

1871.
& CO.,
ETS,
LACES AND
NS,
ND SHOES,
ROADWAY.

! TORATIVE
healthy growth

ont.
ating ingredient
and WHOLLY
hair.
growth of hair
twenty-five years.
ion. attest to its

wishing to test
or by note make
sent to their resi-

M. DEPUY,
nue, Brooklyn.

AGE,

EDITED BY

TON,

of all Living
Society, Litera-

WEDNESDAY
K.

sh in Advance.

THE INDEPENDENT
N. will hereafter
to THE GOLDEN

1 please send their
ely, to

S. TILTON
O. Box 2, 44E.
YORK CITY.

CHEAPEST."

D RD TABLES

scientific accuracy.
best players in the
s and hotels. Illus-
trating to billiards

LENDER
York City.

AL AND HUD-

Trains will leave

wing-room cars at

Car Express. No

rs except in Draw-

ern Express. Draw-

wing-room cars at

with Sleeping cars

and Canandaigua.

with Sleeping cars

to; also for Chicago.

s; for St. Louis, via

napolis. (This train

ng cars attached.

spie trains.

k-hill trains.

12 m., 1:30, 3, 4:30

trains.

ike-pie.

RICK.

1 Passenger Agent.

MENT.

held at

of the

71.

WOODHULL & CLAFLIN'S WEEKLY.

PROGRESS! FREE THOUGHT! UNTRAMMELED LIVES!

BEAKING THE WAY FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS.

VOL. 3.—No. 15.—WHOLE No. 67.

NEW YORK, AUGUST 26, 1871.

PRICE FIVE CENTS.

Rail
Road
Bonds.

Whether you wish to Buy or Sell
write to
CHARLES W. HASSLER,
No. 7 WALL STREET.
New York. 62-63

THE
LOANERS' BANK
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
(ORGANIZED UNDER STATE CHARTER.)
"Continental Life" Building,
22 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK.

CAP. \$500,000
Subject to increase to 1,000,000

BOARD OF DIRECTORS:

WILLIAM M. TWEED, SHEPHERD F. KNAPP,
A. F. WILLMARTH, EDGAR F. BROWN,
EDGAR W. CROWELL, ARCHIBALD M. BLISS,
DORR RUSSELL.

This Bank negotiates LOANS, makes COLLEC-
TIONS, advances on SECURITIES, and receives
DEPOSITS.

Accounts of Bankers, Manufacturers and Merchants
will receive special attention.
FIVE PER CENT. INTEREST paid on
CURRENT BALANCES, and liberal facilities offered
to our CUSTOMERS.

DORR RUSSELL, President.

A. F. WILLMARTH, Vice-President.

TANNER & CO.,

BANKERS,

No. 11 WALL STREET, NEW YORK.

DEALERS IN

STOCKS, BONDS, GOLD AND EXCHANGE.

ORDERS EXECUTED AT THE STOCK AND
GOLD EXCHANGES.

INTEREST ALLOWED ON DEPOSITS SUBJECT TO CHECK
AT SIGHT.

Buy and sell at current market rates, the FIRST
MORTGAGE EIGHT (8) PER PER CENT. GOLD
BONDS of the ST. JOSEPH AND DENVER CITY
RAILROAD COMPANY.

Interest, payable August and February, in New
York, London, or Frankfort-on-the-Main, free of
United States taxes. Present market quotations, 97 1/2
a 98 1/2, and interest.

TANNER & CO.,

No. 11 WALL STREET.

BANKING HOUSE

OF

KOUNTZE BROTHERS,

NEW YORK,

14 WALL STREET.

Four per cent. interest allowed on all deposits.

Collections made everywhere.

Orders for Gold, Government and other securities
executed.

S. J. & F. BEEBEE,
BROKERS,
IN GOLD, STOCKS & BONDS
No. 7 NEW STREET,
NEW YORK.

\$1,000,000!!

By authority of a special act of the Legislature of
Kentucky of March 13, 1871, the Trustees of the Pub-
lic Library of Kentucky will give

GRAND GIFT CONCERT
AT LOUISVILLE, KY.,

ON TUESDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1871,

Under the direction of the best Musical Talent.

100,000 TICKETS OF ADMISSION,

\$10 Each in Currency: Half Tickets, \$5; Quarter

Tickets, \$2 1/2.

Each Ticket will consist of four quarters, value,
\$2 1/2 each. The holder is entitled to admission to it
and to the amount of gift awarded to it
or its fraction. Tickets number from 1 to 1,000,000.

THE CITIZENS' BANK OF KY. IS TREASURER.

All Moneys arising from the sale of Tickets will be
deposited with the Citizens' Bank, subject only to
the order of the President and Treasurer of the Li-
brary, countersigned by the Business Manager.

During the Concert, the sum of
\$550,000 IN GREENBACKS

Will be distributed by lot to the holders of tickets in
the following Gifts, viz:

ONE GRAND GIFT OF	\$100,000
ONE GRAND GIFT OF	50,000
One Gift of	25,000
One Gift of	20,000
One Gift of	18,000
One Gift of	17,000
One Gift of	16,000
One Gift of	15,000
One Gift of	14,000
One Gift of	13,000
One Gift of	12,000
One Gift of	11,000
One Gift of	10,000
One Gift of	9,000
One Gift of	8,000
One Gift of	7,000
One Gift of	6,000
One Gift of	5,000
One Gift of	4,000
One Gift of	3,000
One Gift of	2,000
Ten Gifts of \$1,000 each	10,000
Fifteen Gifts of \$500 each	15,000
Eighteen Gifts of \$500 each	14,400
Twenty Gifts of \$500 each	14,000
Twenty-five Gifts of \$500 each	15,000
Thirty Gifts of \$500 each	15,000
Forty Gifts of \$500 each	16,000
Forty-five Gifts of \$500 each	13,500
Fifty Gifts of \$500 each	10,000
Four hundred and forty-six Gifts of \$100 each	44,600

Seven hundred and twenty-one Gifts in all... \$550,000
After paying the expense of the enterprise, and
making the distribution of the gifts, the balance of
the proceeds arising from the sale of tickets will be
appropriated to the establishment of a

FREE LIBRARY IN LOUISVILLE,

TO BE CALLED THE

PUBLIC LIBRARY OF KENTUCKY.

The Concert and distribution will take place under
the immediate supervision of the Trustees named in
the act of incorporation.

The Trustees will be assisted by well-known and
eminent citizens of Kentucky, who have consented to
be present at the concert, and to superintend the
drawing and distribution of gifts.

The holders of tickets to which gifts are awarded
will be paid on presentation of the ticket or their view
at the office in Louisville the second day after draw-
ing, and every business day for six months thereafter,
and may be sent direct, or through any Bank or Ex-
press Company, for collection. All orders accom-
panied by Drafts, Post Office Money Orders or Green-
backs will be promptly attended to, and tickets re-
turned by mail, registered or expressed, as desired.

Tickets are like greenbacks—good only to the

holder.

Buyers will note that there are only One Hundred
Thousand Tickets, instead of Two Hundred Thou-
sand, as in the San Francisco Gift Concert, and that
there is \$50,000 more distributed. I sold that, and
made the awards in four months, and paid \$128,000 to
ticket holders from November 24 to 15th, 1870, and
turned over \$12,000 to the Secretary due tickets not
presented.

It will be particularly noticed that it is a matter of
impossibility for any one to know what numbers
draw gifts, as it is not known what the gift of any
number drawn from the first wheel will be, until the
sealed box, with amount of the gift plainly printed,
is taken from the other wheel and opened in full view

of the audience, therefore the larger gifts may not
come out until toward the last, or in the middle of
the drawing. The \$100,000 gift in the San Francisco
Gift Concert, under the management of C. R. Peters,
was the 300th number drawn, and was awarded and
paid to a gentleman in New Orleans.

The Numbers and Gifts are drawn by Blind
Children from 8 to 14 years of age.

The Drawing will be extensively published, and
parties ordering Tickets will have printed lists sent
them. Parties forming Clubs and desiring informa-
tion will please address this office.

11 Tickets for \$100; 25 Tickets, \$25; 56 Tickets, \$500;
113 Tickets, \$1,000.

The undersigned, late principal business manager
of the very successful Mercantile Library Gift Con-

cert at San Francisco, California, has been appointed
agent and manager of the Gift Concert in aid of the
Public Library of Kentucky.

The drawing will take place in public, and every-
thing will be done to satisfy buyers of tickets that
their interests will be as well protected as if they per-
sonally superintended the entire affair.

MANNER OF DRAWING.

There will be two glass wheels. One wheel will
contain 100,000 numbers, plainly printed on leather
tags. The other wheel will contain 721 boxes, each
containing a gift. One tag or number will be drawn
from the 100,000 wheel, and the first box drawn from
the second or 721 box wheel will contain a gift, neatly
printed and sealed up, and the gift so drawn from the
second wheel will be the gift of the tag first drawn,
whether \$100, \$1,000 or \$100,000, as announced.

14,364 TICKETS DISPOSED OF IN JULY.

To insure ticket holders, the public are assured
that if only 25,000 tickets are sold, only 25,000 num-
bers go in the large wheel, the 721 gifts awarded, but
diminished pro rata. In case 50,000 tickets only are
sold, only numbers 1 to 50,000 go in the large wheel,
and the 721 gifts diminished one-half; and in case
only 85,000 tickets are sold, the entire 721 gifts will be
paid in full, it being intended no unsold tickets shall
participate.

The Manager has already paid into the Citizens'
Bank \$50,000 toward defraying the expenses, and
does not depend on sales of tickets to pay his ex-
penses of printing, advertising, etc. The public are
invited to the utmost scrutiny as to the reliability of
the entire affair.

Persons desirous of acting as Agents for the sale of
our tickets in any city of the United States and Cana-
das, address

CHARLES R. PETERS, Manager, Louisville, Ky.,

Office, 120 Main street, Johnson's Block.

R. T. DURKETT, President.

W. N. HALDEMAN, Vice-President.

M. W. CLUSKY, Secretary.

CITIZENS' BANK, Treasurer.

For Tickets and Information.

BANKING HOUSE

OF

HENRY CLEWS & Co.,

No. 32 Wall Street, N. Y.

Letters of Credit for travelers, also Commercial

Credits issued, available throughout the world.

Bills of Exchange on the Imperial Bank of London.

National Bank of Scotland, Provincial Bank of Ire-

land, and all their branches.

Drafts and Telegraphic Transfers on Europe, San

Francisco, the West Indies and all parts of the United

States.

Deposit accounts received in either Currency or

Coin, subject to check at sight, which pass through

the Clearing-House as if drawn upon any city bank;

4 per cent. interest allowed on all daily balances;

Certificates of Deposit issued; Notes, Drafts and

Coupons collected; advances made on approved col-

laterals and against merchandise consigned to our

care.

Orders executed for Investment Securities and

Railroad Iron.

CLEWS, HAECHT & Co., 11 Old Broad street,

London.

Central Railroad Company

OF

IOWA

First Mortgage and Equipment

7 PER CENT.

GOLD BONDS.

FOR SALE BY

A. L. HATCH, Fiscal Agent,

61-76

38 PINE STREET

NEW YORK
STATE RAILROAD BONDS.

A First-Class Home Investment.

FIRST MORTGAGE
GOLD BONDS

OF THE

ONDOUT & OSWEGO
RAILROAD.

Principal & Interest Payable in
Gold.

Seven per Cent. Semi-Annually.

This Road covers 100 miles of the most direct pos-
sible line, between the Great Lakes and deep water
navigation on the Hudson River, the whole line of
which will be completed and in operation on or be-
fore October 1st, 1872, and give a new line of road to
Lake Ontario and the West, 25 miles shorter than any
line that can be found.

It passes through the Cement, Flag-Stone and Lum-
ber regions of Ulster County, and the rich, agricul-
tural bottoms of Delaware and Greene Counties, all
of which have not heretofore been reached by railroad
facilities, and from which sections, the formation of
the country prevents the construction of a competing
line.

The 36 miles of road operated for three months is
already paying net earnings equivalent to 7 per cent.
gold, on its cost of construction and equipments.
The issue of Bonds is limited to \$20,000 per mile of
COMPLETED ROAD, the coupons payable in gold in
this city.

PRICE OF THE BONDS, 90 IN CURRENCY.

Full particulars of the above may be had of, and
the Bonds for sale by

Edward Haight & Co.,

9 Wall Street, NEW YORK CITY.

Financial Agents of the R. & O. Company.

CALDWELL & CO.,

BANKERS,

27 Wall St., New York.

Order for Purchase and Sale of United
States Securities, Stocks, Bonds and Ameri-
can Gold promptly executed at the usual
commission.

Collections promptly made in all parts
of the United States and Canada.

Interest, 4 per cent., allowed on de-
posits, subject to sight draft.

MARKET SAVINGS BANK,

82 NASSAU STREET, N. Y.

Six Per Cent. Interest Allowed.

Interest commences on the 1st of each month.

HENRY R. CONKLIN, WM. VAN NAME,

Secretary. President.

