

FREE LOVE:

OR, A PHILOSOPHICAL DEMONSTRATION OF THE

NON-EXCLUSIVE NATURE

OF

CONNUBIAL LOVE,

ALSO,

A REVIEW OF THE EXCLUSIVE FEATURE OF THE FOWLERS,
ADIN BALLOU, H. C. WRIGHT, AND ANDREW
JACKSON DAVIS ON MARRIAGE.

BY AUSTIN KENT.

HOPKINTON, N. Y.

PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHOR.

1857.

TO THE
AIRS OF THE

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1857, by

AUSTIN KENT,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the
Southern District of Ohio.

CORRECTION.

48th page, 15 lines from bottom insert *is* betw
charity and not.

70th page, 7 lines from top, for practical read *fr*
tional.

75th page, middle, for nominal read *harmonial*.

88th page, 2d line from bottom, insert *with him-9*
tween which and is.

136th page, 11 lines from top, for carelessly *for*
causelessly.

Other less errors omitted.

PREFACE.

WE have meant to make the title of our book so plain that no thoroughly conservative mind could mistake — and so waste his money in purchasing it. We have given much of the last twenty years of our life and time to the world, “without money and without price ;” and if we should find it necessary, or for any reason think it best to let our little work partly bear the expense of its own publication, we wish no one to be deceived in getting it. We have no thought of any material remuneration for our own labors. Reader, this is very radical ;—and we confess to a choice not to be the first to wake any who, with all the influences of the nineteenth century about them, are yet soundly asleep upon the lap of the past. We do not wish such to be too suddenly brought into travailing pains for their own spiritual and mental birth to the future — even though we know these must sooner or later come. Some milder and more gradual dose might be better as a first stimulant. We took our pen mainly for the benefit of reformers, and for those whom nature has given

some ability to be such. These are more than welcome — we invite them to read us critically

The subject of Love and Marriage will ever be one of vast importance to our race: we can hardly conceive it possible to rate it too highly. Between 1837 and 1840 Theophilus R. Gates published a series of radical tracts, called the “Battle Axe.” This stirred the waters of orthodoxy. In these, he inserted a letter from John H. Noyes, which declares, that, in a state of heavenly holiness on earth, “Every dish is free to every guest.” The context put his meaning beyond question. All of this, then, amounted to but little more than prophecy.

In 1849, Mr. Noyes came out with a full exposition and defence of his principles in his “Bible Argument.” This was an able, but small, work on Free Love for all saved and redeemed humanity.

Not far from this time—we simply write the date from memory—the Fowlers (L. N. and O. S.) wrote each a book on “Marriage.” They taught that *love was marriage*, but confined it to *dual order—to pairs*. On the whole, these last books were elevating in their tendency among the mass of minds

In 1850, Henry James wrote to good effect in his “Moralism and Christianity.”

In 1852, Dr. Lazarus published “Love vs. Marriage.” This book was of the Fourier cast; and, for the time, was “written without gloves.” It was a most lovely and lovable book, but not so argumen-

tative as some which have succeeded it. It must have put many minds into a right train of thought.

In 1853, Horace Greeley published, in the "Tribune," a part of a discussion between Henry James, Stephen Pearl Andrews, and himself. The whole came out afterwards in a tract, by Mr. Andrews. This must have been deeply interesting to minds on all sides of the questions.

In 1854, Henry C. Wright and Dr. Nichols each published a fair sized book on "Marriage."

The *present year*, we have Andrew Jackson Davis on the same subject. We have long had the writings of Fourier, Owen, and others on the Affections.

We consider all of these books most valuable. None of them are superfluous. We think Mr. Wright elevates connubial love as high as it can be elevated in exclusive dual marriage. He teaches that love is marriage, and sticks by nature, as he understands it.

Dr. Nichols (his wife wrote a portion of the book) takes nature for his guide, but denies its exclusiveness. His book is very instructive; and favors the Free Love doctrine. Mr. Davis, in the main, teaches the philosophy of marriage with great clearness and beauty, but contends that connubial love is monogamic in its highest manifestations. Before closing our book, I intend to review this exclusive phase in Mr. Wright and Mr. Davis, so I will not add more here. Several of these last books

have seemed to come almost simultaneously. It has multiplied the number of readers, on the subject of which they treat, tenfold ; and yet it has, comparatively, but just begun to agitate the public mind. It is now destined to be thoroughly discussed. The fire is already kindled which will bring to the judgment the traditions, with the imperfect institutions, of the past, and burn up the "hay, wood, and stubble" which are found in them. On the whole, I am not sorry that these late authors took, in the main, the several and diverse positions which they did. We are in an age of active thought, and truth is more deeply planted in the understandings and hearts of men by this friendly opposition and discussion. Truth is always safe in such discussions. So far as we hold opinions not based in truth, these may and will suffer a loss in such a mental refiner,—but absolute truth never can. When we get an article of great utility, we are apt to feel a sort of wonder how we could so long do without it. So I felt on reading most of these late works on marriage. Yet probably the world was not prepared for them before. I will add—to my mind, they all seem to have come in about the right order.

We repeat—none of these are superfluous. The subject is not yet exhausted. We hold the pen to add another book to the list,—and we promise the reader, that ours shall not be superfluous. We do not promise that it shall be agreeable to his mental

taste,—unless his taste has been harmoniously adjusted to some of the most radical in the past. We come in defence of FREE LOVE. We do this, because we are sure we find it in nature, in its most exalted and harmonious manifestations.

On the subject of morals and marriage, there has been a great advance in a short space of time. I refer more specially to reformers. A little time ago, “Moses” was the standard. Outward and legal marriages were first,—love and harmony were secondary. Then obedience to simple legal morality was virtuous. Now all this has changed. Among all of these writers, except Mr. Noyes and Mr. Gates, nature is the standard. Nature is the Infallible and Inspired Book ; and its normal promptings are the law of virtue and of morals. Mr. Noyes defends his positions both from nature, and the spiritual and higher teachings of the New Testament. Here, then, there is no controversy among these radical, reformatory writers, as to what is the standard of truth, or as to where the law of marriage is to be found ; none as to the propriety of, or chastity in, obeying these laws. These writers do differ as to the proper reading of nature’s laws. Fourier, Owen, the Fowlers, James, Lazarus, Nichols, Andrews, Wright, and Davis, *agree that true love is marriage*. The Fowlers, Wright, and Davis contend that connubial love, in its highest development, is exclusively dual. Here the latter agree,

•

though in other respects, of much less importance, they differ widely. Fourier, Owen, Noyes, Andrews, and Nichols, deny the evidence of the exclusive nature of this love, and teach more or less the modern doctrines of Free Love. These last differ on other points among themselves.

I am happy to find the controversy so much shortened in space—in extent of range. We all teach that the laws of mind are our guide ; and that these laws must be absolutely FREE. In this sense, we all contend alike for Free Love. We agree that *healthy* affinities and attractions must reign supreme. But Mr. Wright, and some others, tell us that this *healthy* attraction will, and must, in its nature, be always exclusive. I hear some, on the other hand, say to Mr. Wright and his friends,—“Hands and opinions off! Allow us the freedom to settle the nature of our own attractions. Admitting you may know what is most healthy, elevating, and pure for yourself—do not measure all men and all women by your own affectional stature!” I say to Mr. Wright, if you see a law of mind as mind—or the highest law of mind as such,—it is not impertinent for you to speak out that law. We think we know and see some of the unalterable laws of mind, and we claim the right to so far expose and defend these laws. If others differ from us, we not only leave them free to live their views of truth, but we respect them in it. All of us, it is

•

probable, are as yet comparatively in but the “ abbs ” of mental Philosophy. I will never attempt to live any law farther than I think I see it. Reader, we are very near Mr. W.’s opposite. We believe that though men differ much—very much, none, in entire freedom, and uninfluenced in the past and present by other minds or institutions in the bondage of the past or present,—would ever be absolutely exclusive in any of the manifestations of connubial love. This is our position, and our extreme—if it be an extreme. We all agree in the positive nature and force of these laws of mind. Some of us believe these laws can be demonstrated. Mr. Wright finds this connubial love to be “ a law of attraction superior to our wills, and which we have no power to create or destroy.” Again he says: “ Our souls, I believe, are substance, as truly as are air, light, electricity, and magnetism. The same law of creation governs souls that governs all other material bodies.” Mr. Davis fully harmonizes with all of this. I am most thankful for all of this agreement to shorten the labor of future discussions.

The Book of the Law, and the power and binding nature of the law, is equally settled. I here record my gratitude to all of those writers who have done much to elevate marriage over the power of mythology and legal bondage, though they are our opponents as to the main doctrine of our book. They

have each written *up* to the mental and moral elevation of their own understandings. We shall write our highest perceptions of truth. The developing mind of the future will better understand all of us; and better see our faults. They will do us all justice. For though, "round and round we go, truth will at last come uppermost." With the fullest and most entire assurance, I commit my radical book to present and coming humanity.

AUSTIN KENT.

Hopkinton,

St. Lawrence Co. N. Y.

CONTENTS.

Preface.....	iii
--------------	-----

CHAPTER I.

Introduction.....	13
-------------------	----

CHAPTER II.

Definition of Words and Phrases.—Statement of our Position—The Argument Commenced.....	19
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

CHAPTER III.

The Argument Continued.....	28
-----------------------------	----

CHAPTER IV.

The Fowlers—The Argument from Analogy.....	34
--------------------------------------------	----

CHAPTER V.

Mr. Ballou—An Explanation—Part of his Reply in my Rejoinder.....	41
---------------------------------------------------------------------	----

CHAPTER VI.

Mr. Ballou Continued—His Book.....	58
------------------------------------	----

CHAPTER VII.

Mr. Henry C. Wright—A Review—"What is Marriage?"	74
--------------------------------------------------	----

CHAPTER VIII.

Review of Mr. Wright continued.....	98
-------------------------------------	----

CHAPTER IX.

Andrew Jackson Davis—General Remarks—Quotations from his Book.....	109
Appendix.....	135

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

As much as our age professes to be in favor of free discussion, we find a large class, even among partial reformers, who can hardly look at and read dispassionately,—or have any patience with an argument in favor of freedom in love, from a harrowing fear of the real or imaginary consequences of the immediate possible success and spread of such views. Some of these, though of “little faith,” are honest hearted in these fears. Such minds will say to us —“If it were true that freedom in love, and the modern principles of Free Love, would one day in the future of human progression be safe, and be the order of sexual harmony, is it wise to promulgate these sentiments now, when the race is yet so awfully perverted, and often make even truth a “Saviour of death?” These may add,—“admitting entire freedom, and a ‘variety’ is consistant with a perfect state of Society, do not men yet need restraining in some things which in themselves would be right? Did not the learned and wise Paul see some things in the ‘third heavens’ of the

future glory of the church on earth, which he did not consider it 'expedient,' or 'lawful for him to utter?' And did not a greater than Paul withhold even from his well beloved disciples, that which he well knew they could not as yet bear?" We may furthur be reminded of the case of our modern Inspired writer, A. J. Davis, in still postponing his reply to the question, "What and Where is God!" in view of the present state of the public mind.

Reader, we admit, understand, and appreciate this respectable weight of testimony. Nature and the Bible both reveal truth little by little, and hold a "veil" over the rest for the time. Nothing can be plainer than this fact. But, in reply, we will present another phase of the subject, equally plain and undeniable. Jesus, Paul, and every Reformer before and since their day, have taught truths in advance of their respective ages. Such truths have always more or less been used to promote bad ends. We think no sudden and great change, which, on the whole, was of much utility, ever came in our world, without bringing with it its immediate present evils for a time. This is often true of scientific as well as moral changes. An *increase* of suffering is often the first effect of important and useful inventions. I will refer to the first effect upon the poor on the introduction of factories and sewing machines. Society is of very large dimensions, and complex in its parts, and it is not an easy matter

to re-adjust it after a great change. This is true of every phase of it. In my opinion, man can never be freed, mentally and morally, without an increase of immediate suffering. Yet man never can be saved without such freedom. All must learn more or less by experience,—and, in this experience, be “made perfect through suffering.” It is naturally impossible for a child to develop into entire manhood or womanhood, without freedom. They must be trusted to go alone, and “at their own cost.” Abolishing the law of imprisonment for debt, in our state, caused more or less immediate embarrassment to both the rich and the poor. It has now greatly benefited all classes. It also removed a hinderence to the development of mind in moral honesty. That “the law makes nothing perfect”—is a truth found any where, or in any Book. Many of the books to which we have alluded in our Preface—even such as simply teach that love is marriage,—we believe, will not at first serve to lessen human suffering, in their love relations, but add to it. If we are correct in this—we only state it as our opinion—the same may be more true of ours. We flatter no man. Yet all of these books, with ours, will only hasten a crisis, through which the world must pass. There is no affectional salvation—no real or perfect manhood, this side of it. The most inveterate and deepest seated disease of civilization must be probed. The lance will be painful. The

whole body will feel the shock. But it must come !! I have not one doubt but that it will end in greater health to the Patient. . It will promote real purity and chastity—and so an increase of peace, and a more perfect harmony. *Woman* can never rise to her entire womanhood without it.

The question as to the time *when* a higher truth shall be published, is one of expediency. It is important, but not of the first importance. Honest and good men may differ in relation to it. The most true friends of Free Love have differed here. We should seek to be guided by a wise and holy expediency. But no mind is prepared to judge correctly upon it, till he is at least thoroughly awake to a true sense of the terrible and wide-spread bondage and suffering in our present state of society. Its wrongs are as high as heaven and as deep as hell. Whoever sees this, will feel the need of some radical change for the better. The real conservative would never change. The Reformer alone must look, judge, and act. I was born through a long line of orthodox ancestry of New England Congregationalism; and trained, “in the way I should go,” to an orthodox religion; and was once in the orthodox ministry. It has taken me a long time to lay off the unreal of the past. Long after I became established in my present views of Free Love, I could sympathize with Mr. Greeley and Mr. Ballou, in a dread to see these principles spread among the

masses. But since I have laid off many of my conservative views, my faith in humanity has greatly increased. My confidence in the power and safety of truth has alike increased.

We add further—the friends of Free Love are not alone responsible for the general spread of the more radical phases of these principles. The history of the past plainly shows that our opponents would never let us alone. Mr. Noyes was not allowed to rest in peace, in the retirement of his own private or select friends, and his own society. So it has ever been with myself. But so far from regretting the influence which has been brought to bear upon us, we are, at least, most grateful to a kind and wise Providence for in this way freeing us from the lingering remains of what we now believe was a false conservatism.

But, reader, the time has come when there is a necessity for every phase of this question to be thoroughly discussed. It is fairly up before the public mind. All sides have been broached, and more or less defended. Mind cannot be staid till it is fully canvassed. Men do not now, as in the past, follow simple instinct, or unenlightened passion or love. They demand mental instruction, and they will have it. They ask for something more than surface teachers, and human opinions. They ask for philosophy, and they will have it. "The supply will be equal to the demand." The true mind

desires to see every possible objection urged against his most cherished positions. When these fail to stand the ordeal of any amount of the most searching criticism, he has no longer any confidence in, or respect for them. However *sure* he may be that he has the truth, he is MORE SURE of the real power of *truth*, and of *its entire ability to sustain itself*. Such a mind knows, too, that truth is advanced by *repulsion* as well as by *attraction*; that every active mind puts it forward, whether in love with, or in opposition to it. If he stands in the latter relation to it, he is a *repelling power*. We only mean, while man is on the plane of *hatred*—hatred will work utility in his progress. As God lives, *this must be true*. When will men more generally arrive at a proper confidence in the power of truth, and of God? Till this subject—marriage—is thoroughly handled on *both sides*, man's faith can not be deeply laid. Every effort of a true mind will lay the truth more and more fully upon the eternal rock of ages—nature. We always hail with pleasure the promise of any able and fair writer to review and criticise our most cherished faith. We never fail to buy such books. If our opponents have like confidence in truth, and feel as we do, that any agitation must advance it, they will cordially welcome our effort, and thank us for it, as we do them for theirs.

In our age, active minds have little time to parley with moral and mental cowards. We welcome the

coming war—the “bloodless war,” which we have long seen gathering. We shall pray for, work for, and welcome the *crisis*; and glory in the assurance that it will end in good.

CHAPTER II.

DEFINITION OF WORDS AND PHRASES—STATEMENT OF OUR POSITION—THE ARGUMENT COMMENCED.

BEFORE introducing the reader to our argumentative letters, we shall first define some of the more important terms which we shall be likely to use, and so make our exact moral whereabouts more clearly understood. By connubial love, I mean a normal development of the sexual attraction of our nature, in all of its phases. By denying its exclusiveness, I deny that, in such a harmonious development, it will be absolutely confined, in any form of its manifestations, to one of the opposite sex.

When we write non-exclusive, we mean not absolutely exclusive—no more. By promiscuous, we sometimes mean no more than the opposite of entire exclusiveness: the context will show when it means more. We do not teach an entire non-exclusiveness, or, what is the same, an absolute promiscuity. To us, this is equally absurd with

entire exclusiveness. Various shades of preference are natural and so proper. Different minds differ as to their leanings towards entire exclusiveness, or its opposite—absolute promiscuity. This is more or less true on every plane of sexual or connubial love. What we declare to be true of this love is true of every other love. No man or woman is absolutely promiscuous in their social or adhesive attractions. Nor is any one absolutely dual and exclusive. The reader will find the same law to prevail, with various modifications, through all the lower and all the higher loves. Benevolence, the crowning faculty, and the personification of our moral manhood, has its shades of variation. The Great Teacher, though the highest pattern of universal charity and benevolence, showed much partiality, preference for the “brethren;” and he had his “beloved disciple” among the twelve of the more choice of these. His moral teachings are very emphatic, and often repeated, in enjoining this special regard for our brethren. Paul bade us “do good to all men, but especially to the household of faith.” In this, Jesus and Paul acted and taught in harmony with the laws of mind. But enough, I am understood. Truth impells us to regard all according to their real value, and our ability to appreciate it. The former would be a true estimate, the latter is as near as we can practically reach it. Because truth may require me to lay down my life for one

man, it may not for another. Of course, in choosing a partner in marriage, we should not be governed in our selection by an estimate of the *real* worth of the person, but of his or her *relative* worth and fitness for such a relation to us. I write thus full on some of these points, to make clear what I consider some of the true principles of mental philosophy, and so to prepare the way for my mental argument. I have been full, at the expense of some repetition, to save the reader, if possible, from the misconceptions which experience has shown me too often pursue such an expose as this, on so radical a theme.

In what I have written, the reader will perceive that I have not, and he may be assured that I shall not, undertake to oppose the doctrine of a special and "ideal mate," when, and so far as it is not carried to absolute and entire exclusiveness, in any phase of its amative monopolies. In other words, and more correctly, I shall only review and oppose the entire, exclusive feature of the system of dual mating.

