear, T. S. Sheldon, S. C. Hewitt, Lorin Moody, D. F. Goddard, J. H. W. Toohey, S. P. Andrews, Miss Hinkly, Mrs. French, &c. They have held meetings at Buffalo, Boston, New York and Portland. There has been no full report of their proceedings as yet. The most satisfactory report—that of the New York meeting, was published in the *Spiritual Age*; but this report did not contain all the papers read at the convention. The spirits seem to be the prime movers; and the papers read and the machinery exhibited have been prepared by the spirits. In what has been given respecting the improvement of the Race, by greater attention to the laws of reproduction, and the inauguration of better social conditions, there are suggestions certainly worthy of something better than the sneers they have met with from some reformatory quarters. The fault of these agitators, as I conceive, has been in presenting to the public their spiritual papers unpruned of their prolix and peurile English. If the ideas they embody had been clothed in vigorous and tasteful language, their reception by the "spiritual" public would certainly have been more cordial than it has been. Another cause of the ridicule with which this movement has been received, is due to what seems to the most of us, rather wild projects about a spiritual machine and a palace, to be constructed on the model of the human organism. The writer of this not being a machinist or mechanic, can not believe much in this machine of spiritual origin, till it is made to run a pump or saw for a year or two; and he can not but

think that the spiritual architecture will work better in a model than in a palace; and that when it comes to touching a spring, and transporting articles from one part of the mansion to another, it will probably "cost more than it comes to." But S. C. Hewitt, and the spirits, and the sure test of time will eventually decide these things.

This movement appears to contemplate three things, chiefly: The reorganization of society on natural principles, and the establishment of a new church and a new republic, growing out of the legitimate needs of "progressed Spiritualists." Whether all these things are really distinct, or one and the same thing, this witness saith not. With respect to the new church, the following is quoted from the proceedings of the Portland meeting, as reported in the N. E. Spiritualist:

Mr. Andrews said: There is a natural law and order, which, when allowed to operate, will regulate all things. The best hatter will attract and control the hatting business; and so, the best teacher, the highest mediator, will draw around him those who need his mediations. In one sense, we are not so much to FORM an organization, as TO RECOGNIZE THAT WHICH ALREADY EXISTS IN THE CONSTITUTION OF THINGS. There are natural priests, as well as natural hatters and shoemakers. These will be recognized by those to whom they constitutionally bear this relation, and no others are to be required to recognize them. But every natural internal function requires ACCOMMODATION for its external exercise and expression. Hence, association for the supply of this want. Whatever interferes with free expression should be removed. The religious idea seeks expression—hence the need of churches, etc., for its accomodation. But none should be compelled to worship; on the contrary, the non-worshiper should be defended in his right not to worship. Individuality is not to be infringed upon in any way.

Mr. Goddard said: he disliked old organizations as much as any one could. But a TRUE church will be a wise and normal projection of the innate religious elements in man. What are these? 1st. Faith, or aspiration towards and dependence upon the Higher: hence, devotion, reverence, humility. We all recognize this—the goings forth of the soul toward the Infinite Wholeness, by whatever name It or He may be addressed. 2d. Love, or the desire to bless others. These two—love to God and love to man, make the two halves of a whole. They require mutual co-operation, machinery by which to accomplish benevolent ends—Sisters of Charity and a Brotherhood of Mercy—architecture, art, music, commerce, educational institutions—all those surroundings and aids which help to develop man's highest and finest powers.

Suppose they get a new church; will it not have to support a privileged class, with lily-white hands and assuming manners, to do its talking, managing, &c.? And will it not be honorable, in this new organization, as it is in the old, to govern, even if self-elected and qualified by nature for the places of trust? And will not these posts of honor be sought after and secured by hypocrites? Even if ambitious and mercenary motives have nothing to do with setting up this new church, will they not creep in afterwards—so much so that the "new" church would soon stink with corruption, just like the "old" ones do? And if such things should obtain in the new church, would it not be quite as likely to obtain in the NEW REPUBLIC?