The candidature of Miss Clafin and other ladies for civic offices only tends to bring the law prominently before it

world, so that its full weight is comprehended. In that light, at least, those ladies are doing the country a service; and, being their legal advocate, I venture to express myself so here. I could speak long upon the effects of the law, as it will work through the ramifications of society here and in other civilized countries; but I will only say this, that while we men can safely intrust ourselves and our male children to woman, from the swaddling clothes to the shroud—in the cradle, the nursery, the school-room, the home—and while we can stand as her equal before the altar, before God and men through life, and while we can trust her in the church, the ball-room, the theatre, the bazaar and other public places, and while we dedicate to her the fruits of all our toil as equal partner in all that makes life sweet and valuable, we need not "fear" her at the ballot-box. Nor should we unman ourselves by shrieking behind the prejudice that makes petticoats an excuse for not carrying out a law. I do not deal with the question as a matter of policy; it is too late for that. That is settled by the adoption of the amendments, and whoever does not know that is as far behind as the man who had never seen a sunrise, because he did not care to get up so early.

If female suffrage is in harmony with and in promotion of the principle of "universal suffrage," and it is constitutional, I dare not place an obstacle in its way, for I have sworn to obey the Constitution. *Vox populi vox Dei!*

After these remarks, which were received with a goodly share of applause, and delivered in a most earnest and impressive manner, the chairman of the meeting introduced Hugo Elieser, Esq., from whose speech we extract the following points: This response, which I make in answer to a call of the German-American Progressive Association, is mainly intended to dispel some of the exaggerated doctrines and ideas which have been preached to you by the German daily press in regard to the feminine agitation. It seems as though it had been the intention of a great many of those papers to make their readers believe that the consequence of the spread of this agitation would be the entire banishment of men from political life and their use as menials in the household, prescribing for them the duties heretofore fulfilled by the housewife. They have endeavored to take the step from the superior to the ridicule. They were careful to keep from the public everything which might have tended toward any enlightenment on the subject. This reminds one most forcibly of a nurse's efforts to choke the baby's cries with the sugar-lump; but generally the child is bound to fight it out on its own line and to cry until it has become self-reliable and able to insist upon the fulfillment of its demands. The Germans, whose entire sympathy with all political reforms is a well-known fact, should no longer be deceived about the meaning of this agitation. It is impossible for them to stop in their political progress after the equality without regard to color, creed or race has been reached. The work must be finished, and it might just as well be finished at once. When women show themselves capable to assume the same duties as men, their right to enjoy the same privileges is undeniable, and first of these stands political representation.

It is self-understood, that not all women, any more than all men, are capable to act as the proper representatives of the people, and only such women as possess particular abilities and high intelligence, claim the right to such honors. But then it is easy to perceive, that this question will become the enlivening element of a new party, just as the question of liberating the slaves formed the very breath of the Republican party, the body of which already commences to decompose, after this issue has been solved. Perhaps there will be an amount of ridicule heaped upon this movement for some time, until one of the already existing parties will become aware of the necessity to incorporate in its platform "political equality for women" as an indispensable platform, and not until then will it be ascertained how deep a root this movement has already taken in public opinion.

MR. GREELEY ON THE WOMAN QUESTION.

To the Editor of the Golden Age:

SIR: Your article on this topic is so forcible and just in the main, that I presume you will be quite willing to have its slight inaccuracies corrected in your columns. I do not assume that my views of the Woman Question are of much consequence to others; but, in so far as they may possess interest, it is well that they be clearly understood. Let me, then, indicate your misapprehensions without further preface.

I. You say I "hold that there ought to be no divorce at all—not for any crime, even the worst." So far as I can recollect, your only authority for this statement is a remark that, had not the Master spoken otherwise, I would not have deemed adultery a sufficient reason for dissolving a marriage. As you seem to have given these words undue weight, allow me to explain my view more fully.

That persistent, flagitious adultery in husband or wife affords good cause for divorce I have not meant to deny. But there have been cases of transient infidelity to marriage vows, under the influence of passions inflamed by wine and other unnatural excitements, which, being followed by prompt and profound contrition, I would not judge an adequate reason for divorce. You and I both know that wives have often pardoned such lapses in husbands; and I agree that husbands have no rightful immunity in such matters which ought not also to be accorded to wives. And I profoundly honor and reverence the husband who can say to his erring wife, "Though I know that you have been false to God and to me, yet, because of the love I have borne you, of the vow which I have made to love and cherish you till death, and for the sake of the dear children which God has given us, I, believing you truly penitent, will forgive and try almost to for-

get your crime, and thus shield our little ones from undeserved shame." I regard the husband who thus speaks and acts as a better Christian, a truer man, than he who exposes, discards and outlaws the wife of his youth for a flagrant transgression, now sincerely and bitterly repented. I suggest, therefore, that you henceforth represent me as holding that adultery may, but does not always, justify an application for divorce.

You say I hold that "if a man marries and his wife dies, there should be no second marriage." This, also, is too sweeping. Some of my best and most esteemed friends are re-married—happily, I am sure; wisely and nobly, I judge. Nay: I can imagine a case in which the poor, hard-working, widowed father of young children whom he cannot take with him to his daily labor, should feel constrained for their sake to replace his lost wife by another in whose perfect acceptance and discharge of a mother's duties toward those children he could implicitly trust. Pardon me, but I am quite confident that the casual remark on which you based your broad assertion referred to a re-marriage following separation by divorce, not death.

III. Let me state my own conception of re-marriages as complicating marital relations in the other world.

I do not dispute the doctrine of Jesus that "In Heaven, there is neither marrying nor giving in marriage," if you have quoted His words exactly. And yet I feel that there are couples so completely and happily united in this world that they will be nearer and dearer to each other in the next than they would or could have been had they failed to meet in this life; and I think these are happier in either world than though one or both of them had remarried. I do not hold that either would have been culpable in remarriage if widowed on this planet; I only insist that they will both rejoice—and with reason—in their higher life, that neither in this life was married a second time.

IV. You are entirely, eminently right, Mr. Editor, in asserting that my conviction of the proper indissolubility of marriage is the mainspring of my hostility to Woman Suffrage, and to the social philosophy from which many vainly seek to separate the woman movement. Though I have written or dictated very little of what has, during the last ten years, been printed as editorial in the *Tribune* on this subject, it is nevertheless true that my conception of the nature and scope of the marriage relation renders my conversion to Woman Suffrage a moral impossibility.

I have but two left of seven children, and these are both daughters. I would gladly fit them for lives of usefulness and honor, as beloved and loving wives of virtuous, upright, noble men, and mothers, if it shall please God, of good, healthy, happy children. If it be decreed that they are to be, not such women as those I have most admired and revered, but men with a female physique—powerful in ward caucuses and nominating conventions, vehement in Senate and on the stump, and effective before juries in the trial of actions for *crimen con-*—I pray that my career on this globe shall close before theirs is fairly begun. When and where they shall thus shine, it will not be pleasant for me to stay.

Mr. Editor, I believe our countrymen are indebted to you for having discovered (perhaps I should say invented) me as a possible (though most improbable) candidate for the Presidency. Allow me, then, to thank you for your early and frank demonstration that I can in no contingency be counted on or hoped for as a Woman Suffrage candidate. As you forcibly and justly say, there is not even a remote possibility of my ultimately adapting myself to this end. My difference with your crowd is too vital, too radical, to permit the most sanguine dreamer to hope for my conversion. I am growing old; my opinions are tolerably firm; and the Advanced Female of the Laura Fair type, who kills the paragon of whom she claims to be the rightful affinity, and giving the lie in open court to the wife she has doubly widowed, is my pet aversion.

But why should any man be the candidate for President of the woman suffragists? Logically and consistently, I feel that their candidate should be a woman. She ought, moreover, to be one thoroughly emancipated from the "absurdity and folly" of the "narrowness" and the "baleful conservatism" which I am now too old to outgrow. Could you not find one who illustrates in her own person and history what you so felicitously term "the liberal thought of an enlightened age"? Let her be one who has two husbands after a sort, and lives in the same house with them both, sharing the couch of one, but bearing the name of the other (to indicate her impartiality perhaps), and cause and candidate will be so fully meted that there will be no occasion, even under the most liberal, progressive, enlightened regime, to sue for their divorce. Could not one of this class be persuaded to overbear her shrinking modesty and nominate herself?

In a spirit of hearty hatred for Free Love and all its infernal delusions, I remain yours, HORACE GREELEY.

TRIBUNE OFFICE, August 7, 1871.

MR. TILTON TO MR. GREELEY.

Mr. Horace Greeley.

MY FRIEND: This is the "off-year" in politics, and the dull season in newspapers. The Tammany frauds constitute the only vital topic now afloat, and this the *Times* possesses in fee simple. By-and-by the opening battle against Grant's renomination will thunder along the line, and your interest in this, whether as Presidential candidate or in your higher function as editor of the *Tribune*, will engross your whole mind. Just now, in the lull, I seize the best opportunity (if you care to welcome it) to accept a proposition which grew out of our correspondence of last week—namely, that we should compare our views of woman suffrage—yours against and mine for it. But if you are summing up your farm, I can hardly ask you to cease toying with your plow or ax for the sake of returning a day too soon to the habitual weariness of the most industrious of pens. So, while I would be glad (yes, and honored) if you would notice some points which I herewith set down, I shall take it as no discourtesy if you prefer to discontinue this debate.

I. You believe in the principle of Democratic Government—in other words, as Mr. Lincoln phrased it, "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." But this principle, as I hold it, includes both men and women. The American republic is composed of both sexes. Its government exacts the allegiance of both sexes. Its laws, to a great extent, apply equally (though to too great an extent unequally) to both sexes. Its office-holders are, to no inconsiderable degree, of both sexes. Its taxes fall with unrelenting rigor on both sexes. Now, to make our institutions logically consistent, the elective franchise should belong equally to both sexes. Is it not so?

II. You believe, with Thomas Jefferson, that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." But among the "governed," whose "consent" is to

be thus given or withheld, about one-half are women. And yet the government, in defiance of its charter, which is the Declaration of Independence, violates one of its fundamental principles by remorselessly denying to one-half its citizens any voice in making the laws under which they are to live and die. Is this right or wrong?

III. You cling to trial by jury. Now, the courts teem with cases affecting the rights, interests and honor of women. For instance, take the case of a mother's plea for the custody of her children as against the claim of a divorced and drunken husband. I hold that no jury can adequately appreciate, and therefore none can justly settle, such a case unless its twelve members include women as well as men. The horror which you have expressed of women "effective before juries," leads me to say that I am personally acquainted with several amiable and excellent ladies at the West who are duly authorized attorneys at law and practitioners in the courts. And you yourself have not forgotten Portia? Now, if women can stand and plead at the bar, tell me why they cannot sit and listen on the jury?

IV. You defend the American maxim of "no taxation without representation." But I can point you to an army of women who are compelled to submit to taxation, but who are not accorded representation. In England this injustice has lately been swept away, and women as well as men, if they own taxable property, exercise in that country the elective franchise. When Henry Vincent was last in New York, he told me that he saw three thousand women in Manchester go to the polls—just as they might have gone to the post office, or to the city library, or to church. Why would you put the right of suffrage in a republic under greater restrictions than in a monarchy?

V. Speaking of England, I remind you that its governmental head is a representative of that sex to whom you allow no share in the government at all. Your friend John Bright is happy to acknowledge that a woman may be rightfully and illustriously the chief of the state. But if that same woman were an American, you would be distressed to see her exercising even the humble sovereignty of her simple citizenship. Is not the English view, as Mr. Bright holds it, more a credit to an enlightened age than the American view, as you teach it?

VI. You admit that women should have a chance to earn their living. Nothing which the optimists may say of the duty of every man to support some woman (either wife, mother, sister or daughter) can blind you and me to the solemn fact that, morning and evening, to and from their half-paid toil, past your office and mine, there marches an army of women who fight the battle of life alone—women who, by death, have lost the props of their lives—women whose souls moulder on their country's battlefields—women, young and helpless, entering into their womanhood with no daily support save their own industry—women who, if they are to live in virtue and not in shame, must have work to do and wages for doing it. Now, in your speeches to workmen, I have heard you say that one of their most precious privileges was the ballot. You have shown great skill in tracing a connection between the workman's suffrage and the workman's wages—how the mechanic, the farmer or the fisherman would find that the ballot in his hand was money in his pocket. No writer in the land has insisted more sedulously than you that the negro, in order to fix his wages and secure his pay, should have his franchise. Now if the ballot will achieve all this for the wages of a man, have the kindness to inform me why it will effect nothing for the wages of a woman?

VII. You are generous enough to acknowledge that women should have an education. They are as much entitled to it as men. A generation or more ago, the New England high schools were opened to girls as well as boys. The result to-day is that the New England women, as a mass, are the most intelligent body of their sex in America. Now I want this good beginning carried to a better end by throwing open, not only our common schools, but our colleges and universities, to both sexes—instead of restricting these higher institutions, as now, to young men alone. If Michigan University and Oberlin and other colleges in the West are free to women, tell me why Yale and Harvard and other colleges of the East should not be conducted on the same humane and catholic plan?

VIII. You have expressed an abhorrence of the idea that your daughters should become public speakers. This, I confess, surprises me. Have I not seen you repeatedly presiding over public meetings addressed by women? Have you not proclaimed, both in the *Tribune* and elsewhere, the delight with which you used to sit under the ministry of R. V. Antoinette Brown Blackwell? Farther more, would it grieve or delight you if your daughters should have the gift of song, and go before the public as Jenny Lind once did, or as Christine Nilsson now does? But what is the difference, in principle, between a woman's singing and a woman's speaking?