Further explanation:—In the main, I *approve* of the "spirit and nature" of what Swedenborg, the Fowlers, Wright, and others of their like, call connubial love; but I deny that such disinterestedness, such purity, such oneness of soul, such moral elevation and chastity in sexual love, is exclusive, or confined to one. When these men write directly of pure and elevating love, in opposition to impurity and a predominance of self in love, or "lust," I

harmonize with them. When they say that such love as they have described, cannot seek a variety, in entire health, I deny it. When they write upon the nature and spirit of lust and its effects, I harmonize with them. But when they say that all attraction towards a VARIETY, is of such a nature, I deny it. I think I must be understood by all who have carefully read their books. This, too, is very important to a clear understanding. I positively deny that these writers are my opponents, as to what really constitutes a pure and elevating love and attraction, or an impure and debasing one. We all admit that man may lust after one or many. I insist that he may love one and many. I write to prove my last position, and to disprove its opposite.

Our first and main argument will be presented in three letters, the substance of which were written in 1853, and published in the fall and winter of 1854-5, in the "Practical Christian." We shall omit nothing in these letters which we consider essential to our present purpose.

THE ARGUMENT.

FRIEND BALLOU:—

I thankfully accept your hospitality in allowing me a place in your paper, to express my dissent from your views on the subject of Free Love, and to record my reasons for that dissent.

Free Love and Marriage are fast becoming *the* question of the age. All classes will soon see this fact, whatever view they may take of it in other

respects. It has been about the last to ask, and will perhaps be the last to receive, a full and fair hearing. It will have it soon in the Press and in the Lecture-room. Since I suggested, (last fall,) the propriety of a discussion with yourself, it has been brought before the public, and called forth more attention than for years previous. I refer mainly to the two books written—one by Mr. Wright, and the other by Dr. Nichols and his wife—which have been extensively advertised, and more generally read than anything before this. I might add, the introduction and agitation of it through some few spiritual mediums. Mr. Wright and Dr. Nichols harmonize on many points; on others they are diametrically opposed. I am glad to find that some few letters which I wrote last fall (with the intention of sending them sooner to your paper) are confined entirely to this main difference, and as appropriate as I could now write. It will be remembered, those books were not then published. I am glad of the delay in my letters, as many more minds will be prepared for them. I will take the liberty especially to ask those who have read those books, to read my letters; I have many years since taken my position, and I really believe I can demonstrate its truth. I wish to come to the vital question, and make my exposition and discussion as short as possible and do the subject justice. I have no health, ability, or desire to hold a long controversy, and yet I esteem it a great privilege to record what seems essential, and to commit myself to the age in defence of what to me is the most absolute truth—and the most elevated. I have such confidence in the power of truth and such faith in the real good arising from free discussion, that I prefer to do this in the im-

mediate presence of an opponent like my friend Ballou.

The question which I propose to discuss is—Does Sexual Chastity confine every man and every woman to the “pairing” order, or to be exclusively dual in the ultimates of love? Does normal and pure love require this? Or, still more abridged, and just as well understood as now explained—*Should marriage always be exclusive and dual?*”

I take the negative of the last question as now stated. Before proceeding to the argument, let me remind the reader that I came first to my present views of the subject from a careful study of the great “fundamental doctrine” of the Christ, as found in the sum of all revealed commands.—In his love doctrines—(See Matt. xxii. 37—40.) Secondly, I found the same in studying the laws of the mind and the nature of love, as read in the mind. My own choice seems to incline me to make the last first, and the first last; so I will first argue from the mind. In the argument, I intend to show, to a mental and moral demonstration, that normal and truthful love cannot be exclusive or dual. I shall then draw the inference as one self-evident, that the ultimates of love should harmonize with, and fairly represent their source. That the outward manifestations of love should truly represent its inward life and attractions. By normal and truthful love, I mean, when the mind is perfectly balanced, and the mental in freedom of wisdom controls the affectional—or at least the affectional is properly balanced by and harmonizes with the mental. I trust this carefulness in explanation will save much misunderstanding and much repetition in the future.

I say, then, in reasoning from the laws of mind,

I cannot find truth at the bottom of the common Marriage doctrine. For convenience, let me speak as if personal—as I develop in my sentiments and faculties, I find myself possessed of love—an attraction to and affinity for other persons. I find the nature and intensity of this love or affinity to depend upon two things—two persons—myself and the object loved. I am, in the sense in which I am speaking, comparatively a fixed fact in always loving and having an affinity for certain attributes of other human beings. I love mentality. Some minds more than others, because their mentality is more in harmony with the particular development of mine—but I can love no one mind exclusively. For every other person shares in a degree in the same faculties. If I love mind, to love one mind exclusively from another is impossible. All mind is more or less alike. As minds vary, my love may vary. *Absolute, exclusive* love, in this case, if it were possible, would be a natural, more properly an unnatural, falsehood. Truth, or the nature of the mind requires me *to love every like attribute of mind with like love*, and the intensity should be governed by the size of the attribute, and my ability to appreciate it. This would be truth for me.

I love morality, spirituality and religion—here too the same law prevails. I am bound to be impartial in my love up to my ability. Truthfulness, as well as the nature of the mind, forbids that I should concentrate entirely and exclusively upon any one moralist, spiritualist, or religionist. Nature did not make me sectarian. At least I cannot be when I am finished and perfected. Again I say here, I cannot love all alike—all are not alike—nor can I perfectly appreciate all. *Yet I cannot love with a rational,*

truthful love the same moral or religious attribute, found in the same quantity, more in one than in another. It would be unnatural and false. I have adhesiveness, so I love all persons socially—all, male and female—but here I cannot love all alike, and yet I must from necessity love all *like attributes alike*. Truth requires impartiality. I cannot be exclusive, since all have like social attributes.

I have amateness, so I love woman—possibly I may love her, in this sense, exclusively from man; she is possessed of something different from man mentally, spiritually and physically. But I cannot love any one woman exclusively from any other woman. I love all women as such—not alike in mental, spiritual or physical sexuality; far from it; nor can I be exclusive and concentrate my affections, except I do violence, first to my reason, and then to my affections. My love may vary towards different women, as they vary in their mental, spiritual, religious, social and physical womanhood, and as I have more or less ability to appreciate them, or as they are more or less in harmony with either or all these points with my own particular taste; but I cannot love one in the many exclusively from her sisters. My *opponents harmonize with me*, in precept at least, *in relation to all these manifestations of love, except the physical*. They will commend this general and universal state of the affections, and condemn partiality and exclusiveness. But when the whole man develops into harmony with itself, and with every other man and every other woman—when the same universal law is allowed to prevail *through all* the affections, they are shocked with the impropriety; and yet it is as unnatural to exclusively concentrate the love of the physical as it is that of

any other part of the mind. In this our attractions vary, but I insist, it is a natural impossibility to make them exclusive. We must first annihilate or uncreate what God has created. In this sense man is attracted to woman as such, and the same of woman to man. This love for the physical of the opposite sex, and attraction to it, is alike universal in its nature with every other love. As all my previous arguments to sustain the necessary universality of love, apply equally here, I will not repeat them. There are laws to govern mind, as absolute as those to govern matter. The forest tree can be bent by some material cause; so can the affections, by a power of mind or will; but the crooked tree, or the contracted and warped affections, are exceptional and less harmonious. I find no marriage in nature, as the law of marriage has ever been taught us. *I do find the marriage of man to woman.* "They twain make one flesh," says Nature, in all her teaching on this subject. The Good Book, in its higher meaning, responds to Nature's lessons. No truth can be more clearly taught. Without this oneness, this union, either man or woman is but a fraction—a most unnatural fraction. This must always be true—in the next world as well as in this—unless we are to be partially annihilated to fit us for an entrance there. This to us is the extreme of folly. So our reason in this harmonizes with the Revelations of Swedenborg and the Spirits.

I agree with Mr. Ballou and others, that without marriage, the material union of the sexes is more or less adulterous; that conjugal, or, as Swedenborg would write it, "conjugal love," is essential to the purity of such relations. I accept of the latter's description of this love, of its nature, but I deny

that such love is confined to the one—or necessarily exclusive. I believe a well developed man may and should love woman in general, so far as she is the woman of creation, and upright and lovely, (and he could not truthfully love the one without this,) more purely, more justly, more disinterestedly and more conjugally than the most devoted dual lover often feels. I accept of the Love Doctrines of marriage from my inmost soul, having known, and knowing them, but I deny that they are exclusive.

CHAPTER III.

THE ARGUMENT CONTINUED.

FRIEND BALLOU :

I proceed in my reasoning from the nature of the mind. I may, and am required to love a *man* "as myself," with the same kind of love. I may love another man more or less than myself, in degree, according to what he is. If he is on the whole not so good a man, I should not love him as much ; for I am not required to be partial either way. *Nature knows no false humility or false modesty, but only truth.* If he is better than myself, and I have the ability to know and appreciate goodness beyond my absolute goodness, then I may, and normal and well-developed mind requires and prompts me to, love and regard him better than myself. This is possible and natural ; it is truth. Any state but this is so far falsehood. But if I

have not the ability to know and measure his goodness, beyond my own goodness, then I can not love him better than myself. My standard of love, in either or any case, is never absolute truth for another, but simply obeying the command of nature to me. Another should vary in accordance with *his ability*. God does not require any two men to love Him alike in degree. Each is to love with his whole heart, and mind, etc. That is, up to this capacity.

The same law prevails as to my love for *woman*; *and more*. I should not only love her as myself, but *differently*, perhaps exclusively from myself; and if I may not, as a general rule, love her better or more than myself, I have a greater ability to be useful to her than to myself, and in this I promote my own greatest felicity. I may love some one man more than any other man, but I should not, I can not love him exclusively from every other man: *so of woman*. I may love some one man religiously or socially more than any other man in the same sense: *so of woman*. It is *naturally possible*, (but perhaps never a truth as a fact in Providence,) for me to love some one man *more*, mentally, religiously and socially, than any other man, *but never to love any of these parts exclusively from the same parts in other men: so of woman*. We some times, as a fact, love some one woman mentally or socially, or amatively, more than any other woman in the same sense; and were it ever a fact, as it can be conceived naturally possible to be, for us to love one woman in all these particulars more than any other, it would be unnatural and impossible to love such a person *exclusively* from her sisters,—from others of her sex. We can not do it in either or all of these phases of love. Then where in nature is exclusive marriage? No-

where ! I think I am understood here, and invite the closest scrutiny. All of these loves for man or woman, and in man and woman, may be in a very perverted and impure state ; or they may all be the most pure and chaste. My religious love may be religious selfishness and sectarianism. My sexual love may be the greater love for sexual self, or what is the same thing, *lust*. My affinities, from the highest to the lowest, may be all adultery in some of its definitions. But the form or order of their manifestations does not necessarily indicate their purity or impurity. Normal love is pure and chaste in its origin, in its living action, and as much so in all its ultimates. And the ultimates of love should correctly represent their cause. If love cannot be exclusive in the mind, it should not be held to be in its manifestations—in its consummations. The outgoing or ultimates of love should image forth its interior life. The reader will observe that in these letters, thus far, I have aimed to prove—

1. That our love for others *cannot be exclusive* on any one point towards any one person.

2. I draw the inference, as a self-evident proposition, and as one which I believe is universally admitted,—that the manifestation of love should be a *true image* of itself. This will be the case, when nature is left entirely and absolutely free.

Does the *fact of experience*, or the *consciousness* of the mind sustain our position ? Many desire to receive this exclusive love, and the lowest of the race, who regard love in any proper way, are the most tenacious in this desire. Such persons are nearly equally jealous of all the love of a mate—religious and mental as well as sexual. But these persons are not as ready to return this exclusive

love. Many of these neither see the necessity nor feel the propriety of confining their affections, except as they find it enjoined and enforced in the law of marriage, and in the public sentiment which marriage has created. With these the demand is unjust, and selfish, and proves them in a state of disease of the affections; at least they are unbalanced and inharmonious. Many others—the number is more than is generally supposed—ask no exclusive love. They *desire none*. These, in the average, have a more elevated phrenological development than the first class named. I leave room in this statement for the many exceptions. Some of these last would suffer as much with a mate who should be disposed to bestow all her life on him, as the man of the opposite desire would with one who withheld it. Let elevated humanity judge which is the more noble and truthful state of mind. I add, man is *conscious* of the same ability to be *attracted* to the opposite sex in general, as much in *physical* amateness, as in the mental and spiritual. He has the power in a great degree to concentrate all the affections. So he has the power, in nearly or quite the same degree, to confine or direct all. If he be well balanced or well disciplined, he may suspend, indefinitely, all amative desire or attraction towards any woman—his own wife not excepted. This is possible for some minds, placed in almost any conceivable circumstances, and without all the safeguards of the Shakers. But all this is not normal, or natural. It is not truthful or commendable. I repeat; in a normal state of the affections, we are *conscious of their universality*, and not of their *entire* exclusiveness in any one particular. Our ability to control, confine or suspend their inward or outward action towards the many, or the

one, does not stifle, or silence the voice of this consciousness.

I most respectfully invite the friends of exclusive marriage, who believe that the mind is God's Book, and that its *healthy attractions* are his laws, to carefully observe the main arguments in the two preceding letters, and to bear with what may seem to them, too much repetition. My proposition stands in the gap between all contending parties. It is the main hinge on which this great question turns. I am not touching the doctrine of expediency for diseased man, or giving any counsel concerning him. The latter is an *after* and *side* question. I aim to go back of all disease, or "misdirection," and forward to the full health of progression and final manhood. It is not a question of lust, but of LOVE—of *normal attraction*. It is of vast importance, and cannot be longer evaded. I will not detain the reader, by going too much into side issues. I must be full here, even at the expense of some repetition. I must leave no possible chance for misconception. It will only protract the discussion, which is sure to come; and I have suffered too much from misconception already.

We shall, then, press the inquiry upon the mind of the candid reader. Is love on any one point absolutely exclusive? Is it so in amateness? Is it more so in amateness than in adhesiveness?—or in any different sense? If our opponent says yes, and he must; will he give us fully and clearly *his* phil-

osophy—his mind argument? We have said *no*, and we believe we have demonstrated our reply. We court honest and manly criticism; no other. We aver that we are not seeking personal victory,—but truth.—We do not know how to argue with any man to prove that two and two make four; we place it before the man of figures, and we think he cannot help seeing it. So, we believe, we have placed the laws of the mind, before the reader's mental vision, and we think he cannot help seeing them. We think he cannot help seeing, that MINDS ALIKE WILL ATTRACT ALIKE;—and that *so far as minds are alike, they will attract alike*. That this must be true of mind as mind, and so true of all its parts. (We have not argued in the preceding letters, by the analogy, that because one faculty of the brain was non-exclusive, so another must be. We left that for a coming letter.) So, as all minds are more or less alike,—and as each faculty in one mind is some like the same faculty in another mind, there can be no entire exclusiveness:—and as each and every man, and each and every woman, are *more* like every other man and every other woman, than they are *unlike* them, a general attraction, union, and love, must be the rule, in a healthy state of the race. “Repulsion” (or hatred) is a negative;—it represents less attraction. It is a lesser power in mind—is the exception,—and follows the same law with love, as to its non-exclusiveness.

CHAPTER IV.

THE FOWLERS — THE ARGUMENT FROM ANALOGY.

Should the Marriage of the sexes be exclusive and dual ?

So far as I know, the Fowlers, of New York, have done more, for the last fifteen years, *to support exclusive and dual marriage*, than any or all writers in the same time. They profess to find it in the mind, as they read the science of phrenology. That science is now popular, and they are among its first expounders. There is no way that I can better communicate my own views, so far as I wish to do it connected with this science, than by giving their views, and presenting my own in contrast. Let me premise. If phrenology teaches exclusive and dual marriage, it is safe. The friends of Free Love will find themselves in an unequal warfare. Such of my readers as are any way solicitous for morals, and harmonize with the Fowlers, and the present laws of civilization, may rest in the most perfect safety. The writer of these letters will surrender when he finds that the true readings of phrenology are against him. By this statement he implies no present doubt on the subject.

The Fowlers divide the human mind into about forty faculties. They subdivide these into as many more. "Amativeness," or sexual love, they divide into the "upper and lower," or the "spiritual, mental, and physical." They *do* and *do not* exclusively marry the spiritual and mental of amativeness. Mr. O. S. Fowler, in his work on "Love and

Parentage," very plainly, to my mind, teaches the entire concentration of all sexual life or love on one, in perpetuity and without interruption or deviation through natural life. Again, he and his brother do not teach this. They do not marry, or exclusively confine the "spiritual and mental" of sexual love—of amateness. In their delineations of character, they always speak of love for woman in general, with a sort of approbation; and they never pass a great man, in whom this sentiment is prominent, without noticing it to his credit. So of all other Phrenological writers. *In this, these men harmonize exactly with the age, and with all good writers on man.* They are most "orthodox." Mr. Wright, in his late work on Marriage, leaves out so much of sexual love from the exclusive yoke. He says, "the attraction of men and women to each other, as such, has its privileges, and its fixed, just laws to govern it." This general regard for woman, as such, is sexual, and doubtless what Mr. O. S. Fowler calls the spiritual and mental of amateness. This, then, I think, civilization does not intend to marry in her exclusive dual bonds. The feelings of many husbands and wives among us are much disturbed by this general freedom in a partner, and with such, if liberty is taken, it causes jealousies and complainings, but public opinion, instead of condemning such freedom as licentious, where it is not carried too far, or beyond a common degree of spiritual and mental amateness, takes the side of liberty, and condemns the complaining party. The latter are considered narrow minded and selfish. It is plain, then, that the Fowlers,—society in general,—and even the Shakers, allow more or less freedom to a *portion of amateness*. None of these attempt to

entirely confine or suppress the general plane and actions of its higher manifestations. Even the Head Shaker must have his spiritual female mate. Now for the contrast. I do not separate the faculties, and free a part, and confine a part. I do not separate the sentiment—amateness—and free a part and confine a part. *I free the whole.* The whole man and the whole woman. I demand more plain and philosophical reasons for such an inconsistency. I deny that there are any rational and substantial reasons for this to govern a normal mind. Society does not exclusively marry the *greater part* of its sexual love. I would not so marry *any* part of it. Civilization has advanced one step from certain heathen nations who consider it a crime for their women to be exposed to the general gaze, and freed a portion of this part of the brain. I and my Free Love brethren, would free the remainder, and we are as sure that we shall be approved by the future, as we are that civilization is justified in her advances thus far. I repeat the contrast in various forms to get the consistency, or inconsistency, before the mind of the reader. To me this comparison is the strongest of arguments. The Fowlers, and our dual marriage friends, do not marry in their exclusiveness *any one* of these forty faculties of the mind. They do marry in this manner, *one-third* of *one* of the forty, and *no more*. All this general freedom to them is *chaste* and *pure*. I do not thus marry that *fractional part* of *one*. Reader, mark the contrast, and the astounding offense. We are told that the effect of freedom, in all the former, is good and elevating, while in the latter it is most injurious and debasing. What but depravity ever first taught such distinctions and such philosophy? “To the pure all things are pure.” The

freedom of the entire man is pure and elevating. To the impure all things are impure and debasing. To such all freedom is evil so far as they are impure. A pure and holy emotion is pure and holy, whether it concentrates on one object, or many. An impure emotion, or passion, is impure, whether in confinement or freedom. *All free ninety-nine parts of the human brain. I make it one hundred, and leave the man a unit.* I am told that ninety-nine parts of the affections can choose a variety in purity, and with propriety, but that the very fact of this hundredth part so choosing, is proof positive, in the nature of the case, that it is impure and lustful. I deny this out and out, in the name of all consistency, and common sense. I admit that those who are attracted by lust to the one, may be the more so to the many—but those who have attained to connubial love to the one, may attain to and possess it to more. There is nothing in the nature of this, more than in all other loves, which is exclusive. But Mr. Fowler supposes he has found this very marriage in the brain. He calls it “love of one only.” “Duality in Marriage.” I positively deny that there is any such faculty in the human brain. There may be a sentiment in the lower part of the brain, designed to concentrate and intensify all the lower sentiments, but not one anything like his readings, or deserving the name which he gives it; nothing can be more unnatural and unphilosophical. Mr. Fowler locates this supposed sentiment by the side of amateness, and appoints it to hold an entire and exclusive control over the lower part, or “physical,” of amateness, and no more. He never gives it any other office. He could not do this consistently without changing its name, and all his past remarks upon it.