Yet this agitation is a God-send; and this humble pen bids it God-speed! It will stir up the elements of progress, even in the ridicule and opposition it meets; and though it fail as to any practical results, for the present, it certainly is one of the means which will lead to practical results hereafter.

SHAM.—Our readers are aware that Benjamin Pierce, Ls. Agassiz, B. A. Gould, Jr., and E. N. Horsford consented to make a scientific inquiry into the merits of spirit-communication. In their report, they say:

"It is the opinion of the committee, derived from observation, that any connection with spiritualistic circles, so-called, corrupts the morals and degrades the intellect. They,

therefore, deem it their solemn duty to warn the community against this contaminating influence, which surely tends to lessen the truth of man and the purity of woman.

"The committee will publish a report of their proceedings, together with the results of additional investigations and other evidence independent of the special case submitted to them, but bearing upon the subject of this stupendous delusion."

At this writing, the report here referred to has not been published; yet enough has been divulged to show that the eminent savans did not intend to conduct a candid investigation. They refused to allow Dr. Gardner to establish the conditions without which the manifestations could not take place; and then the above quotation is sufficiently indicative of the rancor with which, at least, the chairman of the committee regards Spiritualism. Yet this same Prof. Pierce had admitted to Prof. Hare "that certain manifestations must be due to deception or the spirits of departed mortals." This, taken in connection with his late scientific (?) bull respecting manifestations in general, would go to show that he regards Dr. Hare a deceiver, or else that he (Pierce), is a hypocritical time-server. Posterity will give a just verdict upon the scientific honesty of the two savans, Prof. Robert Hare and Prof. Benjamin Pierce.

CLEARING THEIR SKIRTS.—The Ravenna Convention of Spiritualists did not go quite to the minds of some who are very solicitous about the reputation of Spiritualism. "At a meeting held at the Universalist Church, in Ravenna, on Tuesday evening, July 7th, at the close of a lecture by Mr. Denton, of Dayton, Seth Day was appointed chairman, and J. S. Curtis, secretary." Four "resolutions were then offered, and after some discussion, were adopted, with one dissenting vote." Two of them read as follows:

Resolved, That the sentiments uttered by Mrs. Carrie Lewis, of Cleveland, and approved by Mrs. H. F. M. Brown and Henry C. Wright, in reference to the abolition of the marriage relation, meet with our decided disapprobation.

Resolved, That, as Spiritualists, we discard the doctrine of Free Love, as advocated by Mrs. Lewis, (whether called by that name or any other), as demoralizing in its tendency, and unworthy our countenance or support.

ANTIOCH COLLEGE.—A friend writing from Yellow Springs, says: "College commencement is over, and a grist of fifteen infidels (nearly all), are turned out [have graduated], and the majority of them are pretty well indoctrinated into the principles of Free Love." But Antioch seems to be alarmed; or else, has NATURALLY a great concern for the "propriety" of its female students. It has been the custom of literary societies connected with Antioch College, to hold, occasionally, public meetings in the chapel; and the Alethezetean society, composed of female students, presented the Faculty a request for holding such a meeting; but it was refused, on the ground, in part, that it was too near the close of the term. The society then petitioned to hold a public meeting on the 19th of September, but this was refused, on the ground that the Faculty "did not think it PROPER for ladies to speak in public, alone!" A series of resolutions was then passed, declaring the facts in the case, and disbanding the society; and signed by seventeen lady students. I find the resolutions in the Practical Christian (Hopedale, Milford, Mass.), of July 11th. The following are resolutions 4 and 5:

4. Resolved, That we are not able to see wherein it is a greater violation of the rules of propriety for a lady to speak upon the platform when none but ladies are there with her, than to do so when a gentleman precedes or follows her, either at the public meeting of a literary society, or at the public examination of a school.