IX. You say, "My conception of the nature and scope of the marriage relation renders my conversion to woman suffrage a moral impossibility." Your implication is that woman suffrage tends to dissolve marriage. If you mean by this that woman suffrage will give to women their just rights in the marriage relation, including the right to dissolve it for good cause, then I should be still more eager for woman suffrage than I now am. I quoted to you last week the declaration of the American Woman Suffrage Association—"Resolved, That woman suffrage means the perpetuity of the marriage relation." That resolution, I think, reflects the sentiment of the great body of woman suffragists. But my own view is that woman suffrage will neither destroy marriage on the one hand, nor perpetuate it on the other. For, marriage is an interest common to women and men. How then will woman's vote affect it more than man's? Men have the franchise, but have they used it to vote away marriage? When women get the franchise, will they use it to vote away marriage? No. If the marriage institution is ever to be done away, the first motion toward its abolition will come from men, not from women. It was Hamlet, not Ophelia, who said, "I will have no more marriages." Consider one thing, namely, the loving nature which God has given to woman. There is nothing that a woman so much wants as a home and to dwell in it as the happy wife of a noble husband, and as the loving mother of beautiful children. This is every woman's ideal. Now, if the ballot in her hand is to have any effect at all on her social life, will she voluntarily use this ballot for the destruction of what her soul considers the most sacred thing on earth? How can you persuade yourself that women will vote to abrogate that very marriage which men vote to maintain? But even if women could do this, would not you, and other men like you, be thereby proven tyrants over women in the marriage relation, and would not the necessity be plain that the civil laws regulating this relation should be reformed?

X. Your letter perorates into a "hearty hatred for Free

Love and all its fixed meaning. Free Love, I mean, in contrast to marriage. If you in your Free Love you simply a more of the whole sum more liberty to the State—their and hold you! be your idea of perhaps I would not in all you respectfully ask other words, I right to deter these twain sligh-

XI. You and yet it is not the Mast adultery a su what is Cur upon a won adultery wit trine of divo press this d would divi roges in Cl Paul, I refe and partial here and I believing lu dered; for I bound to ren ing to the vor-e; yzation of

XII. Ye persistent, good caus- teen, woul- or adulter adultery? persistent What wot casualat make it r

XIII. Y divorce I The Stat But all t causes, s support t tuis legis ing it? endeavor subject u

XIV. Amendu knew. them; a cae is a ment s States, a the Unit Mr. Bin ther wor citizens. ment. i says): i privile What i ton's d Judge "privi elective other g tutioa, Fourie and im Americ unaliz: wome shall n leges c oth-r nities" to exch th-citizen therea If the favor

XV. for Pr sistent To the wome office, to be negro cae o ever e Inde for V don a to say willy s et lass

XV. He to be gress th u framed B. A. to cat the I inge

XV. He to be gress th u framed B. A. to cat the I inge

XV. He to be gress th u framed B. A. to cat the I inge

XV. He to be gress th u framed B. A. to cat the I inge

XV. He to be gress th u framed B. A. to cat the I inge

GENERAL WESTERN AGENT, CHICAGO, ILL.

Laborate est orare ;
Hear it ye of spirit poor
Who sit crouching at the threshold
While your brethren force the door ;
Ye whose ignorance stands wringing
Rough hands, seamed with toil, nor dare
Lift so much as eyes to heaven—
Lo! All life this truth declares,
Laborate est orare
And the whole earth rings with prayer

XVI. This leads me to refer to your sitting at Cooper Institute a few evenings ago as chairman of a meeting called to hear a speech from Mr. R. B. Elliott, member of Congress from South Carolina—a negro. I am glad you honored him as you did; and all I ask you to do for woman's enlightenment is exactly what you have done for the negro's. But, on that very evening, in spite of the fact that the American government still refuses the political rights of twenty millions of citizens on account of sex, you went to the *Tribune* office and prefixed to the report of the proceedings the astounding title, "Equal Rights to All." Now, in view of your attitude on the woman question, will you not

MR. GREELEY ALL WRONG.

The wife of Mr. Greeley has given him seven children, and to-day she is a confirmed invalid, roaming the world over in search of health, when not confined to bed, as many another woman is who has borne seven children; she is excluded from active participation in the social, intellectual and other enjoyments of this life, and yet she is anxious that her daughters shall enjoy the same rights and opportunities her sons would have enjoyed had they lived. Confined to a sick chamber, she still has spirit enough to put her name to a petition begging for equal rights and justice. Does this make her any the less a woman; any the less affectionate as a wife, or lady-like? And suppose she should drive to the polls in her carriage and deposit a vote in favor of closing up rum-shops, would that be any more unlady-like than it is to drop cards at the doors of Murray Hill mansions? Mr. Greeley talks of "men with a female physique," when he has over and over again advised the poor women of this city to go into the woods and chop wood, or into the wilds of New Jersey and raise vegetables! Such an occupation would not tend to transform women into men, we presume, nearly so much as it would if they should speak in public or vote. No, no. Mr. Greeley is all wrong. If his doctrines were to prevail our garrets would continue to choke with starving women, who have only a needle between them and infamy or death; our young men would continue to indulge in riotous living, while poor girls walk the streets in scant calico dresses and thin shawls; our magnificent homes would still be the scenes of unhappiness and vice, as too many of them are to-day, because woman is regarded as the creature to minister to man's appetites and passions; our divorce courts would still be thronged with wives anxious to escape from the tyranny of husbands, and our politics would be rotten from top to bottom, as it is to-day, until we are almost at a loss for a remedy, and cry out for a revolution or a vigilance committee. Let those who wish applaud the man of straw Mr. Greeley has set up: the reform will go on all the same, and all good women will be more determined than ever in their efforts. They already have with them the best minds of the age. The pity is that so sensible a man as Mr. Greeley determines to be a stumbling-block. — *New York Globe.*

THE REAL CAUSE OF THE WESTFIELD ACCIDENT.

We have remained silent on the Westfield holocaust just as long as our feelings will allow us to do so. We have watched the course of this examination with deep interest; we hoped that the causes of this wholesale butchery would be thoroughly sifted; and we were slow to censure ere a full opportunity had been given the proper authorities to investigate and explain the causes of which sent over one hundred of our citizens to eternity, and maimed probably over one hundred and fifty more. What in the name of heaven has been done to elucidate the mystery? We have had volumes of testimony to prove that the boiler was a good one; that it was a bad one; that the valve was blowing off; that it was not blowing off; that the valve could not relieve the boiler even if it did blow off. We have had an inspector admitting that he gave certificates to a boiler whose valve was incapable of carrying off the surplus steam the boiler could generate. Some of the witnesses found cracks and flaws in the boiler, as, for example, Mr. Hill, Mr. Light-hall and Mr. Tothersall; while John Plum explicitly declares there was no crack. This is the kind of humbug to which the people are treated, when a hundred or two have been made the victims to the political jugglery that puts politicians into positions of the duties of which they know nothing.

We call attention to the cause of this explosion, and we demand that it be investigated. That cause is the drifting of the holes in the boiler plates to make the holes fit. The holes were punched, did not come opposite each other, and the boiler-makers drove steel taper wedges in the holes and stretched the iron till the holes did come right. The oval shape of the holes attests this. The fact that, from the thickness of the iron, the pressure indicated should not have burst the boiler proves it. We have visited numerous boiler yards and will undertake to produce practical men who will testify that this stretching and fracturing of the iron round the holes, by driving in round steel wedges, called drifts, is done to the extent of a quarter of an inch in one hole.

If one of the officials will call at our office, we will, by appointment, conduct him to boiler shops where the holes are being stretched and fractured in just the same manner. We will go into the first boiler shop we come to, and ask the first workman we encounter in it to show us his drift, and the murderous round steel wedge will appear on the scene, all battered and swelled at the head by the ponderous blows inflicted upon it by a sledge-hammer, every blow meaning death to some one of our traveling citizens.

To punch holes and thus destroy the cohesion of the metal is bad enough, but to deliberately try to burst the hole by disintegrating the surrounding metal (after punching), with a steel wedge, is positively murderous.

Let the authorities see to this, or we shall have to wake them up in a less pleasant manner.

MISS PHELPS, who can do really clever things, is wasting a great deal of very good indignation upon woman's dress: among other things she says:

The average young woman expends enough inventive power, enough financial shrewdness, enough close foresight, enough perturbation of spirit, enough presence of mind, enough patience of hope and anguish of regret upon one season's outfit—I had almost said upon one single street suit—to make an excellent bank cashier, or a comfortable graduate of a theological seminary; * * I once saw a young lady ride the whole way from Portland to Boston in the cars without once leaning back against the cushioned seat, so that she should not tumble her black silk suit. A barber told me that he "curled a young lady" once for a ball, "and she had two hundred and forty-seven curls when she was done. And I began at ten o'clock in the morning and I never got through with her till nine o'clock at night!" Dr. Dio Lewis tells of a being who put four hundred and twenty-five (I think) yards of trimming upon one single dress. * * Four hundred and twenty-five yards! Conceive of the Hon. Charles Sumner or Prof. Longfellow in four hundred and twenty-five yards of trimming! Imagine the speech on San Domingo, or the Psalm of Life, written with a black silk suit tied to the author's coat-tails, he pausing at every classic stanza to see if he had tumbled himself behind. Fancy Brown Sequard at a consultation in two hundred and forty-seven curls. Picture him timing the pulse of a dying man with one hand and tightening his hair-plugs with the other.

This has a sufficient leaven of truth to make the matter tolerable, but it must be taken with many grains of allowance. Nor can it be reasonably contended that the bulk of women have no sense of duty, or that their time is all spent in vanity and foolishness. An appeal having been made in favor of the male simplicity and contempt of self-adornment—it is sufficient to dismays that as "bosh." The male animal everywhere adorns and tricks himself out in braveries, and whether it be the wise and chivalrous Raleigh, with all his fortune on his back, or the modern swell strutting Broadway with yellow gloves and pants so tight as to forbid sitting down, dress and the mirror charm the manly eye fully as much as they do the female heart. How does Miss Phelps herself dress.

The meeting of the German and Austrian Kaisers, announced in the telegrams, will in all probability prove detrimental to the Austrian. In the old fable of the compact between the dwarf and the giant, the dwarf found that, although the giant was honest, somehow the dwarf got the worst of it. So with Austria. If the German empire be a wonderful success, it will naturally absorb the ten million

German subjects of Austria, who would have more affinity with their German-speaking compatriots than with Tschack Magyar or Slav. A compact against Russia is rumored. Bismarck cares little for Russia; he covets Austria, and he does not love Von Beust, his great diplomatic rival. It is not improbable, however, that there may be a present purpose of curbing the Cossack. Already the seeds of the English press give warning of Russian designs. An impregnable quadrilateral of fortresses in South Russia will cover the movement of the mighty masses that are now parading and drilling on the Austrian frontier. And a march on Vienna, with a flank movement on Belgrade and the Balkan, will be the road that once carried Suwarow to victory, and threatened the dismemberment of the Turkish empire and the expulsion of the Sultan from Europe. It will be! Nay, more, it ought to be. What has Europe in common with the slumberous Turk and obstructive Mohammedanism?

The delicacy and exemplary consideration for the public feeling evinced by some of our contemporaries are really touching. It is usually supposed that the tomb is exempt from the eye of the curious or the hand of the spoiler; but this tribute of silence and the eye averted cannot be paid when "the public wants to know." All Americans live in glass houses; those who are at all famous lie in glass coffins. Alice Cary died unmarried. If she had a love she never told it. Her sister Phoebe died having made no confession, and so it might be fair to suppose that what the dead women had not told of themselves nobody else has a right to guess at or proclaim. That is not so in America. Before their ashes are cold their hearts are laid on the press table for scrutiny and demonstration. It is asserted that Alice had a secret passion, and that her life was blighted by an early disappointment. It may or it may not have been. But as the sisters left no record and made no complaint, this intrusion is a disgusting impertinence.

This anniversary of the siege of Derry, in Ireland, was attended with the usual Orange riot. If there be any virtue inherent in Orangism and Ribbonism, that peculiar merit crops out and flourishes in the land where those types of political animosity are indigenous. It may seem fit and proper that certain sections of Irishmen in Ireland should hate and slay each other; although the process even there does not seem to give unmixed satisfaction to the peaceful members of the community. Transplanted to this country, party prejudices and antipathies are meaningless. All foreigners are welcome, all have equal rights. Let them leave their old feuds in the land they have abandoned. Here we want only one political party—the party of peace, progress and prosperity.

"It's an ill wind that blows nobody good." We are glad to find that the fear of cholera has opened official eyes and stirred official stumps. Officially a policeman or a Supervisor cannot see or smell a dead dog or a dirty street. The citizen may have his organs in the most wretchedly perfect order. Directly he dons the garb of office he becomes defective in all his faculties. Every one knows—but those who are paid to know—in what an infamous disgusting condition the poor side streets are kept. How rarely the scavenger carts go round, how perfunctorily the duties of cleansing are performed. A savage rain-storm is a blessing in these neighborhoods. When pestilence comes it avenges the poor! All neglect of duty has to be squared in the general account. Police reports are not of much good unless action is taken. Hurry up.