Even in the strongest concentrated loves between persons of the same sex—as between David and Jonathan, “whose love passed that of woman”—or between two females, he never refers to this sentiment, but places such concentrated loves, if their love is so strong that its rupture ends in death to one of the parties, under the head of adhesiveness. The bare statement of this sufficiently shows its absurdity. Never was science more plainly brought down to meet the prejudices of a still undeveloped age. If adhesiveness can be so concentrated without the aid of a particular sentiment for that end, amateness can be more so, as there is one more faculty in its formation and concentration.

Mr. Fowler never makes any allusion to his exclusive marrying sentiments, except connected with amateness—then it must be sexual, and a part of amateness. This he does not intend to teach.

Again, my objection to this exclusive marriage doctrine, whether it be found in Mr. Fowler’s readings of Phrenology, or in the moral teachings of the Practical Christian, is, that it gives a lower law—the lowest of this lower law, admitting the existence of such a law—absolute and entire control over a higher law. All will tell us, Mr. F. and the P. C. not excepted, that the higher sentiments of the brain should be uppermost, control the entire man, and that all lower sentiments should harmonize with the higher. This doctrine makes the lower, on this point, govern, and requires the higher to harmonize with it. Here is one of our main objections to it. If there is an exclusive tendency (I do not admit it) in the lower sentiments, the higher all prompt to universality—and the more, as they are more fully developed. I admit, there

is strictly no lower law, when every lower sentiment of the brain really harmonizes with the higher. They are sanctified by them, and are most exalted. But this is just in proportion as they are submissive to, and governed by, the higher. When they assume to reign over the higher, they become debased. We and our opponents agree in one thing—that man in the past, either from his fall or “misdirection,” or from his yet youthful and undeveloped state—has been governed by his lower sentiments and propensities; and we are agreed in general, that this should not, and will not, always be so. Exclusive dual marriage is a great improvement, from the entire absence of all real marriage. So it is, on the whole, from a state of polygamy. So is American slavery a better state of society, than a worse, which has existed in the past, when there was no motive—not even a selfish one, as in slavery—for the stronger to protect the weaker; and so stronger tribes and nations, would destroy and completely exterminate other weaker tribes and nations. But none of these states of society are in harmony with man’s higher sentiments. We may leave all unwept for a better—not for a worse. To go below exclusive marriage is worse; to go above such marriage is better. So it is better to emancipate the slave, where the people will not fall back to a worse state of society. The Jews had a sort of slavery,—but I think their extermination of the Canaanites was worse. So we in a little more slow, and possibly on the whole, in a more mild way, exterminate the Indians, or original Americans. I expect to see the race rise above both Slavery and Marriage as it now exists.

Reader, you now have my argument from analogy.

I argue, that as every other faculty of the brain—and two-thirds of the one under discussion,—is non-exclusive; the presumption is that the other third is non-exclusive also. And I confess I cannot see it possible for any mind to reply directly to this by sound argument, and without sophistry or evasiveness. I believe any mind might as well deny and attempt to disprove a truth in mathematics. Under the circumstances, it justly rests upon the friends of exclusive marriage, to prove their exception, or give it up—we demand this of them. Age will not longer protect any Institution.

Again,—should or should not the higher sentiments control the whole man, in each and every act, in harmony with their non-exclusive laws?—Are not the *physical rights* of amateness, as well as the social, mental, and spiritual, of real utility? Are not the former a real good—a valuable power? And so should not this be as such, at the command of our higher manhood—Justice and Benevolence? My questions are fully and plainly put, with the desire that the enlightened reader may understand their import. No real or imaginary fears of evil, which it may be thought will follow these principles, will be a fair reply to them. The slave-holder is full of these, and of such arguments, in defense of *his* social system. Will the friends of exclusive marriage, ape the former in his fears, and in his replies? So far many of them have done *this*—and

ONLY *this*. In this, we hope for a reform among reformers. We hope for something better; for a more fair, candid, direct and rational reply—or none.

CHAPTER V.

MR. BALLOU — AN EXPLANATION — PART OF HIS REPLY IN MY REJOINDER.

IN my discussion with Mr. Ballou, I was to write a series of letters in defense of Free Love. Mr. Ballou was to reply,—I to rejoin,—and he was to follow and close. I wrote five letters, (the last two on the Bible—not here inserted). Mr. B. replied, as was expected. I rejoined at some length in four letters. Mr. B. replied to my first rejoinder, and then in a closing letter.

I have no thought of giving any thing like a full view of that discussion, on either side. But as I wish to review Mr. Ballou, as well as some others, I will simply insert that part of my rejoinder which contains the substance of his main argument on the mind, against my letters on the mind. I will then look into Mr. B.'s Book—"Christian Socialism,"—and see what we can find there directly related to our proposition.

In justice to Mr. Ballou, I would remark--He

professed to understand me, in my first two letters, to reason from "analogy," and replied accordingly, to destroy that analogy. I did intend to reason from analogy in my third, so I accepted his understanding of me,—adopted the analogy, and replied to it as mine. I shall insert but a portion of my second and third letters in rejoinder.

Mr. Ballou's argument against mine, begins, "Sexual love, as involving sexual coition, is radically an instinctive animal appetite. Man has it in common with the whole animal kingdom.—It is not of the nature of Benevolence, or Friendship, or any other truly spiritual love. As an animal propensity, it craves mainly its own gratification, just like the propensity for food, sleep, etc. It does not go abroad seeking opportunities to confer blessings on friend or foe. This propensity, then, is primarily and essentially animal. It has its use and place. Within its own proper limits it may be gratified innocently. Allowed to break bounds, it becomes criminal and pestilent. This is the truth of the case. Is it so with the spiritual loves? with love to God, to virtue, and our neighbor? Not at all. Away, then, with all false analogies; arguments founded on such analogies are utterly fallacious and worthless."

We agree with Mr. Ballou that when this propensity "breaks bounds," it is very evil—but not more so than higher propensities and sentiments. But let us keep to the point. *What are its bounds?* We have proved them non-exclusive, and we are now to answer Mr. Ballou's arguments against us. What are these arguments? This coitionary propensity, he tells us, is "radically an animal appetite," the

same as in all animals, or "in common with other animals." As such it "craves mainly its own gratification," like the desire for food, etc. It does not go abroad seeking to perform deeds of charity and kindness. Still it may be allowed a narrow sphere of action "innocently," and safely,—not so with the higher sentiments. The reader can judge whether I have done him justice in this abridgment. I may mistake his meaning. I hope, for the honor of humanity, that I do mistake it. For if this, as I read it, is considered "innocent" in dual marriage, we have fairly come to the main stone which too often paves the hell of misdirected minds in our exclusive marriages. Is it considered innocent for married pairs to act on this matter, "*mainly*" from the cravings of, and to satisfy, mere animal and fleshly gratification? This may be proper for a beast, for aught I know, but is it for a man? Reader, I may not understand Mr. Ballou; but if he does not mean just this—what can be the force of this argument? He certainly seems to excommunicate this part of the brain from the rest in a most wonderful manner. He "puts it away" "with a vengeance." If I understand him, I should call such a state of the sexual affections, *lust*—not love. *What is man?* Are not the higher sentiments so to control the *whole*, as to humanize them, and raise all parts *practically* above the beast? Is not the *man* to sanctify the animal, in every fibre of his nature, and in every act of that nature? So we read humanity—so we read the man. Nothing short of this *is man*. Is any part of the man to be set apart from—so put away from,—the real man, or whole man, and placed under laws inharmonious with his leading manhood? So long as this is done, this

part will remain an enemy to, and often successfully reign over the best interests of that higher manhood. There is one partially redeeming suggestion in Mr. Ballou's argument. He compares the desire for coition with the desire for food, sleep, etc. Its comparison with that for food is in part truthful, and with that for sleep is, at least, very innocent. But let us attend to the consistency or inconsistency with himself and the good Book which he reverences, in this comparison, while he so degrades it. The Book enjoins upon man—not the beast—"to eat and drink to God's glory." "Whether therefore ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." This command is to the *man*, to control all his propensities and their uses, in harmony with Charity and the Higher Law. But where is Mr. Ballou's consistency with himself? If Mr. B. will admit the same non-exclusive action, as being the law of the mind, and so proper in this propensity that he allows in alimentiveness and every other lower propensity, I will at once lay down my pen; or seek an opponent. That moment we are one. Mr. Ballou knows this.

If he will allow Benevolence and Justice to control, and call to their aid the *entire use* of this faculty, as he does allow them to control, and so call to their aid every other faculty of the man, every other sentiment and propensity of the man, I can write no more, we are one. This would be an entire surrender to the whole meaning of all my previous arguments. I would rejoice over his conversion. But no; he does not mean this. Then what does he mean? What! Let him throw no random shots at this with a mere fowling piece; but make himself consistent with himself, and it possible with any

rational and philosophical interpretation of the mind.

But contrary desire, when it "breaks bounds," is "criminal and pestilent, which is not the case with the spiritual loves." So argues our friend, and seems virtually to challenge a reply. It shall be coming. It is more true of the spiritual love. There is no faculty or part of a faculty in God's creation of mind, that works evil in a strictly healthy state, and within its own proper bounds. Sexual love does not, in or out of legal marriage. In an unhealthy state, and out of these bounds, all sentiments, and all propensities work more or less evil—and are more or less "criminal and pestilent." The higher sentiments have power in man to be more so than the lower. So says nature. So says experience. So says the Good Book. My friend asks, "Is it so with the spiritual?" Most certainly. Nothing can be more true. All the human blood shed upon heathen altars, to appease the wrath of imaginary gods, has been controlled by these faculties in both a diseased state, and widely out of their true bounds. All religious wars have been largely supplied from this spiritual fountain of man's mind. This has been the foundation of the Inquisition and all kindred institutions. The Catholics believed it to be their business to defend religion in this way. In this the religious faculties were shockingly diseased, and were quite out of their proper bounds, even if they had been in health. So in all Protestant persecutions. All of these were often as truly acting from the spiritual or religious faculties of the mind, in their professed zeal for morals and religion, as is the lustful husband acting from amateness, when gratifying himself at the expense of another, under the cloak of conu-

bial love. These spiritual whoredoms, we say, are as truly the fruits of diseased spiritualism, as are the oft repeated sexual rapes, in or out of dual marriage, the results of diseased amativeness. These religious men believed they were acting from love to virtue and the neighbor, and they were doing so in about the same sense, and in no other, that these sexual "criminal and pestilent" acts are from real connubial love. I am understood and challenge a reply. Because one sentiment of the mind is different in its nature from, and perhaps vastly higher than another, it does not follow that such sentiments are not alike non-exclusive. I have "shown that coitionary sexual love" is equally non-exclusive in its nature, as "piety, benevolence and friendship," and that all of these loves are pure and chaste in a healthy and normal state, and that in an abnormal and perverted state, all are "criminal and pestilent." Who will assume to pronounce God's works in nature, or the fruits of his cleansing grace, "common and unclean?"

Mr. Ballou "contends that all coitionary sexual, love, out of true dual wedlock, is, *per se*, adulterous." I believe he has not argued directly to prove this proposition. He has argued against analogies which he supposed were designed to disprove it. We should like to read an argument upon the nature of the mind—for the mind is God's Book—*directly* to prove that all such acts were adultery. That an act that would be pure and chaste in dual order, and which act, out of that order, would be impure and unchaste. Can he not make plain the nature of the change which such act would undergo in this change of circumstances? Will Mr. Ballou give us a specimen of his mental logic, in an argument to

prove that all deviation from the dual order is, *per se*, adulterous? We wait for it.

If a man varies from one, or dual marriage, while his one mate lives to her exclusive pledge, his act is, *per se*, adulterous. But if she commit adultery, then he may get a divorce from her and seek another. He may now innocently embrace another in purity. If this one proves untrue, "he may proceed as before—all in chastity"—and so on indefinitely. He really enjoys a variety through the infidelity of his repeated selections. But his motives are good, and so his act, in its change, is not adultery, *per se*. This is civilization, and the extreme doctrine of dual marriage. Mr. Greeley, and perhaps Mr. Ballou, would bolt from this to them apparent looseness in morals, were it not for their great reverence for the Christ. In civilization, death—and many of these are the slow murders of lust—has and does often free men to a great amount of variety in amateness; but this, too, is not, *per se*, adultery. Though it be the tenth wife, it is dual wedlock still. But if a man but thrice in a lifetime ultimate his love, and does this in harmony with the Higher Law of Free Love, he is, *per se*, an adulterer. This is a monster of inconsistency. And we have a right to look for its retraction, or its overwhelming proof, if such a thing were possible. In such a case the proof should come from a source which cannot mislead or be misunderstood, to command respect. If Mr. Ballou does not admit that the motive sanctifies the act in this succession of wives, by what law does he justify these as pure, and condemn a less variety under the head of Free Love? We press this call. He has multiplied his statements that the coitionary act is only lawful and pure in dual marriage, but he

has not attempted to give any proof of this except by separating amateness from the man, and degrading it to the animal. This manner of handling it, if it were proper, proves nothing as to the order of its manifestations, as to duality or promiscuity.

In the following we come more fully to Mr. Ballou's reply to ours, No. two. "Mr. Kent continues to confound things and terms which ought to be discriminated, as radically dissimilar. I cannot consent to it. He makes no distinction between veneration and benevolence. He talks of loving a person's mentality, spirituality, and morality just as if this were loving the individual being." Really, reader, Mr. Ballou is too profound for me here. I did suppose that loving all the parts or attributes of a being was loving the individual being. But let us attend to him. "But, admiring, venerating and delighting in these is wholly different from loving the individual being, in the sense of the second commandment." The idea is good and truthful after all. It amounts to this, Benevolence or Charity not like any other faculty in the human brain, as to the object or motive of its desire or love; and that the second command refers directly to this as being the highest moral sentiment of the man. *All good and truthful.* We have not hinted one word to the contrary. There are *no two* sentiments of the brain that are alike in this sense. They are every one unlike another.

Again. — "Other loves [than benevolence] are more or less limited and exclusive" — he names "Alimentiveness, Acquisitiveness," etc., etc. I deny the truth of this, in the sense in which I have argued for the non-exclusiveness of amateness. In that sense they are non-exclusive. Benevolence is the feeling of mercy and goodness towards every

object which is capable of receiving such goodness, and being benefited by it. It is exclusive to such objects or to such being. So alimentiveness gives a taste for suitable food, no more. In a healthy state suitable food is the object it desires and takes pleasure in. It may vary its amount of delight in these various articles; but it can never delight in the taste of one article, in exclusion from, or more or less than in another article, which is exactly like the first; nor can the eater be benefited by the one and injured by the other. This is impossible. The same course of reasoning holds good towards every other faculty. So I forbear. I pronounce his statement untrue, if he means it in the sense in which I have argued the opposite in all my letters.

We come now to the argument in Mr. Ballou's reply to our letter on the Fowlers. He states that "Amativeness in man has two radical characteristic manifestations,—a sensual and a spiritual." That the "sensual manifestation is rightful and innocent only in true dual marriage;" "but that its mental and spiritual manifestation, besides having one sacred connubial center, has various legitimate concentric spheres." To prove the above proposition, viz: That sensual Amativeness is not "co-extensive with its spiritual," and that the former manifestation can be "rightful and innocent only in dual marriage," he proceeds, as in a former letter, to divorce a fractional part of amativeness, and to put it on the plane with the animal. I give his words: "Amativeness, as to its lower developments and sensual manifestations, is properly an animal propensity. Man has it in common with all the lower animals. Amativeness, in its highest

developments and manifestations, is proper to man as a spiritual and moral intelligence. 'The animals are incapable of spiritual amateness. The more animal-humans are capable of it only in a low degree, and many have scarcely a conception of it, much less a decent appreciation. It is plain, then, that sensual amateness exists and ultimates itself without spiritual amateness, as in beasts and very sensual humans.' Really, if these statements are true, some persons, who are in the form of men, are not, correctly speaking, men. Either they were never finished, or they have become so diseased that their manhood is dead and gone. Nothing but the beast-man remains to animate the material form. The breath of God, which was to stamp his image, is gone. But what has this *essence* of lust to do with the doctrines of Free Love? Must we come to this for our analogies and arguments? Shall inhumans and beasts be summoned upon the stand to settle the higher law of progressed and healthy humanity? We are convinced that Mr. Ballou is serious in this kind of analogy, and we submit to follow. Such reasoning as this has been so far his first and main argument. We have replied to it in part, when found in a former letter. We will endeavor to do it justice here. First, then, we consent, for the sake of the argument, to the putting away of sensual amateness. (To do which we believe to be a natural impossibility; and if it were possible, in man, it would be 'adultery, *per se*.') What does Mr. Ballou gain in this argument? He separates the lower of amateness from the higher, and puts it under laws inharmonious with the higher, because the former is animal. If this were proper, it might in part destroy my argument from analogy, but it

would prove nothing against my doctrine, and nothing in favor of his. Let us see where his analogy, in comparing man on this point, with the beast, will carry him. However distasteful this may be to us, or to the more refined feelings of the reader, it seems to be necessary, and so we hope it may prove profitable. We consent then, Mr. Ballou, to go with you into the field of animal life. We are bound to look into the nature and order of the love relations of animal; to look into the laws of their marriage. We find here, if we take the whole range, that variety is the rule of love, and at the most a partial duality is the exception. God has so created, and we will not arraign his wisdom. Reader, we are now in the presence of beasts and birds, — life that walks, and life that flies. There is no adultery here. If any man think evil, the evil is in himself. These, God's creatures, are right. We find Amativeness an upper and leading faculty, all right for beasts. So its action is right for beasts. Not so in man. In him it is behind and below in the brain, and so should not lead and control. Then is the analogy we are pursuing truthful? We think not. But we are pledged to follow it to the bottom of our friend's argument. We press the inquiry, then, upon our friend, Are the love ultimations of animals generally exclusive and dual? We expect a categorical reply and its proof. Our opponent, we hope, will be consistent with his animal analogies. Again, are these ultimations of love or passion less elevated and less proper, when they are in the order of variety, and so in harmony with what seems to be the rule of their natures, than when they manifest themselves in a partially, and perhaps sometimes entirely in an exclusively