MANY bits of secret contemporary history have come out through the pillage of the imperial archives after the fall of Napoleon. It is only surprising that so little matter of real interest has been given to the world. Among other trifles is a letter from Alexander of Russia to the Empress Eugenie, offering intervention on the basis of integrity of French territory after the disaster of Sedan. The revolution of September and the flight of the Empress disgusted the Czar, and he left France to her fate. This incident shows the common accord between princes and despots. We Republicans do not hang together in such fashion. We sympathize more with Louis Napoleon, or Kaiser William, or Kaiser Alexander than we do with Republicans. Witness France, witness Cuba.

THE French Republic of 1848, with Louis Napoleon as President, found its mission in helping the Pope against Italy, and garrisoned Rome with French troops. Thiers has always been a partisan of Rome. That reactionary policy of French Republicans was a wonder and surprise in Europe, and has never been satisfactorily explained. It is only traceable to Imperialism, and to that policy which bloomed into the *coup d'etat*. Can it be now that Thiers and the Assembly will give ear to the Pope's insidious persuasions and suffer themselves to be the instruments of Papal restoration. The suggestion seems too preposterous. But who can predict the possibilities of politics?

POST OFFICE NOTICE.

The mails for Europe during the week ending Saturday, Aug. 10, 1871, will close at this office on Tuesday at half-past eleven, on Wednesday at twelve, on Thursday at twelve, and on Saturday at twelve.

P. H. JONES, Postmaster

Without desiring to unnecessarily alarm the community, we think the press have done well to agitate the subject of the possibility of cholera and the yellow fever extending to this country, if it serves to awaken the people to a sense of the importance of a more careful mode of living, greater cleanliness and a more general use of deodorizers and disinfectants.

Some years since, when the Board of Health had ordered the thorough cleaning of every hole and corner of this city, the kitchen of a palatial residence on Fifth Avenue was found to be in such an uncleanly condition that several cart-loads of filth were scraped up. The lady of the house had not seen that kitchen for years! Are there not, even now, many residences of fair exterior which, unknown to many of the inmates, contain the very essence of death? How often is one death in a family speedily followed by another in the same house? We need have no fear of infectious diseases if each one of us will become an independent Board of Health for the preservation of cleanliness and the extinction of noxious and infectious smells by the liberal use of a good deodorizer.

In England much interest has been excited by the discovery of a new disinfectant in chloride of aluminum, which possesses all the valuable qualities of carbolic acid and chloride of zinc, without their objectionable features. Professor Gamgee, of London, pronounces it to be as harmless as common salt and as active as zinc chloride, which is so poisonous and corrosive that it is practically excluded from the sick room. Experiments recently made in this country prove it to be much more effectual when in combination with bromine, and in this form it is now presented under the name of "Bromo-Chloralum." It is a discovery which is destined to prove of incalculable advantage to the world at large. It is prepared as a nearly colorless liquid, without any odor of its own, non-poisonous and inexpensive. Its free use in families would materially improve the general health and effectually prevent contagion. We anticipate a large demand for it as a deodorizer and disinfectant.

It has been introduced in hospitals to dress wounds, especially in important amputations; it has been used at the Westminster Hospital, London, and the Royal Infirmary, Manchester, to arrest the horrible factor of open cancer; it has been used in ulcers, sore throats, scarlet fever, diphtheria, and many other superficial inflammations. As a purifier of air in a sick room; as an antiseptic in the dead-house; as an agent to be used in embalming bodies, and, indeed, for all general antiseptic and disinfectant properties, it may fairly be said to stand unrivaled.

We have been condoling with England at the possible loss of the great iron-plated ship, the *Warrior*, on shore near Gibraltar. But we regarded the calamity with that equanimity, not to say secret triumph, wherewith we serenely contemplate our neighbor's bad luck. After all, the *Warrior* was not ashore at all; it was our own *Guerriere*—an American, not a Britisher. Quite otherwise. We are so sorry. Really, you know.

HENRY CERNUSCHI, whom many of our readers will recollect as the Paris banker exiled from France because opposed to the famous plebiscite, has arrived in this country with the intention of making the tour of the United States and becoming acquainted with its institutions. M. Cernuschi, an Italian by birth, returned to France immediately after the fall of Sedan, became naturalized as a citizen, and was present at the inauguration of the new republic. He belongs to the most advanced wing of the republican party, and demands independent municipal elections throughout France as the best guarantee of a true and permanent republic. In this he is quite right, since centralism has ever been the curse of France, and will be, under whatever form of government, while all appointments, civil and military, are made at Paris. M. Cernuschi is distinguished as a writer upon political economy, and has published several works. In his "Contre Billet de Banque" he takes the same ground in regard to credit money as the author of the "Science of Wealth," to whom he paid a visit at North Brookfield last Wednesday, in company with M. Duret, a gentleman connected with the Paris press. They are to visit all the principal Atlantic cities, and then go by the way of Washington, Richmond and Knoxville to St. Louis, Omaha and San Francisco; and thence, by Japan and India, to France.

THE GOLDEN AGE TRACTS.

Our sprightly neighbor, the *Golden Age*, announces a series of tracts for the times, and begins the list this week with a letter by Theodore Tilton to Horace Greeley, on "The Rights of Women." This letter our readers will find copied into the present issue of WOODHULL & CLAFLIN'S WEEKLY. It forms a neat tract, adapted for popular circulation in large quantities, and ought to go up and down the land. Price, \$3 00 per hundred. Address the publisher of the *Golden Age*, Box 2848, New York City.

THE *Times*' raid on the Boss and his myrmidons has fizzled out miserably. Radical complicity with Democratic frauds was too rich. The people like to be plundered, and they shall be plundered.

Aug. 2
THE
In our last
first announ
Every res
methods of
through, h
from a cer
idea. Mer
forms of t
ble insect
and succe
ing fact
cordance
new prin
also inch
old, is to
position
hitherto
action.
The
teaching
the Br
tical up
and p
never
tent o
with
comm
cepte
prece
terpa
be, a
He
fact
God
Mu
liev
and
up
to
ce
be
sto
to
c
n
t
c

THE RISING POWER IN THE WORLD

In our issue of the 19th inst. bearing date July 16, 1910, we published a special article as follows:

Every revolution, whether in government or in general, has been a revolution. The world has passed through a long process of growth into power and extension from a central point of strength—first a central positive idea. Movements never rise into fullness or constructive form of the world. A positive and clear affirmation, a firm belief in a central idea within us. If the elements of strength and power simply to attack or call in question any existing fact is negatively to affirm that that fact is not in accordance with the general principle, but to assert some new principle which shall supply the place of the old and also include much which is not included in the sphere of the old. It is to assume the aggressive and to establish a positive position, and so to form a nucleus around which all the hitherto diffused strength can rally and organize for offensive action.

The Christian world has for nineteen centuries been teaching the Fatherhood of God and its necessary corollary, the Brotherhood of Man. This, so far as any organic practical application is concerned, has been simply theoretical and preparatory. Practice has been impossible and has never been attempted nor advocated even, to the fullest extent of its significance. Christians profess to believe, and with some degree of faith they do believe, that the time will come when the teachings of Christ will be universally accepted, but they do not stop to consider that the aggressive precursor and preparer for a spiritual kingdom is its counterpart in material affairs. Before a universal religion can be, a universal government must be.

Being fully imbued with the spirit of the greatest of all facts that the human mind can grasp, the Fatherhood of God, and necessarily then with the common Brotherhood of Man, the inauguration of a universal government we believe to be the greatest prospective work of the centuries, and as such we announce it as our central idea and call upon all who can grasp the significance of the proposition to rally to its advocacy and support. If years, decades, centuries, ages intervene before such a consummation can be reached, the work of laying the foundation, the cornerstone, is one which the American people should be ambitious to begin.

From that time we have constantly advocated those principles which have a universal application, ignoring as much as has been possible the common or ordinary affairs of the time. But since that time tremendous revolutions have occurred, some of which, though localized in regard to the sphere of their immediate relations and effects, occupy a mighty place in the common order of governmental evolution as related to the entire globe, all pointing to one general result.

But as yet, even in this country, the perfect foundation upon which a Universal Government could be built secure in permanency is not yet formulated. A great advance, however, toward it is now in process of execution. Government in this era of society relates specifically to what we denominate the political relations of people. All the people have not yet become politically related. All people of some country must become politically related before even the cornerstone of that which can progress to universal dominion can be laid; since so long as there are a large portion of a people unrepresented in and unrelated to the government, such people are liable—ay, certain—to rebel and demand their natural rights. Therefore, no government is secure until it is a government *de facto* for all the people over whom it is maintained.

Having an intuitive perception, as well as the logical demonstration, that this country, being the most advanced in general progressive ideas, is the central point from which the idea of Universal Government must evolve, and around which it must aggregate, we have at all times advocated cosmopolitan rather than national ideas, with the view of bringing people to regard all nations as destined to form a part of one common nation. The deduction, to which reference is made, is fully sustained by the conclusive fact that the people who are represented in our government are so far from being purely American, and so far cosmopolitan, as to be composed of all nationalities, and being so, that in the United States there are already the necessary elements of a Universal Government, since if their people are the representatives of all nations, and governed by one form of polity which is acceptable to them, then there is already in existence a form of government which can spread over the world without change in its basal idea.

As we have said and repeated time and again, the basal idea of our theory is that all the people are the government, while their representatives are simply agents to perform certain specific duties which relate to the security and protection of individual rights.

If that be a true proposition, and we have a form of polity which admits of its application, the very first step to be made is to bring all the people into relations with the government. With this idea in view, we memorialized Congress last December, setting forth the fact that our government, though professing to represent all the people, does not in reality represent any part of the people except men, the women being denied all participation, and asking Congress to enact such laws as would give vitality to the provisions of the Constitution which guarantees the vital idea, the proposition of a Universal Government.

This movement, though not yet passed to a decision in the halls of Congress, is already decided by general consent. Many of our most eminent statesmen accept the proposition. It is simply a question of how long those who hold the governmental power to-day can prevent the consummation. It is the question of the hour, endeavor to deny it as

they may, and the more strenuously they oppose it, the more certainly will political death await them. Being a vital issue, affecting the rights of a large body of citizens, it can neither be ignored nor parried, as it might were it simply a policy—a question of best interests—in which there could be an honest difference of opinion, which there cannot be where the question is one of inherent right.

It was to have been hoped that the Labor Party in convention at St. Louis would have taken a decided stand upon this first principle to be settled, and thus have been in the initiative in this movement, and thereby presented a platform upon which both these branches of reform could have marshaled their ranks. This was the more desirable from a general consideration than from the merely present condition in this country, since the Labor Party of this country, though not formally in alliance therewith, is the counterpart to the International Workingmen's Association of Europe, and at no far distant day will be in active co-operation with it.

The Labor Party of this country has for its present enunciated principles such questions of home policy as have direct effect upon the relations of labor to capital, not looking beyond our national boundaries, and not recognizing that the laborers of other countries are their natural brothers, worthy of and entitled to receive consideration in all matters which are discussed. In this ignoring it is argued that their own interests demand a degree of proscription toward the people of certain other nations, in which policy they depart from the basis of a common humanity, and fall far short of the basal propositions of the Internationals, which denounce war, abrogate national boundaries and demand a unity of interests for all people of all nations, based in the principles which our governmental theory furnish. Therefore, while we have the proper theory for a Universal Government, they propose the only complete application of the theory. From the union of the two must come that perfect blending of interests which prophesy the beginning of the aggregation that will ultimate in a universal application of that theory.

So, too, is the great revolution in sentiment evolved by the movement in this country for political relations among all the people met and counterparted in Europe by the gigantic revolutions toward unification of peoples which have occurred within the same period of time in which that has been active. France, weakening Austria by the forced establishment of the kingdom of Italy, thereby made it possible for Prussia to consolidate Germany without fear from Austria; but in the endeavor to prevent this France herself, who first opened the door for all this grand movement, became prostrated at the feet of the newly-made successor to Otto the Great and Charles V.

The Prussian King, having become the German Emperor, began at once to fortify himself against the only power he had to fear by making friends with Francis Joseph, who is the natural enemy of Alexander, for the possession of Constantinople. This new diplomacy on the part of Bismarck is eminently worthy his past success, since it would not do for Germany to permit Alexander and Francis Joseph to become united against Kaiser Wilhelm, and Austria must need be the ally of one or the other of those powerful monarchs. Being allied with Prussia may make it possible for Austria to regain her lost Italian prestige, as a compensation for her late humiliation at the hands of Napoleon and William, all of which is but preparatory to final final absorption by Germany.

The ostensible motive for this alliance in Central Europe is that Russia and France have also formed an offensive and defensive alliance. But this might has been anticipated by Bismarck, and probably was, and all along have been the real basis of the interchange of kindly feeling with Austria and Italy. In these extensive operations England seems to have had no hand. The country by whose means the first Napoleon was destroyed has now come to be ignored in European diplomacy. Whether this is because her material power has become insignificant when compared with the great Continental powers, or because liberalism is becoming so diffused among the English people, or from both causes combined, it may be hard to determine. Certain it is, however, that there is a potent cause existent which forbids the Gladstone government's entrance into present Continental questions. England's perfidy to France in permitting her humiliation and dismemberment unrebuked has not only lost her the confidence of France, but has taught the other powers her capacity for desertion and unreliability in time of need. This condition of England must naturally compel her to look westward for compensation, and prophesies the coming unity of the English-speaking nations, and thereby an advance in the direction of unitary government.

But behind all this again lie the common enemies of all monarchies and assumed governmental distinctions—the laboring people. They are already largely united by a common bond of sympathy, though that sympathy has not yet resulted in combined organization in this country to the extent it has in Europe. There this organization, amounting to nearly, if not quite, three million able-bodied men, is sufficiently organized to be considered a threat to monarchs, and their representatives appoint a conference for the nominal consideration of the Eastern question, but virtually to devise some plan to suppress the Internationals. The late developments in Russia regarding the organization open up an entirely new and unthought-of issue to the ultimate question of Cossackism or Republicanism in Europe. If

these Russian middle classes really co-operate with the Internationals of the rest of Europe, a different face is put upon affairs, which sharply defines the heretofore dim outlines of the future republics of Europe, which we long since stated to be the Latinic, the Teutonic and the Slavonic—three mighty powers, taking into themselves all other lesser ones. Europe, thus divided, would be safe against war, since the central or Teutonic Republic could always rely upon the protection of one of her neighbors against absorption or humiliation by the other.

The rising importance of the Internationals pushes this question forward for the consideration of all statesmen who are to be distinguished from ordinary people by their foresight of coming events, and by paving the way for their exodus.

Consolidation of peoples is, then, the "Rising Power" in the world, and is the prophecy of near-at-hand realization of something approaching Universal Government. When Europe, revolutionized as pointed out above, shall, with the United American States, inaugurate a Grand International Tribunal for the arbitration and settlement of all international questions, this Tribunal will virtually be the governing power of the world, since but one step more will be required to consolidate into a single form of administration.

Indeed would such a governmental consummation be the prophecy of the millennium which prophets have so long foretold and poets sung? And the securing of equal political or governmental rights to all people in the representative country of the world will be set down in history as the actual turning point in government from its mere diffusive evolution into that of a constructive evolution, which is the grander and nobler form, since it is an aggregation around one point of that which has been all these ages finding its way outward and into the hearts and intellects of the people.

Then and then only can there be a practical application of the brotherhood of the whole human family. Then and not till then can the professions of Christians possess that living vitalizing power which shall make all people brothers and sisters by acknowledging themselves of common origin and destiny. Then and not till then will it be possible for men and women, being equal, in all respects, as human beings, to practice Golden Rule, which is the truest religion of humanity.

MINISTERING SPIRITS.

All places where our friends have lived and died
Are haunted places; thro' the open doors
The gentle spirits on their errands glide,
With feet that make no sound upon the floors.
We meet them at the doorway, on the stair;
Along the passages they come and go.
The stranger at my fireside cannot see
The forms I see, nor hear the sounds I hear.
He but perceives what is, while unto me
All that has been is visible and clear.
The spirit world around this world of sense
Floats like an atmosphere, and everywhere
Wafts thro' these earthly mists and vapors dense
The vital breath of spirits ministering there.

—LONGFELLOW.

THE INTERNATIONAL.

It ought to be known that this association is not secret—it does not aspire to the honor of being a conspiracy. Its meetings are held in public; they are open to all comers, though only members are permitted to speak (unless by special invitation), and none but members are allowed to vote. The several sections in this city and vicinity meet as follows:

- Section 1 (German).—Sunday, 8 p. m., at the Tenth Ward Hotel, corner of Broome and Forsyth streets.
- Section 2 (French).—Sunday, 2 p. m., at No. 100 Prince street (especially to accommodate female members).
- Section 6 (German).—Friday, 8 p. m., at No. 10 Stanton street.
- Section 8 (German).—Monday, 8 p. m., at No. 53 Union avenue, Williamsburg, L. I.
- Section 9 (American).—Wednesday, 8 p. m., at No. 35 East Twenty-seventh street.
- Section 11 (German).—Thursday, 8 p. m., West Thirty-ninth street, between Eighth and Ninth avenues, at Hessel's.
- Section 12 (American).—Sunday, 8 p. m., at No. 44 Broad street.

WHETHER the schemes of the Paris Commune were wise or unwise, whether the deeds of the insurgents were culpable or commendable, each Communist was giving the example which most of all in these craven days is needed: each Communist bounded with alacrity and joy to death for his convictions. Who in England of those that vilify or of those that praise the Paris Communists is willing to do the same? There is one kind of poltroonery, called Mathusianism, preached; and there is another kind of poltroonery, called Secret Voting, preached; and there are numberless other poltrooneries, all seeking to lessen or to extinguish the valiant sense of moral responsibility. The fault of the Paris Commune was not in being too passionate, but in pondering and hesitating when it should have darted itself, a flame of passion, at wicked men and odious institutions. It was too mimetic; it was too much influenced by reminiscences of the first French Revolution. Passion should have the originality of genius; it should imitate nothing. Let us nourish the heat of passion in ourselves; let us kindle the fire of passion in others. If, according to the old Greek saying, "war is the father of all things," warmth is the mother of all things; but a warmth like that of nature, diffused in most opulent fruitfulness, and only exploding from time to time, and irresistibly in lightnings and thunders.

MACCALL.

VICTORIA C. WOODHULL and TENNIE C. CLAFLIN,
EDITORS AND PROPRIETORS.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

One copy for one year	\$2 00
One copy for six months	1 00
Single copies	5

FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTION.

Can be made to the agency of the American News Company,
LONDON ENGLAND.

One copy for one year	\$3 00
One copy for six months	1 50

RATES OF ADVERTISING.

Per line (according to location) - From \$1 00 to \$2 50
Time, column and page advertisements by special contract.
Special place in advertising columns cannot be permanently given.
Advertiser's bills will be collected from the office of the paper, and must, in all cases, bear the signature of Woodhull, Claflin & Co.
Specimen copies sent free.
News-dealers supplied by the American News Company, No. 121 Nassau street, New York.
All communications, business or editorial, must be addressed

Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly,

44 Broad Street, New York City.

OUR NEW WESTERN AGENCY.—Mr. A. J. Boyer, formerly of the "Nineteenth Century," has become our General Western Agent, with office at 165 Washington street, Chicago, Ill., where subscription may be made to the WEEKLY and advertisements will be taken. The rapid growth of the WEEKLY in Western favor has induced us to establish this branch office, and we are happy to be able to announce the engagement of one so favorably known to Reform as is Mr. Boyer, with whom we trust all our friends will join in the endeavor to introduce the WEEKLY into every city, village and hamlet in the great West.

EIGHTH NATIONAL CONVENTION.

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SPIRITUALISTS.

The eighth National Convention will meet in Troy, N. Y., on Tuesday, the 12th day of September, at 10 o'clock in the morning, and continue in session three days.

Each active local society, and each Progressive Lyceum of any State, Territory or Province, which has no General Association, shall be entitled to one delegate for each fractional fifty members.

These Associations and Lyceums are respectfully invited to appoint delegates to attend this meeting and participate in the proceedings thereof.

Mrs. H. F. M. BROWN, President,
137½ Madison street, Chicago, Ill.

H. T. CHILD, M. D., Secretary,
634 Race street, Philadelphia, Pa.

SECTION No. 12 of "The International" will hold their regular meeting at 44 Broad street, Sunday next, at 8 o'clock P. M. Friends from other sections cordially invited.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION (SECTION No. 2).

CITIZEN: The French Section, No. 2, of the International, at the general session of the 6th August, decided that in future it would hold a session on the second Sunday of each month, at 2 o'clock P. M. This reunion has been voted with the special purpose of offering more convenience to the ladies who might desire to join the International, and who cannot be present at the morning sessions. In consequence of this decision your attendance is requested at the next reunion, at the usual place of meeting, 100 Prince street.

H. CHARNIER, Secretary.

TO HORACE GREELEY.

Sir—I find in the *Golden Age* of August 12 an article headed "Mr. Greeley on the Woman Question," and in the same paper an answer by Mr. Tilton, to which I shall also have some occasion to allude. The reason why I feel called on to enter into this particular discussion, the almost necessity which you have laid upon me to do so, will be apparent to the public from the following paragraph—the closing one—extracted from your communication:

But why should any man be the candidate for President of the Woman Suffragists? Logically and consistently, I feel that their candidate should be a woman. She ought, moreover, to be one thoroughly emancipated from the "absurdity and folly," the "narrowness" and the "baleful conservatism," which I am now too old to outgrow. Could you not find one who illustrates in her own person and history what you so felicitously term "the liberal thought of an enlightened age?" Let her be one who has two husbands after a sort, and lives in the same house with them both, sharing the couch of one, but bearing the name of the other (to indicate her impartiality, perhaps), and cause and candidate will be so fully mated, that there will be no occasion, even under the most liberal, progressive, enlightened régime, to sue for their divorce. Could not one of this class be persuaded to overbear her shrinking modesty and nominate herself?

In a spirit of hearty hatred for Free Love and all its infernal delusions,

I remain, yours,
TRIBUNE OFFICE, August 7, 1871.

HORACE GREELEY.

Mr. Tilton, in his reply to Mr. Greeley, has the kindness and courtesy to say:

Mr. Greeley's allusion to a certain lady whom he describes but does not name is an ungentle and gross reflection on a life which has been marked by great suffering, which has been guided by pure motives, and which has flowered into rare worth. Knowing her well, we respect her not less highly than we do Mr. Greeley himself. We know not how to say more.

Neither does Mr. Tilton name the "certain lady," but the allusion by Mr. Greeley to me and my domestic affairs is too pointed and direct to be misunderstood by anybody, and evidently he intended to preclude the possibility of its being misunderstood. To no other woman than to me has this avalanche of malignant venom any applicability. This is, therefore, my conflict. Mr. Tilton may very well answer, even more fully, as he proposes to do, other portions of Mr. Greeley's manifesto on the woman question; but this personality it belongs to me especially to reply to. For the completeness of this reply, I wish, however, first to make another extract from Mr. Greeley's article, and also another from the answer of Mr. Tilton, already published.

Mr. Greeley says:

You are entirely, eminently right, Mr. Editor, in asserting that my conviction of the proper indissolubility of marriage is the mainspring of my hostility to woman suffrage, and to the social philosophy from which many vainly seek to separate the woman movement. Though I have written or dictated very little of what has, during the last ten years, been printed as editorial in the *Tribune* on this subject, it is nevertheless true that my conception of the nature and scope of the marriage relation renders my conversion to woman suffrage a moral impossibility.

I have but two left of seven children, and these are both daughters. I would gladly fit them for lives of usefulness and honor, as beloved and loving wives of virtuous, upright, noble men, and mothers, if it shall please God, of good, healthy, happy children. If it be decreed that they are to be not such women as those I have most admired and revered, but men with a female physique—powerful in ward caucuses and nominating conventions, vehement in senate and on the stump, and effective before juries in the trial of actions for *crim. con.*—I pray that my career on this globe shall close before theirs is fairly begun. When and where they shall thus shine it will not be pleasant for me to stay.

Mr. Tilton replies:

Mr. Greeley speaks of his two daughters with an affection which does honor to his heart, but he hopes that if they are ever to become Woman Suffragists, and to speak in public, or to argue law cases, and the like, he may first have a chance to creep into his grave. And yet those two daughters have a mother as well as a father. Their mother, as is well-known, is a hearty Woman Suffragist. She headed the petition to the Constitutional Convention of the State of New York praying that body to incorporate Woman Suffrage into the new Constitution. She is very ill—nearer to the grave than her husband. And we believe that nothing would cheer her in her sick chamber so exquisitely, or make her so content to exchange worlds, as the reflection that she could pass away, leaving those same daughters in full possession of all the rights which she so bravely demanded for them from the supreme law of the State, under her husband's frown and against her husband's vote.

The war has already opened, then, not only by an unflinching assault upon the character of my private relations, but by, with Mr. Greeley's own consent and by his own act, the commencement of a direct scrutiny of his family relations, as well.

It might, perhaps, be thought more courtly if the social conflict now on the docket of world-issues and up for trial, could have been conducted without personalities or the intrusive inspection of family affairs. I do not doubt that such a mode of conducting the war would suit best with Mr. Greeley's ordinary conservative views; and that it is through some irritation, mistake or oversight that he has overstepped those limits and authorized the carrying of the war into his and his coadjutors' domestic Africa.

For me and mine, we shrink in no manner from this shape given to the campaign. On the contrary, personalities and domesticities are probably, contrary to the conservative prejudices we have all been bred in, just the proper arena on which the war of social ideas should be fought out. For ourselves, we should be very glad if all conventional barriers were set aside; and if we might be held free to discuss openly the facts, as they are known to us, of the private households of all the great lights of the age, men and women, with a view to elucidating the views we entertain. It is with immense sacrifice, and with a real generosity, which we know is in some quarters gratefully appreciated, that we refrain from lifting the roofs off the tops of the houses.

But in Mr. Greeley's case I am fully excused from any courtesy which should restrain my criticism. He has chosen to invade my family sanctum. He will not object to my invading his. I only regret that in his case, as in mine, persons will have to be mentioned who are only incidentally involved. I beg pardon of Mrs. Greeley and her daughters, in advance, but both they and the public will see that certainly no unfriendliness is intended. Every war involves the interests of some innocent parties. I wish to be just. I do not accuse Mr. Greeley of sinning, knowingly and in his own person, against his own code of morality. I think he is one of the very few men connected with the secular press, to say nothing now of the religious press, of New York City, who either believe in or practice the puritanical code in the social relations. I think he is an honest bigot, and not a pretentious hypocrite, on that subject. And when he says that he would oppose all relaxation of the stringency of the marriage laws, and that he opposes female suffrage because he thinks that the civic tends toward the social enfranchisement of women, I believe that he says honestly

what he thinks. It is only the more to be regretted that his prejudice against one form of truth is so strong and unreasoning that it leads him to oppose another form of truth from its incidental associations with the other.