dual order, and so in harmony with what seems to be at least the law of exception, even among animals? Our friend has insisted on taking us to the animal to settle the laws for man—and we now wish to have full justice done to his arguments, so we urge these questions upon him. If *we* draw any inference from the animal analogy, it is that man will comprehend all orders, or every variety of order, unless he has outgrown the exceptional law of animals. As a fact, man in his nature does comprehend the entire natures of all below him. So says science. His analogy, carried out, if it were truthful, would favor our views vastly more than his. But we have not felt the need of such aid. It is the love relations of man which we wish to elevate and harmonize, and we think this should be settled solely by the laws of man's mind. Any truthful appeal to the analogy of the law of animal creation, can never favor exclusive dual marriage, but its opposite. We pledge ourselves to sustain this proposition when it is further called for. I return now to say to the reader, that this whole argument of two radical and diverse manifestations of amativeness in man, is unphilosophical and absurd. If such a separation were possible, it would leave the man in a perverted and abnormal state. But it is not true that any man ever ultimates love entirely disconnected with its spiritual element. I will demonstrate this statement. If God had made this possible—the race in her propagations might so retrograde as to become beasts, or something like them, and so on still lower. In this case there would be an absolute law of retrogression, instead of a law of progression in man. The offspring of such coition could not be human; as like will beget its like. Does the reader

ask for more? We are most glad to know, for the hopes of humanity, that such a separation of a faculty, or of the faculties, is impossible, and so the idea is most absurd. We proceed in our quotations: "Sexual coition is the natural, universal, uniform and inevitable ultimate of sensul amativeness." "But how is it with spiritual amativeness? It may descend into, blend with, and santify sensual Amativeness as in the case of the true dual marriage. But sexual coition is not its own proper and inevitable ultimate." We wait almost impatiently for proof that this spiritual love may not sanctify the non-exclusive manifestations of this sexual love. In every reply Mr. Ballou assumes the only point to be proved on his part. We tell the reader that this higher love will more fully sanctify the lower, when the lower acts behind and in harmony with the laws of the higher, and we argue directly to prove it. We let the lower strengthen the higher, and receive its blessing by its absolute submission to the laws of the higher, and not the higher come down to bless the flesh, by submissionn and conformity to the lower law, or to the supposed lower law. We now come to deny our brother's main proposition in the quotation. We contend that coition is a natural ultimate of spiritual love. That the leading attribute of conjugal love, in a healthy state, is spiritual; that it is non-exclusive, and that it is naturally coitionary in its ultimates. Sensual love is sometimes and in some cases partially satisfied by various little love manifestations short of coition. It often is comparatively so, without any material manifestations. It is in youth. So spiritual love is often comparatively satisfied without the act of coition. But no sexual love in any of its phases can be full

and complete without its coitionary ultimate. Without this it never attains to its hight, perfection and entireness. Mr. Ballou represents the spiritual as descending to bless and sanctify the sensual in dual marriage. Will he deny that the spiritual love is at home in, and is a leading attribute in the conjugal? Will he deny that spiritual love is its very essence and inner life? His language plainly conveys this idea; that it is not. This is a vital point. We hope our friend and the reader will bear with the closeness with which we pursue this subject, if it does occupy some space. We have meant to so write our proposition for this discussion that we and our opponent should be obliged to grapple with the very heart of the whole controversy, with the age, and with reformers, touching this subject of subjects—marriage. We must not pass it superficially. We certainly understand our opponent to deny the vital and essential relations of spiritual amative-ness, in constituting the leading substance of coitionary and so connubial love. I think he does not harmonize on this with the Fowlers; with Swedenborg he does not, and many others of his dual order, but much nearer with the Shakers. No matter. What is truth? With us, connubiality is not synonymous with sensuality. We promise the reader that when we are converted to this doctrine, we shall join the Shakers, at once, on this subject. But in the name of humanity, we protest against the whole of it. Coition, for its most material object—the procreation of offspring—should be, in its leading substance and features, spiritual. As man is a unit, and as he is more spiritual than animal or sensual, so in his act to beget his like, it should be more spiritual than sensual. I speak of the true

man, and I still insist on the analogy, that the lower man should keep behind, and harmonize with, the higher. If Mr. Ballou still insists that my human analogy is false; can he not give us a better substitute in disproving it than his analogy of man and animals in common? We have read his replies with our utmost care, and read them again and again, and we affirm that there is not one word of direct argument to prove the impropriety of a variety in connubial love. He repeats the statements of his belief that coitionary love should only be in true dual marriage; and tries to destroy my analogy by introducing another. But were I to admit the force of his animal analogy, and every word of real argument in his letters, even then he has not taken the first step to prove his proposition, and his exclusively dual order. Where is the proof of his "adultery, *per se*," in a variety in love ultimates? Not a line can I find. In behalf of the friends of Free Love, whose doctrine and practice he has formerly declared to be the foulest of the foul, and adultery by itself, I ask him to prove his position in season for a reply before this discussion closes. In view of his past relations to this subject, and of his present position, as an opponent of Free Love, it is not enough that he satisfy himself in simply replying to my arguments. The discussion was proposed as a mutual affair, between friends, to promote the cause of truth, each of us believing, as I trust, that truth would be elicited by it, whether our opinions were all saved or not. By proof I mean more especially direct argument from the laws of mind, not mere inferences from history. I have not troubled the reader with the foul history of dual marriage, as a presumptive argument for the trial of Free Love.

Because all of the higher and spiritual faculties are more or less non-exclusive, and in that sense universal in their nature, it does not follow as a practical fact that they should ultimate themselves to the same extent. This is naturally impossible. I love all the human brotherhood, non-exclusively, as I have used this latter word in this discussion, yet I pass multitudes with a bare recognition. I carry out no particular acts of kindness, or "special and kind attentions." It is not necessary or called for. So a man may love woman as such, with a true universal, or non-exclusive connubial love, and it be impossible and undesirable to so universally consummate this love; while absolute exclusiveness would be unnatural in either case—in any of the loves. There are mental laws and circumstances which should harmoniously settle each man's actual and more intimate associates, in his acts of social enjoyment, or acts of charitable utility. And yet he is not absolutely exclusive in any or all of these faculties. The well-developed mind is never universal or absolutely exclusive as to his associates in relation to the human brotherhood—or in any of the social or love relation. These remarks have had reference to some part of Mr. Ballou's reply, which I thought it not necessary to quote.

By the better laws of civilization, with woman in general, I may bow the knee before God in social prayer in freedom; I may enjoy mental repasts with her in freedom. Benevolence may give to her the fruits of acquisitiveness in freedom; charity and justice may call to their aid all the power and utility in destructiveness and combativeness for the protection and defense of all women in freedom; I may gratuitously supply the wants of inhabitiveness and

alimentiveness in her in freedom ; I may give the adhesive kiss to all in freedom ; I may supply any child from my paternal fount in freedom ; I may supply my own paternal desire by the caressing or adoption of any child in freedom. What may we not do and enjoy innocently in freedom, by the laws of the Fowlers, Mr. Ballou and civilization ? Every thing except a fractional part of a sentiment called amativeness, all else is non-exclusive, or absolutely free in a healthy state, or under the control of the higher man. For every other freedom is allowed to be health, and health is allowed to be freedom. For every other absolute exclusiveness is considered a disease. For this fraction of the brain, anything but entire exclusiveness is disease, *per se*. This fraction is cut off from its other and higher half, and held in bonds as a criminal. "It has been a criminal." Well, why not put the whole man in bonds ? Every faculty, and every part of a faculty, has been woefully criminal. Why not rush back to slavery and the dark ages for our laws of safety ? "All men, except those who govern the rest, are, *per se*, dangerous in freedom !" It requires strong proof to sustain such monstrous inconsistency. The past, with her pall of blackness still hanging over her, cannot prove it. The future will laugh at it with pity and astonishment.

CHAPTER VI.

MR. BALLOU CONTINUED. — HIS BOOK.

MR. BALLOU asks, in our discussion, what "need" there is of Free Love,—and what "good" will come of it? Even admitting my mind argument, of the non-exclusive nature of the connubial attraction, he virtually asks what *utility* will come of such freedom. Others, who read us, will ask the same question. We reply—the normal action of every faculty and every law of mind, is always of utility. A similar "need" exists, and a similar "good" will follow the freeing of this, which results from the free action of every other faculty. Such freedom is always *strengthening, refining, and elevating*. It is so, and will be so on this, in its temperate, healthy, and free action. The diseased action of any faculty may bring untold evil. One man, or one woman, may live *alone*—a hermit. So one man and one woman may live in entire isolation from all other society; but such dual hermitage is not natural. It more or less *starves* all the human faculties. That state of mind which, from choice, selects such a situation, is sickly and contracted. No man and woman can progress, and elevate themselves, as easily, and as fully, in such disconnection from all others. A variety in the action of every feature of

connubial love, is refining and elevating. Love always elevates and refines. Of course, a variety in this should be governed by the most exalted wisdom. So should the action, and the variety in adhesiveness. When, and so far as, the latter is not, it dissipates and debases. Each faculty has its proper laws, and its "*natural restraints*," but not to absolute exclusiveness. Some minds, in a healthy state, require more society than others. I will be understood, if I have to write "line upon line—precept upon precept." We insist that, as our philosophy deals alike with every faculty, and is in harmony with itself, while that of our opponents does not—and is not,—it is for those who *make the exception*, to PROVE *their exception*. And we urge—we entreat the friends of exclusive marriage, to deal less with *uncertain consequences*, and more with God's eternal laws of order," as read in the *philosophy* of mind. We here say—once, and we hope, for all,—we do not consider mere inferences from history, especially any history which we can obtain, as direct argument, or as sufficient to meet and refute the settled or sure principles of mind.

One more allusion to the discussion, and we pass to Mr. Ballou's book. We record a noticable coincidence. While Mr. B. was laboring to destroy our analogy between the human faculties, by comparing the act of coition in man "with animals in common," his friend Hewitt was arguing in his (Mr.

Hewitt's) paper, in opposition to certain supposed or real Free Love defenders,—that because animals were promiscuous, it was no evidence that man should be. Not one word does Mr. H. write directly to prove his own dual order. (On what grounds shall this always be taken for granted?) A *Lady* steps in here, and intimates, if man was like the animals, there would be no good objection to a "variety." Our unknown fair one, (she does not favor us with her name) writes,—“Remove the restraints of reason and conscience imposed by love, and there is no reason why animal passion should not claim a variety.” To us this is an entire negation of Mr. Ballou's analogy,—and yet he becomes her very ready endorser. (See P. Christian, Dec. 30, 1854.) So does Mr. Wright. *Where* shall we find our opponents in relation to this animal argument? We hope their whereabouts will be better settled on so important a point, before we have occasion to print another edition of our book. It will so much shorten our labor. We did not allude to the *animal*, except in reply to Mr. Ballou. We did not consider it necessary in a discussion about man. Still it was not improper. We ask our opponents then what position the *animal* is to hold in the future of this controversy. We choose at present to *follow*. It is not fair that the same opponent should hang on to these opposite horns at the same time, or change as seeming necessity requires.

Reader, in making the use which I have of the discussion,—I have taken the utmost care not to do Mr. Ballou any injustice, and if, in any thing, or in any statement, he thinks I am incorrect, I ask him to point it out to me, and I will explain or retract, as the truth may require. Though we are wide apart as professed reformers, I am still his personal friend, and I suppose him to be a friend to me. We both *deal sharply* with what we conceive to be the errors and faults of our friends. Mr. Ballou had felt it to be his duty, as a leader and reformer, (I consider him a law reformer), to arraign and condemn all Free Love doctrines and practices. This became more frequent and severe, in his paper. I could and did sympathise with him in part, in relation to some of the evils connected with Free Love, as with dual marriage, in the present undeveloped and perverted state of the race. But he made no exception. He seemed to feel himself called in conscience to do what he could to exterminate it, as a whole, and in all of its parts. I visited him. We spent hours in friendly, but in private discussion. I asked him, if ever he gave the subject a full and fair hearing in his paper, as he had before this given every other question of great interest,—to discuss it with me. When he thought the time had come, and was at leisure to do so, he accepted my friendly challenge, and the discussion followed.

I fully admit there are many evils now connected

with Free Love. Injustice is sometimes done under its cloak. But I believe its friends will "learn wisdom by the things which they suffer," and rise to a greater and better harmony. I know some have so risen. So far, the various efforts at community have caused great suffering and loss of property. Perhaps some half a million has been expended, and some over twenty societies failed, during the last twenty years. And yet we think the effort has been worth all it has cost. Free Love has not done as bad, or been more a failure. Community and Free Love, are both alive and in good health in some places. The real good in both will be saved, and rise. The chaff should be blown away by the winnowing of Providence. So let it be. We were some disappointed in Mr. Ballou on the subject of our discussion, after all, but it was not his fault. He had always been a frank and open spoken man on all subjects which he met.

But to his book. We did not allude to Mr. Ballou, when speaking in our preface of *reform* writers on marriage. We considered him, on this subject, and many others, more nearly allied to the past. In most of his writings he stereotypes to the teachings of an age, almost two thousand years ago, and seldom to the higher law and more spiritual truths of that. Still farther back, he "builds tabernacles to Moses and Elias," as well as to "Christ." This he does to the law phase of Christ's teachings. For Christ

“was made under the law,” and spoke under it, and in parables. He wore the “veil,” as did Moses, to still hide from the many the higher glories of the coming gospel. He still preached law to the “lawless and disobedient.” (I presume Mr. Ballou will consider the above as a compliment to him. And it really stand so in the eyes of the majority.) But we shall proceed to our views of his case, and his course. He talks much in his book of going back to “fundamental principles.” The real import of this, to us, is simply his opinion as to the main truths of the Bible. To me, he seems wholly incapable of going below and above all opinions, to the absolute laws of mind; incapable of going back of all revealed religion, to the Author of it; of simply reading nature in nature’s book. He has been called “the logician.” He is comparatively logical in discussing theology, so called, but never upon the deep principles of philosophy. He is superficial, and never at home, in the latter. On turning to the pages of his book (see 361) on which he records his objections to Free Love, I was disappointed. I had forgotten that, after so fully denouncing our views, he did not even write the first sentence of argument to disprove them from the laws of mind. If such is there, we have failed to see it. Such as it is, I will give it a passing notice. And yet, I should not, in my present book, if it had emanated from an author of less note.

Mr. Ballou, 1, Gives his objections to Polygamy, in which we are happy to agree with him.

"2, Promiscuity of intimate sexual communion is revolting and degrading to pure minded loves. It is unnatural. It comes from perverted amateness, despotism, artificial education, sophistication, or arbitrary custom." * * * By "promiscuity," Mr. B. means the least deviation from entire exclusiveness. More of the same sort follows our quotation. We simply reply to it all, there is not absolutely and necessarily one word of truth in it. *Lust* is "revolting" always "to a pure minded Lover;—" love *never*. We give assertion for assertion.

"3, Sexual promiscuity inevitably tends to moral and social disorder. It sophisticates, perverts and demoralizes its practitioners. It stimulates and confirms the lust of variety." * * * *

We are not required to do more than to pronounce all this false. Mr. Ballou always and everywhere takes the whole point of difference between him and the friends of Free Love for granted. Namely: That the attraction for a variety is lust: "The lust of variety." Before this, he has taken his position, and pronounced every such act of variety "adultery, *per se*." Here, in the presence of his book, I again challenge him or his friends, to show the first line of his, of direct argument of any kind, to prove his position; or to show one sentence where it is not taken for granted. He begs the

entire question. In view of his position in the age as a professed reformer, and of his long and repeated denunciation of our principles on this subject, we have a right to ask and expect more.

He has written what he, and perhaps some of his friends, may consider argument. In justice to him, the reader should know that he has abundantly appealed to the feelings and instincts of men. To what we shall call, to a greater or less extent, *undeveloped, sickly, and perverted* mind. He becomes sponsor for this, and pronounces it pure. "The natural instincts of true love are against it,"—against non-exclusiveness, or our freedom. He asserts that this "instinct is not selfish, but implanted by God to ensure moral and social order." We tell him that a morbid sickly state of mind knows no absolute "purity," or an entirely normal development of "love." We admit that the undeveloped "instincts" of a misguided amativeness, are sometimes against our views. We find men on this, as he finds them on war, and resistance of evil; and he echoes back to us on this all of their old arguments to him, in defence of war, or an injurious resistance. They tell him, the "instincts" of man are against him,—or are in favor of resisting to the death, when necessary, an intruding enemy. That this instinct of self-preservation, is "unselfish, and from God," and shows his will as to the true manner of keeping order." This injurious resistance is more often re-

sorted to in defence of Mr. B.'s exclusive "instinct" in marriage, than any where else. We congratulate him in this case—the marriage question—on finding himself with the majority, and entirely on the *popular side*.

But to his book—"amativeness, like all the passional appetites, has no inherent self-government." True. * * * "safety lies in subordinating amativeness strictly to reason and the moral sentiments." True, it always is in a strictly healthy mind;—in a perfect development of connubial love. Look at Mr. B.'s consistency! He truthfully compares amativeness to all the other "passional appetites." His "reason and moral sentiments," put *every other* "passion and appetite" *under* non-exclusive laws;—and he would consider the man as void of both "reason and moral sentiments," who should think of doing otherwise. Then he places amativeness, or a *part of it*, under entire exclusive law. Reader, look at the depth and logic in this! It is "simply contemptible." An appeal to sickly instinct is not sufficient to justify so irrational a position. Reason and a healthy instinct repudiates it all.

Mr. Ballou goes on at some length, to give his views of the terrible consequences, which, he thinks must follow the spread of Free Love. As to this, we know more about it than our friend. He excommunicates his sexual slaves, who rebel under

the marriage yoke.”* We have long since freed ours from that yoke. We know something of the society of our modern anti-exclusive Jamaica’s.

Again—“4, Sexual promiscuity must degrade and oppress woman.” Reader, in the book, there is nearly two pages, following the above proposition, of his sort of argument. Having settled it in his own mind that all deviation from dual order is the promptings of lust, he goes on to describe and discuss the sure consequences of an entire reign of lust. Admitting his premises, his conclusions are safe. If any reader has his book, he can turn to it. (It is aside from the first intention of our book to give all of these secondary, but still important questions, a full place. Others have written upon them better than we could do, and we must refer the reader to them. We do not desire to supercede any other publication which has gone before us. We refer the reader to a Tract, containing a discussion between “Stephen P. Andrews, Henry James, and Horace Greeley,” and published by Mr. Andrews; and to letters since published in the Tribune, and Mr. Andrew’s reply in Nichols’ Journal. Nowhere else can both sides be found better handled. I ought to add—Mr. Nichols’ book on Marriage, replies at some length to such conservative objections as we find in Mr. Ballou’s book. I

* I simply refer to an act of his society in dismissing a member.

would meet them with pleasure, in any paper open to me. But I am set against making my present work too long. I confess it to be a book of "one idea." But it is a central, a pivotal, idea—and the one on which the main hinge of civilization hangs.

Mr. Ballou does not differ as much from us as at first sight it would appear, in view of our contradictions of him. He, in every line, is in truth, writing of diseased amativeness;—of what Mr. Davis calls "Extremeism." He does not seem to me to have the most distant conception of what I call entire health. He always, or nearly always, degrades amativeness. We confess, in the past, it has degraded itself. Still we write of a healthy mind:—of a healthy attraction. We write of love, not lust. Love is healthy, and is under the control of the wisdom of reason, and the moral sentiments; and not under "carnality." The reign of sexual selfishness, we do not call a healthy connubial love. We deprecate the morbid and irregular action of any faculty. Such fruits are often terrible. Too terrible for human pen to describe. Mr. Ballou and ourselves agree that as a matter of fact, amativeness, as well as all other sentiments, have been, and still are, more or less diseased. He leaves no room, except through law,—the law of exclusive marriage—for its coming health. If it were here our first object to discuss the way of salvation for so sickly a

race, we, most certainly, should propose to mix a little gospel freedom with our remedies. He insists that any deviation from absolute exclusiveness will increase the malady. And, like the Physician, who should advise to the gratification of the craving of a dispeptic stomach for its cure, he insists upon compliance with what to us are the immoral cravings of a worse than dispeptic "instinct," as a means to its desired health. Perhaps even he does not mean all this. He may have little hope of a coming cure; and so labors more to stay its further encroachments. In one point of view he is consistent with himself. Though a non-resistant, he believes in confining criminals,—dangerous criminals. He finds amativeness to be such a criminal. So it is at least wise to confine it to the exclusive marriage yoke. I must confess to no little sympathy with him in this, when, and so far as it is thus ungovernable and dangerously criminal. I am not disposed to quarrel with the past for her sexual discipline. Not in the main, with the shakers. It is even possible, that Jesus was right in favoring,—in speaking favorably of a man's making himself a literal "Eunuch for the kingdom of heaven's sake," or the sake of purity, peace, and happiness. This, was truly an unnatural remedy, to meet a very bad and perhaps really an unnatural disease;—and possibly better than the entire reign of lust. Perhaps better than to commit, and be hung for rape. This

was literally removing, an "offending" member. I say, then, in view of the terrible diseases of the past, I will not judge the sufferer too harshly, for her equally terrible remedies, though they may seem to me unnatural and unphilosophical. They could not do as we can do. I will respect Jesus in living a practical life, like the sect of Esses of his day,—and not marrying in any form;—if, on the whole, he considered it wise and best so to do. His life lacked a wholeness and entireness in development and experience. But perhaps it was the best he could then do. So we judge not the past. My great objection to Mr. Ballou is, that he does not leave room in his marriage teachings for man's progression and "restoration;" for all which is really his present and coming health. Even if the exclusive dual instinct in the marriages of civilization has, on the whole, been the best for the plane of civilization—of this we are not sure, and so do not judge, that instinct is not adapted to, or suitable for the harmony of the future. It will fall before it. So, if Mr. Ballou still feels it to be his duty to represent the "Moses" of this age, and make laws, and write for the confinement of the "animal"—man, I would fain persuade him to leave room in his faith, and in his propositions, for me and my friends, to write in defence of freedom for the God-man. God bless the Moses of each age. But a double blessing will ever attend the Christ—and the Christs of each age.

Ishmael should not war against Isaac,—nor should Isaac be unjust to Ishmael;—even though the one does represent bondage, and the other freedom.

In short, Mr. B., on the subject of exclusive marriage, writes as we might suppose any good conservative mind would have done, during the past few hundred years. I suppose he, as well as we, consider it safe to follow “fundamental principles,” or the “eternal laws of order,” over all consequences. We wish to call him back to the original—so far as man is concerned—source of, and to the search for, these laws. We say, then, if he will once more take his pen, and attempt either or all of the following things:—1st, To reply to my mind argument—of the non-exclusive nature of the attraction of each and every part of the human brain, (as I have made my meaning understood on that proposition); or 2nd, If he should admit my first proposition, show the higher or lower law in mind, which should confine any part of it over its normal attraction; or 3d, Give the mind law which proves his position—that all variety is, “*per se*, more or less adulterous.” I say, if Mr. B. will do either, or all of the above, I will meet him to reply, or to surrender. Till then, I respectfully take leave of him. It is high time the friends of exclusive marriage were put directly upon the defence of their own system. Though their possession has been long, it has never been entirely “peaceable,” but under

repeated protests. In every past age, it has been more or less "in law." As a friend of Free Love, we summon our opponents before the higher court of mental philosophy.

The reader will bear with a little illustration of the general tone and style of the conservative mind in civilization towards the rising Free Love. It comes in my "Liberator," and is so short, and so much to the point, I cannot resist the temptation to copy it.

"LIBERTY A UNIVERSAL CURSE."

Hear the language of the *Richmond Enquirer* :—

"Crime, famine, ignorance, anarchy, infidelity, and revolution, stare the reader in the face on every page of universal liberty. A single season of want in Ireland and Scotland will exhibit more human suffering than a Mrs. Stowe could glean from the annals of slavery through all time and through all countries. The South owes it to herself to throw free society on the defensive. Slave society is co-extensive with man in time and space. It must be natural, or man must be an unnatural being. It is recognized and authorized by the Bible, and was ordained of God. Free society is a little experiment, a departure from nature, that claims no Divine authority, and very little of human authority.

"We put the question to all abolitionists: What have been the results of this little experiment? It is you who should defend yourselves—not us. Human experience, and practice, and divine authority are on our side. You must make out a strong case, in order to justify the injustice of such authorities. Instead of southern men being called out to

lecture in defence of slavery, northern men should be invoked to defend their institutions."

Really, the application is so plain, that it hardly needs any aid from us. The reader can only substitute *free love* in the place of "universal liberty;" *civilization* for "south;" *love* for "society;" the *marriage institution* for "slave society;" *free loveites* for "abolitionists," etc. Please read our extract again with the above substitutions, and we promise it will make a perfect fit for nearly every conservative writer against Free Love.

But we are among the impertinent and meddling "abolitionists" free loveites; and deny all exclusive titles to sex. We have returned, in our book, the demand upon civilization, and called upon her to defend herself against the coming light and rights of Free Love. Her age is admitted, but her character for peace and purity has not been the best, and she must and will make room for a larger "experiment" in sexual freedom.

CHAPTER VII.

MR. HENRY C. WRIGHT — A REVIEW* — “WHAT IS MARRIAGE?”

I SHALL quote very little of Mr. Wright's reply to the above question. It is not necessary. I repeat, my book is not designed to be a substitute for any which has preceded it. I take it for granted that my readers have read these several books. Those who have not, will not, of course, find my reference to them of as much interest. Still, they will not be lost to such. I cannot too strongly urge my readers to read these books on Marriage, if they have not. None can afford to do without them. There is too much real value in them; and of that sort which is generally most needed. Mr. Wright's book was written to elevate love and marriage, and so to elevate the offspring of marriage. It was written for, and suited to, diseased and undeveloped humanity; and nothing is more needed. Comparatively, it was nobly executed. Mr. Wright does seem to reach, to some extent, the true features of connubial love. He reaches what I will call the first germ, or the childhood of marriage. This is much in advance of the large class for whom he wrote; and perhaps all they could bear. With

* See part II. Letter 2, of his book.

nearly every feature of his love-marriage, except its exclusiveness, I can harmoinze. But in most every line, he seems to suppose this exclusive feature to be inseparable from the very nature of such love. He does not see that his real connubial love can be enlarged till it bursts its exclusive shell, and so be enhanced, purified and ennobled. He says, virtually, "Here unto have we come," and then like all conservatives in the past, he adds his "no farther shalt thou go." Yet we have no doubt his book will do more to spread the principles of free love, than any other book written, except that of Dr. Nichols and wife. Perhaps we ought also to except Mr. Davis, though the latter is alike exclusive in his nominal marriage. The reader will understand, that these men are not responsible for this opinion of ours. They, Mr. Wright and Mr. Davis, have certainly done what they could to confine marriage to pairs. But they elevate love and free it from law. Their exceptional doctrines will prove weak. We know something of the effect of such free and elevating truths as those books contain.

But, "What is marriage?" Mr. Wright's "definition of wife," is, "the incarnation of God to her husband. The great Invisible and Intangible made visible and tangible in the deepest and most intense and potent living relation. I speak calmly, knowing the full import of the words I use. No phrase so

fully expresses what thou art to me as this: The incarnation of God."

The reader should know that Mr. Wright conveys his sentiments in a series of letters, representing a male and a female—a man and his wife—communicating each to the other his and her views and feelings as to the marriage relation.

The language of the above quotation is very strong, but I have no controversy with what I believe to be its meaning.

"Worship is a necessity of my being. I must worship something; so must every man and every woman. My soul cannot stoop to worship times and places, stations and titles. I see no God in them. They are all the works of men's hands. But I worship thee, without one shrinking doubt as to my right to do so, or as to whether God will accept this devotion to the embodiment of my highest conception of his attributes, as being paid to him."

All this is very strong; but I only object to it from its exclusive concentration of worship upon one. Let such a soul enlarge till it knows and enjoys a more expansive worship. I should not have supposed so large a soul as Mr. Wright's could have penned so narrow and confined a sphere of worship. However, it is only carrying the worship which nearly all christians have concentrated upon the head of Jesus, into exclusive and dual marriage.

"In thee, God is manifest in the flesh." Brother

Wright, we worship many Christs and many women ;—all Saviours and all women ; and we do not dispute that all real women are Saviours, and are Gods “manifest in the flesh.” So are real men. Then do not confine an enlarged soul—one that has outgrown the shackles of sectarianism and exclusiveness, to worship one individual object, and upon one individual altar, to the exclusion of all others. But we are thankful for even this progress from the past. Man, in a low and undeveloped state, has always held low views of woman, and of the objects of her creation, as made for the gratification of his lower nature. The change is refreshing. Man has held woman below himself. Even the wise Paul—wise for his day,—tells us “the woman was made for the man, *not the man for the woman.*” Nothing can be more false to nature than the last clause, which we have emphasized. We almost wonder that such a mind could not sooner break from such debasing traditions. But such views are passing away. Woman is becoming man’s equal—verily his object of worship. If the conservative reader is offended with my friend and myself on this, can he not pardon something for the ultra effects of reaction. The man has always been worshiped more or less by the woman, and he has loved to have it so. I differ from Mr. Wright in that. I would not worship one woman in exclusion from all others. And I confess to finding it agreeable to receive

worship from more than one. Nor do I desire to receive this worship from even the one, in exclusion from all other men. The expansion of heart and mind, which would lead the woman of my preference to love and worship other men, equally deserving with myself, with the same kind of love and worship, only endears her to me. For they, too, are a part of me, they are my brethren, and "all flesh is one flesh." My benevolence and adhesiveness are the greater, and the higher, and so control and baptise in their fount my entire connubial love. I do not allow even here the higher sentiments to be absorbed in, and controlled by, the lowest of the lower. Mr. Wright, deepen and enlarge the spirit of your theology in human brotherhood. To me, this exclusive spirit and worship is insipid and childish. In connubial manhood, truth, even in a mate, is both desirable and lovely; and truth is just. Justice can never be absolutely exclusive.

More from Mr. Wright—— "A masculine soul and a feminine soul in marriage, are absorbed each into the other. The essence of each enters into the other; permeates, fills and thrills it, leaving to neither a separate existence. Thought responds to thought, will to will, heart to heart. * * * *
The entrance of two souls, each into the other, thus making of two one perfect being—this is marriage, as my heart defines it. * * * * I cannot feel

that I have an existence apart from thee. Without thee I can do nothing. I am nothing. In thee I live, move, and have my being. To dwell in thee is to dwell in love, in God. I have no hopes, no longings, no aspirations, no life, apart from thee."

Really, a woman is the whole saviour of my friend's theology for a man—and a man is the whole saviour for a woman. More:—She is the whole of society, to her husband, which he can possibly desire or receive. Each is entirely "absorbed" by the other. But we think we understand Mr. Wright, through these long expressions of love, and we do not like to clip his wings of connubial affection. We are entirely in love with the real substance of the union here described. We only wish to enlarge it. We would not care if—oh how glorious it would be—if, in the progress of the race, the time should come, when all men feel to all women, and all women feel to all men, like this. 'This would be heaven, verily. Methinks I should like to live in such a day. No, I am not yet pure and expanded in soul enough for that. But, surely, love would then "work no evil to his neighbor," or to his neighbor's wife. I promised not to quote much from this chapter, as it was not directly connected with our difference. But its real meaning was too rich. I could not pass it. Yet I tell the reader the book is full of more like it, and as good. I rejoice to know that when men attain to such

views as this book contains, they will not stop here. When man has really advanced to such love as this for the one, he will go on till he reaches it to the many ; and the harmony and consequent happiness will be just so much greater. Then, "every old man I meet will be my father,—every old woman, my mother ; every young man I meet will be my brother, and every young woman will be my sister—if need be, my wife. All children will love me, and I will love and embrace them. They will be mine." How glorious that day ! A day so long prayed for by all the pious of earth. In this heaven, there will be no exclusive marriage, or giving in marriage. But we shall all be as the real and higher angels. We say, let that day come ! let it come ! though it should over turn and over turn, —purify and sanctify,—sift and burn, in a preceding judgment, and bury in one common grave of the past, all sectarianism and all exclusive marriage, and land our race in one ocean of love and union ! Let all jealousy and hate go to its own place ! All this will do no harm, but untold good. We confess to some little dread—(for others, not for ourselves, we think we have lived passed it)—of the coming storm on this subject, when, and as we know our prayers, and the prayer of Mr. Wright, for the spirit of his prayer is like ours, it will be answered. We do not dread, but glory in the moral calm which will succeed it. Then will the "will of God be

done upon earth, as it is done in heaven." We shall be as the angels. We have no doubt but exclusive marriage prevails to some extent, in the lower spheres. But we do not call these angels of heaven.

"The husband is the ideal actualized. No other man is like him, or ever can be. He is stronger, nobler, truer, more tender, more perfectly adapted to the wife's delicate intuitions than any or all other men." "Nobler, truer." Should marriage make a fool of a woman? Shall she believe what may be a falsehood? This is contending for perpetuity of a disease, which is now altogether too prevalent. But if every word of Mr. Wright's statement was true, it does not prove his entire exclusive feature in marriage. There is no evidence of the absolute truth of most of it. This entire monopoly of sexual love over all other loves, is untruthful and sickly. Mr. Wright, in his book, truthfully defines connubial love to be sexual love, and yet he everywhere seems to give this lower faculty power to monopolize and control all above it. He exalts it at the expense of all above it. In a truthful harmony, it should be below other loves, and never act at the expense of any. Instead of harmonizing this with other loves in the brain, each in their true order, he attempts, virtually, in all his writings on the subject, to concentrate all other loves in this. To us this is abnormal, and we never call such a state of mind healthy, or the true connubial love. It is but

fractionally so. Mr. Wright, in this way, lowers manhood and womanhood. Still, as he marries the faculties of the mind, though it be unnatural marriage, placing the lower above the higher, it is much better, and in advance of the past.

We nearly harmonize with Mr. Wright in the "perpetuity of love," except that we go further, and would not, in any way, hint that it was possible for death to make any change with it. Perhaps we do not differ much with him in his exception,—that an unequal development after marriage might end, at least, in a (partial) divorce. We believe this often comes, in marriage entered into on some of the lower planes. Mr. Davis believes in nature's divorce, as well as in nature's marriage. Mr. Wright represents the husband as saying to his mate, "Thou can'st not continue to love me if I become unlovable." This is good philosophy. No more can a normal mind help loving all which is to it lovable.

We come now to the direct issue between us and Mr. Wright. In the question which he puts:—

"IS EXCLUSIVENESS A FIXED LAW OF MARRIAGE?"

We have said no—Mr. W. says yes. (See Letter IV. page 125.)

"VARIETY IN LOVE, OR POLIGAMY,"

"Nina," (the name of Mr. W.'s ideal lady respondent,) "it is settled between us that our oneness

will be eternal, if our present desires and wants are truly answered ; also, that the perpetuity of our oneness depends on our knowledge of and fidelity to the natural laws by which marriage is designed to be regulated. The question arises—"Is exclusiveness a fixed law of mind ? I ask not should either marry after the death of the other." This looseness in relation to a surviving partner, after the death of his or her mate, is entirely inconsistent with his whole defence of exclusive marriage. By his philosophy, any such marriage could be nothing but adultery. It is not necessarily a crime to die before one's mate—and so love, which we both contend is naturally eternal, cannot be sundered by death. But to numberless inconsistencies is every man driven, who engages in the defence of error.

"But can woman be the wife of more than one man ? and can the relation of husband be truly sustained to more than one woman, at the same time ? To this my heart and my head give a negative answer. Reason and affection assure me that polygamy is unnatural, and therefore wrong."

We shall make no entire defence of polygamy. On the whole, it is more unnatural than exclusive dual marriage. It is all one sided and unjust. Exclusive dual marriage aims to monopolize the entire heart of one. Polygamy does the same by more than one—perhaps many. Of course I cannot approve of the exclusive and monopolizing phase of it.

When there are more females than males, so far as provision for these is concerned, it is better than our present civilization. But mixing up polygamy with "a variety in love," as Mr. W. has done, is very illogical and improper. It does not belong with the latter. We believe Mr. Wright knows this, but we leave it with the reader to judge of the motives which prompted to this course.

"What says the heart? Is there a husband whose love is concentrated on one woman as a wife, who can willingly allow another man to be to his wife what he is? He loves her — her alone — above all others, and he earnestly desires that she should return his affection."

Really, if he concentrates his love on her alone, at her call, it is but just that she should do the same by him. If he simply loves her above all others, it is just that she should do the same by him. We say, let the friends of exclusive marriage be just, while they choose, and are in that order. When they can endure it no longer, let them relax their demand first. "Be just if the heavens fall," and then they will not fall.

"The very fact that another can claim her interest or win her affections, enough to make marriage attractive, strikes a death-blow to a true lover's peace. It is equally true of woman. Hence the origin of that expression of feeling commonly called jealousy."

Mr. W. here seems again to mix up polygamy with the doctrine of a "variety." We have dismissed his polygamy.

If Mr. W. means, in the above, to teach, that the exclusive feeling is hurt by a lack of exclusive feeling in a mate, we admit it. But we still deny that such an exclusive feeling is "true love" in its fulness. It is fractional and abnormal; and its action causes the "jealousies" to which Mr. W. is disposed to be merciful. *He* should be. But a normal action of Free Love never produces these jealousies in normal and healthy minds. The reader will permit me here to record a somewhat singular, and yet not very uncommon anomaly. Mr. Wright has long been accustomed to find himself in a very lean minority on nearly every subject which he introduces. I speak it to his credit. He has seldom found men's feelings and instincts with his own, and with what he considered to be the truth. This has been true in his position on war and its opposite—non-resistance, slavery, woman's rights, and woman's sphere, sectarianism, etc. Here, on exclusive marriage, in which the race are as corrupt as on any other subject, his first and last, and his only arguments are no arguments, but appeals to the feelings and instincts, and even 'jealousies' of men in general. Such appeals are not better here than elsewhere. We should go back of "misdirected" feeling to the laws of mind, to right up an

already careening ship. Is this all that Mr. W. can produce in defense of his dual marriages? Is it his best kind of proof? We were not required to do more than by our counter testimony pronounce it untrue, and pass it. We have and mean to follow him, and reply to such as we find. On every other subject, he pronounces men selfish and perverted. Here he is disposed to tread with care over the complainings of an unnatural demand, or to allow and defend its morbid claim.

"If we are true to ourselves and to each other, neither can outgrow the other. I can never seek an enlargement of soul that cannot be shared by thee. The fixed object of our lives must be to perfect the harmony between us."

All good, except a little savoring of law. But this is good instruction for those for whom he wrote. The well developed and healthy will do right spontaneously, from the right in them. With these, love and harmony will always take care of themselves. True love will live by its own inherent nature.