When, therefore, I take the liberty of saying what has been an open secret for many years, that Mr. Greeley's home has always been a sort of domestic hell, I do not mean that Mr. Greeley has proved an unfaithful husband, in the ordinary sense of that term. On the contrary, he has, rather, I think, been held up, and I believe rightly, too, as a model husband in that particular. And for that reason the fault and the opprobrium of the domestic discord has been heaped on Mrs. Greeley. And who has ever come to her defense? Or take another case of a lady who has laid under the ban of public ridicule and censure longer than Mrs. Greeley. I mean Xantippe, the wife of another philosopher of the same stamp. The world has been told, and has repeated for more than twenty centuries, the serio-comic story of her irritable and scolding temper, of her unreasonable and tormenting conduct. And the world has sympathized with Socrates, and has condemned her.

Who has ever troubled himself to inquire how much philosopher Socrates or philosopher Greeley has had to do with souring the temper, unstringing the nerves, and completely disorganizing the sensitive machinery of a delicate woman's organization. Mankind look so much to effects and so little to causes. A scolding woman is a palpable fact, to the annoyance of everybody about her. A senseless brute of a man, even though a philosopher—a man I mean, now, merely, when the case is no worse, who has no delicate capacity for appreciating a woman's nature—may, quite unconsciously to himself, and quite unobserved by others, grate continuously on the sensibilities of her soul, more, a thousand times, than the tongue of a shrew upon the ears of anybody. Whenever, therefore, a scolding, a nervous, an unreasonable or even a devilish tendency is developed in a wife, it is well to scrutinize closely the qualities of the husband.

Nothing can be more aggravating to a woman and a mother than a senseless indifference on the part of a husband and father to all the aspirations of mother and daughters for some wider career or some greater security of condition than that which marriage affords. The total forgetfulness on the part of Mr. Greeley that there is any such party in interest as Mrs. Greeley, in speaking of the destiny of their daughters, is a probable indication of the man's whole character in his relation with a high-spirited woman who was intensely conscious that she ought to go for somebody in the world, but who was choked with the suffocating consciousness that she was made into a practical nobody in the grip of that divine institution which Mr. Greeley upholds, and by the callous manishness of Mr. Greeley himself, who, instead of consulting the woman as to what she needs, knows it all for her, and prescribes her sphere. Mr. Tilton's point is, therefore, well taken, that there is a Mrs. Greeley also in the case, and one who has had the bravery to head a movement for suffrage directly in the teeth of Mr. Greeley's insulting assumption of being himself the only party entitled to have an opinion on the subject.

But Mr. Greeley makes the unconscious insolence of his position somewhat pathetic by alluding to the fact that of seven children that he has had, he has only two now remaining. There are thinkers and philanthropists in the world who would inquire why Mr. Greeley's children have died; or if they had been born idiots, why they were idiots; or if deaf or blind, why deaf or blind. And there are some who so connect sequences with their antecedents as to see that the incompatibility or disharmony of parents is a fruitful cause of the death of children, as it is of their deformity. If, then, it shall appear that the ignorant bigotry of Mr. Greeley himself, blindly and stupidly unconscious, but real, such as would now decide on the fate of his remaining daughters with no reference whatever to their individuality or wishes, has first wrecked the happiness of a wife, and then the harmony of a household, and finally abridged the lives of five out of seven of the children of that marriage, perhaps it will also appear that Mr. Greeley, while complying with every demand of the law—a Pharisee of the Pharisees on the marriage question—is not less guilty before the bar of a higher morality than Victoria C. Woodhull, whose irregularities and lack of deference for Mrs. Grundy disturb Mr. Greeley's mind so seriously.

So much in respect to Mr. Greeley's domestic family. A word now in respect to his official family, his editorial staff, and his political favorites and associates. Mr. Tilton makes the point on him so strikingly well on this subject also, that I cannot forbear again to quote:

But even if the worst which Mr. Greeley imagines against a woman nominated for the presidency were true—if, for instance, she were a profligate—Mr. Greeley's own logic would estop him from objecting to her political preferment on this account. Mr. Greeley believes in the same morality for men as women. Now he has spent a lifetime in advocating the fortunes of politicians who were perfectly well known to him to be personally unchaste. How many Presidents, Governors, Senators, Representatives, Judges and the like has Mr. Greeley helped to elect, knowing or believing at the very time of his advocacy that they were loose and irregular in their private lives! How many public men does the *Tribune* now, day by day, as occasion arises, compliment on their public efforts, knowing at the same time that they are rotten in their private characters! Consistency is said to be a jewel. Perhaps this is the reason why Mr. Greeley does not carry it about with him.

He now says that he is not the author of the *Tribune's* diatribes against the woman suffragists. This is as much as to

THE WEEKLY BULLETIN OF THE PANTARCHY.

DEFINITION AND DEFINITIONS OF FREE LOVE.

The New York *Tribune* of late, and now Mr. Tilton's *Golden Age*, have gone wool-gathering over the possible and appropriate meaning or meanings of Free Love.

Mr. Tilton has the following:

WHAT IS FREE LOVE?

There is a loose, idle and mischievous phrase going up and down the land, to which the numerous people who use it attach various meanings, no two persons apparently using it in the same sense. We refer to the term Free Love.

It is high time that this expression should now have a fixed and definite meaning. It is not in either Webster's or Worcester's dictionary, but sprang into existence, we believe, since both these lexicographers died. As it ought to have an unmistakable interpretation, we propose the following plan for determining it:

Let Mrs. Paulina Wright Davis, Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Mrs. Mary A. Livermore, Mrs. Celia Burleigh, Mrs. Victoria C. Woodhull, Mrs. Lucy Stone, Miss Susan B. Anthony and Mrs. Rose Mackinley—by all of whom we have seen this phrase used in various and conflicting senses—sit down, each of them, as soon as their eyes fall on this paragraph, and drop a note to the *Golden Age*, giving in the briefest possible compass their separate ideas of its proper signification.

We will take pleasure in printing all these communications.

Then, after having submitted the case to this jury of good women, we will see if we can get the jury themselves to agree in accepting any one of their various significations as final, and to be adhered to in future.

We think the press generally would agree to abide by such a decision. Meanwhile there is confusion, daily worse confounded. Mr. Greeley condemns Mrs. Paulina Davis because she is a Free Lover, and the *Commercial Advertiser* condemns Mr. Greeley for being the same.

Let us end the perplexity by having the letters of definition.

I cannot perceive anything loose, idle and mischievous in this phrase, or anything more so in connection with the whole subject than the loose, idle and mischievous lack of logic in anybody's mind which should occasion any difficulty in understanding the subject. Mr. Tilton would not commit the folly of calling Freedom of the Press a loose, idle and mischievous phrase. Just as little would he fall into the absurdity of confounding freedom of the press with the immoral and distasteful uses which some authors and publishers may choose to make of that freedom. He would know and say, at once, that the question of the right and expediency of the freedom of the press, taking into account all the uses and all the abuses which will come of it, is one thing to be considered, and a wholly distinct question from that of the abuses as such. He would know and say that every freedom is by its very nature, as freedom, liable to be put to bad uses by bad people; but that that fact does not determine that the freedom is a bad thing; inasmuch as good people need that same freedom for the best of uses and purposes. It is astounding to me that any American, in whose home he must, as a child, have heard precisely these distinctions dilated upon a thousand times, as the justification of all the forms of freedom which we enjoy, can need at this day a definition of freedom in any new application, logically allied with the forms of freedom already vindicated; or that he can need to have pointed out to him the difference between the *Principle*, covering all uses good and bad, and the *uses themselves*, good or bad, which different kinds of people may make of the freedom. I am equally surprised that anybody, any such person especially, an American with the very definition of freedom born in his blood, should think or name the clear, expressive, appropriate and beautiful term Free Love a loose, idle and mischievous phrase, and call for a jury of matrons to define it, for the use of self and partners of the editorial corps.

Whether the ladies appealed to will volunteer to disperse the mistiness which, after twenty years' discussion, continues to envelop the editorial brain upon this plain subject I cannot say. Masculine genius is not called on in this behalf by the *Golden Age*; but about ten years ago Mr. Greeley did apply to me formally and expressly "to tell the people what I meant by free love; for," he added, "they will persist in calling me a free lover, and you know, Andrews, that I ain't." Willing, out of my abounding benevolence, to give the distinguished editor, politician and philanthropist a certificate of good moral character, in which department I consider myself an expert, I prepared the following definition, which was published at the time in the *Tribune*, and which I now republish in the Bulletin of the Pantarchy, hoping it may be some consolation to editors in search after knowledge under difficulties, until such time as Mr. Tilton shall get his jury of women impaneled.

For that sturdy conservatism and bigotry which, with no pretense that it does not understand us, honestly doubts that freedom can be trusted so far, whether in this new and more delicate sphere of human affairs it will exhibit the same self-regulating potency which it has in other spheres, I have complete respect; but as for that mental slumpiness on the part of reformers, and especially of such as believe in the thing itself, and propound and defend it under other names, but who can never make out what free love means, they rank with the men in anti-slavery times who were "as much

anti-slavery as anybody, but they were no *Reformers*," because abolition was the straightforward and direct name for anti-slavery, which, in consequence of being so, had been covered with the slaveholders' opprobrium; and weak-kneed advocates tried, therefore, to dodge it. For all such it requires a higher degree of Christian virtue to feel tolerant. May the Lord help us to preserve our equanimity in speaking of them.

S. P. A.

FREE LOVE.

To the Editor of the N. Y. *Tribune*.

Sir: During some five or six years past, and especially of late, the Newspaper Press has made free use of my name in connection with what it denominates the Doctrine of Free Love. Every variety of interpretation has been put upon my opinions, usually the least favorable which the imagination of the writer could devise, with a view, apparently, of cultivating still further the natural prejudice existing in the public mind against any one bold enough to agitate the delicate and difficult question of the true relations of the sexes, and the legitimate role which the Passions were intended to play in the economy of the Universe. During the same period, I have allowed the Press to make what havoc it pleased of my reputation, uttering no word of explanation or reply, for the reason that neither Press nor People were, as I believe, prepared to do justice in the premises, and I preferred to "bide my time," rather than seek or accept the stunted half justice which I might, perhaps, have supplicated and obtained. Most or all of my *co-doctrinaires* have pursued the same course. Two results have followed: First, in the absence of any readiness on the part of the public to know the truth on the subject, false, extravagant and ridiculous notions have flooded the country in its stead; secondly, in the absence of any opportunity for a judicious popular advocacy of Social Freedom, and despite abuse, the doctrine itself has made unprecedented progress, until at this day its advocates are numbered by thousands, while there are included among them an unusual proportion of the wealthy, intelligent and refined.

However flattering it might be, under ordinary circumstances, to have a large corps of learned and respectable gentlemen, like the members of the Press, anxious to expound one's opinions, I confess that I should prefer to represent my own convictions and views. Should the time have arrived, therefore, when, in your judgment, it will better subserve the wants of the public to have an authentic statement of a doctrine which they are not expected to approve than to be begoggled and deceived by false, confused and conflicting reports, you will, at the same time, confer a personal favor by publishing the following definition of Free Love.

America, and through it, the world, have been recently startled, shocked and horrified even, by the announcement of a new freedom, the Freedom of Love. It may be well to reflect that every new idea, fraught with any genuine greatness or value, has, in other times, startled, shocked and horrified the public in whose ears it was first uttered, and to inquire whether we, in our day, may not be, perchance, repeating the same ridiculous farce, the night-mare of the world's infancy, the panic of ignorance and "verdancy," with which the race has always hitherto accorded a reception to every new dispensation of the truth.

Is there anything to terrify the imagination in the idea of Freedom? Is not Freedom already recognized and worshipped as a goddess, and her image stamped upon the coin of the realm? Is it Love that is viewed as a monster, whose very name paralyzes with fear? There are ancient writings, not a little revered among us, which declare that "Love is the fulfilling of the law," and again, that "God is Love." How, then, does it happen that Free Love, or the Freedom of Loving Hearts, should be a word of terror to mankind, so that the world forgets her propriety, and is made to misbehave herself, with unseemly alarm, at the mere mention of an etymological combination, the elements of which, uttered separately, fall with the soothing cadence of a lullaby upon the same excitable nerves.

Free Love is simply the antithesis of enslaved Love. This is equally true in all the senses of which the word is susceptible, whether confined to the amative and sentimental relation of the sexes, or enlarged to signify the whole affectional nature of man.

In beginning an agitation for the emancipation of the human race from the tyranny which prescribes what it is lawful for them to feel, the writer of this intended the freedom of the whole range of the affections, and adopted, as the technicality to express that idea, the term "Freedom of the Affections." The common instinct of the people, more direct and simple than the speculations of philosophy, has substituted the term "Free Love," and calls the partisans of the doctrine "Free Lovites."

The principle of Individuality prohibits me from assuming to represent the opinions of others. For myself, and for so many as concur in the views here expressed, I accept and approve the amended terminology. Individually, I am, then, a Free Lovite. I adopt and promulgate the doctrine of Free Love, in every legitimate understanding of its signification. Without restraining the meaning of the word to the relations of the sexes, it is admitted that those relations are included and mainly intended by it, and that the freedom proposed contemplates the entire abolition of the institution of Marriage as a legal tie to be maintained and perpetuated by force.

The first popular objection to Free Love, to be anticipated

as existing in the public mind, is the prevalent belief that the Bible has prescribed an indissoluble monogamy, or the life-marriage of one man and one woman, as the only form of the union of the sexes which God approves. This belief results from the interpretation which some of the words of Christ in relation to marriage have almost uniformly received. Whenever positive discoveries are made in science, the interpretation which theologians have previously put upon scriptural texts must, perforce, be modified and adapted to the ascertained truth. If a newly discovered fact or principle, no matter what, be such as to compel the conviction of the human mind by a direct appeal to reason or consciousness, there is no alternative for any religious dogma which stands opposed to it but to yield and give way before the progress of knowledge. It belongs to the theologian to find a new interpretation, which shall coincide with the revelations of science. The Scriptures have been held, at various periods, with equal unanimity, to teach that the sun revolves around the earth; that kings reign of divine right, and must not, for any cause, be resisted; and that the world was created in six literal days. With the progress of astronomy, politics and geology, each of these convictions has given way before the scientific discovery of adverse facts and principles.

If Physiology should establish the fact, for example, that disease is planted in the human system from birth whenever there is incompatibility of temper or temperament between the parents, that the death in infancy of more than half of the children born is due to this more than to any other cause, and that, therefore, the best interests of the race require that the relations of the sexes shall be adjusted by science, aided by unlimited freedom and every variety of sexual experience; or if Physiology or Sociology fairly and fully establishes any other PRINCIPLE, touching the Science of Man, which is adverse to our present monogamic marriage system, the present theological and ethical belief on the subject not only may, but must, be swept out of existence by the new species of knowledge thus acquired. Principles and known facts refuse absolutely to be set aside out of deference to any Creed, however sacred it may be thought to be. If exegesis cannot provide a new rendering for the text, so much the worse for the text, and for the book in which it is contained. Theology itself is a progressive science, and, perchance, it may be found teaching, at no distant day, that the Christian Millennium, the Socialist Reign of Harmony, and the Will of God to be done on earth, for which we pray in conjunction with "Thy kingdom come," are one and the same period, and the same again with the "kingdom of Heaven," in which there is neither "marrying nor giving in marriage," but where "all are as the angels of God." Perhaps it may also teach that this last expression signifies "the saints made perfect," or simply Men and Women developed and wise enough to be a "law unto themselves," understanding the laws of their own organization, and gladly obeying the truth as it is revealed to them, in their own experience, from day to day. It is not impossible, therefore, that the religious teachings of a few years hence may recognize a continuous succession of "Dispensations," in the last and highest of which, in the future, neither the constable, the policeman nor the turnkey shall be a necessary functionary to compel men and women to live together in unloving relations, or to prevent them from regulating the most sacred affairs of their private lives according to the dictates of their own judgments and consciences.

However all this may be, and whatever Physiology or Theology may determine, or not determine, Sociology already affirms and demonstrates that the fundamental principle of social order is the recognition of the sovereignty of every individual. Whether constancy or variety, conjugality or promiscuity, or all of these combined in a more composite variety, is the natural or the divine law upon the subject, this fundamental principle decides that the individual himself is the sole judge, for himself, upon all these questions, and not any pope or magistrate whatsoever. It decides that I must not attempt to enforce upon you my reading of the Scriptures, my religious belief nor my sense of right, in any particular in which your exercise of your own freedom is not in some palpable way aggressive or injurious to me.

In this country, and in this age, we have, in one sphere of social affairs, a successful and triumphant practical illustration of the theory that the recognition of the rights of the individual is the talisman of order and harmony in society. Here and now, for the first time in the world, and after ages of bloody conflicts in arriving at this simple and effective mode of regulating the subject, the matter of worship is abandoned wholly to the deciding power of the person immediately interested; limited only by the inhibition of encroachment. Not only is he permitted "to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience," but, equally, to neglect or refuse to worship Him altogether; and the result is peace and fraternity; in the place of the inquisition, the burning fagot and war.

For one, I reject and repudiate the interference of the State in my morals, precisely as I do the interference of the church to prescribe my religious deportment or belief. The outrage on human rights is in my view no less in kind to assume to determine whom men and women may love, and what manifestation they may make of that sentiment, than it is to burn them at Geneva or Smithfield for heretical practices or faith.

Such, then, is Free Love—neither more nor less. It is simply a branch or single application of the larger doctrine of the Sovereignty of the Individual. It decides absolutely

nothing wi
lation. V
concerned
duration
lative en
pate reg
matter wh
law.

The att
an unbric
confusion
as yet of
than the
rapidly
struct th
telligent
wisely a
late to i
refined.

The
grand o
also fou
belief ti
lief the
bolical.
anti-pr
fore
ligious
orthod
do not
incarn
it inflie
grace

Ever
mind l
gionist
the hu
ment
py, B
Man
born i
other
tive
that
man,
born i
stitut
an att
violen
than
taking
quenc
ing tl
their

It i
but tl
that i
gious
whic
nated
that
derek
ral a
ture
later
cludi
the
were
from
sequ
note
W

Free
fit
with
man
the
itself
know
It

exce
men
the n
of it
enert
So

From
ratio
appa
natur
not s
berd
of be
overl
exam
whil
dem
natur
tany
pree

...the weaker than it. Thus intellect governs those destitute of it, as men govern those destitute of physical strength. At the same time, Love governs the weaker sex, in which affection is dominant, and constantly governs the stronger, despite the preponderance of knowledge adversely.

Hence the certainty that, in Freedom, the few superior natures will organize and exhibit a simple of human society of a type so infinitely more beautiful and attractive than any other which can exist in the midst of a slavery imposed by a majority of inferior natures, and engaged to the measure of constraint which they feel conscious of requiring, that the example alone will be a far more powerful corrective of the undeveloped mass lying beneath it than any arbitrary restraint whatever. What does happen under the operation of the Freedom of the Press, will happen under the operation of Free Love. At first, we have a preponderance of trashy, vulgar and unwholesome literature—which is, nevertheless, better than no literature, since it teaches the masses, who are on a level with it, the habit of reading, and prepares the way for a gradual elevation of taste on the part of some, and finally of all. In the midst of the general debasement, a few superior writers utter the still, small voice of refined taste and elevated views. From the fact that the people are free to read, and already can read, these find an audience among whom some few respond with appreciation. The few in time become many, and the many all. Thus Freedom, while it seemed to give rein to unbridled licentiousness, was laying the foundation for the universal prevalence of purity and refinement.

Perchance it may be intelligently held hereafter, in the same way, and in the bright light of anthropological science, that "Free Lust," even in its most revolting excesses, is a better thing for humanity than the forced celibacy and passionate starvation of Monks and Nuns, and of the hundreds of thousands of "old maids" in Catholic and Protestant Christendom—the victims of a moral marasmus, which shrivels the soul, and which admits of no alternative but disgusting and solitary vice.

The third and last grand objection to Amorous Liberty relates to the maintenance and culture of Children. This objection assumes that the isolated family offers the only mode of properly caring for offspring. The family, as now constituted, is, in fact, a very hot-bed of selfishness, which, while it provides for one's own children badly enough, permits the children of others, equally good, to starve at one's door, with the comfortable assurance that the responsibility belongs with somebody else. A grand social revolution is soon to occur. In this generation THE PEOPLE float in palaces upon their rivers and bays; in the next they will live in palaces upon land. Then the nursery will be a Unitary Institution, scientifically organized and adapted to the new social state. Let the reader refer, upon this subject, to a tract called "The Baby World."

Finally, the words Free and Freedom are everywhere honored, except in the connections "Free Niggers," "Free Women," "Free Thinking" and "Free Love." They are scoffed at in these relations because they stand opposed to Tyrannies that are still respectable—Slavery, Marriage and the Authority of the Church. When Tyranny of all kinds shall have disappeared, Freedom of all kinds will be revered, and none will be ashamed to confess that they believe in the Freedom of Love.

STEPHEN PEARL ANDREWS.

P. S.—Free Love does not and cannot mean anti-marriage, in the same sense as freedom from chattel slavery does mean anti-slavery; for slavery being an enforced relation freedom in relation to it prohibits it. But in so far as marriage is anything which can exist voluntarily in its inception and continuance, freedom cannot assail it, but is bound to defend it. Freedom is so large a word that therein seems to be difficulty for most people to compass its meaning. Free Love embraces the freedom to have no relations with the other sex whatever; just as free worship includes the right not to worship at all; the right to reject all overtures (even in marriages); to protect one's self from the excesses of love in others, no matter whom, as well as the right to marry (if done voluntarily) or to mate without marriage, at the discretion of the parties. What it insists is that those who mate without marriage shall be held as respectable as those who marry. This seems an immense stretch, but we in this country have gone two-thirds the whole distance toward it. Formerly, and in some countries now, bastards were accursed socially, even to the third and fourth generation. In this age and country, by the mere progress of enlightenment, the curse has been completely lifted off them, and persons born out of wedlock are just as respectable as those born in it, provided they behave as well, and more so if they behave better. The highest political or social position is as open to them as to any other, until we have almost forgotten the difference. Free Love insists that this same common sense and good sense shall be extended to the parents. There are twenty or perhaps fifty thousand mistresses in this city, who are, in all senses, just as intrinsically good and respectable women as the married women, while yet they are ostracized by public opinion. Free Lovers make no such distinction. Even when married themselves, and living in all senses regularly, or under the law, they accept, socially, those who do not, the same as those who do; insisting that people shall sink or rise by relation to their real respectability or good conduct, and not by some fictitious and legal standard, which blinds the judg-

ment, fosters pride and phariseism, and hardens the heart. I have, myself, been a regularly married man, and recognized as a good husband, during all my fight for Free Love—I married, indeed, a second time in the midst of it. Why can't people understand devotion to a principle for its own sake; for the truth there is in it? S. P. A.

CORRESPONDENCE.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—All communications intended for publication must be written on one side only. The editors will not be accountable for manuscripts not accepted. Correspondents will please condense their letters. Many valuable communications are crowded out by their length.

SWINBURNE AND WHITMAN.

NEW YORK, August 6, 1871.

Dear Victoria—The perusal of the writings of two symbolic poets of the day, intuitionists of the new movement of the time—the one in love, and the other in both love and freedom—have suggested to me the thoughts which follow.

Each individual soul measures all other souls by the standard of its own judgment, and pronounces bad in them all that is not in harmony with its accustomed thoughts and feelings, or such system of ethics or religion as faith or reason may have taught it. But to the true poet—the too oft unacknowledged teacher and legislator of the world—or the real philosopher and universal scientist, "there is nothing either good or bad, but thinking makes it so," and public opinion is but a "fool's gudgeon," as Mercutio calls it.

In no fact that I know of is this law more perceptible than in relation to that wholly original school of modern philosophers, mostly female, with a few males, who are trying, emotionally and scientifically, to cure love of its errors; who believe in free love, and are free lovers, and who are, of all others, the most abused and the least understood; pelted with the small pellets of the brain and tongue, both by the conservative, who fears their freedom, and by the licentious, who cannot conceive of liberty without license, use without abuse. In ordinary unthinking minds, in whom first impressions are not corrected by that careful consideration which is the angel that "whips the offending Adam out of us," the term "free love" is associated with that reckless opprobrium which envy, jealousy or the narrowness of view above mentioned casts upon all whose lives are of larger scope than those who are cribbed, cabined and confined by temporary expediency or educational bias. On the other hand, to the worshipers of freedom as the only principle by which humanity can be developed, these words convey the sublimest import; suggest a method by means of which only can the race be improved up to that ideal standard of animal body and ethereal mind which has yet, perhaps, never been individualized upon the planet; of which the Apollo of Praxiteles is the material symbol, with the heart of Christ, the imagination of Shakespeare, and the ratiocination of Stephen Pearl Andrews to constitute the mind.

Freedom to love! Without this freedom life is stripped of its purport and beauty. The chronicles of the race, as recorded in tale or history, prove that whatever restrictions have been put upon that omnipotent passion have made countless millions mourn, have turned existence into a terror and horror, have, by making love criminal, except under the restrictions of law or custom, perverted the noblest aspirations and quenched the light of hope in the truest minds. Out of this romance of earnest passion, and the impediments which have been thrown in its way by false institutions, narrow prejudices or the selfish sense of ownership, the poets have weaved that woeful story of miserable expectation or wild imagination, temporary fruition and hopeless disappointment, which gives pathos and verity to the couplet:

"The course of true love never did run smooth."

The poets have all despised the conventionalities which would trammel love even in its wildest vagaries; and they have told in song the tale of "Free Love," until the heart of the whole world beats in sympathy with a true free lover, who obeys the elective affinities of nature, and hates the cold obstacles which admit impediment to the marriage of true minds.