"In every step of my course, the wife of my soul must stand by my side. I can desire no honor, no station, no heaven apart from thee. If thou art delayed I must be delayed with thee. We are one in love, in will, in purpose, in destiny. Be it ours to eternize this oneness. We will stand, go back, or forward, together."

Mr. Wright, probably, does not mean to "stand"

from progression, or to go back into evils. What a glorious time it will be when the race—every man and every woman—shall be deluged in such a spirit of love and oneness, each to the other, and all to all; when every man shall love his neighbor as himself, and his neighbor's wife as his own wife.

“With this fulness of satisfaction in thee, how can I desire another as a wife? There is no room for another in my nature; it finds in thee all I can receive from any woman in marriage, and it repels the thought of any other in this relation. The existence of the desire for a second person in the marriage union, while the first one lives, proves that the first relation has ceased, if it ever existed. It seems to me that marriage-love is, in its very essence, exclusive.”

“While the first one lives.” This looseness is unpardonable. It destroys all force in much of his previous argument. He has said that “true love” was in its nature “eternal,” as well as monogamic; that death would not weaken it. He and we believe that none of us will ever die in any sense which affects love. Then why does he repeat such language as the above. If Mr. W. has his true mate, and by some accident he falls first, will he feel it any more right for her to be joined to “another as a husband?” Will it appear any more “pure and chaste” to him? It is impossible for her to love the last, or cease to love Mr. W. He is no less

“loveable,” and has committed no offense. Mr. Wright, give up the defense of exclusive monogamic relation, or come up to the courage to be more consistent, and manfully stand your ground.

When I adopt Mr. Wright’s views, I tell the reader, I will carry them out consistently. I will never wink at adulteries with a second mate, after the departure of the true and eternal mate.

I think Mr. Wright must have intended the first part of our last quotation as an argument. The last sentence but one is a mere statement of his opinion. His closing inference has no relation to the argument. His implied argument is a “fullness of satisfaction” in the one; “no room for another.” We quote him farther :

“Men and women have a nature that can be shared by every other man and woman in the ties of friendship, in perfect accordance with the law that binds men and women together, as such. But in marriage, this general tendency of each to the opposite sex, concentrates itself in one, and therefore excludes all others from the privileges and endearments of marriage. The glory of marriage is its exclusiveness. The soul, conscious of refinement, purity and dignity, will shrink from sharing the relation with more than one.”

Mr. Wright here frees every part of the mind, except the connubial—which is a part of the sexual. And yet, with all the importance which *he* attaches

to this subject, he is perfectly indefinite. In a general manner, he states a distinction, but in no way does he ever define the line of demarkation. No other faculty should be concentrated. Connubial love should always be on one, "therefore it excludes all others." It is impossible for Mr. Wright to define this unreal, untrue, and indefinable distinction. But the argument continues the same, a "fulness," or "no room" for more. Really, we do not see the special "glory" in exclusiveness for such a reason. If this is not intended to be the argument, then there is none; it is all mere testimony—mere opinion. He always assumes the superior "refinement, purity, and dignity" of this exclusiveness. We will accept of this when he has proved that it is in harmony with the laws of mind. Its purity will then be self-evident.

But let us attend to the argument;—"no room for another." When any thing is full it can contain no more. In the same sense in which one object fills any thing, it cannot hold more. This is not bad philosophy. We believe in a law of mind, with more or less power to control the action of mind; that is, in a degree of what we shall call "free agency." That a man has some power to "keep" or give "the doors of his heart to her that lieth in his bosom." We have said the man could not be in a normal state, absolutely exclusive in his affections on any thing; and that if he could, it would be false.

That if a man was in love with one woman, he would love another woman who was like her, or so far as she was like the first. But we also said, a well developed mind had more or less power to control the action of his love or life, in confining, concentrating or diffusing. We know of no man who carries his belief, in this power, farther than we. This, the reader must have observed in our main argument, as we there stated it plainly. Perhaps Mr. Wright denies the natural power in mind to control, one way or the other, the concentrations of love. We some think he does. If so, in this he is again inconsistent with himself, as he fully teaches free agency, in its preservation or destruction. In our last extract from him, and in all of them, he represents his male lover as having concentrated the entire life, action or flow of his connubial love on one woman, and of having exclusively monopolized her entire connubial soul. So he has a "fulness of satisfaction in" her. So there is "no room for another." So he is spending all he has and receiving all he can contain. Should we admit this state entirely possible—admit the fact and the philosophy—there is no shadow of proof here that this is the most healthy, normal, refined, purified and elevated state of connubial love.

Mr. Wright's book is a real emanation from his own soul. We believe him honest in his testimony, and do not dispute its correctness, only as we deny

the entire distinction which he makes between that sexual love which he allows between all men and all women, and that which he confines to the one. Sexual love is one. It has, like other loves, a variety of manifestations, but all are governed by the same law. In its higher manifestations, Mr. W. but partially confines it, but partially concentrates it. In its lower action, he entirely confines and concentrates it. This, reader, is all there is to his undefinable distinction.

Adhesiveness may be concentrated. It was so between "David and Jonathan." Their love "passed the love of woman," in general. The writer has known this concentration upon two of his own sex. An inequality of subsequent development has given us a natural divorce. We think, in an improved state of society, there will be more adhesive love, but less exclusive concentration. There is no mystery about connubial love. It is simply the development of sex to manhood and womanhood in a true harmony with all of the loves above it. So it must be of tremendous power, whether in concentration, or a partial diffusion. If adhesiveness between the same sex can be, sometimes, stronger than death, what must be the power of love, when another faculty, another strand of great strength is added to the cord, as it is between those of opposite sexes. Added to this, the entire power of the tremendous and despotic institution of civilized marriage, goes to concentrate and dualize the love between

the sexes. In civilization, all are shut up to this exclusive dualism under pain of entire sexual starvation, or loss of caste and character. Law is perpetually invoked to protect and enforce it. If any of the fair sex, who are not allowed to institute means to provide even for their own acknowledged rights in her exclusive law marriages—and so fail to obtain them—are at last impelled, from whatever motives, to seek and partially obtain those rights out of her order and her law, they are pursued by a spirit of persecution which has more than the cruelties of direct murder in it. It lingeringly torments without freeing its victim. Though these sometimes soon find freedom in death. But we tell the friends of exclusive marriage, the day of her damning injustice and cruelty is passing away. Mr. Wright is not responsible for all this. He is in part, as the reader will see by our further quotations. He slanderously condemns all love out of exclusive dual order, but does not hold any to the forms of outward law. The day is not far distant when the race will look back upon our law, in the place of love, to marry and to keep together married pairs, with as much wonder and contempt, as we now look upon the past hanging of witches. The requirement of obedience on the part of the woman will then appear alike ridiculous and inhuman. They will exclaim, “What! keep men and women *in love*, in married relations, by law?” They will read that this

was then (now) thought necessary for the protection and safety of society! They will in their impertinence, ask how could society be in fear of love? History will explain it all.

Before proceeding to further quotations, the reader will bear with a further illustration of our last.

A man enters an orchard of delicious fruit. Some particular tree attracts his attention above all others. He enters beneath its boughs, and supplies his alimentiveness to a surfeit, and from time to time continues to do so. He continues to feel a "fulness," and has "no room" for more. He casts a general and even appreciative look at other trees, but he desires none of their fruit. In this state, his stomach "repels" the thought of eating from them. Very likely! But does this prove that he has a taste—a love for the fruit of that tree only? And who will assert that he acts wiser, and more in harmony with even his nature, or health of his stomach, than the man who, though he may have some preference for some tree or trees of the orchard, more than for all, still, to some extent, supplies his equally normal appetite from several?

"Much is said about a variety in love. It is said that the passional nature of man needs a fuller satisfaction than a single object can afford; that some men must suffer unless they live with more than one woman as a wife. But the history of polygamy, under whatever name, and by whatever and by whom—

soever sanctioned, demonstrates that it is unnatural, since its consequences are evil, and only evil. It renders men imbecile, in body and soul, and tends to a disproportion of the sexes. Woman can never attain nor keep her true position in a state of polygamy. The only marriage which commends itself to the instinct, the reason and the heart is exclusive, and therefore, this alone will elevate and purify man and woman."

It is plain to us that Mr. Wright intends still to confound Free Love with Polygamy. This is gross slander of the former. Mr. Wright's marriage lies between Free Love and polygamy. Free Love frees all women. Polygamy is exclusive marriage extended from one to many. We are sure that Mr. Wright must see this. We write more for the benefit of woman than for man, as we believe woman suffers more than man, whether she be bound to the man in units, or by tens or by hundreds, as in the case of David and Solomon, and others. Polygamy is not better than dual marriage, but worse, only where there is a redundancy of females. So far "its consequences" are not entirely evil.

We have no particular sympathy for the plea for a "variety," in our last quotation. At the best it is an unjust remedy for diseased and undeveloped mind. Such is not the argument of Free Love. But as bad as we think this argument, we do not see how civilized marriages can, with sober face, oppose it.

Let us look at their system as it stands in opposition to it. It may not be unprofitable. What then is the fact as to present society? In the marriage bed, there are not less than thirty thousand females sacrificed annually in the United States, upon the altar of lust, or intemperate amateness. (No enlightened physician will dispute the entire truthfulness of this statement. If any should, we covet the privilege of discussing it with him, in any place which can be opened to us.) Added to the above, are a large class in our cities who go in the same way—if possible worse, out of law—in spite of law. While this is being enacted on one side, on the other side, there are an equal number of both sexes, dying annually of sexual starvation, from necessary amative fasting, and from the “solitary vice” which sometimes follows such a life of entire and unnatural abstinence. Many dare not take the step in marriage, knowing there is no reprieve—no mercy, if it should prove unfortunate, short of death, or adultery—so called—and consequent loss of character. Such, at least, often delay long, and so there are many in single fractional life, when they most need their just rights in love. In this we refer more to females. Males are vastly more addicted to “solitary vice.” A physician who has just published a book on the “Physiology of Marriage,” testifies that this vice is on the increase, and that it is worse for the race than “fornification.”

Civilization has never yet dreamed—aloud, at least—of any thing like a successful remedy for all, or for any of these evils, and yet she is in convulsions of fear, if any man proposes a radical change, lest she should be plunged into something worse. Our friend Ballou is always in this state of mind. So is Mr. Greeley. We do not wonder at this. We sympathise with them to some extent. We have not referred to the real character of civilization, to reproach her, for she is our mother. But we insist, if she truly sees her disease, and knows of no available remedy, she should be more lenient with her children, who may think they have found, and are determined to apply one. Still her very disease creates her fear, but we cannot consult it. We have sounded the thing till we are sure there is no saviour in civilization for civilization. She has tried law and bonds. We leave her to try it still. We shall try gospel and freedom.

We respect the motives of some who oppose Free Love. Still a very large class of those who make the greatest opposition act from unworthy motives—from an unwillingness to give up their household gods. These prefer the law, as they are afraid to trust their sexual interests in a state of absolute freedom of woman. These are “wiser than the children of seemingly more light,” and see and know that the real principles of Free Love will bring no gratification to their abnormal flesh. Wo-

man will not then be compelled to meet and surfeit the demand of lust, at the cost of life, as she now is. We do not intend to fully discuss, or reply to all the fears of the ill consequences of our views. We think we say enough to help every enlightened reader out of his fears. We give him the key. If that does not suffice, we must again refer him to Messrs. Noys, Andrews, and Nichols.

Reader, we did not take our pen with a first desire to hasten the downfall of the institution of exclusive marriage, even in its lowest and law phases. much less in its highest spiritual developments. We are not conscious of harboring any ill will towards it. We have felt the power of its persecuting arm, but we have long since out-rode its iron sway, and thoroughly forgiven it. We judge no man for his connubial order. We encroach upon no man's marriage rights, nor will we suffer another to judge, or trespass upon our freedom. To our own master we stand or fall. We go at our own cost, and we allow all others to do the same. We respect every man in living to his clearest and highest light, be that light more or less. We feel but little more than sympathy for the many monsters of amative perversion among our own sex. We wish them no harm—but much good.

We did take the pen to illustrate and defend the principles of freedom in love, in and for those who choose it, and to weaken the despotic power and persecuting spirit of the marriage institution.

CHAPTER VIII.

REVIEW OF MR. WRIGHT CONTINUED.

WE return to Mr. Wright's book. "The ideal of love and marriage, in every young heart, is with one, never with more than one. Social discord and wrong may introduce other notions, but I understand a deep signification in the old story that for Adam there was but one Eve created."

Whether the statement be true or false, that the first development of any young mind towards conjugal love is to one, is comparatively of no importance. The mind, in developing to any new thought or feeling towards woman, may generally be so enlarged, while it is on some person in whom there is some thing to create, or call forth such thoughts and feelings. Besides, by precept and example, every person from his earliest thoughts of marriage love, is made to understand that his only chance of honorable participation, is with one, and only one. However general his entire love may be, he knows well, as he develops to the normal desires and calls of manhood, that he must remain in his fractional state, or more or less call in his scattering and free loves, and concentrate them on one. And he certainly may as well do this, for if he long delays, all corresponding loves, one after another, will be leaving him from a like necessity on the part

of others. Exclusive marriage, by her process of sexual draining, absorbs to itself almost the entire love atmosphere, and so leaves all who from necessity or otherwise remain out of her bonds, in a state of double starvation. In this way she has had power to compel compliance to her rule and order.

In our day, it is wiser for most men and women to submit, or choose what to them may be the least of two evils. But who, from all of these causes, knows the power of mind over mind, in the dualizing and concentrations of love or the power of habit in leading to it? Mr. Wright would appreciate the full force of all these influences if brought to bear on his side of the controversy.

Mr. Wright is the last man whom we should have supposed would have referred for his support, to the mythological "story" of Adam and Eve. We are glad of it. A little while ago, it was a first argument in the minds of nine-tenths of the sticklers for dual marriage. Admitting this "story" taught just what Mr. W. wishes to draw from it, it is going back six thousand years for the testimony of men as to marriage. What would any reformer think of a man who should go back so far to settle the order of society in other respects? Mr. W. would pronounce such a man beside himself. He knows very well what he would think, if I were to cite him back to feudalism, back to savagism, for arguments to defend any moral question! Mr. W. so we think

of you in this case ! Even this would be less than half way back to his supposed dual pair. Truth is never so straightened for foreign aid.

But admitting every word of Genesis to be a literal and truthful revelation from God, it does not help the friends of exclusive marriage. Every argument which Mr. Wright could bring from it, would be equally good in favor of an entire dual hermitage. Adam was as fully shut up by that dual Providence of his creation, to one woman socially, adhesively, as he was connubially. So of Eve to Adam. Each were shut up to one person. How long will real reformers—for in some respects Mr. W. is one—make it necessary for us to waste ink, pen, and time, in reply to such shallow and sophistical inferences as this ? Can not so aged an institution do better than refer us to its gray hairs to command our respect ? We tell the reader that Mr. Wright will never allude, in this manner, to “Adam and Eve,” in a public discussion with an opponent of good common sense. He is too wise and too shrewd to risk himself in such a position.

* * * “Is the marriage tie capable of extension ? If a man finds in half a dozen women equally powerful attractions to marriage ; if each exercises an equally deep, vitalising, elevating influence on his life ; if the union with each one would be enough to bless his life, were all the others exterminated, then he has a right, if all equally desire it, to be the

husband of them all! But what does experience prove in this matter? The case is not even supposable. It is absurd in the statement."

Mr. Wright here fairly puts the question. "Is the marriage tie, (connubial love,) capable of extension?" But his reply to it here is superficial, and to us it seems evasive. Again, we say, admitting every word of his answer to his own question, it does not prove anything in support of his exclusive marriage. If true, it reveals an undeveloped state of mind. Let those who covet a state of mind which would be entirely satisfied with the one, "were all the others exterminated," pray for it. We respectfully dissent from such a sentiment, and from such an experience. We ask no alliance to one who is capable of being so filled by and absorbed in us. We leave with Mr. Wright the entire glory, chastity and purity of such marriages. Our opponents need never be jealous of us. We have no attractions towards so confined an atmosphere.

It is not true that a man may not feel an equally strong connubial regard for more than one. It is not uncommon for some of the most spiritually developed minds, to find it difficult to select between two or more. The idea is entirely possible in nature. But the mandates of society must be obeyed—the selection must be made. One may be received; the other must be cast off. Mr. Wright, to do justice to his side of the subject, should give his philosoph-

ical reasons for confining amativeness and not adhesiveness, as both may and do generally have their preferences.

“The sentiment of love finds satisfaction in one object. The passional element, which borrows the holy name of love, may crave a wider range. When men say they need a variety, they say, in other words, that in them, the passion has the ascendancy over the sentiment. The man in whom the need exists, should not take the high social rank implied by the desire for true marriage, but descend to that level in creation wherein criminal passion makes no distinction in its objects, and finds equal satisfaction in them all. Men who advocate a “variety,” know that true, pure marriage-love cannot be felt to more than one; but they wish to find, in their various attractions to woman, a sanction for what were otherwise unqualified brutality.”

Reader, I almost owe an apology for the above extract. I thought it expedient. I have extolled Mr. Wright's book as a whole. In a few words, I will do justice to this phase of it. On coming to a close, on this subject, Mr. Wright attempts to fill up what has been wanting in sound, direct, and pertinent argument, by open-mouthed and foul slander of his opponents. In the unlimited and universal manner in which he has penned and left the above, it becomes aggravated falsehood. He, at least, ought to have “known” this. If any reader, who knows

something of the amount of falsehood in it, can give him even the apology of ignorance, he is bound in charity to do so. We confess to finding it difficult for us to do this. Again I say, I covet not that part of the head or heart which can so "descend to the level" of a lower manhood. His putting such slander into the mouth of his ideal lady, is not very tasteful; (so it stands in his book.) We will not give what would be a just retort, lest we seem to follow his example. The reader of his book will find some more like our last quotation, but we pass it. Had it emanated from a lower mind, and been disconnected with so much which was really good, I should not have thought of noticing it. Such slander will always injure the cause which it indirectly aims to upbuild; so we can afford to let it pass back to its own side of the house.

If the only possible condition of connubial purity and chastity is with one, and that the one eternal mate, as Mr. W. teaches, the world is necessarily in a deplorable condition, for it is naturally impossible for any man or any woman to be sure of finding and knowing that one, till far advanced in life. No person can know their mate till, or any farther than, they know themselves. A man cannot know his own nature and power faster than it develops in him. This, at the best, is only little by little; or gradually. Towards woman, he first develops to an all-absorbing love for the feminine. This may be to

some particular woman, in whom the feminine element manifests itself most in accordance with his ideal of woman. Perhaps his own spiritual and intellectual powers are yet comparatively in embryo; so these are secondary in their influence upon him. He marries on this plane of his development, and experiences great felicity and harmony. He feels his cup comparatively full, and "no room for more." So does his chosen one. In a little time, each begins to come forth in the more important features of their religious character. We will suppose this to be between twenty-five and thirty. Here they are not organized alike, and so, from necessity, they grow apart: no fault of theirs. One is conservative, the other reformatory. One looks religiously back, the other forward. We say, this is no fault of theirs. Again, from thirty to forty, each begins to really know his or her intellectual power. Here too they go apart. One has less, the other more: no fault of theirs. They still love; and perhaps have no less love, but one's cup is not now full, and they have not entire harmony. Perhaps one is now far from the equal of the other. Each may suffer more or less from this inequality. Neither complains of the other. We write here what we have more than once seen as an actual fact, and what we should have experienced in our person, if Providence had not in the first instance saved us from the act of actual marriage. Still we insist that marriage, in the case

described above, is not false, or against nature. Such a marriage is, so far as it goes, in harmony with nature, and is chaste, on its own plane. Yet such a couple could not live eternally in a first relation, each to the other. Nature leaves room for, as well as works her changes in such cases of unequal growth. She gives various degrees of divorce, but not always absolute and entire. She also has her degrees in marriage. And so far as any one keeps in harmony with her varied promptings, all is well. There need be, and there will be, no collisions.

Adhesiveness has her degrees of concentration, and her like changes. We are sure Mr. W. cannot fairly do away with the force of these suggestions. Mr. Davis agrees with us, in the main, as to the past.

I think Mr. Wright encourages sudden and vehement love attractions, by the power which he gives it over the entire mental and moral manhood. He represents its action as uncontrollable, and hardly leaves room for the real power of our free agency. But whatever may be the amount of truth in his statements, I must caution the inexperienced mind against an unnatural and sudden flow of abnormal attraction. We often see this rush of amateness, in its reactions from the equally unnatural restraints of law and bondage. I do not so much condemn as deplore it. Though, under the circumstances, it is not strange, its consequences are often very unfortu-

nate. Some very strong love attractions are far from being healthy. Reason should never fail to guide wisely and safely the soul's ship of love. Let me illustrate. A physician of the very first eminence, related to me the following case which came under his observation. "A man of refinement and standing in society, suddenly found himself 'in love' with a lady of equal refinement. The lady reciprocated his attachment, and they were soon, as is common in such cases, absorbed in this overpowering love." (Mr. Wright's book would most certainly justify its extreme power.) "The man had a wife. But she was a real believer in the doctrine of 'love over law,' and in 'obeying the latest connubial affinity.' She did not wish to hinder the testing of her husband's latest love, if the thing could be managed wisely in view of the tongues of out-siders. The man moved with his law wife, and his lady love to a place where they could manage their love relations, unharmed by society around them. In less than two months, this all-controlling love began to relax. It reacted to indifference, coldness, and a slight disgust, on both sides. All extreme regard ceased. Of course, they were now in an awkward dilemma. But we must leave them here." After relating, in substance, the above, the Doctor said to me, "What do you think of it?" I said, "I think it a case of partial disease of the affections. It was an amative fever." "That is it,"

said he. "It begins, comes to its crisis, and ends in reaction, like disease."

When the system loses its equilibrium, when the blood rushes unnaturally from one part of the body to another, from head to heart, or from heart to head, we all consider it more or less disease. It is a real derangement of the physical man. So when nearly the whole life and action of our entire loves, social, moral, and intellectual, concentrate upon the connubial or amative, the affectional equilibrium is lost. The mind is unbalanced, and is incapable of judging or acting wisely. This is abnormal. Revivals almost always partake of the same religious disease, or abnormalism. We fully admit, that even this, in religion, or in connubial love, is sometimes better than stagnation—than moral and sexual death. But life and love are much better than either.

I have no doubt, but such cases of unbalanced love, as I have related above, will vastly increase for some years to come. The law bonds upon love are to be taken off; and men are not yet sufficiently developed, and wise in experience, to use their freedom without much wrong and suffering. But liberty will work its own cure. We rejoice in the assurance of a still larger amount of returning health. Men and women are too deeply involved in what Mr. Davis calls "extremism and inversionism," to regain their health, without a season of these

alternate chills and fever. These sudden and excited developments of love are called "falling in love." It often is "*falling* in love." It is better, in every step of our progress, to *rise* in love.

A leading feature in Mr. Wright and Mr. Ballou is an expression of abhorrence of any deviation from one in love; or of not receiving the entire love and worship of the mate. This sort of, to us, sickly sentiment, always occupies more space than any sort of argument. While we have the most entire respect for those who, for good reasons, live to their exclusive bonds; we have none for this narrow and belittling feeling which these writers so boastingly hold in the fore-ground.

Mr. Wright urges the necessity of striving, by careful cultivation, to perpetuate love. This is good instruction to the undeveloped; for whom he wrote. But those who are actually developed to their higher plane of connubial love, have nothing to watch or to strive for. Such love, in entire spontaneity, will protect itself. All on that plane are beyond any possible thought of jealousy, distrust, or fear, as to the present integrity, or as to the future, of a mate.

Marriage makes one of two, and one of many. So much so, that either fraction in the one will as soon be jealous of him or herself, as to have the same feeling towards any other person in the unit. "*Perfect love casts out all fear*" and restless anxieties. Each loves the other, through and through,

as him or herself. Yet in this state, each person in the two, or in the many, lives his or her entire individuality. No one is owned by or owns another. Each is his and her own; and each knows how to live his individuality, so as not to harm another. Dear reader, all of this is possible. Perhaps not possible for children, but possible for real adults. There is a lack of spontaneity in Mr. Wright's love marriages. So does each lose much in individuality. But more of this when we come to Mr. Davis.

CHAPTER IX.

ANDREW JACKSON DAVIS — GENERAL REMARKS — QUOTATIONS FROM HIS BOOK.

A. J. DAVIS, as a Clairvoyant Medium, is the miracle of the age. We think him, in some sense, justly entitled to the appellation of "head," as a teacher of the Harmonial Philosophy. We say, as a teacher, for, with Paul, we make a distinction between a teacher and a father, and we do not consider him the latter. The mass of spiritualism which has since flooded us with its intellectual and moral blessings, and also with its fanaticisms, has produced nothing like him, as a whole. Several minds in this and in the other sphere, have successfully criticised

some parts of his works. Many of his moral writings are like prophecy, far in advance of his own actual moral elevation. Perhaps this is true, in a degree, of all reformers. Mr. Davis, as a teacher, occupies a field of vast extent, and of overwhelming importance. Through him, wisdom is uttering her voice to the sons of men. He now writes directly to, and for, a large class of minds. Many of these minds, though of reformatory blood, are not yet past the star-light of harmonial truth. If there was a Divine wisdom in the thing signified, by the "vail" over the face of Moses, when giving the Law to the Jews,—and I believe there was,—a like wisdom, for like reasons, may hide from our seer and teacher some of the higher freedom of the more glorious future, by its spiritual veil. Mr. Davis, evidently to us, does "not see to the end" of some of the law phases, which still linger in the infancy of his harmonial philosophy. As a believer in a wise and holy expediency, we cannot complain of Mr. D.'s spirit teachers for this ;—and they may be alike untaught. We in no way find fault with the Providence. Even the ancient Jesus found it necessary to leave the world without revealing all of his highest perceptions of truth to his dearest and best beloved disciples ;—much less to the world in general. They—the disciples,—could "not bear it." Moses, Jesus, and every reformer since, were likely to be the best judges, each for himself in this matter. We only

wish to see all highly inspired minds so write as not to cross the track of the future, and come directly in collision with it. But we waive this desire or seeming objection.

We love Mr. Davis. From a partial diversity in our mental "temperament," he is not our first masculine mental love. But no other man living ever instructed us as much as he. We have been taught much higher moral or spiritual truths by another. We reverence A. J. Davis as a teacher.

We now approach no written testimony with more reverence than we do his. We love and respect his guiding angels. But God has created in all of us our own separate individuality. He will never recall it;—I speak reverently. Nor should we ever yield the first iota of it to any being below Him. When Mr. Davis writes to my understanding, new and important truths, I most thankfully receive them. When he, or any other mind, writes what I cannot understand, I leave it, but with care not to oppose it. But when he opposes what I know to be truth, I have no fear to review and criticise him. The reader will bear with my confidence. Such an assurance is not necessarily dogmatism. Every man knows some things. I, too, am a medium of over twenty year's steady growth; and not only write in harmony with a legion of angels, but I write what I am identified with, by having traveled all the way to it. I am responsible to the world for

my book ; yet I have leave of my guiding angels to invite Mr. Davis and his guiding angels to a full discussion of the point of difference between us, in the presence of the men of earth, and the men of the spheres. I, and we, most respectfully challenge him and them to the discussion. And we add, if this challenge shall be taken no notice of, without other reasons, we shall not accuse these opponents of cowardice, or of other unworthy motives. We take our position in this, but judge no other man's or angel's duty or privilege.

Mr. Davis' book on *Marriage* has instructed us. He goes deeper into the philosophy of mind, and is much more liberal, on the whole, than Mr. Wright. It no less elevates love. Mr. Wright's book was comparatively more from his *heart*. Mr. Davis' was more from his *head*,—but from the upper and *wisdom* part of it. In Mr. Davis, there is little less in amount or volume of the magnetism of love, and vastly more in wisdom—in higher truth. Mr. Davis has his “*seven phases of marriage*,” and contends for the naturalness of these various forms—bigamy, polygamy, and omnigamy,—on the several lower planes of the mind ; and so he is almost entirely free from the bigotry and intolerance of the past and present. Such a spirit in a writer on so sensitive a theme, is most lovely, and entirely beyond this age. Mr. Davis testifies that on the harmonial plane, monogamy, or one man with one woman, is the only

possible marriage. In his reply to Dr. Nichols he argues against a "variety." He repeats his "everlasting gratitude to Mr. Wright for the exclusive feature of his book ; and, like him, confounds ancient and modern polygamy with modern Free Love. He entirely ignores the true and elevating principles of the latter, and associates it, sometimes with partly the same form, and sometimes with the monopoly of polygamy, which is a different form, but always with the undeveloped and sexual relations of the long past, or of the far back to a rude age. Whether this is from the deepest ignorance of the whole subject or otherwise, I leave for the reader to judge. Mr. Davis knows that the monogamic, as well as the omnigamic form extend back alike into the past. And the "pot" of the past cannot successfully slander the "kettle" of the same past, in relation to its color. We have never charged exclusive dual marriage, as such, of sensualism ; nor will our opponents successfully fasten the latter to the car of Free Love, as such. The effort is most inglorious. I did not expect it from Mr. Davis. The most charitable conclusion possible to put upon all this is, that it is the fruit of ignorance. We have felt no disposition to summon up the dead past to directly help our cause, or to wound our opponents ; though we might have just as truthfully done so. All forms of love have been more or less drunk with sensualism in the past. Mr. Davis tells us this was more

natural in the infancy of the race. So I believe: Mr. Wright goes back six thousand years to find a pair to support his dual order. Mr. Davis would send Free Love back to degrade it. (I do not say this was his motive.) I am taking it for granted, that the reader has seen Mr. Davis' book. We shall be to it soon. Gentlemen, we decline the journey for either object. We disapproved of this in Mr. Wright; and we have no need to go back for our support. Mind is with us, and we can read it, but if Free Love has so great an antiquity as Mr. D. gives it, we respectfully ask all who have a peculiar respect for ancient institutions, to let this have its proper weight in our favor. This is entirely fair. We prophecy that the time is not far distant when such men as Mr. Davis and Mr. Wright will be compelled to see a distinction between our philosophy of sexual freedom, and that of the past or present sensual freedom,—or more correctly, sensual bondage,—as we see and confess the vast distance between their exclusive marriage, and the general marriage of the present, and nearly the entire past. We do them justice, as they do not us.

The reader will find our first extract on page 297 of Mr. Davis' book. We think this the most appropriate, and the nearest related to our subject and argument of anything in the book.

"I have shown," says Mr. Davis, "that man's love-department is divided into six separate actuating

life-principles, each having its own independent mode of being and doing. Each has an attraction of its own, and therefore seeks a separate gratification. From these six loves there emanates six atmospheres. Each atmosphere is composed of differently *shaped* atoms, having, consequently, different affinities and manifestations. But the six emanations, nevertheless, commingle and blend into *one* atmosphere, which then environs the individual as the air surrounds the earth.

“This aromal sphere of the soul is what sensitive natures feel on the approach of different persons; realising an *attraction* or *repulsion*—being affected pleasurably or otherwise, without perceiving a palpable cause. This atmosphere is what a dog smells in his master’s path.

“Each love has also a different-*colored* atmosphere; this fact in connection with the different *shaped* atoms, constitutes and makes the individuality.

“And each love gravitates to its kind. The particles composing self-love are *angular*; hence you can feel the nettles of selfishness. Parental love is composed of more *spherical* atoms; hence children and horses, cats and dogs, feel the presence of its atmosphere. Animals are readily domesticated under the influence of this love.

“Strangers can feel the aroma of fraternal love; its atmosphere is finer and its particles more smooth and penetrative.

"And you can feel, in certain persons, the character of the conjugal love; whether it be on the subordinate scale, or elevated to the higher phases. Its particles are *gross* or *refined* in *shape* and *color* in accord with its intrinsic growth. *Self-love* is, in everything, a *bigamist*; it invariably asks for two pieces, a common expression of selfishness.

"*Parental love* is a *polygamist*; it calls for plurality of pets or productions. Its attractions lean towards many children; and embraces many even more rapturously than one. If children are not desired by all, it is mainly owing to external circumstances.

"*Fraternal, filial and universal loves* are by nature omnigamic in their affinities. They love a countless variety of objects and subjects. In their rapturous and ever-widening sympathies, they encircle millions at once. It will be a glorious era, and exceedingly peaceful, when these "loves" can have a practical development.

"But conjugal love, the marriage principle, when in its juvenile or adolescent stages, includes all the preceeding forms; it is a *bigamist*, a *polygamist*, an *omnigamist*, and is unsteady; but with maturity and with civility of development comes the power to love but ONE counterpart. And when thus developed, the atoms of conjugal love are spirally shaped; the female interlocking with the male atmosphere; each flowing into the other's being."

The above, we understand to be Mr. Davis' clair-

voyant testimony. To us, it contains some of the deepest and most clear mental philosophy which we have ever seen in print; and also some which we think complex, uncertain and erroneous. The entire distinctness and individuality of each faculty, and also their union and harmony, the various shaped and colored atmospheres, all commends itself to our understanding. All of this is very beautiful. It is a real jewel. That these loves in their individuality, are one a "bigamist," one a "polygamist," and three "omnigamist," while the sixth, the sexual, passes through, in its growth, all of these phases, up to, or down to the monogamist, is more doubtful. We do not like to take the room to give our entire objections to some part of it. Why could he not have informed us whether any other faculty changes its form in progression? This is left entirely in the dark for so important a subject. But the question is, what are they, each and all, when acting in the highest state of union and harmony? For they are one, as well as many. Conjugal love grows and develops to the "power to love but one counterpart." "And when thus developed, the atoms of" this "love are spirally shaped."

Now this is a tremendous proposition. This is the hinge on which civilization turns. It should not have been passed so slightly—no argument—no proof—but testimony only. We have testified that this love will develop to an ability to love *more*

than one, and we have argued to prove it. But we are glad of so much from Mr. Davis. It seems that sexual love has been right in the past, in its free loves. It was acting to its nature. Children should not act like men. This is quite a step gained.

Progression generally brings enlargement and an increase of power. But we find connubial love contracting in progression, decreasing in breadth and extent of power, as it advances. How remarkable that every man, as he attempts to defend exclusive marriage, reverses the order of every natural law, and never gives a substantial reason for so doing. They seldom give us any reason. Mr. Davis, do other loves change their form by progression? If so, in what direction? Do they contract and centralise, or do they expand and enlarge? We are inquirers and learners. As Mr. D. said nothing of their change, we will conclude they do not: we mean, of course, in form of manifestation. We have no evidence of this change in amateness, in its separate individuality. We admit, that as progression brings a relative change between it and other faculties, so its action may to the same extent change. Admitting the "shape" of the connubial atmosphere does change, how does this hinder its fitting all alike progressed opposites? Does Mr. D. mean to teach us that this atmosphere is so concentrated upon, so confined to, the one, that it has no power to get a release, and so stray elsewhere. We

do not believe in any permanent release or suspension. But we insist, that "to divide is not to take away." We do not withdraw our adhesive love from one in order to love another. No more do we the connubial. Mr. Davis, like others of his faith, does not marry, exclusively marry, all of the connubial atmosphere. He allows some part of it to act in harmony with the laws of the higher loves—with the "universal loves." As a comparatively high mental philosopher, we call him back to this subject. His work is hardly begun. He is bound, on every principle of justice, to give us at least some clue to the law which separates this faculty, and frees a part and confines a part. Show us why some part, (we do not know what part—the distinction is his, and his friends, not ours,) can be non-exclusive, and other parts cannot be. As he has failed to give us any clue to this, we go in search of proof, but we fail to find it. If we take the outer man as an index of the inner, we are not relieved. We see nothing more incompatible in this sense with the omnigamic form in coitionary love, than in any other, any higher. Mr. D. would and does virtually admit this. We insist, then, that we have a right to call for proof.

At first, our opponents, like Mr. Ballou, contended that always and everywhere, every act of variety was, *per se*, "more or less adulterous." Long since many of these have arrived nearly to Mr. D.'s

position, that various orders might have been right in the past, and possibly to some extent in the present. But these now contend lustily that "any how, they know the exclusively dual is the highest, and the final of connubial love." On the whole, this is a real gain in the right direction. We took our pen to rout them from this last stand point, and we are sanguine of final success. Here is their last breast-work, and here will come the death-struggle of exclusiveness. Mr. Davis, a noble and an honorable leader, has taken his position in this gap. We hope and believe he will never surrender this post, while he has any philosophical ammunition left to defend it. We court the discussion of this last question. What is the highest order of connubial love? This book contains our argumentative reply to the question. Will our opponents give us as thorough and as direct a defence of their position, if the thing is possible.

Mr. Davis defines marriage to be "the union of the essence of two atoms." We add, the union of two or more atoms. There is a duality in marriage; it is between the two sides—the male and the female atmospheres. I have no doubt but that Mr. D. sees this duality. He sees a healthful harmony in the joining of the two—a man and a woman. We see a still greater harmony in the marriage of many.

Even much of the higher harmony of marriage, which he does teach, or foretell, he carries to the

other sphere for its practical realization. Yet all of it, and more will be experienced here, and on this earth. Like Paul in his "third heavens," and Swedenborg in his "celestial spheres," he sees things there, which are but clairvoyant views of things to come, and to be enjoyed here. He sets untruthful bounds to the present, and coming attainments on our earth.

"Repulsion," I believe, is considered by Mr. D., as a *negative*, or a less attraction, and designed to regulate the various degrees of attraction. At least, this is our view. And should we admit that those on a widely different plane may never be so far attracted to each other, as to desire and normally enjoy all of the rights of connubial love; it is still true that those on the same plane, and of "like-temperament," may. Such cannot in freedom, be entirely exclusive. That which joins them to one, will join to all on the same plain, and of the same "temperament." The ability to appreciate the one, gives the ability to appreciate all others on the same plain and of the same temperament.