Two modern poets, one of America and the other of England, have chanted some phases of free love—Walt Whitman and Algernon Charles Swinburne—two heralds, as it were, of the approaching era when the armed and cruel Eros shall no longer pierce his victim, scattering blindfold his poisonous darts; but where Cupid shall have grown into the wisdom of the god who loved Psyche as the symbol of the soul of womanhood; the time when the loves of humanity shall be as pure as the loves of the plants, and the aroma of the spirit shall consecrate those ecstatic unions and unimaginable blisses, which are now so infrequent as to be but as

"The wavering memory of a lovely dream,"

a momentary gladness dogged by decay and change.

These two poets are the prophetic precursors of the true Free Love period, when love shall be a principle as well as a passion, a science as well as an emotion.

The Free Love women of America are grateful to Mr. Swinburne for his appreciation and delicious rendering in words of slumberous harmony, with

"Taste of sound; diverse and delicate,"

of the exquisitely sensuous in nature, the graceful worship of the deliciousness of bodily sensation as it existed in the

"I think some divine support has equalized us with them."

Yours for love and freedom,
FRANCIS HOWE MACKENZIE

On the other hand, a small minority claim the same privilege (another claim consistent with their condition of this republic), but because they are in a minority, Mayor Hall forbids the parade, on account of it being the tradition of an English king's victories. Why were the Protestants not forbidden to celebrate William's recent victories, because Frenchmen were not numerous enough to be a political power. Mayor Hall & Co. simply re-enact the English politicians, using the strongest political adage: "some means Orangemen should become the majority." Political wire pullers would shift sides in double quick time.

When I was
years, my great-
grandmother was
years so that
keeper, who
my grandmo-
The evi-
and made a
shorter later
instead of give-
rimer, to whom
most of friends
suspect—I set
upon my feet
reader will
may appear
diary, and
is dwelling
purpose in the
cern for us
told to in-
where we did
ing, very
house with
low to be
Anna Be-
house with
specialties

When I was a promising young man of three-and-twenty years, my good uncle died and left to me his estate. My grandmother had preceded my uncle in departure several years, so that at his death I was left with only an old housekeeper, who had been the companion more than attendant of my grandmother.

MY FRIENDS AND I.

The sudden removal from our small family circle of its head made a void which the pressure of exterior influences, though intended to remove, only made the more obvious. Instead of giving me time to recover from the loss of my adviser, to whom I had deferred in all my little difficulties, the host of friends—more numerous than I before had reason to suspect—forced upon me the unpleasant task of deciding upon my future. As I had been quite unsuccessful (as the reader will have learned) in my efforts to secure the necessary appendage to an establishment, a wife, I must immediately, under the burden of my loneliness and inexperience in deciding matters of importance, choose the course I would pursue in the future. My aunts exhibited the greatest concern for my standing in society, and their acute perceptions told them just what each one of our acquaintances, upon whom we depended for our respectability and social standing, would think and say about my living alone in a large house with only the old housekeeper, whose care had until now been all that both my uncle and self had required.

Aunt Barbary said that such a course would shut all the houses where young ladies of the requisite amount of respectability to fit them for superintendents of my establish-

ment. I felt that it would compel me to a life of celibacy, and I had called from her own lips the words which I now repeat.

My aunts soon began to question me, upon my return home, when I had been out riding with Sandford. The Averys had been talking about his williness, and Mr. A. had told Clementine not to favor his advances, so I must be careful. When I went down to the Fishing Banks with young Sevens they were sure he was not respectable, for he did not belong to their set; never had heard of him, in fact; therefore I must look well to the choice of my associates. I went into the country to spend Sunday with young Hawkins; we attended church three times, but when I returned I was informed that Mr. Hawkins used to be very respectable, and was a pillar of their church, but he lost his property, and since he had gone to farming was not recognized as of their set, though his son appeared to be quite a promising young man; still, I must look well to my associates! spoken with much deliberation and evident depth of feeling.

It is no wonder that I tried to look so well to my associates, and sought relief from the importunities of relatives in lodgings, as the English, with the pride of poverty, call rooms let by the suite of one or more. Here I did not escape the sharp watchfulness of relatives, and I often wished myself Adam, he was so free from this evil.

My first experiment in choice of rooms fell upon one of moderate proportions, adjoining to which was a dark closet, which was, by the exceeding politeness of the lady of the house, promoted to the grade of a room, and, as a natural sequence, that elevation of character made the single large room into a suite. Why may not that same fiction be effective in its application to mankind? Is it not? Do we not lift ourselves to a higher level by raising our fellows? In these rooms I thought to find peace at least, and so determined that I would do something. For about three days I wrote letters, read useful books and made up my mind that there was that in me which, if only brought out, would make quite a man of Isaiah Sleeper. By the time I was well started my old chums began to find me; then they would drop in at the rate of four or five a day, and the time passed on so rapidly that I soon forgot my work, and found that one thing was as much as any person can do well. If you will keep up with the polite society of a city you will not need any other occupation.

The extent of my entertainment of fellows soon got to the ears of my aunts, and I have always thought there was a little conspiracy formed to keep watch over me. My home was with humble people, a worthy widow, who owned the house she occupied and who was able to make a good living for herself and one daughter by judicious management. I have never been fully satisfied whether it was the fellows who visited me, or the daughter of the landlady whom the aunts watched so unceasingly.

It seems that single ladies, after passing say the age of thirty, look upon every young couple of different sex who may be brought together as sure of making a match. Possibly their forlorn condition begets this opinion.

I will describe this daughter of my landlady as well as memory will permit, that the reader may judge of the probabilities of a good ground for the fears of my aunts: Height, five feet three and a half (not bad); very thin (not good); black hair, much of it, on a small head; shoulders very sloping; waist waspish; step mincing; would have had the Grecian bend if it had been fashionable in those days. But it was her face that was the striking point of attraction or repulsion. She had a very large face if you looked at her profile, but excessively diminutive when viewed full front. Her eyes were black, full and piercing; but when her head was a bit turned, you could see only one, for her nose stood out so far from the rest of her face that Gothic but feebly represents the style. Shall I go on, or can you decide upon the probabilities of a young man falling in love with a poor girl of that description.

This eternal vigilance of relatives is, no doubt, a valuable element in society as at present organized, but it can be carried to excess as well as other evils.

[TO BE CONTINUED]

THE CASE OF MRS. FAIR.

Daniel McFarland, conceiving that he had a right of ownership in Mrs. Richardson because she had been his wife, killed her husband, was tried by a jury of men and acquitted. He ought to have been convicted.

Mrs. Fair, conceiving she had a right of ownership in Mr. —, who saw fit to exercise his right of self-ownership by marrying another woman, asserted her supposed right of ownership in him by murdering him. She was tried by a jury of men and convicted.

But it was not the same jury that convicted one and acquitted the other. Perhaps the San Francisco jury would have acquitted McFarland; probably the New York jury would have convicted Mrs. Fair. But we don't know. All we can say is that both criminals were believers in their right to own the persons of others.

I think, speaking from the standpoint of self-ownership, that Mrs. Fair's case is "none of our funeral," and can see no more right in Mrs. Fair or Mary Harris to kill their lovers than in McFarland to kill his ex-wife's husband. Self-ownership precludes such tragedies, and I do not see that advocates are called upon to add to their burden of unpopularity by seeming to indorse acts which can result only from a violation of those principles.

BALANCE.

MY FRIENDS AND I.

CHAPTER VI.

When I was a promising young man of three-and-twenty years, my good uncle died and left to me his estate. My grandmother had preceded my uncle in departure several years, so that at his death I was left with only an old housekeeper, who had been the companion more than attendant of my grandmother.

The sudden removal from our small family circle of its head made a void which the pressure of exterior influences, though intended to remove, only made the more obvious. Instead of giving me time to recover from the loss of my adviser, to whom I had deferred in all my little difficulties, the host of friends—more numerous than I before had reason to suspect—forced upon me the unpleasant task of deciding upon my future. As I had been quite unsuccessful (as the reader will have learned) in my efforts to secure the necessary appendage to an establishment, a wife, I must immediately, under the burden of my loneliness and inexperience in deciding matters of importance, choose the course I would pursue in the future. My aunts exhibited the greatest concern for my standing in society, and their acute perceptions told them just what each one of our acquaintances, upon whom we depended for our respectability and social standing, would think and say about my living alone in a large house with only the old housekeeper, whose care had until now been all that both my uncle and self had required.

Aunt Barbary said that such a course would shut all the houses where young ladies of the requisite amount of respectability to fit them for superintendents of my establish-

ment. I felt that it would compel me to a life of celibacy, and I had called from her own lips the words which I now repeat.

My aunts soon began to question me, upon my return home, when I had been out riding with Sandford. The Averys had been talking about his williness, and Mr. A. had told Clementine not to favor his advances, so I must be careful. When I went down to the Fishing Banks with young Sevens they were sure he was not respectable, for he did not belong to their set; never had heard of him, in fact; therefore I must look well to the choice of my associates. I went into the country to spend Sunday with young Hawkins; we attended church three times, but when I returned I was informed that Mr. Hawkins used to be very respectable, and was a pillar of their church, but he lost his property, and since he had gone to farming was not recognized as of their set, though his son appeared to be quite a promising young man; still, I must look well to my associates! spoken with much deliberation and evident depth of feeling.

It is no wonder that I tried to look so well to my associates, and sought relief from the importunities of relatives in lodgings, as the English, with the pride of poverty, call rooms let by the suite of one or more. Here I did not escape the sharp watchfulness of relatives, and I often wished myself Adam, he was so free from this evil.

My first experiment in choice of rooms fell upon one of moderate proportions, adjoining to which was a dark closet, which was, by the exceeding politeness of the lady of the house, promoted to the grade of a room, and, as a natural sequence, that elevation of character made the single large room into a suite. Why may not that same fiction be effective in its application to mankind? Is it not? Do we not lift ourselves to a higher level by raising our fellows? In these rooms I thought to find peace at least, and so determined that I would do something. For about three days I wrote letters, read useful books and made up my mind that there was that in me which, if only brought out, would make quite a man of Isaiah Sleeper. By the time I was well started my old chums began to find me; then they would drop in at the rate of four or five a day, and the time passed on so rapidly that I soon forgot my work, and found that one thing was as much as any person can do well. If you will keep up with the polite society of a city you will not need any other occupation.

We would reape
readers to the

WINTER

BALDWIN

and refer them to
G. H. H. publisher

WINT

In every department business, are up to will be at least an attempted. The clothing we o increase the effi city of every bran

It is a fact to
here, that we re
made clothing C.
in America. Th
corner, no house
two hundred th
Men and Boys, a

The fall and successful operation, never has country.

Our old patrons who are intended season, will find wants in every place - no small the best work the year round for us every week.

It shall be a advantage known work for our advantages for satisfaction to

FRF

DIN

23 New

70 Male

•

during the

most careful

waltem.

FOUR

author o

New &

ONE DO:

PRC

**TO KNOW
In great**

What's

And, sh

1:1 w:t

7

References

100

100

100

11/11/2016

LOCKWOOD & CO.

BANKERS,

No. 94 Broadway.

A SPECIAL BANKING SERVICE
FOR THE
BANKERS AND BROKERS

MAIN BRANCH

Bankers and Brokers

100 Broadway

New York

BRANCHES IN

Bankers and Brokers

100 Broadway

New York

ST. LOUIS CITY

100 Broadway

New York

100 Broadway

100 Broadway

DUNCAN, SHERMAN & CO.

BANKERS,

No. 11 Nassau Street.

— OFFICIALS OF THE NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE
— OFFICIALS OF THE NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE
— OFFICIALS OF THE NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE
— OFFICIALS OF THE NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE

VERMILYE & CO.

BANKERS.

Nos. 16 and 18 Nassau Street.

100 Broadway

GOVERNMENT SECURITIES

AND IS

GOLD AND GOLD COUPONS

Buy and Sell on Commission.

RAILWAY STOCKS, BONDS AND GOLD.

Making Loans Advances

INTEREST ON DEPOSITS.

Important to Merchants and Manufacturers,

WHO WISH TO INCREASE THEIR WEALTH.

Current State of all the Railroad Men. Manufacturers
and all, with complete statistics, have been compiled
by the undersigned. The object of which is to
furnish the public with reliable sources of Railroad
Men throughout the country.

To those wishing to send orders to any particular
calling, these lists are available, each business being
separately in a single work, and classified in Boston
and Toronto; all the information being derived from
monthly correspondence in all parts of the States.

J. ARTHURS MURPHY,

MERCHANDISE AND STATISTICAL AGENCY.

111 Nassau Street, N. Y.

Reliable correspondence is sent to several houses in
the North and West, with whom arrangements are
now made to be made.

LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY



22 UNION SQUARE NEW YORK.

PAID UP ON ALL APPLICABLE POLICIES
ALL POLICIES PAID UP ON ALL APPLICABLE POLICIES
DIVIDENDS PAID UP ON ALL APPLICABLE POLICIES
LIBERAL LIMITS OF TRAVEL

ALL POLICIES NON-RENEWABLE

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

ARTHUR C. ALLEN, Secretary.

J. D. REYNOLDS, President.

J. D. REYNOLDS, President.

— OFFICIALS OF THE NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE
— OFFICIALS OF THE NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE
— OFFICIALS OF THE NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE
— OFFICIALS OF THE NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, President.

H. B. CLAPLIN & CO.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

THE GOLDEN AGE.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

G. EBBINGHOUSEN & CO.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

FURNITURE,

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.

220 N. 3rd St. N. Y.