Mr. Davis teaches us that the best we can do at present, in seeking a connubial mate, is, if possible, to reach the "spiritual plane," and see that the "central temperaments" meet in harmony. Then by effort, and a careful culture, all others, or any less degree of repulsion; can be brought into submission, and perhaps at last into love, and so render

the union eternal. If these repulsions are healthy and normal, this course, so far destroys spontaneity; and, like Mr. Wright, he, in this manner, detracts from individuality, for the sake of unity. If these repulsions are unhealthy, we give the same advice, and add more to it. We advise all to at least overcome these little repulsions, so far as they are abnormal, between all on the same plane. But never, in any case, or for any reason, to suppress or oppress a healthy repulsion. Free Love neither requires nor allows any such sacrifice. It leaves unabridged the most perfect spontaneity and individuality. The centrifugal force is as important as the centripetal, and we would leave all natural forces alike free in matter or in mind.

Yet we insist even here, that, as benevolence can do every other act of utility in harmony with its general law of justice and mercy, over these lesser repulsions, without harming them, so the same is true, to some extent, on this subject. There are various good motives which may wisely lead to the ultimates of love. A degree of need, mutual and normal enjoyment, and the creation of offspring, are among them. In the first and second cases, at least, if the two do not mix atmospheres any farther than they harmonize, no harm is done. This is sometimes possible. Not always. As I shall not take the room to prove this last proposition, the reader can take or leave it as it seems to be truth or otherwise to him.

I am sure Mr. Davis will not tell us that God ever made two persons of the opposite sex, who were entire attraction, and no repulsion. Then nature never perfectly married two. But nature may, and probably does, create a perfect fitness for each and for all in the race; then why not let each find that supply in the race? Why try to improve upon his works? Why not allow a perfect spontaniety, and not warp each individuality for the sake of unity? Why not allow the race to progress to a higher and more perfect harmony, in a perfect spontaniety? Why marry any man, real man, harmonial man, one iota beyond his normal and spontaneous attractions? Why labor to assimilate the one to the other more than is strictly natural? Let each and every person differ from me eternally, so far as they were made to differ. Universal love will harmonize and supply all. I shall find every phase of marriage somewhere, and every mental, moral and material want supplied. I have no right to ask or expect a perfect "rest" in any one woman, but I have such a right in the race—in woman. So I give myself to woman. If I find much more "rest" in some one woman, than in any other—and this is natural—I may and should take and enjoy it.

On page 411, Mr. Davis comes directly to the question of a "variety" in love. But he does this in reply to Dr. Nichols. For two reasons, I think it unnecessary for me to quote much, or write much in reviewing it.

First, I see from "Nichols' Journal" of last month, that the Dr. has replied to him in a later edition of his work on marriage. Second, Mr. Davis resolves the question of a variety in love, into the question of the "fickleness, unsteadiness," or otherwise, of love. On this, I certainly have no controversy with Mr. Davis. I doubt whether Dr. Nichols has. We all admit that love, in an undeveloped state, is sometimes fickle. I am sure it will not be so in true harmony. Mark, I only contend that we may love more than one. I think I do not favor divorce, in the present state of the world, as much as Mr. Davis or Mr. Wright. They allow a variety by a succession of persons; I more by a succession of acts, but without "putting away." I do not like "putting away." It often partakes of a much greater degree of injustice than entire exclusiveness. Nature does not often, after forming or permitting so entire a union, absolutely and entirely put away. As a fact, I never advised the separation of man and wife. Perhaps, in a few cases, more wisdom might have lead me to do this. On the whole, I do not generally approve of too violently disturbing past and present relations, to get to the better which we may justly hold in promise. Sometimes it may be wise.

Mr. Davis asks: "Does not every well developed person obey the law of harmony? What is harmony but the unity of variety—that is the centralization of diversity?" I only reply, a variety in harmony,

is consistent with the action of every love of the mind. Connubial love "centralises" on woman. He adds; "Every love, as I have hitherto affirmed, is monogamic: I speak now of the regulated soul. When the soul finds that occupation which meets its attractions, it does not wish to be divorced therefrom, but steadily loves and labors onward." I fully agree with this sentiment, as I understand him here in the use of the word "monogamic." In my reply to Mr. Ballou, I said that every faculty was, in one sense, confined to one desire—one object. But man, in this "regulated" state, finds this one desire—one object, met in many persons. Even benevolence has but one desire—it desires but one object; still it takes a universe to supply material for its gratification.

"Alimentiveness" has but "*one* desire," but it takes a variety of articles, and a variety of diverse mixtures to fully supply it. "But presently comes a fatigue, a thought of monotony, a longing for novelty," in exclusive monogamic marriage. "Well, have true lovers no other resources? Let me think.
* * * * Society is accessible—friends are to be visited and entertained, the imperative demands of the remaining five affections are to be considered, and to all these varieties may be added an endless programme of pleasurable efforts and realizable aspirations for the world's advancement."

Mr. Davis has here totally annihilated his entire

argument, if he meant it as an argument, from the monogamic nature of all the loves. Because, if that monogamic law confines connubial love to one person, it alike confines every love to one person. So all of this "society," and these many "friends," are licentious. That law, so carried out, would take all, like the mythological Adam and Eve, into a dual hermitage.

Mr. Davis expresses his opinion of our views somewhat freely, but we pass it. "Can there be freedom in error?" No, never. "The truth shall make you free." Yes, always. But we ask our opponent, what is truth? Where is the truth on this subject? and we take our present leave of his slight argument, (we are not sure that he really meant it as an argument,) by inviting him back to the subject.

Mr. Davis refers to the testimony of Swedenborg, as to the dual marriages of heaven; and relates a particular case of great glory, resplendent beauty, and comparative loveliness. Probably no testimony from the other spheres has gone past this. Jesus testified beyond it, but from what evidence, we do not know. In the nuptial pair which Swedenborg describes, much of their beauty, to him, was from their beautiful clothing. He writes much of the coverings, or apparel of angels, as well as of their marriages, and yet he barely drops the testimony, that "the innermost angels, go naked." (I quote from

memory.) I testify that there is no exclusive marriage or clothing in the higher or real heavens. All exclusiveness, and all veils are there taken away. Nature is too pure and too beautiful to need, or be marred, by covering. But we should have supposed that even if they were naked, they might have appeared in clothing to his sight. It would have been wise. Still we have no doubt but exclusive marriage and clothing may be common in Paradise, Purgatory and the Hells. I presume Swedenborg saw that loving couple, in what I should call Paradise—or some of the lower heavens. Paul saw, in vision, to the “third heavens,” but he thought it not expedient then to tell us what he saw there. The customs of heaven and of earth, on the same moral plane, will be nearly alike.

But there is another interesting view of this case, which may be suggested; as it is so appropriate a reply to Mr. Davis. Mr. Davis tells us in his book, that it was “visions of the *vulgar female* extremist” which “supplied Swedenborg with material for his infernal spheres.” We saw, twelve years ago, that the great seer’s description of the “celestial angels” of heaven, was nothing more than a truthful view of some of the celestial angels of our sphere. It did not exceed the truth of the moral or spiritual elevation of some minds of our mundane world. And we then thought it more than probable, that he was only relating “visions” of the future elevation of

progressed humanity on our globe. With this view, his relations of the glorious nuptials of heaven might have been simply a just tribute of prophesy of Mr. Wright's and Mr. Davis' Love marriage, and possibly the identical image of "Ernest and Nina" in our friend Wright's mind. But we have no need to resort to such an exposition, believing, as we do, that what exists here exists there.

Mr. Davis sees and foretells a coming war—"a bloodless war," on the subject of marriage: and yet in his position, he seems compelled to entirely ignore one of the first, if not the first, great and honorable champions in this war, John H. Noyes. We tell Mr. Davis, the hardest battle will come when and *where* men are required to relinquish their monopolizing grasp upon woman. When the man feels that the last vestige of what has more or less strengthened his ownership of sex, is giving way before the fires of coming truth, then and there we shall see a sensation which has not been equaled in modern times. Man, in the past, has rested upon deeds and marriage certificates for the protection of his lands and sexual claims. Our reformatory opponents require him to yield the *certificate* and some times to consent to a *change of possession*. This, as Mr. Davis foresees, he will oppose. But we shall only see the full strength of his opposition, when the demand comes home to him to unconditionally and forever yield his entire personal and exclusive grasp upon each

and every woman ; resting each year, month, day, hour, minute, of his coming future, upon his own inherent loveliness to attract and supply his coming wants. This is a condition which undeveloped mind is far from coveting ; but is ever ready to seek to avoid. Our non-exclusive principle, added to our entire and absolute freedom of woman, is what will "lay the axe into the root of the tree." If the past teaches us any lesson—and we think it does—it is that as man has progressed, this man-power over woman, with its monopoly of exclusive ownership, has become less and less. Polygamy is a sort of wholesale and one-sided sexual monopoly. Monogamy is an improvement in the right direction. Its monopolies are less, and it is more just to man and more reciprocal ; yet it is far from being entirely just, even on its own principles, to woman. The rich and the powerful have receded from many to one ; so far as they have lived to their covenant. Marriage, in her present *injustice*, is old in years, and strong in power. She seems to sit in comparative ease, and in her slumbers, as did slavery a few years since. But she sits upon a volcano of smothered and crushed affections, which will in a coming hour, break her slumbers and arouse her from her lethargy. The fires of a true and burning Love will yet burn up and consume, as they are fanned by the perpetual gales of truth, her exclusive and selfish conubiality. Their powers are at work, and nothing

can stay them. Everything will forward and hasten it. The more narrow minded and sexually selfish have always felt it keenly that they were not permitted to carry their exclusive system into heaven; but the prophesy of their religion had taught them not to hope for this. But when these lower minds—I speak what I know—see that another prophesy in the same book is to have a fulfilment—that the will of God is to be done on earth as it is done in heaven—as the higher angels do it—they will howl in their misery. Such minds do not, and can not at once enjoy the free spirit of angels. We should be glad of the assurance that the coming war would be entirely “bloodless.” Still we have no fear personally. Nor have we a thought of living to see the full consummation of all of which we speak. Progress is slow at the best; and doubtless it is well that it is so, on the whole. We tell the, as yet, undeveloped world, there is to be a mighty *change*. Now selfishness is the rule in everything. Benevolence is the exception. Progress will change all this. **BENEVOLENCE WILL ONE DAY BE THE RULE, AND SELFISHNESS THE EXCEPTION.** When man has fairly grown to his manhood, he will be nothing lower than this. The marriages of Mr. Wright and Mr. Davis are glorious, compared to the past, for they really and truly elevate love to the lower phases, or to the germ of spiritual and harmonial connubiality. But we prophesy that even these,

in the future, will have comparatively "no glory," by reason of the glory which will then so far exceed them. The fruition of a ripe, manly and womanly love will then comprehend and absorb all of the good in all below it; then, in connubial love, benevolence will be the rule, and selfishness will be the exception. I glory in the hope and assurance of such a day; and in living to hasten it. The formation of man's brain promises all of this, and it will not lie. Mental philosophy never lies. Progression will redeem its every pledge. Nothing is more sure. We come back to that "war"—as we hope "bloodless war." We agree with our opponents that it is coming. We, in entire respect and friendship, yet solemnly, put the question—when that war fairly comes, in all its intensity, and aims its most deadly blows against our non-exclusive principles, where will Mr. Wright and Mr. Davis be found? That hour will try the souls of reformers. We, in the commencement of this mental, and more than mental, stir, stand in defence of all, or nearly all, in which these opponents have parted from the principles of the past. Where will they be when the crisis more fully reaches our camp? I must repeat my interrogatory—will they then be found, on the whole, for, or against us? We aver that we are not anxious for ourselves, or for the cause which we identify, as to the practical answer which the future may give to these questions. Each in his

book, has classed us with the enemy. Will these men ever retract that folly? Double folly to the real cause which they seek to promote! I will not speak for Mr. Wright, but I think Mr. Davis, if he does not then directly favor free love, will be a mental and moral non-resistant towards it, and treat it with entire respect. We hope not to be disappointed. More, we hope he will yet rejoice, and feel "everlasting thanks" to a higher power, in the final fulness, as well as in the infancy, of his Harmonial philosophy.

We and our opponents alike contend for the absolute freedom of woman. This is well. Then it is right that she should be "allowed to choose the *father of her children.*" We here tell our opponents if she, *in freedom*, shall continue to do this, in strict harmony with their dual doctrines, *we* will never reproach or condemn her for it. Are *they* ready to meet us here, if in such freedom, she shall, to any extent, act in harmony with *our views*? We have a right, and do demand as much as this of them. We ask Mr. Wright in the name of every principle of justice and consistency, after having so nobly defended the rights of woman, to take off and keep off *his* hands from all women, and from man also. I honor the man or woman who, from an honest faith, or belief, lives to his or her dual pledge. I have no heart in me to reproach or slander such. We ask, and demand of our oppo-

nents, who *talk* freedom, to *feel and act* freedom—
allow freedom.

If we fail to make them understand our mental philosophy, we will then meet, and appeal to them to let *woman* be *free*; and we covenant with them to keep hands off—judgments and reproaches off—and we will abide by her practical decision. We can join issue here, if they and we really mean the *freedom* of *woman*. This is a good and fair test. We shall write our book as they have theirs, and then wait with entire trust to the developments of the future. Woman will have her freedom. Truth will grow and prosper, and that shall be our final arbiter.

APPENDIX.

WHILE we have been writing our book, New York city has been all astir with a volcano of Free Love. No not that: It was a volcano of exclusive marriage, touched off by a free love match. (See city papers about the 20th of October.) The Tribune reissued its bulls and pledged itself anew to the defence of the family. Other editors—from the greater to the less, even to the remote towns—caught the spirit of the times, and were on the alert; and alike renewed their vows of watchful care and kind regards to their old mistress. Seriously—what has happened to cause this alarm in the marriage institution? Has free love encroached upon her just and established rights? Has she clandestinely entered the sexual plantations of her neighbor, and enticed away his body slave-mate? No! There is no evidence of that. Has she taken the liberty to regulate her own domestic concerns to her own taste, regardless of what might be the incidental effect upon her old neighbor? We think not even that. She has spoken her mind of exclusive marriage, and recommended free love! She has talked about the

marriage institution. It will not do. Something must be done. The power of the law must be invoked. She must send the noble Brisbane to her city dungeon for a night, as a token of what she can and will do, if her wishes are not regarded! Shame on such despotism and cowardly persecutions in Protestantism! Shame on such inhumanity in the light of this age!

When an institution of so great age, and being in such an overwhelming majority, is so easily and carelessly set in such excited and angry motion, it is moral proof equal to a mathematical demonstration of her inherent weakness, and of her consciousness of it. It must be rotten at heart, and without a sure foundation. Like slavery, it quakes when touched! Yea, when even looked at! Mr. Greeley, Mr. Ballou and others, would know how to appreciate such reflections as these, if connected with any subject not in harmony with their faith. Our opponents see the full force of them, when they relate to slavery. Gentlemen, consistency is a jewel. If I were to find such a sensation on my side of the house, from comparatively so small a cause, even though our beloved is hardly through her teens, I should recommend its friends to look again, and overhaul the whole concern, to lay a deeper foundation for their superstructure. Mr. Greeley believes in the entire safety of truth in free discussion, when it relates to the institutions of his remote neighbors, but does he

really dare to trust it and himself here? Has he no fear of the consequences here? From his course with Mr. Andrews, and since, we think he has. Still, as he believes in a true expediency, he may have thought the people would not yet bear it. Perhaps not. We do not complain of him, but we do thank him for what he has ventured in this line.

I have not done with Mr. Greeley, I wish to record my sincere gratitude to him for the good he has done to the cause which I advocate, as also to every other radical reform, in preparing the way for it and them by his general efforts on the side of free discussion. Whatever may be his future course, I promise never to forget his past services. He has made his impress on the age, in favor of a degree of freedom. Like the colter to the plow, he has cut the sod. True, in all this he has never meant to advance free love; and as this child is being born, he would gladly slay it. He has just renewed his pledge to always pursue it, and if possible exterminate it. (I suppose the late pledge in the Tribune to be his. At least he stands in that position.) To the cause of the most radical reform, Mr. Greeley's name has been John (the baptist,) *now* it is Herod. Christ has come and John is no more needed. We think Herod is; but we have no fear that he can do his successor any real harm. We most sincerely pray that he may not do by what has been the John in himself, as the Herod of old did with the

baptist." As one who still loves him we have feared this.

Mr. Greeley is still really devoted to the spread and advancement of free love; never before half as much so as now. He has taken his position behind, in the rear of it, and by his opposition he will bring the whole power of his tremendous battery to drive it forward. The cause has able leaders enough, and Mr. Greeley has taken the best possible position which he could take, and the only one which he is now prepared to occupy. Here he will act with zeal. Reader, these were our reflections on reading the late pledge of perpetual opposition to our principles in the Tribune. As I turned from my pen to that paper for relaxation, I was encouraged and strengthened by that promise to oppose. I do not believe that a truthful opposition will ever advance error. But I do believe that an untruthful opposition will always advance truth.

[The author would say to the reader that from unavoidable hindrances, this small work has been delayed over a year since it was ready for the press.]

ETERNAL JUSTICE.

BY CHARLES MACKAY.

The man is thought a knave or fool,
Or bigot, plotting crime,
Who for advancement of his kind
Is wiser than his time.
For him the hemlock shall distill ;
For him the axe be bared ;
For him the gibbet shall be built ;
For him the stake prepared ;
Him shall the scorn and wrath of men
Pursue with deadly aim ;
And malice, envy, spite, and lies,
Shall desecrate his name.
But truth shall conquer at the last :
For round and round we run,
And ever the right comes uppermost,
And ever is justice done.

Pace through thy cell, old Socrates,
Cheerily to and fro ;
Trust to the impulse of thy soul,
And let the poison flow.
They may shatter to earth the lamp of clay
That holds the light divine,
But they cannot quench the fire of thought
By any such deadly wine ;
They cannot blot thy spoken words
From the memory of man,
By all the poison ever was bruised
Since Time his course began.
To-day abhorred, to-morrow adored,
So round and round we run,
And ever the truth comes uppermost,
And ever is justice done.

Plot in thy cave, gray anchorite,
Be wiser than thy peers ;
Augment the range of human power,
And trust to coming years.
They may call thee wizard and monk accursed,
And load thee with dispraise ;

Thou wert born five hundred years too soon
 For the comfort of thy days.
 But not too soon for human kind—
 Time hath reward in store;
 And the demons of our stories become
 The saints that we adore.
 The blind can see, the slave is lord;
 So round and round we run,
 And ever the wrong is proved to be wrong,
 And ever justice is done.

Keep, Galileo, to thy thought,
 And nerve thy soul to bear;
 They may gloat o'er the senseless words they wring
 From the pangs of thy despair;
 They may veil their eyes, but they cannot hide
 The sun's meridian glow;
 The heel of a priest may tread thee down,
 And a tyrant work thee woe;
 But never a truth has been destroyed:
 They may curse and call it crime;
 Pervert and betray, or slander and slay
 Its teachers for a time.
 But the sunshine aye will light the sky,
 As round and round we run,
 And truth shall ever come uppermost,
 And justice shall be done.

And live there now such men as these—
 With thoughts like the great of old?
 Many have died in their misery,
 And left their thought untold;
 And many live, and are ranked as mad,
 And are placed in the cold world's ban,
 For sending their bright, far-seeing souls
 Three centuries in the van;
 They toil in penury and grief;
 Unknown, if not maligned;
 Forlorn, forlorn, bearing the scorn
 Of the meanest of mankind.
 But yet the world goes round and round,
 And the genial seasons run,
 And ever the truth comes uppermost,
 And ever is justice done.